

# GLASS-STEAGALL NU!

## Luk Wall Street ned, før den slår dig ihjel!

*31. august 2016 (Leder) – Med betydningsfulde, internationale topmøder, der starter den 2. september, og med den amerikanske Kongres, der vender tilbage til Washington den 6. september, vil de næste to uger blive langt mere afgørende for USA's fremtidige skæbne, og for menneskehedens fremtidige skæbne, end det amerikanske præsidentvalg den 8. november.*

Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at, med mindre Kongressen handler – og handler nu, i september – for at genindføre Glass-Steagall, som det første skridt i en langt mere omfattende omstrukturering af den økonomiske og monetære politik, så har hele det transatlantiske system direkte kurs mod en nedsmeltning.

I diskussioner med kolleger i dag sagde LaRouche følgende:

*»Hvis de undgår spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall i særdeleshed, samt relaterede spørgsmål, så vil de personer, der beter sig således, bringe deres egen død over deres hoveder. Man kan ikke tillade sig at ignorere det, der står på spil her. Man vil få en masse pludselige dødsfald, fordi de ikke var opmærksomme og gjorde, hvad de skulle.«*

Denne kommende weekend vil blive vidne til en fremmarch af tre på hinanden følgende, internationale topmøder for statsoverhoveder, i Asien – Ruslands Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Kinas værtskab for G20-topmødet og Laos' værtskab for ASEAN plus 6 – og disse topmøder vil kontinuerligt etablere den kendsgerning, at Kina, Rusland og Indien – og ikke Obama og NATO – er i færd med at skabe et nyt, globalt system. Og mens Kina tager føringen ved denne uges G20-topmøde for at skabe et nyt og retfærdigt, globalt

finansielt system, så har håndlanger for briterne, den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama, i sin sindsforvirrede tilstand, og som en del af sin agenda for krig mod Rusland og Kina, planer om at promovere sin ekskluderende handelsaftale, Trans-Pacific Partnerskab (TPP), der på forhånd er dømt til undergang.

USA holder søndag den 11. september en mindedag i anledning af 15-års dagen for terrorangrebene den 11. september, 2001, og denne årsdag er den første, hvor de virkelige, udenlandske sponsorer af terrorangrebene – det britiske og saudiske monarki – står afsløret, med de nu frigivne 28 sider af den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport fra 2002. Dette 28 sider lange kapitel afslører også nogle af de institutioner, der kørte mørklægningen, inklusive, men ikke begrænset til, FBI og CIA. I lyset af disse afsløringer vil New York City fejre denne weekend med en imponerende række koropførelser af Mozarts Rekviem, der opføres af Schiller Instituttets kor, inklusive en særlig messe den 11. september, til ære for New York City's Brandvæsen (FDNY), hvilket alt sammen indgår som en del af kravet om total juridisk retfærdighed for det afskyelige mord på mere end 3000 amerikanere og andre, for femten år siden.

Og der er klare og accelererende tegn på en umiddelbart forestående nedsmeltning af det transatlantiske system. Den aftale, der blev indgået i sidste øjeblik for at redde Italiens Monte dei Paschi-bank, er nu ved at smuldre, og JPMorgan Chase taler nu for at gennemføre en bail-in (ekspropriering) af den private sektor for at undgå, at hele den italienske banksektor bliver udslettet. CNBC rapporterede i sidste uge, at »bankerne forbereder sig til en økonomisk atomvinter« og er i færd med at udarbejde nødplaner, ifald det værste skulle indtræffe, planer, der forudser eurozonens totale opbrud og enden på den Europæiske Union gennem en hel række afstemninger over hele Europa til fordel for en exit.

Aldrig har den sandhed stået klarere, at, hvis befolkningen

skulle ønske at vende de seneste femten års, for ikke at sige de seneste halvtreds års tendenser omkring, så ville Obama blive fordømt som en tragisk skikkelse, og patriotiske kræfter ville gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall nu!

Lyndon LaRouche talte i diskussionen om denne befolkningens underliggende frygt:

*»Og I ved, at FBI er en del af dette her. Andre institutioner er, som FBI, er ansvarlige for undertrykkelse af sandheden. Jeg tror, tiden nu er inde til at undertrykke FBI! I det mindste, indtil de lever op til deres ansvar ... Og alle de personer, der støttede ideen om at sætte mig i fængsel, var bedragere. I særdeleshed nogle af de højtplacerede folk i det juridiske system. De gjorde det. De begik en forbrydelse ... Problemet er, at folk ikke handler på det, som de erkender, er problemet! Så vi må mobilisere folk som sådan, til at mobilisere sig selv. Med andre ord, til ikke alene at mobilisere sig selv som sådan, men til rent faktisk at mobilisere deres egen indsats over for andre ... Problemet er, at folk bliver bange. De er bange for FBI og alle mulige ting, der foregår. De er intimideret.«*

### **Tiden er inde til at handle**

Som for eksempel med de igangværende topmøder, inklusive det forestående sammentræde af FN's Generalforsamling i anden halvdel af september, er stærke strategiske skift i gang. Putin har forpurret den amerikansk/britiske politik i Sydvestasien og har vundet Tyrkiet og nu endda førende røster i Tyskland til fordel for en politik, baseret på international lov, elimineringen af terrornetværk samt økonomisk udvikling på storstilet skala.

Det bliver nu med stadigt voksende klarhed åbenlyst, at Kinas, Ruslands og Indiens politik med nye infrastrukturkorridorer over hele Eurasien og Afrika er blevet en politik, der er langt mere magtfuld end Obamas forsøg på at fremprovokere krig

med Rusland og Kina.

Som Lyndon LaRouche sagde under diskussioner med kolleger tidligere i dag:

*»Jeg tror, vi nu har det rette publicerede materiale. Det vigtigste er simpelt hen at holde fast i materialet om udvikling, og at forøge det. Vi får sandsynligvis den bedst mulige hjælp på baggrund af de nye angreb på 'gangsterne', som vi kalder dem. Og mange kongresmedlemmer tvinges nu til at forsvare vore borgeres rettigheder.*

*Det betyder, at vi simpelt hen vil mobilisere befolkningen. Vi vil mobilisere befolkningen til at gennemtvinge disse rettigheder – deres rettigheder, på baggrund af dette, blot denne simple overvejelse. Det vil ikke fungere på nogen anden måde.«*

Glass-Steagall er det første, uomgængelige skridt i både USA og Europa, for at afvende et finansielt lavineskred. Der er fremsat Glass/Steagall-lovforslag fra begge partier i begge Kongressens huse, ligesom Glass-Steagall indgår i valgplatformene for både det Demokratiske og Republikanske Parti, og en vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall i de kommende uger vil sluttelig vende hele valgprocessen omkring, til fordel for det amerikanske folk som helhed.

Den nye, globale, finansielle arkitektur og en verdenslandbro med transkontinentale storprojekter, der nu er under opførelse, er blevet promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i over fire årtier. **Tiden er nu inde til at gennemtvinge en vedtagelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen**, en eliminerings af de finansielle derivaters finansielle atombombe og implementeringen af Lyndon LaRouches tre andre hovedlove: skabelse af statslige kreditbanker; en definering af et kreditsystem, der sigter på en forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktive evne gennem storstilet udvikling og infrastruktur; samt at fremskyde de videnskabelige grænser gennem udforskning

af det ydre rum og udvikling af fusionskraft.



Menneskeheden har et ubegrænset potentiale for økonomisk vækst og udvikling af kreative evner. Vi må nu hævde vores naturlige, menneskelige ret til fortsat fremskridt, der er ubegrænset, eller også stå ansigt til ansigt med vores egen frygt.

---

## **Tyskland: Welt am Sonntag: Syrienseksperter: Putin ændrede hele geometrien**

29. august 2016 – Med en ekspertanalyse fra to, førende tyske militære personer, rapporterede *Welt am Sonntag* den 28. august, at de to mest fundamentale postulater om Syrien fra Obamas Hvide Hus og NATO er blevet modbevist. »Fred med Assad?« lyder overskriften på artiklen, og indledningen lyder: »Tyrkiet invaderer Syrien; dette er efter aftale med Rusland og Assad-regimet. Dette kunne ses som et totalt kursskifte, hvilket fortsat benægtes af Vesten.«

*Welt* har et længere interview med Wolfgang Ischinger, chef for den årlige Sikkerhedskonference i München og en førende tysk, konservativ militærtænder, der siger: »Jeg mener, at Tyrkiets 'nye ansigt' over for Assad [hvor de accepterer, at han foreløbig forbliver ved magten] er forståeligt. Og jeg opfordrer til, at Vesten finder det forståeligt. Kendsgerningerne er enkle. Vi kan ikke ignorere dem.« Ischinger kalder således Obamas, Camerons og NATO's første postulat og »røde linje«, nemlig, at Assad må gå, for »en

forfejlet plan«.

Den russiske præsident Putin udgør vægtstangen i situationen, og den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan søger at tilslutte sig ham, observerer *Welt*. Bladet citerer også den tyske general Harald Kujat, en tidligere vice-øverstkommanderende for NATO, der smadrer Obamas og hans bandes andet postulat, nemlig, at der »ikke er en militær løsning« i Syrien. Kujat siger, at dette er forkert, og at alle de involverede magter i realiteten har søgt en militær løsning, begyndende med USA/UK, der angriber de kurdiske militser og de såkaldte »moderate oprørsstyrker«, og Erdogan, der angriber al-Nusra og al-Qaeda.

