

**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:

**Rusland tilbyder aftale om
nuklear oparbejdning til
Tyskland;
russisk-tysk forum om
råmaterialer afholdt i
Düsseldorf**

25. nov., 2016 – På det Russisk-tyske Forum for Råmaterialer i Düsseldorf i går, præsenterede Valery Jazev, præsident for mineindustriens entreprenører, Tomsk-specialforskningsprogrammet for en oparbejdningsreaktor, der

skal oparbejde brugt atombrændsel. Målet er at udvikle en reaktor til kommerciel brug, der kan oparbejde fra alle former for brugt atombrændsel og radioaktivt materiale.

Tomsk-projektet involverer, forklarede Jasev, arbejde på udviklingen af radioaktive materialer til medicinsk brug, så vel som også mærkning af materialer til industribrug. Jasev sagde, at Rusland er forud for alle andre nationer inden for denne sektor, med et 10-15 år langt forskningsforspring, og at Rusland om nogle få år vil være i besiddelse af en profitabel teknologi til global eksport. Rusland kunne også tilbyde denne teknologi til at oparbejde brugt atommateriale fra Tyskland, som vil få brug for en sådan teknologi, når de i 2022 afslutter anvendelse af atomkraft. Dette kunne betyde et vigtigt russisk bidrag til et energipartnerskab med Tyskland.

Fremtrædende tyskere ved samme begivenhed, f.eks. Klaus Töpfer og vicekansler Sigmar Gabriel, valgte imidlertid ikke at tage imod tilbuddet, men førte i stedet en masse nonsenssnak om »andre synspunkter, som naturligvis må tages i betragtning« og i øvrigt insisterede på den tyske regerings vanvittige strategi for fornybar energi. Dette inkluderer Gabriels synspunkter om retningen af »moderniseringspartnerskabet« med Rusland, nemlig reduceringen af CO2-udslip. Ildevarslende, at Gabriel præsenterede dette som et område for samarbejde uden for sanktioneerne.

**Den udnævnte, nye FN-
generalsekretær afholder**

hjerteligt møde med præsident Putin

25. nov., 2016 – I går mødtes Antonio Guterres, den udnævnte generalsekretær for FN (tiltræder 1. januar 2017), med Vladimir Putin i Moskva. De to havde mødtes ved tidligere lejligheder, inklusive, da Guterres var Portugals premierminister, i 2000, og da han var FN's flygtningehøjkommissær, og Guterres genkaldte sig, at de to havde haft »vigtige, konstruktive og effektive relationer«, som Kremls webside rapporterer.

Putin understregede, at Rusland altid har støttet en styrkelse af FN's »ledende og centrale rolle i internationale anliggender, i konfliktløsning og i kampen for menneskerettigheder«.

Da han talte til reportere forud for mødet, roste Ruslands FN-ambassadør Vitaly Churkin Guterres' professionelle og personlige egenskaber og beskrev ham som én, der »kender hele FN-systemet og ved, hvad han ønsker at opnå«.

I sine bemærkninger til præsident Putin understregede Guterres, at »vi lever i en verden med multiple trusler fra de mangedoblede, nye konflikter ... Jeg er en stærk tilhænger af, at globale problemer kun kan løses globalt, at det ikke er muligt, at en ensidig fremgangsmåde kan løse dem, og jeg er en stærk tilhænger af den mangesidige rolles betydning«. Han understregede den Russiske Føderations »afgørende« rolle, »ikke alene i FN, men i alle aspekter af internationale relationer, og jeg ville sige, at en absolut fundamental betingelse for, at jeg kan være i stand til at være til nytte for det internationale samfund, er at kunne have en meget konstruktiv og positiv dialog og relation med den Russiske Føderation«.

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


LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 25. november, 2016


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

der betragtede Xi Jinpings besøg som den mest betydningsfulde begivenhed, der nogen sinde havde fundet sted i Ecuadors historie, baseret på det potentiale, som dette tilbød denne nation.

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

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

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

om tjenesteydelser på over 33 % i løbet af blot ét år langs Bæltet og Vejen; Kinas Eksport/Importbank har udestående engagementer i flere end 1000 projekter og har for ganske nylig underskrevet aftaler om omkring 500 nye projekter i nationerne langs Bæltet og Vejen. Kina er i færd med at  udbygge 150.000 stipendier, som tilbyder uddannelse til 500.000 eksperter til uddannelse i Kina; har etableret 500 Konfucius-institutter i hele verden; har initieret flere end et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

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

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

Jeg vil nu bede Jeff Steinberg om at fylde verdensbilledet ud og forklare vore seere, hvilke flanker, hvilke håndtag, hvilke

vægtstænger vi har for at ændre USA's politik på dette tidspunkt?

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

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

mødes med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping. Jeg mener, at Lozansky-Jatrus-ideen om et trilateralt møde ville være ekstraordinært værdifuldt. Det er vigtigt at huske på, at, i 1944, var det præsident Franklin Roosevelts kurs i sine handlinger for at etablere De forenede Nationer – hvilket skete i 1945 – at inkludere både Sovjetunionen og Kina i FN's Sikkerhedsråds fem permanente nationer. Husk på, at Roosevelt forstod, at der var imperiepolitikker, der stadig var kernen i Det britiske Imperium med Churchill, og på lignende måde med Frankrig. Så ideen med at have Rusland – dengang Sovjetunionen – og Kina i dette permanente Sikkerhedsråds kernegruppe, reflekterede den kendsgerning, at Roosevelt dengang så udsigten til denne form for et alliancesystem hen over Eurasien. Jeg mener, at der er en historisk baggrund, for netop denne form for russisk-kinesiske samarbejde, at se hen til her. I de seneste 15 år har det været en hjørnesteen i Lyndon LaRouches globale politik med et USA-Rusland-Kina-Indien-samarbejde, især omkring videnskabelige programmer; især udforskning af rummet, som basis for global fred og udvikling. Så disse ideer er fremlagt.

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

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

meget tvivlsomt kapitalgrundlag på \$14 billion; i virkeligheden er det sandsynligvis meget mindre end det, for nogle af de værdipapirer, som bliver talt med som kapitalreserver, er grundlæggende set illikvide og kan ikke – selv i nødstilfælde – gøres likvide.

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

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

Ovenstående er første del af det Internationale Webcast; det

engelske udskrift af hele webcastet følger her:

**MAKE THE MOST OF THE OPENNESS IN POLICY NOW,
TO INSURE A NEW PARADIGM FOR THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE THE INAUGURATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

States; rather than the kind of gambling that we see now.

Let me pull up this chart [Fig. 1] just to show a bit of this success that we've seen along the Chinese economic program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering

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

set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has initiated

over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade agreements,

and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects – including

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

Road
nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Losansky 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 Kraft Ehrlicke har forudsagt. Snart vil videnskabelige, tekniske og industrielle aktiviteter på Månen tilsammen udgøre en uerstattelig del af hele rumprogrammet – ikke længere blot et globalt rumprogram, men ét, der allerede inkorporerer det umiddelbart omkringliggende rum.

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

rumfartssystem, som vi hidtil har benyttet os af, alle er blevet formet af trækkene ved det kemiske system for fremdrift, vi har brugt.

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

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

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

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

Foto: 14. maj, 2010 – Et af NASA's sidste rumflyvninger,

rumfærgen Atlantis besøger den Internationale Rumstation for vedligeholdelse og montage.

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:

**EU-parlament vedtager at
indføre modforholdsregler
imod russisk**

»informationskrig«

23. nov., 2016 – »Den, guderne vil tilintetgøre, gør de først vanvittig« – dette gamle ordsprog er stadig sandt.

I dag vedtog EU-parlamentet en resolution, der kræver, at EU »responderer til informationskrigsførelse« fra Rusland. De russiske nyheds-websider RT og Sputnik skulle angiveligt være blandt de farligste »redskaber for russisk propaganda«.

Zero Hedge rapporterer, at 691 parlamentsmedlemmer tog del i afstemningen: 304 stemte for den ikke-lovgivende resolution, der bærer titlen, »EU's strategiske kommunikation skal indføre modforholdsregler mod propaganda fra tredjepart«. Der var 179 parlamentsmedlemmer, der stemte imod, og 208 undlod at stemme. Zero Hedge rapporterer, at dokumentets forfattere rent faktisk sidestillede modforholdsregler mod Rusland med modstand mod Daesh (ISIS) terrorgruppen og opfordrede EU-medlemslande til at øge finansieringen til kontra-propagandaprojekter.

Resolutionen var skrevet af parlamentsmedlem Anna Fotyga, et polsk medlem af de Europæiske Konservatives og Reformisters (ECR) gruppe. Gruppen hævder, at Moskva har til hensigt at »anstifte frygt og dele Europa« og kræver forholdsregler til imødegåelse af den angivelige russiske propagandatrussel. Fotyga hævder, at Moskva yder finansiel støtte til oppositionspartier og organisationer i EU-medlemsstater, som forårsager disintegration internt i blokken.

Som følge heraf skal de russiske nyhedsnetværk RT og Sputnik, Rossotrudnichestvo Statslige Agentur og Russkiy Mir (Russia World) Foundation angiveligt være blandt Ruslands mest truende »propaganda-redskaber«, der må imødegås.

På helt utrolig vis anbringer EU-dokumentet også russiske medieorganisationer »på linje med terrorgrupper, såsom Islamisk Stat«.

Den russiske præsident kritiserede skarpt resolutionen og sagde, at det demonstrerer »politisk degradering« mht. »ideen om demokrati«. Putin sagde, » ... De [europæiske embedsmænds-] 'lærere' [har altid sagt til os], at den mest ondsindede måde at håndtere modstandere på er at forbyde noget, og at det ikke er i overensstemmelse med demokratiske principper og normer. En åben diskussion er altid den bedste måde.«

Putin konkluderede, at EU-parlamentets resolution er et »åbenlyst tegn på degraderingen af det vestlige samfunds vision om demokrati«.

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)

Europa vil lide under fastholdelse af sanktioner mod Rusland

21. nov., 2016 – I et interview til Wien-avisen, *Kurier*, sagde økonomiminister for Moskva-regionen, Sergej Cheremin, at han forventer, at Trump vil forbedre relationerne med Rusland, alt imens han ikke er så sikker på, om EU vil ændre sin politik for Rusland.