Der findes ikke længere nogen »moderate oprørsstyrker«, insisterer Kujat, »hvis der nogensinde var nogen«. Ideen om en »forhandlet fred« baseret på, at Assad tvinges ud, var derfor et totalt korthus, en opskrift for kaos, siger han, »en alles krig mod alle«. Hvad der er vigtigere, så ændrede Putin fuldstændig situationen fundamentalt, da Rusland inter文nerede sidste september, den 30., og søgte en militær løsning mod alle terroristgrupperne, med Assads egen imødekommende regering som Ruslands »styrker på landjorden«.

Den lange og detaljerede undersøgelse af Thorsten Jungholt, hvor han påpegede det grundlæggende skift i alliancen, som Putin frembragte, vakte tydeligvis postyr i Tyskland. Dagen efter forsøgte *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* at modbevise dette i en lederartikel, der hævdede, at Tyrkiet stadig ønsker, at Assad »skal forsvinde« nu. Denne løgn modsiges af den tyrkiske udenrigsministers egne, nylige, officielle erklæringer, og viser blot, i hvilken grad, *Welt am Sonntags* rapport af den nye virkelighed har forårsaget uro.

---

# Overvind Obamas politikker nu; glem alt om valget 8. november

*30. august, 2016 (Leder)* – De næste par uger bliver langt mere afgørende for USA og menneskehedens fremtid, end det amerikanske præsidentvalg den 8. november.

I disse to uger vil vi opleve en fremmarch af tre, på hinanden følgende internationale topmøder, der afholdes i Asien, og som vil etablere den nye virkelighed, at det er Kina, Rusland og Indien – og ikke Obama og NATO – der skaber og former denne fremtid.

Og USA vil ikke være det samme efter 15-årsdagen for 11. september-angrebene, den første årsdag, hvor de, der var de reelle, udenlandske sponsorer af disse terrorangreb, står afsløret. Den forrykte tåbelighed, som var Bush-Obama krigene, og som fulgte i kølvandet på disse terrorangreb, er således blevet gjort klar og tydelig; det samme er også den russiske præsident Putins medmenneskelighed, med hans omgående tilkendegivelser af solidaritet med USA på daværende tidspunkt. I de næste to uger vil New York håndtere disse afsløringer gennem en slagkraftig række af minde-korkoncerter, opført af Schiller Instituttet, i hele byen.

Der er vægtige strategiske skift i gang. Putin har forpurret de amerikansk/europæiske præmisser om terroristbekæmpelse i Sydvestasien, idet han har vundet Tyrkiet for sin tilgang til problemet og nu er i færd med at vinde toneangivende røster, selv i Tyskland. Kinas, Ruslands og Indiens politik med at bygge landbroer og korridorer med ny infrastruktur i hele Eurasien og Afrika er blevet mere potent end Obamas forsøg på at provokere Rusland med krig, og »udstede regler« for Kina.

Alle Obamas giftige bestræbelser på at gøre Kina til en fjende

af de 10 ASEAN-lande er endt ud med, at Kina er *mere* indflydelsesrigt i ASEAN end før. ASEAN's årsmøde – efter weekendens Østasiatiske Økonomiske Forum og derefter G20-mødet i Hangzhou, Kina – vil være det tredje af de magtfulde topmøder, der alle fokuserer på at genskabe vækst og produktivitet for verdensøkonomien efter det sidste årtis sammenbrud, udløst af Wall Street.

Og Obamas anti-kinesiske »handelsaftaler«, TTP (Trans-Pacific Partnerskab) og TTIP (Trans-Atlantiske Handels- og Investerings-Partnerskab), bliver erklæret for døde, selv af deres tidligere tilhængere. Hvis vi optrapper vores indsats i løbet af disse to uger, er der bedre chancer for, at Kongressen snart vil gen-vedtage Glass-Steagall som lov, end tilfældet er for Obamas TTP eller TTIP.

Den nye, finansielle arkitektur og Verdenslandbroens storslåede infrastrukturprojekter, som disse topmøder vil tage sigte på, er blevet promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche over fire årtier.

Vil de fremtvinge en accept af Glass/Steagall-bankregulering og en afskrivning af den finansielle atombombe, som de finansielle derivater udgør?

Det kræver, at vi nu optrapper vores mobilisering for det, som Lyndon LaRouche har kaldt sine Fire Kardinallove: Glass-Steagall; nationale kreditbanker; teknologiske fremskridt gennem infrastruktur-byggeri; fremme af videnskabens fremskudte grænser gennem udforskning af det ydre rum og udvikling af fusionskraft.

Der er et ubegrænset potentiale for menneskehedens økonomiske vækst og udvikling af kreative evner. Obamas Hvide Hus vil sandsynligvis *modsætte sig* dette nye paradigme på G20-topmødet. Det er vores ansvar at lave om på *det*.

*Foto: Vladimir Putin og Barack Obama holdt et bilateralt møde på sidelinjen af Fn's Generalforsamlings-møde. 29. september*



**RADIO SCHILLER den 29. august  
2016:**

**Det Østlige Økonomiske Forum  
i Vladivostok Rusland  
vil være optakt til G20-mødet  
i Kina**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**OBAMA ER EN FIASKO – Verden  
har brug for en ny finansiel  
arkitektur nu!**

*26. august, 2016 (Leder) – Uanset hvor meget tid, han har tilbage, må Obama afsættes, hvis der skal komme noget som helst fungerende nyt præsidentskab i USA i den kommende periode. Hans præsidentskab har været en fiasko, og én, der skaber ravage, død og kaos i USA og i verden gennem ulovlige krige, finansielle redningspakker (bailout), droneangreb,*

ødelæggelse af sundhedssektoren, narkotikarelaterede dødsfald, arbejdsløshed samt Obamas personlige psykotiske patologi. Samtidig med, at Eurasiens nationer under ledelse af præsident Putin konstruerer et nyt, strategisk og økonomisk system, må Obama fordømmes for det, han er: en ynkelig fiasko og en tjener for det døende, britiske monarki.

Det er det igangværende samarbejde mellem Rusland og Kinas lederskab om et nyt økonomisk system, samt presserende strukturelle ændringer i det globale finansielle system, der er af yderste betydning. Dette er den afgørende flanke for at undgå en atomar verdenskrig og finansielt kaos – resultaterne af Obamas mislykkede præsidentskab – og dette er også det toneangivende diskussionsemne blandt verdens ledere ved de mange internationale topmøder, der skal finde sted i løbet september og oktober måned.

Kinas præsident Xi Jinping har til hensigt at sætte det afgørende spørgsmål om et nyt, globalt, økonomisk og finansielt system på dagsordenen for det kommende G20-topmøde i Hangzhou, Kina. De officielle kinesiske medier, fulgt af russiske top-analytikere, har gjort det klart, at ethvert sådant nyt og funktionsdygtigt system må omfatte USA – hvilket betyder, at USA må opgive sine illusioner om at regere en unipolær verden, der ikke længere eksisterer, og begynde at samarbejde med store nationer om et nyt og retfærdigt, økonomisk system.

Dette blev d. 24. august fremhævet i et telegram fra Kinas officielle nyhedsbureau *Xinhua*, med titlen »Interview: Rusland og Kina bør samarbejde i G20-regi om at tackle udfordringer.« Andrey Kortunov, generaldirektør for det Russiske Råd for Internationale Anliggender, som står i tæt forbindelse med det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, sagde: »Jo længere, disse reformer udskydes, desto højere risiko er der for nye kriser og ustabilitet i verdensøkonomien.« Han tilføjede senere, »Hvis Beijing og Moskva i dag tilbyder deres koncept for stabilitet til det internationale samfund, er det ikke bare

tomme ord, men forslag baseret på mange succesfulde erfaringer.« Han bemærkede, at USA kunne være »en kompleks og undertiden uforudsigelig partner«, men ikke desto mindre »bør både Rusland og Kina konsekvent søge fælles fodslag med Washington og undgå kriser, uden at gøre indrømmelser på principielle spørgsmål«.

En reportage i *Xinhua* på samme dag, også vedrørende G20, angreb »over-afhængighed af pengepolitikken« og fokus på »markeder« i modsætning til »nationer« – på bekostning af en politik, der sigter mod reel, fysisk-økonomisk vækst og er baseret på teknologisk innovation. »Kina vil bruge konferencen til at anspore til dialog mellem udviklede lande og udviklingslande omkring potentialet for at skabe vækst gennem reformer og innovation.«

*Wall Street Journal* har antydnet, at det var på anmodning af Kina, at den Internationale Betalingsbank (BIS) i en nyligt udsendt rapport advarer om, at der på nuværende tidspunkt ikke er nogen mekanismer på plads, der kan forhindre en eksplosion af den globale, finansielle derivatboble på mere end \$600 billioner, hvis nogen større spiller skulle gå i betalingsstandsning. I noget, der kun kan betegnes som en smertelig underdrivelse, blev *Business Insider* tvunget til at indrømme, at resultaterne af denne undersøgelse »er lettere skræmmende«, for, hvis det ikke lykkes for derivat-handelshuse at håndtere en krise, så bliver derivater til »u-eksploderede atombomber, der putter sig dybt i det finansielle system«. *Wall Street Journal* fortsætter med at bemærke, at Kina har placeret de centrale handelshuses sikkerhed »højt på dagsordenen« af G20-topmødet d. 4. – 5. september.

Der er nu en voksende og udbredt opfattelse blandt topembedsmænd i det transatlantiske område, at Europa og USA står på den yderste rand af en finansiell eksplosion, hvis enorme størrelse kun modsvares af deres egen benægtelse af både dens globale konsekvenser og af sammenbruddet af vestlig dominans. Bloomberg rapporterede tirsdag d. 23. august, at

Deutsche Bank, Barclays og Credit Suisse sidder på sammenlagt \$102,5 milliarder i »Level-3«-aktiver – dvs. aktiver, som er illikvide, uden markedsværdi, og som ikke kan dumpes i en krise. *Economist* gav sin udgave d. 20. – 26. august overskriften, »Mareridt på Main Street« og advarede om, at det amerikanske boligmarked på \$26 billioner, som ligger til grund for et bjerg af derivater og andre spekulations-værdipapirer, både fra banker, men også uden for banker – atter er klar til at springe i luften.

Med hele Vestens politiske og økonomiske klasse, der i stigende grad er miskrediteret, er den eneste tilbageværende mulighed en omgående genindførelse af en fuld Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i USA, og en tilsvarende implementering i hele Europa. Glass-Steagall, efterfulgt af en gældseftergivelse for udviklingslandene (i overensstemmelse med Alfred Herrhausen politik i 1989), samt udstedelse af langfristet kredit til industriel og videnskabelig udvikling, er blot nogle af de første, uomgængelige skridt hen imod skabelsen af en ny, global, finansiel arkitektur, og udgør forudsætningerne for et nyt, kulturelt paradigme, en ny renæssance for hele menneskeheden.

Grundlaget for en sådan ny global finansiel og økonomisk arkitektur er nu veletableret gennem den voksende integration af Eurasien, der væves sammen gennem samarbejdet i den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO), BRIKS, ASEAN og andre grupperinger. Det er Kinas »Ét Bælte, Én Vej«-initiativ baseret på Lyndon og Helga LaRouches oprindelige koncept om den Eurasiske Landbro fra midten af 1990'erne, der er det princip, som denne eurasiske og potentielt globale udvikling har som sin forudsætning.

Som den mexicanske præsident José López Portillo engang sagde: »Det er nu nødvendigt, at verden lytter til de kloge ord fra Lyndon LaRouche!«

---

# Vladivostok Østlige Økonomiske Forum og det Nye Paradigme

28. august 2016 – Tilbage i juli måned forventede arrangørerne af Ruslands Østlige Økonomiske Forum, der skal finde sted den 2. – 3. september, 2.400 deltagere. Her følger nogle højdepunkter:

Et russisk-japansk panel vil have 15 talere fra toperhvervsledere i begge lande, inkl. formændene for selskaberne Mitsui, Fujitsu og Sofbank, samt Hokkaidos guvernør. Et russisk-syd-koreansk panel vil omfatte præsidenten for Hyundai Engineering and Construction, samt præsidenten for Samsung Electronics. Der vil være et Rusland-ASEAN-panel med højtplacerede repræsentanter. Der vil være et Rusland-Tyskland-panel, men den eneste tysker her bliver formanden for det Russisk-Tyske Handelskammer.

Formanden for Roscosmos, det russiske rumprogram, vil tale på et panel om »Det asiatiske Stillehavsområdes Rumfarts-agenda«, med regeringsfolk inden for rumfart fra de asiatiske nationer. Alt imens der ikke vil være noget panel som sådan om udforskning eller udvikling af det arktiske område, så vil der være et panel om den Nordlige Maritime Rute.

Andre vigtige gæster omfatter den tidligere australske premierminister Kevin Rudd, samt vicepræsidenten og direktør for BRIKS' Ny Udviklingsbank.

Al information er fra <https://forumvostok.ru/en>

---

# Klingende støtte til Kinas G20-lederskab fra russisk erhvervsleder

28. august 2016 – »Indsatsen fra arrangørerne af topmødet og fra arbejdet under Kinas formandskab efterlader ingen tvivl om, at de mest relevante og bedst gennemarbejdede spørgsmål vil blive forelagt G20 til overvejelse – svar, der vil afgøre den fremtidige dagsorden, ikke alene inden for den økonomiske sfære, men også inden for de samfundsmæssige og humanitære sfærer«, sagde Kirill Dmitriev, direktør og formand for Russisk Direkte Investeringsfond (RDIF), til det officielle kinesiske nyhedsagentur *Xinhua* i dag.

Kina demonstrerer et fremragende eksempel på ikke alene integration i verdensøkonomien, men også mht. at respondere til de udfordringer, der findes på globalt niveau, sagde Dmitriev.

Ansvarlighed over for stabilitet og vækst er et afgørende element i Kinas bidrag i global sammenhæng, og et eksempel for mange lande.

Samarbejde omkring investering, til hvilket Kina i stort mål bidrager, spiller en særlig rolle, sagde Dmitriev og tilføjede, at Rusland og Kina har samme opfattelse i flertallet af spørgsmålene på dagsordenen. »De to lande mener, at der ikke bør være barrierer for strømmen af investeringskapital, og de ser et betragteligt potentiale i den fælles implementering af infrastrukturprojekter, især projekter på tværs af grænser«, bemærkede han.

Han nævnte konstruktionen af den første jernbanebro over

grænsen, over Amur-floden, og som i betydelig grad vil reducere transportomkostninger, som et eksempel på et sådant samarbejde. I øjeblikket er finansieringen og byggeriet af den russiske del af denne forbindelse i gang, sagde Dmitriev. Den intergouvernementale Russisk-Kinesiske Kommission for Samarbejde omkring Investering overvejer i øjeblikket 66 projekter til en samlet værdi af \$100 mia., sagde han.

»Vore kinesiske partnere har en langsigtet vision og en systemisk fremgangsmåde mht. afgørelse af spørgsmål. Dette omfatter en klar opfattelse af selskabers strategiske interesser, af nationale interesser og taktiske kapaciteter«, sagde Dmitriev.

Den Russiske Direkte Investeringsfond er landets suveræne rigdomsfond, der foretager direkte investeringer i førende og lovende russiske selskaber sammen med globale topinvestorer.

*Foto: Kirill Dmitriev (t.v.) ved et møde med Vladimir Putin.*

---

# **Hvordan menneskehedens produktivitet udløses: En ny økonomisk orden. LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast, 26. august 2016.**

Matthew Ogden: I aften har vi en særlig gæst med os, Paul Gallagher, økonomisk redaktør for *EIR*, og som vil præsentere for os det klare og presserende nødvendige valg, som

amerikanere må træffe for at opgive den forfejlede økonomi, som er Obamas politik med nær-nul-vækst, og beslutsomt må tilslutte sig den nye, økonomiske orden, som Kina har indledt. Med det forestående G20-topmøde, der skal finde sted om en uge, har Kinas præsident udtrykkeligt gjort det klart, at det er hans hensigt, at dette topmøde skal bruges til at fremme skabelsen af en »ny international finansiel arkitektur« i samarbejde med Rusland og andre betydningsfulde magter, baseret på videnskabelig og teknologisk innovation og vækst. I mellemtiden konfronteres USA og Europa med det transatlantiske systems fremstormende implosion, der ikke alene skyldes den enorme akkumulering af gældsbobler og eksponering til derivater, men i endnu højere grad årtiers fravær af enhver reel vækst i økonomisk produktivitet. Kinas program for udforskning af Månen tjener til at illustrere kilden til ægte, økonomisk værdi. Kun gennem en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og en gældseftergivelse for at afskrive den kolossale boble af fiktive værdier kan USA blive en del af denne nye, økonomiske orden og tage del i udløsningen af menneskets kreative evner.

## TRANSCRIPT

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It is August 26th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from LaRouchepac.com. As you can see, I'm joined in the studio tonight by Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and by Paul Gallagher, a special guest today, Economics Editor for *Executive Intelligence Review*; and we also joined, via video, by Kesha Rogers, member of our Policy Committee, joining us from Houston, Texas. Hi, Kesha!

We are meeting here at the day that the 3rd edition of the LaRouche PAC publication *The Hamiltonian* is hitting the streets of New York City. This is Edition

3, the August 26th edition, as you might be able to see from



this very small edition copy. The very large headline is "Obama is a Failure. The World Needs a New Financial Architecture, Now." That encapsulates the framework of our show today.

I think, as we've said recently over the last couple of weeks, we are highly anticipating the upcoming G-20 Summit, which is going to be held in China, hosted by China, hosted by Chinese President Xi Jinping, on September 4th and 5th – a little bit over a week from now. What's happening in the lead-up to that G-20 Summit is the consolidation of really what is becoming the framework for a new international financial and economic architecture. You have a consolidation of cooperation among countries of Eurasia – mainly China, Russia, and India, but many other countries besides – including moving forward with the development of the [international] North-South Transportation Corridor [instc], and many other economic bilateral and multi-lateral relationships among the countries of that region.

But, what is being stated explicitly by the leadership of China and of Russia is that this framework, this paradigm, must replace the failed paradigm which is now bringing the trans-Atlantic system down with it, and must become the framework for a new international, global economic order. I think it was said, very clearly, by a spokesman for the Russian International Affairs Council, who said in an interview this week, "Russia and China should work together, within the G-20 framework, to secure a new international financial architecture." That's Andrey Kortunov, [Director General at the Russian International Affairs Council]. And then, just yesterday, a spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Minister, said, "What will happen during the G-20 Summit, is a major change in the world economic landscape."

Now, what we've discussed, including in a discussion today with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, is that it can be seen very clearly that China and Russia absolutely "know what time it

is," as Mr. LaRouche has been warning all of you: that we are on the verge, if not in the midst, of a complete implosion of the trans-Atlantic financial-economic-social-political system as a whole. And this is not just because of the debt exposure of the largest banks, or the derivatives exposure, or anything like that, but it is – and I think this is what Paul will get into in much more detail – it is because we have neglected any real economic growth, any real concept of economic value in this trans-Atlantic system for at least the last 30-50 years, and in fact have rejected the very idea of the necessity of productivity and economic progress.