»Personligt er jeg overbevist om, at Trump vil gå meget pragmatisk frem. Han er ikke kommet med aggressive bemærkninger om Rusland. Med hensyn til Europa kan en kritisk situation imidlertid udvikle sig. Hvis relationerne mellem USA og Rusland bliver bedre, og EU holder fast i sanktionerne, så er Europa i fare for at isolere sig.«

Sanktionerne kom også under angreb i Tyskland: Wolfgang Büchele, formand for den tyske industris »Ost-Ausschuss der Deutschen Wirtschaft« (Komite for økonomiske relationer med Østeuropa), skrev i en kronik til erhvervsavisen *Handelsblatt* i dag, at »tiden er inde til at stille spørgsmålstegn ved sanktionerne«. Med hensyn til den officielt erklærede »politiske prioritering« inden for handel med Rusland, »ville

det være godt, hvis denne prioritering blev brugt til først og fremmest at finde politiske løsninger på politiske kriser, og ikke lægge byrden på økonomien.« Sanktionerne mod Rusland har intet opnået i Rusland, men de har forårsaget enorme tab i trecifret størrelsesorden i Europa. Polen, de tre baltiske stater og også Tyskland og Østrig, har lidt enormt under sanktionerne, sagde Büchele. Alene Tyskland har lidt et nettotab på 13,5 mia. euro på handlen med Rusland, hvilket svarer til 60.000 tabte jobs.

Sanktionerne blev også angrebet i Italien af parlamentsmedlemmer fra M5S-partiet: Deputerede Paola Carinelli sagde under et besøg i Moskva i sidste uge, at den italienske økonomi har haft et nettotab på 7 mia. euro og 200.000 jobs. Senator Vito Petrocelli fra M5S kom med lignende kommentarer om, at »sanktionerne var forkerte fra starten. Meget af det har overtrådt de italienske foretagenders rettigheder og interesser. Der har absolut ikke været nogen fordele ved sanktionerne. Vore små og mellemstore virksomheder har ikke længere nogen som helst mulighed for at arbejde med russiske partnere.«

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 instinkt 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 menneskeheden fremtid beror ...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Foto: Mennesket og Universet – Universet, og mennesket.

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: USA's politik for spændinger med Rusland

ikke godt for det amerikanske folk

18. nov., 2016 – I går advarede præsident Obama, der nu synes at stå på broen af Titanic sammen med den tyske kansler Angela Merkel, endnu engang den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump om, at han ikke må ændre noget som helst af det, Obama har gjort i løbet af de forgangne otte år. Med Merkel ved sin side i Berlin sagde Obama til Trump, at han ikke må indgå aftaler med Putin af bekvemmelighedshensyn, »selv om det krænker internationale normer, eller selv, hvis det efterlader mindre lande sårbare eller skaber langsigtede problemer i regioner som Syrien«.

Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov responderede i går, hvis ikke til Obamas specifikke udtalelse, så til hans holdning, og advarede om, at fortsatte spændinger mellem USA og Rusland ikke gør noget godt for det amerikanske folk.

»Hvis præsident Obama ønsker fortsatte spændinger, er jeg sikker på, det ikke ville være til gavn for det amerikanske folk og for løsninger på globale problemer, fordi meget afhænger af vore to stater«, sagde han til Rossiya 24. »Han [Obama] rådede Trump til at skelne mellem valgfeber og reelt, praktisk arbejde. Det er min fornemmelse, at Obama selv befinder sig på situationens emotionelle side, og tænker mindre og mindre på, hvordan reelle problemer løses.«

Global betydning af

diskussion mellem Putin og Trump

15. nov., 2016 – »Ikke blot af bilateral, men af global betydning«, var sådan, som *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche karakteriserede den første telefonsamtale den 14. nov. mellem nyvalgte præsident Trump og den russiske præsident Putin. De to ledes diskussion om behovet for at udvikle de amerikansk-russiske handelsrelationer og økonomiske relationer var i særdeleshed svanger med forandring i de internationale udsigter for økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt, så vel som også fred.

Rapporten over mødet fra Trumps kontor lød som følger:

»New York, NY, 14. nov.: Nyvalgte præsident Donald J. Trump talte i dag med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der ringede for at overbringe sine lykønskninger med sejren i et historisk valg. Under samtalen diskuterede de to ledere flere spørgsmål, inklusive de trusler og udfordringer, som konfronterer USA og Rusland, strategiske, økonomiske spørgsmål, samt det historiske forhold mellem USA og Rusland, der går over 200 år tilbage i tiden.

Den nyvalgte præsident Trump bemærkede over for præsident Putin, at han ser meget frem til at få en stærk og holdbar relation med Rusland og det russiske folk.«

Den russiske præsidents kontor udstedte denne kommentar:

»Præsidenten ønskede atter hr. Trump tillykke med sejren i præsidentvalgene, ønskede ham succes med at gennemføre hans program fra før valget og bemærkede sin villighed til at opbygge en partnerskabsdialog med den nye administration, baseret på principperne om ligeværd, gensidig respekt og ikke-indblanding i hinandens interne anliggender ...

»Under samtalen var Putin og Trump ikke alene enige om at fastslå den nuværende, utilfredsstillende tilstand i de bilaterale relationer, men talte også til fordel for aktivt at arbejde i fællesskab for at normalisere relationerne og sætte som mål et konstruktivt samarbejde inden for en lang række spørgsmål. Begge sider understregede nødvendigheden af at skabe et solidt fundament af bilaterale bånd gennem udviklingen af relationer inden for handel og økonomi.«

»Putin og Trump var enige i nødvendigheden af at slå deres indsats sammen, mod en betydelig, fælles fjende – international terrorisme og ekstremisme. I denne sammenhæng diskuterede de spørgsmål vedr. en afgørelse af den syriske krise ... Begge sider var enige om at fortsætte med telefonisk kontakt, med udsigt til et muligt, personligt møde, der skal arrangeres af repræsentanter fra begge sider. Det blev bemærket, at næste år er 210-året for etableringen af diplomatiske relationer mellem Rusland og USA, hvilket bør foranledige de to sider til at komme tilbage til pragmatisk, gensidigt gavnligt samarbejde i begge landes interesse, såvel som også for stabilitet og sikkerhed i verden.«

Trump skal efter sigende overveje en genoplivelse af Kerry/Lavrov-aftalen om Syrien

16. nov., 2016 – Washington Times rapporterede i går, at den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump overvejer at genoplive planen om fælles militære operationer med Rusland imod al-Nusra-

terrorgruppen. Udenrigsministrene for USA og Rusland, hhv. John Kerry og Sergej Lavrov, havde udarbejdet aftalen sidste september efter måneders forhandling, men den blev næsten omgående saboteret af forsvarsminister Ash Carters Pentagon med bombardementet af syriske tropper i det østlige Syrien mindre end en uge efter, at aftalen trådte i kraft.

Pensionerede generalløjtnant Michael Flynn, tidligere chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) og Trumps nationale toprådgiver, råder efter sigende Trump til at satse på en ny æra for amerikansk-russisk, militært samarbejde.

»Vi var klar til at gå i gang, og vi kan blive klar til at gå i gang igen«, sagde en amerikansk embedsperson fra forsvaret.

En embedsperson fra Udenrigsministeriet sagde på denne baggrund, at »Obama-planen« (i realiteten Kerry/Lavrov-planen), der i september måned opfordrede til skabelsen af et Fælles Integrationscenter, med base i Genève og med personel bestående af russiske og amerikanske, militære embedsmænd, efter al sandsynlighed ville blive forelagt den tiltrædende administration. Udenrigsministeriet har rent faktisk mindst to gange i den forløbne uge bekræftet, at diskussioner mellem amerikanske og russiske officerer fortsat har fundet sted i Genève, på trods af selve aftalens fiasko. Embedspersonen understregede imidlertid over for *The Times*, at der ikke er nogen, der ved, om Trump og hans endnu ikke udnævnte, nationale sikkerhedsteam vil acceptere planen.

»Det er alt sammen spekulationer på nuværende tidspunkt«, sagde embedspersonen og tilføjede, at det ikke står klart, »om de vil bevare strategien, som den er, nappe lidt af den, revidere den eller fuldstændig skrotte den«.

Foto: John Kerry (venstre) og Sergej Lavrov, hhv. USA's og Ruslands udenrigsminister, udarbejdede i september måned en aftale om fælles militære operationer i Syrien til bekæmpelse af terroristerne.

Bulgarien kunne blive en bro mellem Rusland og den Europæiske Union

16. nov., 2016 – Valget af Rumen Radev som præsident for Bulgarien kunne åbne op for en vej, hvor Bulgarien bliver en bro mellem Rusland og den Europæiske Union, iflg. en udtalelse fra et bulgarsk medlem af EU-parlamentet. Det bulgarske medlem af parlamentet, Momchil Nekov, fra Socialistpartiet, sagde til Sputnik: »Jeg håber inderligt, at relationerne mellem Moskva og Sofia bliver varmere. Jeg er fuldt ud overbevist om, at Bulgarien kan blive en bro mellem Bruxelles og Moskva. Rusland er en partner, og jeg mener, vi bør kommunikere på normal vis i en ånd af velvilje og samarbejde.«

Radev er tidligere kommanderende over Bulgariens luftvåben og har, i modsætning til den fratrædende præsident Rosen Plevneliev, der har lagt sig i slipstrømmen af EU's anti-russiske linje, været fortalere for at droppe EU's sanktioner mod Rusland og opbygge tættere bånd til Moskva, for at hjælpe Bulgariens pressede økonomi. Han roste også den nyvalgte, amerikanske præsident Donald Trump for at »søge mere dialog« med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin.

Med hensyn til sanktionerne sagde Nekov: »De gensidige sanktioner gør ikke noget godt for nogen af parterne; de præsterer intet, så jeg kan ikke se nogen mening i at forlænge dem eller have dem.«

Nekov, der bemærkede valgsejren for det Socialistiske Partis kandidat Igor Dodon, som også er kendt for sin venligtsindede holdning til Rusland, kritiserede medierne for at kalde valget

af Dodon for en »sejr for Rusland og et nederlag for den Europæiske Union«, og for at referere til både Radev og Dodon som »pro-russiske kandidater«.


»Jeg mener, at dette er en form for propaganda, der forsøger at rejse mure, hvor vi behøver broer. Vi bør ikke glemme, at det er bulgarerne og moldoverne, der direkte vælger deres præsident, og ikke nogle politikere eller medierepræsentanter fra Vesten«, sagde Nekov. »Jeg mener ikke, at bulgarerne er skuffede over EU. Bulgarnes klager er relateret til det globale kaos, der har direkte og indirekte virkninger på dem«, understregede han.