We're going to be discussing that, but also from the standpoint which will be filled out in a little bit more detail in the second half of our show of what *is* the concept of real economic value, and how indeed are China and Russia leading mankind toward a revolution in economic productivity, which is centered very prominently around their dedication to a space program, especially around lunar development and lunar exploration. With that said, I'd like to invite Paul to open up the discussion.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thank you! Let me start by saying we have to relate the American people, American policy-makers, American elected officials emphatically to the September 3rd, 4th G-20 Summit being hosted by China, because just as there was a necessity about a year and a half ago for the United States to become part of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank [aiib] and the other global institutions of new credit for infrastructure which China was initiating, one will remember that at that time, instead, the Obama Administration set its teeth against the AIIB bank, tried in vain to sabotage it and prevent countries from joining it as members. One need only say that as of now, there are 60 nation-members of the AIIB, and of next year it's expected that there will be 90 nations trying to participate in the generation of high technology infrastructure credits in the grand task of the New Silk Road,

(or the Eurasian Land-Bridges), across Eurasia, through the Mideast, into Africa – communication, power, transportation being revolutionized in this way. The Obama Administration took the United States to the sidelines, and worst, to the adversarial position, to try to sabotage that.

We have to do differently, in this case, because our economy is completely failing. We have the condition of an imminent second 2008 bank panic, not because of this or that particular deal, or even this or that particular bubble, but because the economies of the United States and Europe have sunk so far in the non-recovery of the 2008 collapse, that even the biggest banks themselves have been destroying their hosts and shrinking, their stocks collapsing, their collapse as a whole emerging from that cause, of the absolute inability to make profits in economies which they have done so much to ruin.

What China is proposing – and remember China has said, that the leading other nation-guest at that G-20 Summit is President Vladimir Putin of Russia – what they are proposing is a "new financial architecture." Now "financial architecture" basically means how do nations regulate their banks, and perhaps in the other order – how do nations create credit for purposes of progress: economic, technological, scientific progress, and direct that credit where it should go. Secondly, how do nations regulate their banks; and thirdly, how do *international* institutions – particularly international credit institutions, lending institutions – how do they function, in order to make this progress possible for all the nations involved, and in particular allow less-developed nations access to both the credit that they need, the technological development, and the self-development of the skills which are necessary for this kind of progress. That's what a "new financial architecture" means. Clearly, the financial architecture since 1971, when we went to the floating interest rate, and, particularly since the Presidencies of Bush and Obama, this financial architecture

has been a complete failure.

So, they are saying, this is not just a two-day summit, but a collaborative process which has to continue among the G-20 nations until a new financial architecture is accomplished. I'll get to what that would mean, particularly on the part of the United States and Europe. But, let me read one thing that a leading scholar in China said, about this September 3rd and 4th G-20. He said, "This is a very important summit for all the countries in the world." This is Su Xiaohui, Deputy Director of Strategic Studies at the China Institute of International Studies. Many scholars of his type might have said this. "China is hosting this summit because it is what other countries wanted. It is the other countries that wanted China to host this event, this growth and innovation summit. In recent years, there have been plenty of problems in the world economy, and all the countries in the world, including G-20 members, are eager to find solutions. Other countries know China can be a leader in addressing the world's economic problems."

What he is saying, in diplomatic terms, is many countries to take the lead in a summit whose purpose is an all-out drive to restore growth and productivity in the world economy, because China has been the driver of growth and productivity in the world economy for the last ten years, joined now by India, and despite crippling sanctions, with some very striking accomplishments by Russia. For example, that Russia has become, as of right now, the world's leading wheat exporter. It has become self-sufficient in many categories of food, in which it was 50% dependent on imports when these sanctions were put on. So, although its economy, under these financial and economic sanctions, is not growing, nonetheless it has successfully grown in ways which prevented literal starvation of its economy and its population, by these sanctions. That's why they have to lead it.

This puts a challenge to China, obviously, to really hold

their determination to make this summit a real accomplishment, in terms of growth and progress. Only a couple months ago the Chinese Finance Minister, Lou Jiwei, and the [Minister of Commerce (formerly known as the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation), Gao Hucheng,] made public statements, particularly when the finance ministers of the G-20 met, saying the condition of the world economy is grim. World trade, in un-inflated terms, has essentially stagnated for the last 5-6 years. No growth at all. There are many nations in the world with no growth, they said. It's a grim situation which must be reversed by the G-20. Again, diplomatically, they weren't naming the zero-growth nations. But I will, very shortly.

China, on the other hand, is continuing to put large volumes of combined public and private credit issuance, something on the order of \$250 billion a year equivalent, into investments, both within China, across the New Silk Road economic belt, and further afield as well. In comparison to that, you have the United States. Obama. We say he's a failure. No question. One of the things he fails at, is arrogantly bragging that "the United States sets the rules," and China has to follow them; that China is merely a raw-materials-producing and cheap-goods-producing economy, and has to grow up and join the advanced economies of the world. This is one of the sports, in which Obama is a failure, is trying to brag and shine over China. Let's look at it.

U.S. economic growth in the eight years of Obama's Presidency has not equalled U.S. economic growth in the first year of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency, nor in the second year of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency. In both of those years, by the way this growth is calculated today, in recovery from the Great Depression, under the impulse of Roosevelt's policies, the growth in the United States was on the order of 10%-11% a year, in '33 and '34, and again in '35.

BEN DENISTON: Each individual year?

GALLAGHER: Each individual year. The total growth of the U.S. economy, by GDP measures, during Obama's entire Presidency, has been 1.1% a year; 8.4% over his entire [tenure]. So, he hasn't *equalled*, in 8 years of recovery from the Great Recession, the growth of each of Franklin Roosevelt's first 3 years in the recovery from the Great Depression.

Now, the reasons for this are more fundamental than the measures of growth, which include a lot of things, but suffice to say, that Europe whose annual growth per year during the same years that Obama has been President, has been an average of 0.6% per year. China's growth during that same 8-year period has been on average 8.1% per year. So, it's been very similar to the rate of growth which was generated under the impulse of Roosevelt's policies; and not accidentally, because the policies of credit-generation, infrastructure investment, high-technology innovation – in this context particularly space exploration, fusion technology development. In these areas, they have been very similar in the 21st Century context to what Roosevelt did when he became President; and getting similar results and exporting those results to a significant degree to the benefit of other countries.

What lies underneath this, as Lyndon LaRouche has really stressed to the satisfaction of everyone who has listened to him, and should go and look into this; is the loss of productivity – the collapse in the growth of productivity in the United States and European economies during that same period of time. There is a crude measure of productivity which one often reads about in the financial press and in reports from the Commerce Department and so forth. By that measure, which is simply gross domestic product divided by the number of hours worked of the labor force, by that measure, productivity growth during the term of Obama in the White House, has been approximately 0.8% per year. And actually, you can see if you look at the progression, that that growth took place in 2010, 2011, 2012, and part of 2013. Since then, we

have seen no productivity change whatsoever; in fact, three of the last four quarters of the year reported by the Labor Department, have seen productivity in the United States go down, not up. So that productivity in the last 12 months of this economy has gone down. I won't go into the European figures.

This is crucial, even though it's a very crude measure, because it indicates that the productivity of labor is not increasing in such a way that labor can get higher wages; so wages stagnate when this is the case. New capital investments by business are not taking place; the rate of new capital investments by business is extraordinarily low. If this is now on the screen [Fig. ?], this shows a more fundamental measure of productivity growth known as technological productivity growth, or total factor productivity growth. Before giving you a narrow definition, let me read a report which was done by the National Bureau of Economic Research about the growth in the 1930s of this total factor productivity in the United States economy; which you can see is the highest of those bars. What the National Bureau of Economic Research said much later in a report written in this century, is that "The extraordinary growth of this technological productivity in the Roosevelt New Deal era, was due to the very strong growth in electric power generation and distribution, in transportation, in communications, in civil and structural engineering for bridges, tunnels, dams, highways, railroads, and transmission systems, and in private research and development." In other words, what happened during that period of time which made it an even greater burst of productivity than we saw during the World War II mobilization which followed it, what happened during that period of time is that the tremendous demands on the economy of the great infrastructure projects of Roosevelt – including the development of nuclear power and the development of all of the huge hydroelectric power sources; was that everything involved in engineering power, in engineering roads, in engineering tunnels, in engineering

great civil works of all kinds, was technologically revolutionized. The companies involved and the agencies involved made breakthroughs in research and development in order to do these things more powerfully and more efficiently; and really to conduct projects on a scale that had never been done before, in such a way that there was very rapid technological progress under the impulse of this pursuit. And scientific progress as well, if you think what underlay the development of the nuclear power piles, it was the beginning of particle physics, the beginning of nuclear biophysics, the beginning of plasma physics, and the basis for the attempt to develop fusion energy today. There were tremendous developments going on underneath these great works of the Roosevelt era.

So, if we go back to the slide for a minute, you see that by far the highest rate of yearly growth in this technological productivity; that rate of growth is almost 3.5% a year. That rate of growth is in the 1930s; followed by the 1940s, including the war mobilization when it is about 2.7% per year. And after rather a slump in the Eisenhower 1950s, back up in Kennedy's Apollo project 1960s to 2.7% growth per year in technological productivity; and then look what happened. If I could take you off through the '70s, '80s, '90s, the first decade of this century with the Bush Presidency, 1% per year growth or less. And if I could take you off the end of that graph to the Obama years, it would be 0.53% growth per year, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research. So, you see there the under-girdings of the collapse of an economy in the complete loss of real productivity in that economy; and therefore, the ability to launch growth and sustain growth which this represented.