Foto: Tidligere bulgarske kommanderende over Luftvåbnet, generalmajor Rumen Radev, kandidat fra Socialistpartiet, vandt valget til Bulgariens præsidentembede med 59,4 % af stemmerne.

Trump og Putin kan, og må, knuse terrorisme i Syrien – og globalt

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. november, 2016 – I kølvandet på Trumps produktive diskussioner over telefon med Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping i denne uge, og den politiske bortgang af Obamas (og Hillarys) krigsplaner, er der intet til hinder for, at disse tre, store nationer kan samarbejde om at knuse den britisk/saudisk-sponsorerede terrormaskine internationalt, med begyndelse i ISIS og al-Nusra i Syrien. »Der er ingen anden måde at gøre det på«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. »Putin står i centrum for dette. Enhver hæmning af dette må forhindres.«

Den amerikanske befolkning er hastigt i færd med at indse, at

det lange mareridt med økonomisk forfald, epidemien med narkotika og selvmord, evindelige krige og den ærefrygtindgydende trussel om atomkrig, endelig kunne være forbi. Otte år med Bush og Obama er ved at være slut. Det er stadig uklart, om Donald Trump vil lægge sin populisme til side til fordel for at gennemføre Glas-Steagall og knuse Wall Streets magt over USA's regering og økonomi – som han har lovet, han ville gøre. Det vil afhænge af, om det amerikanske folk mobiliserer sig selv til støtte for en løsning – og ikke blot en afvisning af de seneste otte års ondskab. Denne  løsning ligger nu foran dem, i form af **LaRouches Fire Love**: Glass-Steagall; en genindførelse af nationalbankvirksomhed; en afslutning af monetarisme til fordel for et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, til finansiering af infrastruktur inden for landbrug og industri, uddannelse og sundhedssektoren; og en genindførelse af videnskabelig udvikling, begyndende med et genoplivet NASA-rumprogram og stærkt udvidet forskning inden for fusionskraft.

I dag ankom hold af aktivister fra New York, Baltimore og Virginia til Kongressen med krav om ikke at vente til Trumps indsættelse, men derimod handle i denne 'lame duck'-overgangsperiode for at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og de Fire Love. Det Demokratiske Parti er i oprør efter de tæsk, de fik i valgene til præsidentskabet og Kongressen, men meldinger fra LaRouche-aktivister i hele landet lyder på, at mange demokrater langt om længe ser den kendsgerning i øjnene, at Obama og Hillary Clinton havde tilsluttet sig de republikanske neokonservative, der ikke tjener den amerikanske befolkning, men Wall Street og krigsmaskinen. Trumps afvisning af både Obama og de republikanske neokonservative, med samt deres krigsplaner, under sin kampagne, skabte et tilflugtssted for demokrater, der så ondskaben med Obamas drabsmaskine.

De neokonservatives »unipolære« verden – med Obamas udtryk, »vi sætter reglerne« – har beviseligt skabt USA's og dets EU-allieredes totale isolation internationalt. I Europa går

valgene, efter Brexit, imod EU-diktaturet og for en genopretning af bånd til Rusland, som det ses i Bulgarien og Moldova. Tyrkiets udenrigsminister sagde i dag, at hans land føler en sådan lede over de europæiske ledere, der truer med at smide det ud af NATO eller afslår dets anmodning om optagelse i EU, at de planlægger en folkeafstemning om nationens forhold til EU – en »Tyrkxit«.

Et alternativ viser sig klart. Med sit »Nye Paradigme« centreret omkring politikken for den Nye Silkevej, rejste Xi Jinping i dag til Sydamerika, hvor Ecuador, Peru og Chile vil være vært for statsbesøg, og hvor han også vil deltage i APEC-topmødet i Peru. Ecuadors præsident Correa lovpriste Kinas rolle i at transformere hans lands fysiske økonomi i løbet af det seneste årti og beskrev det aktuelle besøg som »det vigtigste besøg af noget statsoverhoved i Ecuadors historie«.

☒ Den samme entusiasme for et nyt paradigme ses i hele Afrika og Asien, og i stigende grad også i Øst- og Vesteuropa. Overalt grunder folk på en fremtid, hvor USA ikke længere truer med krige og undergravning gennem »farvede revolutioner«, men som i stedet går med i BRIKS, AIIB og den Nye Silkevej om opbygning af en fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Dette potentiale må realiseres, især i selve USA. Et vindue mod muligheder åbner sig for os, men det kunne være kortvarigt, og med utænkelige konsekvenser, hvis vi mislykkes.

Foto: Gipsmodellen af Frihedsstatuen (Statue of Freedom), bronzestatuen på toppen af Capitols kuppel, står i Capitols Emancipation Hall.

Nej, det var ikke FBI's værk: Dette er et globalt paradigmeskift

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. november, 2016 – I kølvandet på diskussionerne om fundamentalt nye amerikansk-russiske og amerikansk-kinesiske relationer mellem valgte præsident Donald Trump og den russiske og kinesiske præsident, hhv., vil vi, på Asia-Pacific Economic Conference (APEC) i Peru i denne uge, muligvis få en erstatning for Obamas fejlslagne TPP »handelsaftale« at se, og i stedet få en ny handelsaftale, der er initieret af Kina, med 19 andre lande, inkl. Trumps USA. Den støtte opbygning af et nyt, økonomisk paradigme omkring den Nye Silkevejs store, »win-win« infrastrukturprojekter, vil tage endnu et stort skridt fremad. Dette er, hvad USA må tilslutte sig, med en ny, statslig kreditinstitution, og med en ny Glass/Steagall-lov, der vil nedkæmpe Wall Street.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som vil tale for Sammenslutningen af Peruvianske Økonomers nationale konference aftenen før APEC-konferencen, sendte dette budskab til aktivister fra New York State, der har kurs mod Washington, D.C., for at kræve Glass-Steagall:

»Først og fremmest vil jeg gerne sige hej til jer. Dette er selvfølgelig en meget vigtig intervention, for valgresultatet i USA, som mange mennesker ikke så komme, er i realiteten en del af en global udvikling. Alle forklaringerne, som de amerikanske medier kommer med, er for det meste røgslør, eller en eller anden forloren forklaring, som f.eks., at det var FBI, der kostede Hillary valget, osv., osv.

Det, der i virkeligheden finder sted rent strategisk, er, at befolkningsmasserne i den transatlantiske sektor – i Europa, og i USA i særdeleshed – nu virkelig har fået nok af et

Establishment, der vedvarende har handlet imod deres interesser. Det, de kalder »overløberstaterne« – menneskene i disse stater er ikke repræsenteret af det transatlantiske etablissement. Dette ved de, fordi, for dem, er livs- og arbejdsvilkårene i løbet af det seneste årti, kan man sige, men i realiteten i løbet af de seneste 50 år, kun blevet værre og værre. Folk er nødt til at have flere jobs samtidig for at få økonomien til at hænge sammen. Der har været mange tilfælde, hvor deres sønner, og undertiden endda deres døtre, er blevet udsendt til Irak fem gange i træk og er kommet hjem, totalt nedbrudte. Så folk har oplevet, at livet bare bliver værre for dem, og at de med Washington/New York-etablissementet intet håb har.

Man så det samme fænomen med Brexit-folkeafstemningen i Storbritannien i juni måned; som også her ikke bare handlede om flygtningene, og ikke bare handlede om de mere åbenlyse spørgsmål, selv om disse spiller en vis katalyserende rolle; men, det var den samme, fundamentale følelse af uretfærdighed, og at der simpelt hen ikke længere findes en regering, der tager sig af det almene vel. Og uanset, hvilke forklaringer, de hoster op med, så vil dette ikke forsvinde, før situationen er forbedret, og god regering er genetableret i USA og Europa, og i andre dele af verden.

Det umiddelbart næste punkt, hvor den samme vrede med al sandsynlighed vil vise sig, er ved den forestående folkeafstemning i Italien – hvor man den 4. december vil have en folkeafstemning om en forfatningsændring og, som stemningen i øjeblikket er, som også vil blive en afstemning imod Renzi-regeringen. Renzi lovede først at træde tilbage; nu siger han, at han ikke vil træde tilbage: Under alle omstændigheder, så vil denne udvikling fortsætte, indtil man indsætter en forbedring.

Trumps valgsejr er selvsagt et åbent spørgsmål, for det står endnu ikke klart, hvad hans præsidentskab vil blive for ét; men, som Lyndon LaRouche har understreget næsten hver dag

siden valget, så er dette ikke et lokalt, amerikansk anliggende. Dette er et globalt anliggende; det er et internationalt spørgsmål.

En af de væsentligste grunde til, at Trump vandt valget, er, at han, især i den seneste fase, havde understreget, at Hillary Clinton ville betyde Tredje Verdenskrig pga. hendes politik for Syrien, fordi hun ... foreslog en frontal konfrontation med Rusland. Det var præcist at ramme hovedet på sømmet, for vi befinder os på en meget, meget farlig kurs for konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.

Under valgkampagnen har Trump gentagne gange sagt, at han ville have en anden holdning over for Rusland. Og siden han blev valgt, har han talt i telefon med både Putin og Xi Jinping og i begge tilfælde sagt, at han vil arbejde for at forbedre relationerne mellem USA og så Rusland og Kina, hhv. Dette er selvsagt ekstremt vigtigt; og det andet, ekstremt vigtige spørgsmål er: Vil han følge op på sit løfte om Glass-Steagall, hvor han især i byen Charlotte atter sagde, at han ville gennemføre Glass-Steagall?

Dette er virkelig hovedspørgsmålet. For kun, hvis man gør en ende på kasinoøkonomien, som er den virkelige årsag til krig, kan situationen i realiteten bringes tilbage på ret køl. Alle de progressive – Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren og selv [Nancy] Pelosi – har allerede sagt, at de vil samarbejde med Trump, hvis han vil satse på dette økonomiske program med infrastruktur/jobskabelse/Glass-Steagall.

Vi bør lade tvivlen komme ham til gode; men, vi bør også være klar over, at hele Wall Street-slænget og de neokonservative i det Republikanske Parti vil gøre alt for ikke at få dette. Derfor må vi have denne intervention for virkelig at opdrage Kongressen og Senatet mht. det, der virkelig står på spil. Hele verden holder nu øje med – holder så at sige vejret – spørgsmålet, om der kommer en ændring til det bedre i amerikansk politik?

Det gør der forhåbentligt. Men det vil kræve alle forholdsreglerne. Glass-Steagall som den absolutte forudsætning, uden hvilken intet andet vil fungere; men det er ikke nok. For, vi taler ikke bare om en bankreform. Vi taler om et totalt nyt paradigme i det økonomiske system. Og dette nye paradigme må defineres af **LaRouches Fire Love**, som alle må sikre sig, at de forstår, når de skal udføre denne form for lobbyvirksomhed.

For, Lyndon LaRouche har understreget, at nøglen er at øge arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Som følge af de seneste årtiers neoliberale, eller monetaristiske, politik, er denne produktivitet i den transatlantiske sektor faldet under punktet for break-even, hvor det går lige op. Dette er grunden til, at vi må have en nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton; vi må have en politik for statskredit; vi må have et internationalt kreditsystem, et nyt Bretton Woods-system; og vi må selvsagt have et 'win-win'-samarbejde mellem alle nationer omkring opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej – også internt i USA – så den bliver til en verdenslandbro.

Af ekstraordinær betydning er den fjerde af de Fire Love, der siger, at man ikke kan få en forøgelse af økonomiens produktivitet, med mindre man satser på et forceret program for at opnå fusionskraft; samt et internationalt program for udforskning af rummet. For kun, hvis man foretager denne form for avantgarde-spring i produktiviteten – fusionsteknologi vil bringe os en helt anden, økonomisk platform. Med fusionsfaklen vil vi blive i stand til at få sikkerhed i energiforsyningen til hele planeten; man vil få nye råmaterialer, fordi man vil blive i stand til at bruge ethvert affaldsprodukt, hvor man udskiller diverse isotoper og genskaber nye råmaterialer ved at sammensplejse isotoperne, som det skal gøres.

Så det repræsenterer et gigantisk, teknologisk spring. Det samme gælder for rumfartsteknologi, for det vil få samme virkning som under Apolloprogrammet, hvor hver investering i rumteknologi, i raketter, i andre nye materialer, gav 14 cents

tilbage for hver cent, der blev investeret. Og alt fra computerchips til Teflon-køkkengrej, og alle mulige gavnlige resultater, opstod som biprodukter af rumforskning.

Og for at få verdensøkonomien ud af den nuværende tilstand, især i den transatlantiske sektor, må man have denne form for kursomlægning i retning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og en forøgelse af **energigennemstrømningstætheden**. Og hele denne Grønne ideologi – som i virkeligheden er en ikke-udviklingsideologi – må erstattes; og verden må komme tilbage til den kurs, hvor det fysiske univers' virkelige, fysiske love er kriteriet for sandheden, og ikke en eller anden ideologi.«

Foto: USA's Capitol-bygning efter den første, omfattende restaurering i mere end et halvt århundrede. (Foto: USCapitol Flickr)

Efter Trumps valgsejr: Tyskland må nu gribe initiativet for Den nye Silkevej! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Den »Marshallplan« på en milliard euro, som udviklingsminister Gerd Müller har foreslået, er et skridt i den rigtige retning, men slår langt fra til. Tyskland kan nu yde et enestående bidrag til det nødvendige epokeskift ved officielt at erklære,

at det samarbejder med Kinas Nye Silkevej, frem for alt i genopbygningen af Mellemøsten og Afrikas industrialisering.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 14.
november 2016:
Efter Trumps valg: Skab en
USA-Rusland alliance,
gennemfør Glass/Steagall-
bankopdeling**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Obama er blevet dumpet
– det er nu afgørende at
genoprette**

relationerne med Putins Rusland

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. november, 2016 – At åbne for forhandling og potentielt samarbejde mellem den russiske præsident Putin, den nu valgte, tiltrædende amerikanske præsident Trump og Kinas præsident Xi er nu *sine qua non* for at bringe verden væk fra randen af verdenskrig og således gøre en økonomisk genrejsning mulig, især i USA og Europa.

Ingen – hverken Trump eller nogen anden nation eller betydningsfulde part – bør forhandle med Barack Obama. Obama er færdig; hans TPP og TTIP »handelsaftaler« er færdige; hans »Assad skal væk«-promovering af jihadister for at overtage Syrien er færdig; hans bestræbelse med »omdrejningspunkt Asien« for at besejre Kina er færdig. Og det samme er hans lange forsvar af Wall Street imod det amerikanske folks vrede.

På paradoksal vis er, på trods af meget hysteri blandt fremtrædende liberale, håbet om, at Wall Street kan brydes op og dets magt over amerikansk politisk liv brydes, nu stærkere, end det har været i mange år. At genindføre Glass/Steagall-loven er dette håbs første instrument og mål, men potentialet er at genoprette hele den tabte, amerikanske produktivitet, tabte produktive beskæftigelse og levestandard, ødelagte økonomiske infrastruktur; det tabte håb om en fremtid.

☒ Dette er den mobilisering, som er i gang i LaRouchePAC for november-december, for Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Love« for at redde USA's økonomi og dets folk.

Men, konfrontations- og krigsprovokationerne under hele Barack Obamas præsidentskab, imod Rusland og Kina, må afvises på en meget synlig måde, for at dette håb kan fremmes. Ruslands Putin har allerede fremlagt specifikke forslag og tilbud om samarbejde. Mange europæiske kræfter, der har været i

opposition mod sanktioneerne og krigsoprustningen over for Rusland, efterlyser direkte »topmøde«-drøftelser mellem Putin og Donald Trump.

Og Kina udgør det eneste håb for Trump-administrationens evne til at virkeliggøre sine storstilede planer om at bygge ny, økonomisk infrastruktur. Uden samarbejde med Kina vil USA hverken have kreditten eller de fysisk-økonomiske midler til at bygge dette højhastigheds-jernbanenet, disse nye elektricitetsnetværk, havne, lufthavne osv.

Offentlige begivenheder demonstrerer nu, at ikke kun de amerikanske vælgere, men også betydningsfulde grupperinger og ledere i selve det Demokratiske Parti har dumpet Barack Obama og hans administrations politik for »Wall Street og krig«, og, sammen med Obama, også har dumpet Hillary Clinton, der i givet fald ville være blevet hans, og hans politik, efterfølger. Senator Bernie Sanders' erklæring i dag, »Hvis hr. Trump har modet til at gå op imod Wall Street, vil vi arbejde sammen med ham, spørgsmål for spørgsmål«, er et udfald fra progressive Demokraters plan om at overtage partiet efter liget af Obamas politik.

Vi ved ikke, hvad Trumps team vil gøre. Vi ved, hvad amerikanske borgere må gøre for at sætte Kongressen til at arbejde. Wall Street må betale for sin årtier lange økonomiske ødelæggelse. Wall Street må brydes op, og dets finanskasinoer lukkes ned – Glass-Steagall. Der må skabes ny kredit til produktiv beskæftigelse og produktivitet.

USA må tilslutte sig de eurasiske magters Nye Silkevej, hvis vi skal genrejse os økonomisk. Bestræbelserne på at fremprovokere krig med disse magter – Obamas »eftermæle« – må bringes til ophør.

Foto: Lyndon Larouche understregede søndag, at Putin vil respondere favorabelt til en fornuftig tilnærmelse fra USA.

(foto: kremlin.ru)

Tysklands general Kujat opfordrer Trump og Putin til at komme til forhandlingsbordet

Wiesbaden, 11. nov., 2016 – Tysklands general Kujat (pensioneret) udtalte sig, i et interview på MDR radio i dag, forsigtigt mht., hvad valgte præsident Donald Trump rent faktisk kunne gøre, men var meget udtrykkelig omkring det faktum, at noget som helst af positiv karakter ville kræve, at de to atomsupermagter finder presserende områder af fælles interesse. General Kujat, der var formand for NATO's militærkomite (2002-05), sagde, at, hvis Trumps valgkampagne-udtalelser om Putin og Rusland rent faktisk får betydning, »så bør vi byde det velkommen«.

Forespurgt, om han var enig i de bekymringer, andre har luftet omkring en tilnærmelse mellem Trump og Putin, sagde han: »Nej, det kan jeg ikke følge. Vi må simpelt hen indse, at vi taler om lederne af de eneste, tilbageværende supermagter, og at vores sikkerhed og fremtid er afhængig af, at disse to magter ikke kommer i en militær konfrontation med hinanden, og derfor bør vi, i vores vurdering af disse to supermagtsledere, have en verbal nedrustning.« Han henviste her klart til dæmoniseringen af Putin, men også til de dumdristige vurderinger fra den europæiske elite og de europæiske medier, som er fikseret på Trumps personlighed, og som overser stemningen hos den amerikanske befolkning. Han kritiserede den

kendsgerning, at, da den tyske regering og Frankrig var med til at bringe volden i Ukraine ned til et minimum, trådte USA til side og leverede i stedet militærstøtte og anden finansiel støtte, som »ikke gav meget løfte om succes«. At bringe Trump til forhandlingsbordet med Putin øger chancerne for en forsoning mellem interesserne, bekræftede han.

I Syrien, sagde han, bør Trump gå tilbage til Lavrov-Kerry-aftalen. Hvis USA begynder at udskille terroristerne, så kan USA og Rusland samarbejde.

Forespurgt, om chancerne for fred var bedre nu med Trump, end hvis Clinton havde vundet, var general Kujat klar: Under Clinton ville vi have fået en fortsættelse af de forudgående politikker, inkl. interventioner i andre stater, ligesom med Libyen. Selv om han nævnte Obamas angivelige forsigtighed mht. militære løsninger, forventer han af Trump, at denne »ikke har den fejlopfattelse, at Amerika må være verdens politibetjent og atter må intervenere i alle verdens brændpunkter.«

General Kujat sluttede med en nyttig anbefaling om at benytte den 6-9 mdr. lange overgangsperiode til at skifte over fra »valgkampagne-modus og til en Verbündeten Modus«, som lyttere med lethed kunne opfatte som samarbejde mellem fornuftige allierede (Verbündeten), såsom de bedre styrker fra Tyskland.

Foto: Tidligere formand for NATO's militærkomite; tidligere generalstabschef for Bundeswehr, general Harald Kujat.

Stoltenberg til Trump: Du kan

ikke ændre NATO

9. nov., 2016 – NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg lykønskede Donald Trump med præsidentvalgsejren, men, under en pressekonference i dag tilføjede han, som svar på et spørgsmål, strengt, at, uanset, hvad Trump måtte mene, så kan han ikke trække sig tilbage fra USA's forpligtelse over for NATO.