Again, it's very important that this was recovered so rapidly in the 1960s when Kennedy again put great expenditures and great projects at the very frontiers of science in the Apollo project to reach the Moon, but in the broader plans which were



then being made and developed for the further exploration of space, which we'll get to. This made a tremendous difference. I should point out that, according to a recent study by the Harvard School of Business of this same factor, in China over the last decade, it has grown at a rate of 3.08% annually; somewhat higher or equal to the highest that the US has achieved, namely that under the Roosevelt period. So that when you have this collapse in productivity in the US and European economies, you have at the same time, de-industrialization of those economies accelerating; with the result of on the one hand, a real destruction of the labor force – the people. We've talked about this, it isn't necessary to go through it again; but we've talked about the connection between this process and the increasing propensity of Americans who were previously productive, to commit suicide in one way or another – by drinking, or drugging, or in other ways themselves to death. The data just keep coming, the studies just keep coming out on this; each one more depressing than the last. That has been the result of this real collapse; and it has even begun – as I indicated at the beginning – to shrink and undermine the biggest banks who have done so much to cause it. So that even the derivatives markets have, in the last few years, have shrunk; and so have the biggest banks, which became even bigger by swallowing other banks in 2008. They have shrunk; they are parasitizing a host which is dying.

The best way to conclude, I think, would be to quote something that Helga Zepp-LaRouche said this morning, which I think is absolutely correct: "If the United States and Europe are to cooperate in 10 days with the purposes of this growth and innovation summit of the G-20, they must do two things, otherwise they're not cooperating. The first thing is they must implement and enforce Glass-Steagall regulation of their banks. And I should point out that China is the only major economy in the world which has a currently enforced efficient Glass-Steagall bank separation law; passed in 1993. It has been much debated since then, but kept intact and enforced.

They must pass Glass-Steagall and enforce it; and secondly, they must write off – not just write down, but write off – the nominal values given to the still \$500-700 trillion worth of derivatives on the books of their banks. In order that those banks can again, under Glass-Steagall become vehicles for the transmission of productive credit and progress. If the United States and Europe are willing to do that, then the real work can begin, of restoring growth and scientific progress to the world economy. If they're not, then they are effectively to be accounted saboteurs of this noble effort that is being led now by China." So, I'll stop with that.

OGDEN: I do want to add just one quick thing before we get into what Kesha and Ben have to present. I would say, Helga and Lyndon LaRouche are not merely peripherally involved in this process which is now coming out of China; but actually centrally involved, both now and historically. I think it should be remembered that just a few weeks ago, Helga LaRouche was one of the prominent speakers at an event called the T-20, which was a gathering of international think tanks and other persons of that type in the lead-up to the G-20 summit in China. Helga LaRouche was involved in that. Helga has travelled to China I think half a dozen times in the recent several years now; and is a prominent personality in the public discourse there. One other thing that is notable is that the G-20 was developed as the G-22 in 1997-98 at the time that Bill Clinton was making a speech at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City; where he called for a new international economic architecture. That was the framework in which the G-22 was formed. That was exactly the same time that people probably remember the recent webcast where we showed the video clip of Lyndon LaRouche speaking in Washington DC about the development of the New Silk Road, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and the cooperation between Russia, China, and India in creating a new economic framework for Eurasia. That has now converged; the new international economic architecture and the New Silk Road Eurasian Land-Bridge is one thrust that's coming

out of China and Russia. Historically, even rewinding back before that, Mr. LaRouche's proposal – which Bill Clinton did pick up on in a certain way in 1997-98 – was for a New Bretton Woods; a reorganization of the world economic system, which is something which he has been on the record centrally leading for 40 years if not more, going all the way back to some of the discussion among leadership of the Non-Aligned Movement for a New International Economic Order by that name. And also Mr. LaRouche's idea for international development banks, which is exactly what the AIIB or the BRICS new development bank now are echoes of.

So, historically, this is something that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have led from a central position and continue to play a very central role in shaping. And I would just emphasize Paul's point that it is now incumbent upon the United States to take very bold and dramatic decisions to communicate, "Yes, we are no longer going to be Obama failures. We are no longer going to reject these overtures that are coming very explicitly from China for participation in this new system; but we're going to join it, and we're going to show not only our good will, but our intention to do so. By restoring Glass-Steagall immediately and freeing ourselves from the bondage of this dying system which is dragging the entire trans-Atlantic down with it. So, that's an action point that needs to be taken in the days ahead.

GALLAGHER: That's very well added, and I think Lyn and Helga have given the kind of laser focus to this impulse for development, which China, Russia, other countries, India, have shown. That it had to be focussed around not only the frontiers of science, but the frontiers of travel so to speak; of passenger and freight travel, and of crossing the Eurasian continent, which had never been done before. But now, in addition, and particularly recently, Helga has, through a whole series of major conferences, put an additional focus on bringing that development, that Silk Road, through the

Mideast; as the only way in which the cauldron of the Middle East could possibly be made into a peaceful and developing area, is through that same New Silk Road process. There's been a great response to that in countries like Yemen, Egypt, other countries of the Mideast.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to take up from there. I think the question at hand is, what is it that fosters this impulse for development that you spoke of, Paul; and what fosters the rapid increase of rate of growth in a society? Mr. LaRouche, over the years, has defined this as the creative development of the human mind and the productive powers of labor of a society to make new breakthroughs and scientific and technological progress that actually improves not just the conditions of mankind on the planet; but improves mankind's ability to actually go out into the far reaches of our galaxy, to develop the resources of our Solar System. This is exactly the discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche – some of the Policy Committee members and our Basement Team – just recently. His response to the rapid developments of China's leadership in developing the Moon and their plans for going to the far side of the Moon by 2018, that what we're looking at here is not just going to the Moon for the sake of going to the Moon, or finding another landing spot on the Moon. This is critical in a commitment toward international cooperation and a science driver essential for cooperation and development throughout the planet and beyond. Mr. LaRouche recently called for and made the point that we have to have a complete mapping and development of our Moon's surface. He called for the mapping of the Moon's surface being something that we do not and have not fully come to understand. A lot of people will say, "Well, we've already been there, done that." A lot of nations have landed various rovers on the Moon, or satellites on the Moon; or we've had orbiters taking pictures of the Moon. But one thing we have not done, is to go to the far side of the Moon; and recognize the potential that is set to be unleashed from this new feat and endeavor that only China –

being the first nation – would be out to present and create.

So, I think when we think about what it is that fosters economic progress, again, we have to look at what China is representing as a leader of the world right now in terms of what they've unleashed in the rapid development of their momentum towards space exploration; and particularly development of the lunar surface. There is so much that we have yet to accomplish right now. We've only touched at a very small surface area of the Moon. It's important to see that the opening of the far side of the Moon represents a vast potential to give us new insights into human growth.

So, we were just a moment ago talking about the negative growth rates under the insane policies of the Obama administration. Well, what has this been caused by? What has this been a result of? This has been a result of Obama's continued murderous policy and spitting on the legacy of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and John F Kennedy, and the visionary legacy embodied by the great German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke. What he has done, not just to dismantle the space program, but to dismantle the commitment towards human development and human progress. What has he done in place [of that]? He's actually shut down our Constellation program; the program that had slated us in the trajectory in the United States to be in cooperation with nations around the planet around the commitment to return to the Moon, and eventually to the far side of the Moon. What did Obama replace this policy with? He replaced it with an insane policy of capturing an asteroid, cutting our fusion development program, and continuing to bail out the Wall Street speculators who represent no commitment to human progress and growth.

The American people have to ask themselves how much longer will we put up with this atrocity, this tragedy that has taken hold of our nation? Right now, you look at what was offered to Obama by the Chinese, by the Russians, in terms of "win-win" cooperation; the "win-win" cooperation exemplified by the

offer of President Xi Jinping of China to not only work for the common aims of mankind in the development of the Silk Road development plan and projects that were going to benefit the growth of all mankind. To work in collaboration on the exploration of space, which is absolutely crucial to this intention. Obama has refused that. The American people and members of Congress have sat by and done nothing about it.

So, you look at the fact of, this is the reason why we face a negative growth rate in the society right now represented by the United States and the trans-Atlantic financial system. There are a lot of nations right now that are starting to get knocked over the head and recognize that if they don't join with the progress and the New Paradigm being set forth by China and Russia for international cooperation in space development and economic growth, they will be, as the head of NASA in the United States said about the US not cooperating and collaborating with China in space exploration, on the outside looking in. That's where we're going to be if we do not actually take up this full commitment to not just the exploration of space, but truly to what that means. It really can be defined by looking at the vision that was laid out by Krafft Ehrlicke as a great associate and friend of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche before he passed away. What Krafft Ehrlicke identified in terms of the importance of lunar exploration in a writing that he provided prior to his death, earlier in his life, called "Lunar Industrialization and Settlement". I want to read from that just briefly, to give you a sense of what it is that is the priority for the development of the lunar surface in the way that Krafft Ehrlicke envisioned it. It must be taken up as a national and international mission again. So, Krafft says that: "The most important aspect of lunar development lies in the human sector. It bears repeating that technological progress and environmental expansion are no substitutes for human growth and maturity; but they can help the human reach higher maturity and wisdom. He goes on to say that "Human growth is contingent not only on the absence of

war, or overcoming war, poverty, and social injustice. But also on the presence of over-arching elevating goals and their associated perspectives. Expanding into space means to be understood and approached as world development. As a positive, peaceful, growth-oriented, macro-sociological project, whose growth is to ultimately release humanity from its present, parasitic, embryonic bondage in the biospheric womb of one planet. This will demand immense human creativity, courage, and maturity."