»NATO's sikkerhedsgaranti er en traktatmæssig forpligtelse«, sagde Stoltenberg. »Alle allierede har aflagt højtideligt løfte om at forsvare hinanden. Dette er absolut ubetinget.«

Stoltenberg talte ved et møde for europæiske diplomater på USA's ambassade i Bruxelles.

Wall Street Journal skriver, i sin dækning af Stoltenbergs bemærkninger, bekymret, at, hvis Trump, der har været en kritiker af NATO, virkelig ændrer kursen i politikken over for Rusland, som udtalelser, Trump har fremsat under kampagnen, indikerer, at han kunne gøre,

»kan NATO blive tvunget til at gentænke sin plan om at deployere 4.000 tropper, inkl. amerikanske soldater, til de baltiske stater og Polen til næste år. Hr. Trump kunne også genoverveje Obama-administrationens planer om at sende en brigade med tungt infanteri til Østeuropa i begyndelsen af næste år«.

Det har man da lov at håbe.

Vi må sætte dagsordenen!

USA må gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Webcast, 11. nov., 2016;

Leder

Det andet punkt, som står meget klart, er, at LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) har sat dagsordenen; ... Glass-Steagall; den omgående nødvendighed af at nedlukke Wall Street; og det faktum, at det amerikanske folk ikke var villigt til at acceptere Obama-Clinton-dagsordenen om at bringe USA ind i Tredje Verdenskrig med en konfrontation med Rusland. Men vi må fortsætte med at sætte dagsordenen. Der er intet alternativ, ingen erstatning for en fortsat mobilisering og en fortsat klarhed i lederskab, som kommer fra LaRouche Politiske Aktions-komite og vore allierede.

*Studievært, Matthew Ogden: Jeg håber, alle har haft mulighed for at se **specialudsendelsen efter valget**, som vi udlagde på denne webside onsdag; med direkte udtalelser fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Vi har haft mulighed for at tale med hr. LaRouche flere gange siden, inkl. for blot en time siden; og hr. LaRouche fastslår fortsat den pointe, at dette er en højst uafgjort situation; meget udefineret. Vi har endnu ikke fået de fulde fakta om, hvad implikationerne af den tiltrædende administration vil blive, men to punkter står klart. Og jeg tror, at folk meget klart har set, at dette har været en total afvisning af hele Obama-Clinton-Wall Street-apparatet, der havde overtaget det Demokratiske Parti; men også, på samme tid, det Republikanske Partis Bush-Cheney-apparat. Begge partier er nu ophørt med at eksistere i deres tidligere form,*

og vi befinder os i en situation internt i USA, der ikke har fortilfælde.

Det andet punkt, som står meget klart, er, at LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) har sat dagsordenen; og dette punkt burde stå klart med de foregående år, der har ført frem til i dag, inklusive med Kesha Rogers' succesfulde kampagner med stor indvirkning, hvor hun har stillet op til valg til offentligt embede. Men vi har på dagsordenen sat: Glass-Steagall; den omgående nødvendighed af at nedlukke Wall Street; og det faktum, at det amerikanske folk ikke var villigt til at acceptere Obama-Clinton-dagsordenen om at bringe USA ind i Tredje Verdenskrig med en konfrontation med Rusland. Men vi må fortsætte med at sætte dagsordenen. Der er intet alternativ, ingen erstatning for en fortsat mobilisering og en fortsat klarhed i lederskab, som kommer fra LaRouche Politiske Aktions-komite og vore allierede.

Jeg vil gerne oplæse et kort uddrag af lederartiklen, der blev udlagt på LPAC's webside i dag, for jeg mener, at det meget klart definerer, hvad hr. LaRouches aktuelle analyse af denne situation er. Derfra går vi over til diskussionen. Overskriften lyder: **»Trumps sejr betyder kun en udsættelse af krigsfaren – med mindre der vedtages en langt mere fundamental forandring«**. Den indledes med følgende erklæring:

»Donald Trumps valgsejr, og både Hillary Clintons og Barack Obamas valgnederlag, betyder en kortvarig udsættelse af fremstødet for Tredje Verdenskrig imod Rusland, under forudsætning af, at Obama forhindres i at foretage en eller anden vanvittig handling i sine tilbageværende 'lame duck'-uger – overgangsperioden – i embedet. Det faktum, at en umiddelbar fare for atomkrig midlertidigt er taget af bordet, er vigtigt, men det løser ikke den anden, alvorlige krise, som verden konfronteres med.

Det transatlantiske finanssystem er stadig på randen af total disintegration, og med mindre man omgående håndterer dette problem, vil betingelserne for global krig snart vise sig igen. For at løse denne umiddelbare krise, må den amerikanske Kongres omgående vedtage de love, der er fremstillet i begge

Huse, for en genindførelse af den oprindelige Glass/Steagall-lov fra 1933, og som bryder for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-bankerne op, i totalt adskilte kommercielle banker og investeringsbanker. Dette må være det første punkt på Kongressens dagsorden, når den vender tilbage til Washington i begyndelsen af næste uge.»

Det fortsætter således:

»Når denne presserende handling er vel overstået, må der træffes yderligere forholdsregler til en ny form for relationer mellem de ledende nationer på planeten.»

Dette vil vi gå meget mere i dybden med i udsendelsens løb, men denne udtalelse fortsætter med at citere nogle udtalelser af Sergej Glazjev, præsident Putins førende rådgiver; og af Chas Freeman, fremragende topdiplomat i USA's diplomati; og på anden vis, og som nu fastslår den meget klare og korrekte pointe, at tiden nu er inde til at indse, at verden er på vej ind i et totalt nyt paradigme. Og ud over blot en detente mellem USA og Rusland, hvilket er en potentiel meget positiv udvikling, så må USA også gengælde tilbuddene fra Kina om at gå med i dette program med den Nye Silkevej, det Nye Paradigme; med at gå med i AIIB og på en meget konkret og afgørende måde gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

Vi kan meget klart definere, at hr. LaRouche er den førende statsmand på scenen i USA lige nu. De Fire nye Love, som vi gentagende har understreget i løbet af de seneste mange måneder før dette valg, er fortsat øverste punkt på dagsordenen. Denne dagsorden begynder selvfølgelig med Glass-Steagall, men programmet er i sin helhed en renæssance for USA, i traditionen efter Hamilton.

Under en tidligere diskussion i dag, understregede Helga Zepp-Larouche dette brochure-tillæg, der blev udgivet af LPAC for næsten et år siden – **»The United States joins the New Silk Road«** (Se også **dansk introduktion** ved samme navn). Heri

fremlægges det meget klart, hvordan USA kan tilslutte sig dette nye paradigme.

Jeg vil gerne indlede med et par uddrag af disse udtalelser, som Sergej Glazjev og Chas Freeman er kommet med, og som tydeligt taler om netop denne pointe; men der kan siges meget mere. Dette er fra et interview med Glazjev til Itar-Tass umiddelbart efter præsidentvalget: Artiklen siger:


»Ifølge Glazjev viser de amerikanske valg, at 'det amerikanske folk ikke ønsker krig. For første gang i verdenshistorien har vi chancen for at få en ny økonomisk verdensorden, uden at føre en verdenskrig.'«

En tale, som Chas Freeman holdt i Hawaii nogle få dage før valget, med titlen, »Ét bælte, én vej«, slutter med den pointe, at

»USA må nu indse, at det nye paradigme, defineret af AIIB og den Nye Silkevej og alle de andre initiativer, som Kina har taget, er det nye spil i byen«.

Og Chas Freemans pointe er, at amerikanerne ikke er med i spillet. Tiden er nu inde til, at amerikanerne går med i dette og indser, at det er i vores egen interesse at gå med i initiativet for Ét bælte, én vej (OBOR). Chas Freeman siger:

»Kinas voksende indflydelse er en meget god grund til at søge at få en plads ved siden af det, både i de nye og gamle råd i den fremvoksende, multipolære verden, snarere end forgæves at søge at ekskludere det. USA må være konstruktivt og hjælpsomt, ikke negativt og kritisk – stadig mindre obstruktivt – i takt med, at alt dette udfolder sig. Amerikanere har meget på spil mht., hvordan Eurasien bliver integreret, og mht., hvordan dets relationer med andre kontinenter og regioner bliver. Tiden er inde til at komme med i spillet«, konkluderer han; »tiden er inde til at deltage i udarbejdelsen af ordenen efter Pax Americana. Tiden er inde til at bruge Kinas initiativ til amerikansk fordel.«

Jeg kunne sige mere endnu, men jeg vil blot fastslå den 
pointe, at tiden nu er inde til at anerkende det fulde
ansvar af det intellektuelle lederskab, som LaRouchePAC har
defineret og fortsat leverer. Og, med de **Fire Nye Økonomiske
Love**, med implikationerne af **Alexander Hamiltons økonomiske
rapporter**, der oprindeligt definerede og skabte USA, og med
anerkendelse af, hvad klokken er slået; og med skiftet til en
totalt ny, international, økonomisk og strategisk orden, er
det vores ansvar at mobilisere USA og bringe det ind i denne
nye orden.

*(Herefter følger aftenens diskussion; se video/engelsk
udskrift.)*

WE MUST SET THE AGENDA!

THE UNITED STATES MUST JOIN THE NEW SILK ROAD.

International Webcast, Nov. 11, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's November 11, 2016.

Happy

Veterans' Day! My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to
welcome you to our regular weekly Friday evening broadcast
here

from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio today by Ben
Deniston, my colleague, as well as Kesha Rogers, member of the
LaRouche PAC Policy Committee and former candidate for Federal
office – United States Congress and US Senate – joining us
from

Houston, Texas; and Michael Steger, joining us from San
Francisco, California, also a leading member of the LaRouche
PAC

Policy Committee.

I hope everybody had a chance to see the post-election
broadcast special that we posted on this website on Wednesday;
which included some direct video statements from both Lyndon

and

Helga LaRouche. We've had a chance to speak with Mr. LaRouche several times since then, including just about an hour ago; and

Mr. LaRouche continues to make the point that this is a highly inconclusive situation; very undefined. We have yet to get the

full facts on what the implications of the incoming administration will be, but two points are very clear. And I think as people have observed very clearly, this has been a total

repudiation of the entire Obama-Clinton-Wall Street apparatus that had taken over the Democratic Party; but also, at the same

time, the Bush-Cheney Republican Party apparatus. Both parties

have now ceased to exist in their previous form, and we are in an

unprecedented situation inside the United States. The other point which is very clear is that the LaRouche Political Action

Committee has set the agenda; and this point should have been clear for years leading into this, including from Kesha Rogers'

successful, highly impactful campaigns for Federal office.