So, that's what we're discussing here. How do you actually free mankind from this adolescent stage? From the understanding that we are confined to one small planet with limited resources, to the bondage of a biospheric womb on the planet that keeps mankind at states of limited development in a fetal position. When is it that human beings are going to decide to grow up and to leave the nest? That is what is represented by the mapping of the lunar surface; that is what is represented by mankind's reaching out and growing up and going out into the exploration of space. That is the creative process that we must take up right now, which is being denied to us by the attacks on our space program. This is not just the space program as a fun, side project or a hobby; but what is essential to the creative progress of mankind as Mr. LaRouche has clearly understood and has made clear in his development of the Four Laws to Save the United States. The essential aspect of those Four Laws, as was stated by Paul earlier, starting with the Glass-Steagall banking reorganization, going into the progress of re-establishing a credit system, to invest in long-term development projects, has to be centered around a science driver fusion program. This can only be fully developed and fully realized when we realize and bring about our full potential in the exploration of space and everything that represents; including the development of helium-3 on the Moon.

So, as I've said; as Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. LaRouche

understands, and as the Chinese and others who are cooperating with them understand, that the most important aspect that we're dealing with right now is the defense of human creative progress. So, I'll just stop right there.

BEN DENISTON: I think that's well said. Maybe the point to be taken through all of this, the focus on the issue of productivity in the beginning, this discussion of the space program, what we really need to push in this context is the realization that this program Kesha's laying out, returning to Krafft Ehrlicke's vision for lunar development and expansion into space; this is necessary. This is a necessary program, this isn't a cost. These are the kinds of things that actually are the substance of increasing the net total value accessible to mankind as a whole; increasing the productive powers of labor as we're discussing. You hear all this silly talk still about jobs; creating jobs, when we have a net collapse in the productivity of the economy, as we saw with what Paul went through, what Kesha's talking about. This is what actually creates the type of activity that increases the ability for society to sustain itself at a higher standard of living increasingly with less labor input required to maintain the requirements of society. Maybe in the context of Mr. LaRouche's emphasis in the recent weeks, that's also the importance of his focus on Einstein. That also goes to a deeper level of what are the fundamental changes that mankind only uniquely can make that allow us to have these kinds of transformations. We certainly have a clear program before us with what China and Russia are leading.

Just for our viewers, next Wednesday, we're going to be discussing some of this lunar program in a little more detail. So, I would definitely highlight that as a coming episode; we're going to focus a little bit more on this lunar far side program. What China is doing; what's so unique about the far side of the Moon. We just have a clear march from these nations leading in this direction – fusion and space together.



This is the driver that's absolutely needed; it's not a cost, it's not an expense. It's a necessary requirement for mankind; especially for the United States in our state right now. That should also be seen as driving to the process of pushing real fundamental breakthroughs in science such as we haven't had since Einstein. I know Jason Ross has elaborated this in recent days to good effect.

With the imminent breakdown of this financial system and the importance of this G-20 focus coming up right now in the context of clear recognition that we're right on the verge of something worse than a repeat of 2008; I think this being the clear message and marching orders for where we need to go, is absolutely critical at this point. It's not enough just to address and reorganize the financial system; that's absolutely required, but to what effect? To actually drive the kind of growth that China's leading; Kesha's leading a revival of that in Texas to get that going in the United States again.

OGDEN: Along those lines, this entire process that I laid out in terms of Mr. LaRouche's advocacy for a new international financial architecture, was never separate from his insistence that it had to be based on fundamental scientific revolutions; the discovery and incorporation of new physical principles into the economy at large. Not let's rearrange just the bureaucracy of how banks work, or something like that. And it was not even just what other people turned it into, which was that we need equal representation for the developing countries; or the Third World is not having the proper voice at the bargaining table at the World Bank or something like that. It was never something at that level; it was always at the level of why did Mr. LaRouche found the Fusion Energy Foundation, for example. Can you imagine what kind of productivity would be unleashed by the development of commercial, controllable fusion power? That would be unequalled by anything that has come heretofore; it would make what FDR achieved look like hardly anything. Mr. LaRouche's

emphasis with the Strategic Defense Initiative was always that we need a breakthrough in terms of physical principles; it was hand-in-hand with fusion energy development, but it was also bringing that into the realm of space exploration and harnessing principles which were beyond what man even understood at that point. In the same exact period, he was also discussing how are we going to have lunar colonization and colonies on Mars. This was LaRouche's emphasis all through that time.

So, the new economic architecture is not separate from a fundamental revolution in science on the caliber of what Einstein achieved; and that is what drives economic productivity. Nothing less than that.

GALLAGHER: I wonder if you can get the third graph on the screen. This gives an idea of how – this goes from 1958 over to 2012, and it's the NASA budget. This gives an idea of how rapidly leaderships of the United States abandoned the actual frontiers of space exploration before we had even gotten to the Moon for the first time. Because by the time we did, that tremendous drop was already underway; and it goes all the way to the present day. The same thing could be shown for the United States effort in research on fusion. They just were abandoned in the face of the extraordinarily powerful visions of human future powers that pioneers like Krafft Ehrlicke had, in terms of covering the Moon's surface with a new human habitation and industrialization as a jumping off point for the rest of the Solar System. All of that – he called it the Seventh Continent – all of that was abandoned along with the tremendous power resources and capacities involved in the fusion technology. Today you can barely find a laser cutting process anywhere in US industry; these things have just been abandoned. If what you see in that graph were reversed very suddenly under the impulse of a desire and a decision that gets rid of Obama and his leadership, and a decision that says we will be part of a team of space-faring nations which in

this endeavor would be led by China; maybe in others by us, in others by India, in others by Russia. We'll be part of that overall exploration and this will reverse; this would have a tremendous impact on the entire not only productivity, but the condition of society. This is really the condition of the individual human being, who has these creative possibilities is what LaRouche is always, always talking about; that this is what makes such possibilities of an individual becoming a genius and the fruitfulness of that genius. This expands it to the greatest degree, if leadership will make these kinds of decisions. This decision is right in front of us with this upcoming G-20 summit; and again, I repeat what Helga said. If the US doesn't put Glass-Steagall into law – it's now been adopted by both parties in their platforms; it ought to be law by no later than the end of this year. If the US doesn't put Glass-Steagall into law immediately, and enforce it right off the collapsing derivatives bubbles; then it's sabotaging this process which has to go forward. Then we will see more loss of our population, more suicide, more drug addiction, more hopelessness among the population unless we make this 180 degree turn.

OGDEN: One thing Helga has also repeatedly said upon her return from these trips to China, is that – and I think other people just pick up on this, too – is that the optimism is pervasive; you can sense it among the population. The 3.8% growth rate in productivity, the 8% growth rate, is just a reflection of an attitude that says, "Our job is to create a future. We will give our children a future. Our lives have meaning because we are involved in creating a future which has not, prior to this point, existed." If you contrast that with an increasing pessimism, cynicism, rage – which is clearly reflected in this election process in the United States population – all of those are symptomatic of exactly what is being addressed in this discussion.

One other thing that Krafft Ehrlicke said which I thought was

just well put; he said, "If God had intended us to be a space-faring species, he would have given us a Moon." Well, he did; and that's the launching-off point for mankind to move into the Solar System and beyond. So, if that's not an optimistic idea of the capabilities of the human species, I don't know what is. I know that that's one of the elements that is also being incorporated into the Manhattan Project process.

One more thing I wanted to mention before we close the show today, is the accompanying articles in this week's *Hamiltonian* are: 1) a short article by Jason Ross on the true genius of Einstein. It's called "Discovering Humanity's True Nature; the Case of Einstein". But then, the back side of the broad sheet is a discussion of 1) an article by Diane Sare, called "2016: America's Moment of Decision, *in which she discusses some of the legacy of the optimism surrounding the tradition of Classical music within the United States and the fight to revive that tendency among people who were close friends with Lyndon LaRouche when they were alive: Bill Warfield; Sylvia Olden Lee; Robert McFerrin; and others.* And then there's a very short excerpt of an interview with the national music director of the Schiller Institute, John Sigerson, in which he's discussing the significance of the upcoming series of four concerts of Mozart's Requiem over the weekend of September 11th, in the interests of justice and in dedication to the victims of those attacks and everything that has happened since. So, that's another very crucial element in terms of the ability to uplift a population and to give them a sense that a future is possible; and that these kinds of very dramatic changes in policy could happen in a very short amount of time. If we were able to force the declassification of the 28 pages, which we did; nobody can deny the very significant central role that we played in doing that. People might have said, "This is a hopeless cause." If we were able to do that, then yes, we also can force the passage and enforcement of Glass-Steagall and a radical, dramatic change in policy of the United States in the direction of this new economic

architecture which is being led by China and Russia among others.

With that taken as the final word, I'm going to thank everybody for joining me – Paul Gallagher, Ben Deniston, Kesha Rogers; and thank you all for joining us here today. I know we continue to gain new subscribers of the LaRouche PAC live YouTube channel; so I encourage you, if you have not done so yet, to subscribe to this channel. You will get the opportunity to have a notification of this discussion that Ben mentioned next Wednesday, on the further implications of the Chinese lunar program. Thank you for joining us and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

## **RADIO SCHILLER den 21. august 2016:**

# **Den nye Silkevejsalliance er på vej til at sejre**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# Hvorfor har vi alt for længe tilladt et Imperium at dominere vores eksistens?

## LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 19. august 2016

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Engelsk udskrift.

WHY HAVE WE ALLOWED AN EMPIRE TO DOMINATE OUR EXISTENCE FOR FAR TOO LONG?