But

we've put on the agenda: Glass-Steagall; the immediate necessity

to shut down Wall Street; and the fact that the American people

were not willing to accept the Obama-Clinton agenda to bring the

United States into World War III with a confrontation with Russia. But we must continue to do so, and we must continue to

set this agenda. There can be no alternative, no replacement for

a continued mobilization and a continued clarity of leadership coming from the LaRouche Political Action Committee and our allies.

Now, I would like to read a short portion of the lead item

which was posted on the LaRouche PAC website today, because I think it very clearly defines what Mr. LaRouche's current analysis of this situation is. And then we can open up the discussion from there. But the title is, "Trump Victory Is Only

a Reprieve from War Danger Unless a Much More Fundamental Change

Can Be Enacted". It begins by stating the following:

"The election of Donald Trump and the defeat of both Hillary

Clinton and Barack Obama has provided a short reprieve in a drive

for World War III against Russia, so long as Obama is prevented

from taking some kind of insane action in his remaining lame duck

weeks in office. The fact that an immediate danger of nuclear war

is off the table for the time being is important; but it does not

address the other grave crises that the world is facing.

"The trans-Atlantic financial system is still on the edge of

total disintegration, and unless that problem is immediately addressed, the conditions will soon re-emerge for global war.

To

solve that imminent crisis, the US Congress must immediately pass

the pending legislation in both Houses, to reinstate the original

Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, breaking up the too-big-to-fail banks

into totally separated commercial and investment banks. This must be the first order of business when Congress returns to Washington early next week."

This continues by saying: "Well beyond that urgently required action, other measures must be taken to forge a new kind of relations among the leading nations of the planet." This is something we will elaborate much more during the course of this broadcast, but this statement goes on to cite some statements that were made by Sergei Glazyev, a leading advisor of President Putin; Chas Freeman, a top and very distinguished diplomat in the United States diplomatic community; and otherwise, that make the very clear and correct point that now is the time to realize that the world is moving into an entirely new paradigm. And beyond just a détente between the United States and Russia, which is a potentially very positive development, the United States must also reciprocate the offers from China to enter into this New Silk Road, New Paradigm program; entering into the AIIB, joining the New Silk Road in a very concrete and definitive way.

Now, what can be very clearly defined, is that Mr. LaRouche is the leading statesman on the scene right now in the United States. The Four New Laws that we have been repeatedly emphasizing over the course of the recent several months leading into this election, continue to be the number one agenda item. Of course, that begins with Glass-Steagall, but the entirety of

the program is a Hamiltonian renaissance for the United States.

Now, during a discussion we had earlier today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized this supplementary pamphlet which was issued by the LaRouche Political Action Committee almost a year ago – "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance". And this very concretely lays out how the United States can join this New Paradigm.

Now, I'd like to just begin with a few excerpts from these statements that were made by Sergei Glazyev and Chas Freeman, which I think clearly get to this point; but I think a lot more can be said. This is an interview with Sergei Glazyev from {Itar Tass} in the aftermath of the Presidential elections: "According to Glazyev," this article says, "the result of the US elections show that 'The American people don't want war. For the first time in the world's history, there is a chance to a new global economic order without waging a world war.'"

And then Chas Freeman, in a speech called "One Belt, One Road" which was delivered in Hawaii a few days before the election, end with the point that "The United States must now realize that the new paradigm defined by the AIIB and the New Silk Road, and all of the other initiatives that have been taken by China, is the new game in town." And Chas Freeman's point is that Americans are not in the game. Now's the time for us to enter into this and to realize that it's in our interest to

join

the One Belt, One Road initiative. Chas Freeman says, "China's

growing influence is very good reason to seek a seat alongside it, both in the new and old councils of the emerging multi-polar

world, rather than continuing to futilely try to exclude it. The

United States needs to be constructive and helpful, not negative

and critical – still less obstructive – as all this unfolds.

Americans have a big stake in how Eurasia integrates, and in what

its relationships with other continents and regions become.

Time

to get in the game," he concludes; "time to participate in crafting the post-Pax Americana order. Time to leverage China's

initiative to American advantage."

And I could go on, but I want to just make the point that

now is the time to recognize the full responsibility of the intellectual leadership that LaRouche PAC has defined and continues to deliver. And taking the Four New Economic Laws, taking the implications of Alexander Hamilton's economic reports,

which defined and created the United States in the first place,

and recognizing what time it is; with the shift to an entirely new international economic and strategic order, it's our responsibility to mobilize and bring the United States into that

new order.

So, I'll just leave it at that; and I think we can explore

some of the implications of this in discussion with Kesha and Michael.

KESHA ROGERS: OK, I will start in response by saying that what has to be recognized is that the fight has never been a matter of party politics, one party over the other; because as President George Washington said, "Party politics is the bane of our nation's existence." What we saw during my campaigns for US Congress, was very instrumental in that; because the people I was able to pull together were people from all different types of backgrounds. It was a question not of just what party you belonged to, or what your race was, or any of that; but this question of what do we want to see for our nation and for the future of our nation? Reviving the vision and the ideas of President John F Kennedy, President Franklin Roosevelt; people of all different types of backgrounds – as has been stated – came together around Glass-Steagall to defy Wall Street, and they continue to do so. The Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and so forth. So, I think it's important to note that what we have identified is a question of the direction that mankind has to take; that the people of this nation have come together on a few accounts that have been completely against what the establishment had thought would happen. During my campaigns, the victories around the two nominations despite the fact that the party establishment did everything in their power to create a divide against the truth that myself, Mr. LaRouche, and our slate were saying; that Obama represented a threat to this nation. The cancelling of the NASA Constellation program, the continued policies for backing Wall Street against the interests of the population. The second time that we saw the population come

together in a real way – as has been said on a number of occasions here – is the JASTA vote. The JASTA vote was not a

–
Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act – was not a Republican

or a Democratic issue; so I think we are now eliminating the party system. This has been a big part of what I have been advocating, what Mr. LaRouche has been advocating is that we have

to have a new conception of mankind brought forward. I think it's been very clearly stated in the discussions that we've had

with him, that are really continuing and hopefully we can get that developed in this discussion today. The idea that this is

not just a US issue; now we're talking about how do we improve and develop new conceptions of international relations. New conceptions of relations among human beings.

Just a couple of things I want to start off with to develop

that. First of all, just in the discussion we had with Mr. LaRouche yesterday, in response to the election and where we must

go from here, he said we will get a unity among human beings as

human beings. The US and Russia can work together as human beings; and we are looking at mankind in a universal way. We are

going to learn how to apply our minds. People have to see the meaning of their existence in a way that most people have not. If we're really going to conceptualize that idea, I think what we're going to discuss here today is: 1. The concrete policies

that are needed to bring together the type of collaboration as we're seeing develop from the development of the BRICS nations

–
Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa – and their

cooperation. The development of the AIIB, and the offer of cooperation through the Silk Road, by President Xi Jinping to the

United States. People probably remember that Obama rejected it.

Now, the mission is, we have to reverse the rejection. We have

to work with Russia; we have to take up China's offer. But we have to take it up in a bigger way than just around treaty agreements or working together on international cooperation of projects. Those things will be essential, but the essential is

going to be the development of a new, unified, international mission of a new direction for mankind in space collaboration. I

want to develop that a little bit more, but I will stop right there, because I think we need to pull a few more things together

to come back to that point.

MICHAEL STEGER: The underlying ability for the LaRouche

organization and LaRouche PAC to operate as a leading force on the planet has been something that eludes most people. It's not

something that's in the predicates of the policies we've been fighting for directly; there's something philosophically more profound. It does stand out, the fact that this election, where

vote came from, what people voted for – whether it be in the Democratic primary, where we saw Glass-Steagall both by Martin O'Malley and Bernie Sanders, and again even by Trump at the end

of the general election campaign; where Glass-Steagall came up again. {We} were the leading factor and force of a political fight, won in the opposition of Bush and Cheney and the clear tyranny that they represented, but even more distinctly,

because

of the nature of Obama in this last years—which is important just to take a few seconds, not long, but just to recognize: the

Republican Party for the last eight years worked with Obama. There was no real opposition to it. That's why the Republican Party is really in as much of a shambles as the Democratic Party is.

The Party system, as Kesha said, is gone, because there was no legitimate opposition to Obama, except for what we did. And it started on the Obamacare question. We led the fight entirely. We defined it as a Nazi program, while the Republican Party was likely going to adopt it and support it, the same way Mitt Romney had pushed in Massachusetts. It was generally a kind of Heritage Foundation, right-wing, healthcare reform. We recognized it to be, underlying, a fascist program of population reduction, and we've been relentless with Obama, unrelenting, on the question that this Presidency was a failure and a very danger to mankind.

But then you had Lyn's intervention following the invasion of Libya, and the killing of Muammar Gaddafi, and Lyn's precise insight that this represented a very accelerated drive for nuclear war. There was immediate resonance, immediate response from the leadership in Russia. Like Dmitry Medvedev, [then President, now Prime Minister]. And we saw an increasing level of recognition, somewhat slowly, but from key figures, who began to identify the fact that Lyn was absolutely right. And that

again

became a center of the discussion of the U.S. Presidential election over the last few months.

So, you have the immediate collapse of the financial system

– which is there, we're on the precipice, this has been in the financial media now practically for a year, going back to last December, when the financial markets collapsed then. There's a very, very imminent breakdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It's an underlying bankruptcy, a deep bankruptcy. Then you also have the immediate drive for war. Both of those issues

have now been on the table. That's what the American people voted

for. It was a mandate for the LaRouche policy. And for the very

reason that the political establishment in this country compromised on Lyn, going back to the 1980s, shut down his efforts for space exploration, for collaboration among nations,

and instead put an FBI attack on him and our organization, they

got this kind of revolt. Had they adopted Lyn's policies then, you wouldn't see neither the breakdown of our economy and our society, the threat of nuclear war, or the collapse of a revolutionary type situation in the United States.

The only way to really address this problem is to address it

quickly. We are talking about a timeframe where if the new Administration coming in does not fulfill what the LaRouche PAC

has defined as the "New Presidency," then it will fail, and fail

quickly. There is a quality of crisis in the country, and so there is a level of urgency that Mr. LaRouche expressed today in

our discussions. We need to get a handle on this. The policy

orientation needs to be very clear. And it needs to be a comprehensive program. You can't just implement Glass-Steagall, though that's exactly where you have to start. You've got to go with the full Hamilton perspective. You've got to look at a full development of the country. And you can't go with this Wall Street garbage. It's not going to function.