International LaRouche PAC Webcast , Aug. 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's August 19th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden. You're joining us for our weekly broadcast here on Friday evenings of our LaRouche PAC webcast. I'll be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined, via video, by

Kesha

Rogers and Michael Steger, both leading members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

As we broadcast this show here tonight, the second edition – newest copy – of the weekly publication, {The Hamiltonian} is going to press. This is going to be flooding into the streets of New York City close on the heels of the first edition, which came out two weeks ago. Both Kesha Rogers and Michael Steger have articles that are on the front page of this week's copy of {The Hamiltonian}. Michael Steger wrote an article called "LaRouche Was Right. End Wall Street, Now", and Kesha Rogers wrote a very profound and beautiful article called "A Truly Human Culture – an Expression of the Creative Human Mind."

What Kesha addresses in this article is the inner relationship between the minds of Lyndon LaRouche, Albert Einstein, and Krafft Ehrlicke, and their conception of what a truly human culture is.

Joining us here today is Jason Ross, who has actually prepared a condensed presentation on the subject of some of the unique discoveries of Albert Einstein, which will add to our discussion here today.

But before we get to that, we've agreed to begin today's broadcast with a sort of travel back into time. Now that we are on the verge of a total consolidation of this new Eurasian system, which is based around the original idea of the Russia-India-China Strategic Triangle, which was championed by Lyndon LaRouche and also championed by Prime Minister Yevgeny

Primakov of Russia in the 1990s, we are finding ourselves in a completely unprecedented situation. It's, I think, very clear, as we approach the G-20 Summit, the Vladivostok Economic Forum, and also the United Nations General Assembly, that the entire strategic geometry of the planet has shifted and has realigned.

As is rightly pointed out in the lead of today's LaRouche PAC website, this is not just a "practical" realignment of nations, but, since we are talking about Einstein here today, this is almost the "gravitational effect" of an idea which was introduced almost 20 years ago by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

The video that you're about to see is a very short excerpt of a speech that Mr. LaRouche made at a forum in Washington, DC in 1997 in conjunction with the release of the {Executive Intelligence Review} {first} edition of the special report on the subject of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was a presentation that was made as part of a series of so-called "development conferences" that were held in Washington during those couple of years – 1996, 1997, 1998 – and I think what you'll see in this video is the fact that it was Lyndon LaRouche's "marching orders." It was sort of his creative vision of what the role that China, with the New Silk Road, and also the role that Russia would play in completely reshaping the strategic geometry of the world.

So, this is a short excerpt of that speech from 1997:

LYNDON LAROUCHE: There are only two nations which are respectable left on this planet, that is, nations of



respectable

power: that is the United States, particularly the United States

not as represented by the Congress, but by the President. It is

the {identity} of the United States which is a political power,

not some concatenation of its parts. The United States is represented today only by its President, as a political institution. The Congress does not represent the United States;

they're not quite sure who they do represent, these days, [laughter] since they haven't visited their voters recently.

The President is, institutionally, the embodiment of the

United States in international relations. The State Department can't do that; the Justice Department can't do it; no other Department can do it; only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can represent the United States as an entity – its entire personality, its true interest, its whole people.

Now, there's only one other power on this planet which can

be so insolent as that toward other powers, and that's the Republic of China. China is engaged, presently, in a great infrastructure-building project, in which my wife and others have

had an ongoing engagement over some years. There's a great reform

in China, which is a "trouble reform." They're trying to solve a

problem. That doesn't mean there is no problem. But they're trying to solve it.

Therefore, if the United States, or the President of the

United States, and China, participate in fostering {that} project, sometimes called the Silk Road Project, sometimes the

Land-Bridge Project, if that project of developing development corridors across Eurasia into Africa, into North America, is extended, that project is enough work to put this whole planet into an economic revival. I'll get into just a bit of that, to make it more sensuously concrete.

China has had cooperation with the government of Iran for some time. Iran has actually been completing a number of rail links which are an extension of China's Land-Bridge program (or Silk Road project). More recently, we've had, on the side of India, from Indian leadership which has met with the representatives of China, to engage in an initial route, among the land routes, for the Land-Bridge program. One goes into Kunming in China. I was in that area, in Mishana, during part of World War II. Out of Mishana we had planes flying into Kunming, "over The Hump," as they used to say in those days. I'm quite familiar with that area.

But if you have water connections, canal connections, and rail connections from Kunming through Mishana – that area – across Bangladesh into India, through Pakistan into Iran, up to the area just above Tehran, south of the Caspian – you have linked to the Middle East; you have linked to Central Asia; you have linked to Turkey; you have linked to Europe.

Then you have a northern route, which is pretty much the route of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built under American influence and American advice, by Russia. You have a middle route, which is being developed, in Central Asia, with China and Iran.

India is working on a plan which involves only a few hundreds of kilometers of rail to be added – there were a lot

of  
other improvements along the right-of-way – which would link  
the  
area north of Tehran through Pakistan, through India, through  
Bangladesh, through Myanmar, into Kunming, into Thailand, into  
Vietnam, down through Malaysia and Singapore, across the  
Straits  
by a great bridge, into Indonesia.

There's a plan, also, for the development of a rail  
link  
through what was northern Siberia, across the Bering Strait  
into  
Alaska, and down into the United States. There's a Middle East  
link – several links – from Europe, as well as from China, but  
from China a Middle East link into Egypt, into all of Africa.

So, what we have here, is a set of projects which are  
not  
just transportation projects, like the trans-Continental  
railroads in the United States, which was the precedent for  
this  
idea, back in the late 1860s and 1870s. You have "development  
corridors," where you develop, on an area of 50-70 km on  
either  
side of your rail link, your pipeline, and so forth. You  
develop  
this area with industry, with mining, with all these kinds of  
things. Which is the way you {pay} for a transportation link.  
Because of all the rich economic activity. Every few  
kilometers  
of distance along this link, there's something going on, some  
economic activity. People working, people building things,  
people  
doing things.

To transform this planet, in great projects of  
infrastructure-building, which will give you the great  
industries, the new industries, the new agriculture, and the  
other things we desperately need. {There is no need for

anybody

on this planet, who is able to work, to be out of work.} That simple. And that project is the means.

If the nations which agree with China – which now includes

Russia, Iran, India, other nations – if they engage in a commitment to that project which they're building every day; if

the United States – that is, the President of the United States,

Clinton – continues to support that effort, as he's been doing,

at least politically, then what do you have? You have the United

States and China and a bunch of other countries ganged up together, against the greatest power on this planet, which is the

British Empire, called the British Commonwealth. That's the enemy!

If on one bright day, say a Sunday morning, after a weekend

meeting, the President of the United States, the President of China, and a few other people say, "We have determined this weekend, that based on our advisors and the facts, that the international financial and monetary system is hopelessly bankrupt, and we in our responsibility as heads of state, must put these bankrupt institutions into bankruptcy reorganization,

in the public interest. And it is in our interest to cooperate as

nations in doing this, to avoid creating chaos on this planet."

The result, then, is that such an announcement, on a bright

Sunday morning, will certainly spin the "talking heads" on Washington TV. [laughter] But otherwise it means that the entire

system, as of that moment, has been put through the guillotine, and the head is rolling down the street. Alan Greenspan's head, perhaps.

That means we have at that point the impetus for building, immediately, a new financial and monetary system. Now, in putting a corporation which is bankrupt, into viable form, what do you do? You've got to find the business that it's going to do, which is the basis for creating the new credit to get that firm going again.

The Land-Bridge program, with its implications on a global scale, is the great project which spins off directly and indirectly enough business, so to speak, for every part of this world, to get this world back on a sound basis again.

OGDEN: As you can see, this is a very prescient speech, and in fact it was Lyndon LaRouche's active intervention, travelling to Russia, his wife travelling to China in this period, the publication of {EIR} Special Report about the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has shaped the current situation we find ourselves in. One thing that's interesting to point out, is those maps that you were seeing. At that time many of those rail routes and other pipeline routes were merely proposals, but now many of them are actually in the process of being built.

I think it's clear, 20 years on, this is the emergent dominant system on the planet. At the same time, the

trans-Atlantic system is in completely blowout mode. You have an oncoming implosion of trillions of dollars of non-performing debt and derivatives exposures, which are being projected into every major bank across the trans-Atlantic system.

In the meantime, in the build-up to the G-20 Summit and into the United Nations General Assembly, you've got the role that especially President Putin is playing, in consolidating a series of alliances, mainly between Russia, China, and India; but also this emerging alliance between Russia and Turkey; and, very significantly, the very strengthened alliance between Russia and Iran, where Russia is now using bases in Iran as a point of departure for fighter jets to go in and fight against ISIS in Syria.

Putin, who is being honored as the Number One guest at the upcoming G-20 Summit in China, is certainly at the center of all of this. His career and Mr. LaRouche's career, over the past twenty years since that speech was delivered in Washington, have very closely paralleled each other.

I think we can open up the discussion with that as a basis.

KESHA ROGERS: Did you want to start, Jason?

JASON ROSS: You can go ahead Kesha, or Michael.

ROGERS: Okay. I think Michael might be having some technical difficulties, so I will go ahead and get started.

When we look at Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, first of all, going back to this video that you just showed, it's extremely important to look at this video as a characteristic of who Mr. LaRouche is, and his 40- to 50-year track record in economic development, and what he has been organizing around, from the standpoint of the center of economics being based on the human intervention, the human creative process. And what actually distinguishes him from all of the other so-called "economists" out there, because as you just said Matt, what we're dealing with right now is a breakdown crisis in the society that Mr. LaRouche has recognized going back to his first forecast of the late 1960s, 1970s. What were these forecasts based on? They were based on the fact that if you went along with a mathematical idea about how society should function, then you were completely misunderstanding – or should I say wrong in your understanding of what actually fosters progress in society. What fosters progress in society is not money per se; and this has been Mr. LaRouche's focus on the role of Alexander Hamilton. [That's] why right now as many people have seen, we've already put out one edition of a new newsletter that you just showed Matt, called {The Hamiltonian}. This is extremely important because now we're putting out the second edition of {The Hamiltonian}, which is having reverberating effects, particularly throughout Manhattan; which is the center of the fight for the nation. That is the fight where Alexander Hamilton led the fight for the development of our US Constitution against the British criminals like Aaron Burr, and against those who wanted to destroy what the United States actually represented.

But it goes deeper than that; because I think what we've discussed a lot around Mr. LaRouche's current fight in Manhattan and what we're doing with this {Hamiltonian} is what has defined the mission for bringing about the new Presidency. Michael wrote an article last week on the question of the new Presidency fostered by Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws and the bringing in of those Four Laws. The article that's in this week's {Hamiltonian} is by Michael around LaRouche's track record in economics and why Wall Street has to be brought down now. It is followed by the article that I wrote on the human creative process. I think we'll get more into that, but when we bring up this question of a New Paradigm for mankind and the identity of a renaissance, some of it becomes in most people's minds because of the society and culture we live in, a little superficial. It is based on this idea that a renaissance has a different meaning to it. When we speak of the idea of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, first and foremost, it is the idea of creating something that has not yet existed; something that the human creative mind has to bring into existence. When you go back and you start to look at the idea of what the conception of the Italian Renaissance was based on historically, it was the idea of putting mankind and the human creative process at the center of the Universe.



I think it's important that we'll get into this; that this is what has shaped the identity of Mr. LaRouche around his emphasis on the unique creative role of Albert Einstein and the unique creative of others such as was mentioned earlier – Krafft Ehricke. I think it's important for people to look at this, because the question now is that with the collapse of the society that we're seeing right now, the detrimental collapse of the culture, what we're seeing in terms of what's taken over the thinking of the population. The population is not capable of actually making decisions as human beings; they're making decisions based on what somebody tells them is possible or is not possible. I think this is a problem we're running into. How can you actually say that you have the ability to make decisions as a free citizen when you're making your decisions based on what you think is already possible and has been determined as precedents set and possibilities that are already a determining factor of what can and cannot happen.

So, I think that's important to look at as people are thinking about this insane election process. Instead of thinking about what is going to shape your future; is it going to be something that happens to you? Or something that you actually bring into existence? That's what Mr. LaRouche has been completely focussed on. The population has to have a sense that you're responsible for your future; you must bring that which does not exist into existence, based on your understanding that

human beings are not animals. We don't have to go along with the insanity of what we're told we have to accept.

So, I'll start with those remarks for now, and let you guys go on with more.

OGDEN: Well, we just got Michael back, so maybe we should hear him.

MICHAEL STEGER: Hi.

OGDEN: Great! Welcome back. We were just discussing some of the implications of going back and looking back at that video of Mr. LaRouche's speech in 1997. I think you actually had something to point out about the timing of that speech and what happened just immediately afterwards.

STEGER: Yeah, and part of the dynamic in organizing some of the layers of China at that time was that it was not clear to many in China at that time, or in Asia, that the western trans-Atlantic system had major failings and weaknesses. It was just two months after that speech was made that the Asian financial crisis erupted; dominating Southeast Asia and Japan — the so-called "Asian tigers". It really made it very clear that the entire financial system could go. It was just a year later that the whole LCTM crisis happened. So when Mr. LaRouche is referencing the bankruptcy of the financial system, that was very

apparent in just months to come to almost everyone on the planet;  
as apparent as it was in 2008 when the financial system blew again. As we point out in the article in the new {Hamiltonian},  
the level of insanity that now dominates 20 years later, creates  
what is clearly the largest financial breakdown in modern history. This is a kind of financial bankruptcy only comparable  
to perhaps the blow-out in Italy in the 1300s; which brought a Dark Age to Europe.

But what is remarkable is how much these nations like China  
– it's just striking; and maybe this has already been stated –  
but the context of China and India collaborating on major routes  
is an ongoing diplomatic process today. Far more engaged, far more serious than anyone can probably imagine; let alone the integrations of countries like Iran, Turkey. Everything that Mr.  
LaRouche laid out about 20 years ago, is now on a far greater active collaborative effort among these nations. It is somewhat  
a testament to the power of ideas and how that can shape history  
at crisis moments; as we saw in '97 and what we see today.

OGDEN: I think one thing that is very clear from just looking at  
Mr. LaRouche's role in the middle of this, is his emphasis on the  
mission that has to bring nations together. In other words, this  
is not just geopolitics in a cynical sense. This based around a  
concept of what is the human species? What is real profit?

How

do we create a future for a growing population; and how do we establish the kind of optimism that mankind has a future towards

which the current generations can work? It's pointed out, I think a lot of what we're seeing right now is not just a projection of the past into the present. This is a reflection of

a future intention. You can look at what China is doing, for example, in terms of their space program. The fact that two years from now, you're going to have a Chinese probe going to where no man has gone before; to the far side of the Moon, to discover things that perhaps we don't even know are questions yet, in terms of man's relationship to the Universe.

When we were discussing some of these questions with Mr.

LaRouche yesterday, he had one thing to say which I just would like to quote verbatim from him which I think can provide the basis for a furthering of this discussion. What Mr. LaRouche said was the following: "Mankind is not based on the limitations

of individual human behavior; but, in fact, man as a species is

based on the individual powers of the human mind to go beyond what mankind had conceived of prior. Giving mankind a power over

the Universe greater than anything achieved heretofore."

We've

been putting a lot of emphasis on the personality of Albert Einstein, but for what reason? For the very reason that Albert

Einstein is paradigmatic of exactly that sort of individual, revolutionary characteristic of genius. That the genius takes what was believed prior to that point and calls it into question,

and overturns major aspects of what mankind had believed and had

put into practice up to that point; and revolutionizes mankind's understanding of the Universe and of himself. So, I think that's sort of a window into why the emphasis on Albert Einstein right now.

JASON ROSS: It's difficult to speak for LaRouche; and he's got opportunities to speak for himself on this site, too, which he'll continue doing. But the example of Einstein as a real {mensch} you might say, a real human being, what it is to be a person is essential for a couple of reasons. One, if you think about the role of LaRouche in history and the economic breakthroughs he made several decades ago now, you look at the courage that he had to stick with what he knew was right despite whatever opposition might come his way; despite what was effectively a life sentence in prison, to not compromise in the face of that. An economic forecasting record that's unparalleled and proposals for polices that are now – as you heard in that video, and as is taking place right now with China's One Belt, One Road taking the world. So, in terms of how Einstein fits into that, I want to take up something that Kesha had brought up about popular opinion. Because where do you get a freedom in your thoughts from? How are you able to be a free thinking citizen; or how are you able to come to conclusions that are your own, as opposed to having a basis in their popularity. Or whether you think other people might think them, or whether you

think you ought to look like you think them to get ahead somehow.

Is there an actual standard for whether something is true or not?

Yes, there is; and unfortunately and deliberately, that's really not part of our culture or our education right now.

So, LaRouche has emphasized that the general understanding of Einstein is false; it's wrong. Most people's images of who Einstein is as a person, his work to some degree, it's just not true. And we've got to clean that up in order to make a case about what his approach was to the Universe, to mankind, to life; and how that was important, it made it possible for him to make the scientific breakthroughs that he did. But he was a whole person; he was an entire human being, including the role of his violin – something that LaRouche has referred to a number of times.

So today, I want to go through a few things – somewhat briefly. We're going to have a "New Paradigm for Mankind" Wednesday show this coming week on Wednesday after a hiatus of some period. So, we'll be able to get into this in a bit more detail then, but I want to take up three things. First is briefly, some thoughts from Einstein; quotes from Einstein. How did he think about things beyond his scientific work also. Second, I want to talk about his most famous discovery – relativity; and what that implies. And then third, talk about quantum mechanics as an example of Einstein's courage against popular opinion; which is something that he had from a very young age. Then we'll see how that plays into these other concepts.

When he was 67, Einstein was asked to write down a

sort of

an autobiography; which he felt was like writing an obituary before he had passed. He was a nice guy, so he still did it. I'm going to read some quotes from this; it's called his "Autobiographical Notes". He starts off very early; he says, "Even when I was a fairly precocious young man, the nothingness

of the hopes and strivings which chases most people restlessly through life, came to my consciousness with considerable vitality. Moreover, I soon discovered the cruelty of that chase;

which in those years was much more carefully covered up by hypocrisy and glittering words than is the case today." So, the

vain chase for success, this isn't a real identity. He says, "It

was possible to satisfy the stomach by such participation, but not a human being insofar as he is a thinking and feeling being.

Thus, I came – despite the fact that I was the son of entirely irreligious Jewish parents – to a deep religiosity; which, however, found an abrupt ending at the age of 12. Through the reading of popular scientific books, I soon reached the conviction that much of the stories in the Bible could not be true. The consequence was a positively fanatical free thinking,

coupled with the impression that youth is intentionally being deceived by the state through lies. It was a crushing impression. Suspicion of every kind of authority grew out of this experience. A skeptical attitude towards the convictions which were alive in any specific social environment; an attitude

which has never left me." It's not some popular opinion.

He wrote that, "The contemplation of the huge world, the

vast riddle of the Universe around us