A point that Kesha really made an emphasis of, and that Lyn emphasized on Wednesday following this election, stands out, because there is clearly – as Matt, you read from the Chas Freeman quote – at the highest institutional level of recognition, that this New Silk Road orientation is in depth; it is not weak; it is not superficial. As someone from the Chinese Consulate in San Francisco recently said, "This is not on paper. This is on the ground. This is a real project. This is not the TPP." The question though, is how is this approached? The approach of the political establishment may be best indicated by Henry Kissinger and these types: is to approach it from the Hobbesian view – an animalistic view of man, where you're looking for advantages. How do we take advantage of this? How do we work with this? China is looking to their advantage. How do we look to our advantage?

It doesn't mean that one disregards one's own benefit. But the emphasis that Lyn made, and I think what Kesha was developing, is that you have to look at the universal nature of mankind. You have to look at what policies, what approach

towards

the relationship among nations is of benefit to mankind as a whole, or as Helga said on Wednesday in a discussion, what used

to be referenced as the "common aims of mankind." That has to be

then the basis, the philosophical basis for a scientific foundation, for a new relationship among nations. And that really

then defines how this can be very much a new paradigm or a new era for mankind. Not only is an immediate action required, but the potential of action is perhaps greater than it's ever been.

OGDEN: Just to continue to emphasize the point that you, Kesha,

brought up, the first indications, I think very clearly, of what

hit with full force with this election, was what you were able to

generate around your campaigns for federal office.

BEN DENISTON: Over and over again.

OGDEN: Three times in a row. Twice the Democratic nominee

for Congress, and then you forced the Senate campaign into a run-off, in Texas, on precisely this LaRouche PAC program. Every

time that people say, "Oh, we are so surprised, we are so shocked, none of the polls saw this coming," whether it was in this general election campaign for President, whether it was in

the Brexit vote – every time somebody tells you that, you say, "No, that's actually not true."

DENISTON: Most people probably know, but it's worth emphasizing: Kesha led with "Impeach Obama." You had a

Democrat

leading the Democratic ticket on impeaching Obama, and that was what shocked. It was national news. It's kind of amazing that the Democrats are so far behind, so much in this crazy bubble, that they can't see where the ferment is in the population. Just to add that in there.

OGDEN: Absolutely!

DENISTON: It shocked the country, it shocked the world.

There was international recognition when Kesha won [the Democratic Party primaries for U.S. House in 2010 and again in 2012; and came in second in a field of five candidates for U.S.

Senate in 2013, but lost in the run-off]. These guys are now years and years behind the ball on this thing.

OGDEN: The other element of your campaigns, Kesha, was a clear vision for the country. This is an element of inspiration that a population which was, yes, legitimately angry and enraged against the policies of the last not 8 years, but the last 15, 16 years of both the Obama and Bush administrations, and had been ground into the dust and left behind, and were literally suffering from an increase in mortality, and so forth, as we've spoken about.

It was not only a rage factor, in terms of that, but it was also, and it continues to be – and this must be recognized – a deep desire for purpose, for meaning, for inspiration, and for

a
vision of what the future actually can be. And, Michael, as
you
were saying, it's a philosophical question: What is the
meaning
of mankind? What is this really all about? Why am I
struggling,
day in and day out? What's the meaning behind "what it means
to
be human?"

And so, the Number One point of emphasis in your
campaigns,
Kesha, and the Number One point of emphasis continues to be,
what
is the role that mankind is going to play over the next 100
years
in this solar system and in the universe? It was clear when
John
F. Kennedy committed the United States to having a man on the
Moon before the end of the 1960s, that this was the defining
moment in the entire generation at that point. The United
States
rose to the challenge because it was a truthful challenge.

We applied the Hamiltonian principles to make that
happen.

You stood up and you said "We're going back to space. China is
doing it." In the years since your campaigns, Kesha, China has
achieved unbelievable feats. There will be a robotic lander on
the far side of the Moon. If we put this on the agenda, and we
say, "We are no longer going to succumb to the backwards
agenda.

We're going to join hands, not only on the New Silk Road here
on

Earth, but we're going to join hands with China to go back to
the

Moon. We're going to go to Mars. We are going in a way which
affirms the true, creative nature of the human species. We're

going into space." That's the other element of this.

ROGERS: Yeah, that was already defined by Krafft Ehrlicke. It was defined by Lyndon LaRouche. It was exemplified, as has already been stated, in a conception of mankind and the relationships among human beings, that most people, through the degenerate culture that we have been immersed in, has yet to actually, truly experience. It's not just a question of "Well, I like this policy of going to the Moon," or "Yes, we should do that," or "Kennedy's idea of going to the Moon was for economic profits or to put feet on the Moon and then it was going to be over." We were talking about policy for a 50-year-plus plan, or should we say, a generational.

Right now, the problem is that we have lost the conception of acting for the next generations. Most people say, especially with space policy, "Well, we'll see what this next President's going to do, but then after that we have to follow whatever the next President wants to do, and it's just going to be an up-and-down cycle. Maybe we'll have a good one who wants a good policy, and maybe we'll have a bad one." But that's not how the process works. As I said, this is a question of international relations, but also, as Krafft Ehrlicke said, the question of development of space, and what that represents for understanding our relationships right here on Earth is a Universal, an Extraterritorial Imperative.

I think these conceptions are not just things that are

to be
thrown around, but they really have to be conceptualized,
understood, and mastered, just as Lyn's emphasis and very
important call, that the only thing that can save the United
States right now, and for that matter save the entire world
against this economic collapse, is the return to those
Hamiltonian principles – the recognition that we have to
restore
an understanding of what Hamilton was developing in his four
reports: "Report on Public Credit;" "Report on a National
Bank;"
"Report on the Subject of Manufactures;" and "On the
Constitutionality of the Bank of the United States."

We've done a number of very thorough presentations on
those
points, because that's not just something of the past, or just
"policy issues," but it is the necessary direction that has to
be
re-established right now: how are we going to build up our
capabilities on this planet to provide for the needs of every
single human being? We're talking about development around
food,
most importantly around fusion resources—LaRouche's Fourth
Law.
We have to have a science-driver fusion program. This is the
key
aspect of China's policy for their Moon mission, and their
space
program – the mining of Helium-3, the development of the far
side of the Moon.

This is the policy that the United States has gone far
away
from. We just have to just put the United States back on
course
again, and that the course of action has been clearly stated
by
the direction that China's taking with their space program.

It's interesting to note: that was the direction we were going in, or slated to go in, with the development of the Moon, under not just President John F. Kennedy, but this was the policy that was being put forth prior to President Obama cancelling it.

OGDEN: I want to pick up on what you said, Michael. What the LaRouche Movement – both in the United States, but also internationally – has clearly been at the forefront of for decades, is the agenda. The intelligentsia of the planet has concentrated itself, at key moments of history, around what the conceptions for the future must be that have been laid forward by the LaRouche Movement. I just want to bring up one point which was contained in this report. This is the transcript of an international conference that took place in June of this year. Coincidentally, it was literally the day after the Brexit vote occurred; which had the entire trans-Atlantic expert establishment on their heels. Nobody supposedly saw this coming. But the keynote speaker at this event was Helga Zepp-LaRouche; one of the other keynote speakers was Ambassador Chas Freeman. At that point, the point of the One Belt, One Road policy, the New Silk Road policy was put clearly on the agenda. The other major agenda item of this conference was the necessity to work with Russia to resolve and rebuild the situation inside Syria. This conference was called in order to discuss the contents of this massive special report, which was published by {Executive Intelligence Review}. This is "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge"; and with the publication of this, the entire nitty-gritty aspect of what this New Paradigm really means on the

ground – not on paper, as you said, Michael – was put into writing.

At that point, Helga Zepp-LaRouche called for the publication of a supplementary pamphlet which would concretely elaborate exactly how the United States would join that New Silk Road. And with all of the discussion now in the last few days of infrastructure and big projects and how to create millions of new jobs inside the United States, this is clearly the number one item of relevance. Now, we're going to play a short excerpt from a video which was put out by LaRouche PAC about two months ago. The full video is called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge", but this short excerpt from the concluding portion of that video elaborates exactly how the United States could work with China and work with these Eurasian countries to build itself into this New Silk Road. So, I'd like to play that excerpt for you right now.

"As part of the trans-Atlantic, the United States is also associated with a high standard of living. However, the Wall Street-dominated, post-World War II paradigm has taken its toll on the US economy and its people. Scrapping its agro-industrial sector for financial and services industries, with the promise that it would make for a more competitive economy, high-earning skilled work was out-sourced to cheaper markets abroad which

provide a living wage for their workers. This flawed version of globalization lowered the productivity of the Americas as a whole, increased the rate of poverty throughout the hemisphere, and invited billions of dollars of illicit money flows from the global drug trade, which to this day represent a significant portion of the cash on hand in the Western banking sector.

"However, even after the 2007-2008 crisis, when the bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic financial system could no longer be covered up and needed an emergency bail-out –

"|'This is not just about Lehman Brothers; these problems are not limited to Wall Street or even Main Street. This is a crisis for the global economy.'

"– no serious structural reforms have been made to the Western financial establishment; putting the West and the rest of the world at risk of an even greater crisis.

"No wonder that in recent years, China, Russia, and other emerging economies have begun to create new international financial institutions, based on a concept of 'win-win' relations among nations and created to facilitate economic development and trade for all participants instead of preserving the hegemony of some. Instead of the exclusivity of US trade agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, China has extended an invitation to the US and the rest of the Americas to join them in establishing a new era of global economic development.

"I state this very clearly to President Obama that

China

will be firmly committed to the path of peaceful development;
and

China will be firm in deepening reform and opening up the
country

...|'

"But can the US envision a world where it is no longer
the
sole superpower; and instead shares that responsibility with
other nations?

"'|..|.and will work hard to push forward the noble
cause of
peace and development for all mankind.' [Chinese President Xi
Jinping]

"The potential for US participation in the New Silk
Road

program is immense. One key project in EIR's New Silk Road
report is finally connecting the Eurasian continent with North
America at the Bering Strait. A Bering Strait provides the
needed symmetry to make the One Belt, One Road strategy a
global

one; and would transform the two continents the same way the
ancient Silk Road opened up Europe to Asia.

"Imagine boarding a magnetically-levitated train in
downtown

Paris or Berlin, travelling 250 miles per hour across the
steppes

of Siberia, through a tunnel below the Bering Strait, emerging
on

the other side in Alaska on your way to Manhattan. Layered
with

a freight and passenger rail line running north-south from
Alaska

to the lower 48 states from Eurasia, is the construction of
the

long-awaited North American Water and Power Alliance [NAWAPA];
an

Apollo-era continental water management system that takes freshwater run-off from Alaska and Canada, and diverts it southward for use in the arid southwest United States.

"And while the average American will tell you these projects are impossible, the average Chinese today is building them. In the last decade, China – comparable in size to the United States – constructed over 11,000 miles of high-speed rail; and seeks to triple that number by 2020. Similarly, China's Three Gorges Dam and South Water North projects are some of the greatest water infrastructure projects ever undertaken. In the new 'win-win' paradigm, big infrastructure investment is the new normal everywhere."

That video is available on the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel and the LaRouche PAC website. But I'd like to ask Ben to just follow that up.

BEN DENISTON: Off of the discussions that Matt referenced with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the last couple of days, we wanted to redirect people's attention to this supplementary pamphlet. Obviously the full report is a little bit hefty for your average American, we did want to produce this shorter, condensed kind of organizing report to really grip people and give people a sense of what it means for the United States to join this New Silk Road program, this New Paradigm. We want to make sure people know

—
we can bring up on the screen share here — that this full report is also available on our website. If you go under "our policies", "US Joins the New Silk Road" it's available right there; and the entirety of the report is available here. As Matthew said, this was published almost one year ago, so maybe some of the introduction might be a little bit dated to the context of the time when we put this out; but the substance, the content, is still very relevant, very crucial, and integrates together with the more recent focus Mr. LaRouche has put on his Four Laws program.

But just to give people a very quick overview of the report, we can see here in the table of contents, it's broken into a series of chapters following the introduction. The first chapter really provides somewhat of a sketch, but a real presentation of what can be done in the United States in the context of joining this New Paradigm. So, passing Glass-Steagall; engaging in an international credit/finance system to facilitate growth, development. What does that mean? Well, as was referenced in the video, one of the mega-projects that's been on the table for a century now quite frankly, if not longer, is this Bering Strait connection; literally connecting, via high-speed rail, North America into this entire World Land-Bridge perspective. So, that's been long recognized as a keystone project. That can come together with — as was also discussed in the video — high-speed rail across the United States. As Mr. LaRouche, in his work

on

the Eurasian Land-Bridge and World Land-Bridge, had developed, these are more than just rail corridors; this mankind developing

the interior regions of continents. Moving from a coastal dominated civilization to one that actually master the interior

landmass of regions. A lot can be said, but this really goes to

the heart of his science of economics, his insight, his metric of

potential relative population density; how mankind can transform

the so-called "carrying capacity" of a piece of land of society

with this kind of development. So, bringing in high-speed rail

and all the associated infrastructure to make vastly larger regions of the territory of the United States inhabitable and developable. We have huge amounts of unused land waiting to be

developed.

In the development of this report, Helga LaRouche also placed a large emphasis on the development of new cities; new renaissance cities as she called for as part of the whole development program. Bringing rail, water, power to these new regions of the country to develop new, highly-organized cities;

not just urban sprawl, not just endless unorganized development.

But actual cultural city centers organized around a central region, focussed on an educational, artistic focus of society; and you center your activity around that. That's also discussed

in some detail in this report.

This is obviously going to create major spin-off effects in

terms of job requirements; rebuilding US industry. All kinds of connected jobs required to support that kind of activity. So, this talk about creating millions of jobs, this can be done very easily in the context of this New Paradigm system. One thing we fought with in producing this report was actually gripping people with what this means. It's easy to go through the figures – this many miles of rail, this many cities, etc. – but the American people have suffered so long under a lack of this kind of development, that it's important to really grip people and give them a sense that these are not just projects; this is your future. This is a return to the idea that every generation is going to be fundamentally better off than the generation before them. That you live your life with the recognition that your children are going to have a fundamentally better life than you were able to live; and it was because you and your generation contributed to creating that.

It's been recognized – LaRouche PAC may have been the first to point this out – but it's now generally recognized, the current youth generation does not have that. You have the first situation potentially in American history where the younger generation is worse off than their parents' generation. If you want to talk about the death rates, the drug epidemic, all these things, that's the substance of what's driving that process. Not just poverty per se, but poverty in the context of no future;

complete degeneracy of society.

So, returning to this idea that there is to your job, to your employment, to your activity, to your family's activity, to your neighborhood, your city, your town. There's a purpose in investing and creating a new, higher state of living for the nation as a whole; and that's what this really means. That's driving inspiration in China, in nations working with China; in this whole One Belt, One Road program. That's what we can revive and return to in the United States; that's what these infrastructure projects really mean. It's about mankind participating in the truly immortal nature of mankind's creative development.

And what we also address in this report, just to point this out to people directly, is an added integral element of that is a real science driver program. So, we have on the one hand – it's not separated, but together with the idea of joining the New Silk Road, rebuilding the United States on a higher level with new infrastructure, a new standard of living; also engaging in the science driver programs and technology driver programs that push to new frontiers. Fusion power. With fusion power, you can completely transform mankind's capabilities; you can blast mankind up to a higher level of potential existence. Both in making power available, but also completely revolutionizing all kinds of production, industry, technologies; it's a totally new stage for mankind.

This goes directly together with space; the

development of
the Moon, the development of helium-3 resources on the Moon as
a
key fusion fuel. So, bringing mankind really into a level of
a
Solar System species, a Solar System existence; and learning –
we had some discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today –
learning what the Solar System is really all about. There are
some of the most basic things we still don't understand about
how
the Solar System works; even how the Moon works. Our
knowledge
is still extremely limited in terms of what mankind is
existing
in here in this Solar System; let alone what the Solar System
is
doing in the galaxy, and how to understand these kinds of
things.
Recognizing that that is kind of the first of the substance of
these kinds of revolutions of mankind's ability to exist. If
we
discover these higher levels of the principles organizing the
fundamental nature of the universe, we can uniquely utilize
that
understanding to transform how we act.

So, it's this intimate connection that Mr. LaRouche, I
believe, is the first to really define scientifically between
fundamental scientific discovery and the crucial role of real
scientific method in that context, and what people call
economic
progress and economic growth. That's the integrated central
picture that we have to present and break through on; and we
have
presented it in a somewhat short but moving and condensed and
illustrated way in this report. So, Helga had specifically
requested that we draw people's attention again to this
important

piece of organizing ammunition that we have; to move people in this time of ferment, in this time of potential, to not sit back

and wait for something to happen, but to take action. Realize this is the future we can create. We've just had an opening created that gives us the potential to act; it's not here yet, but now we have a potential that we have not had for four terms

of the Presidency. So, I think this is critical that we get all

this on the table and move immediately with the recognition that

this is the true mission of mankind.

STEGER: I would just like to say, on the Four Laws, which captured this policy direction, the subtitle is that this is not

an option, but an immediate necessity. And I think it's worth making it clear that these are not policy options from the standpoint of government. These Four Laws and this orientation

that Ben just laid out, is actually a necessary and integral functioning of any competent form of government. Hamilton uniquely understood that at his time; there was resistance from

the slave-based oligarchy at that time which opposed the recognition that the economic power to unleash mankind's advancement, to orient mankind towards this level through manufacturing, through industry, and especially through the scientific process. But that was an integral part of what government required to fulfill its obligation to the well-being

of its population and its posterity. So, these Four Laws are a

necessity not simply because of the economic crisis; they must be

adopted by government as laws. Our government today, to

secure

for the first time as Glazyev said, for the first time, world war

is no longer a danger; and for the first time the United States

will set the leading example of a form of self-government based

on the highest scientific conception of mankind based on these Four Laws; and have the economic power and potential to unleash

that unique characteristic of mankind. These Four Laws are of that quality of significance.

OGDEN: This is the immediate action agenda. And as Lyndon

and Helga LaRouche said earlier, there's a lot that's undefined;

there's very inconclusive facts available right now. But the one

thing that is clear, is that we need a full-scale mobilization from the people who are involved in the activities of LaRouche PAC, to immediately force the Glass-Steagall agenda. Congress is

coming back into session at the very beginning of next week – Monday and Tuesday. They need to be confronted with an absolute

torrent, a flood of calls and activity from around the country to

say "There is nothing else; this is agenda point one." And to pull out all the stops on this entire program. We've emphasized

we have the ability to pull together the entire country on the Four Laws action page; this is action.larouchepac.com/fourlaws.

If you haven't signed up there yet, that's available. There's also a place where you can submit your reports. All of the material that you need is on that website, including the

Alexander Hamilton four reports and Mr. LaRouche's original document, "LaRouche's Four Laws". Then as Ben just showed you, we also have this supplementary page, a digital pamphlet that we produced; "The United States Joins the New Silk Road". This is also available on the LaRouche PAC website.

So, we are in undefined and uncharted territory right now; I think people are recognizing that at the point that the United States, for example in the 1930s, faced similar situations, it was only because of the immediate leadership that Franklin Roosevelt provided with the entire program – this was the initial Glass-Steagall, this was a reorganization of the entire bankrupt financial system, this was immediately getting people back to work – that is the agenda. At that point, it was undefined what was going to happen; it was because Franklin Roosevelt provided the kind of leadership that he did, that prevented what could have been a very dangerous situation from degenerating into that. It's our responsibility to place that onto the agenda now. Nobody else is going to do that. We have a short reprieve, a short window of reprieve from the danger of World War III. You have qualified leadership from around the world tentatively reaching out and saying we are ready for an entirely new paradigm of relations with the United States. Russia, China, other countries around the world. But the United States that they want, is LaRouche's United States.

So, thank you very much for joining us. I'd like to especially thank Michael and Kesha. Kesha, thank you; and I'm sure we will be looking to you for some more in the near future.

And I'd like to thank Ben for joining me here in the studio. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. If you haven't

subscribed

to our YouTube channel yet, do so immediately. And subscribe to

our weekly and daily emails as well. Thank you and good night.

POLITISK ORIENTERING 10.

nov., 2016:

Donald Trump! Hvad det betyder,

og hvad LaRouche-bevægelsen nu må gøre.

Se også 2. del.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video 2. del:

Lyd: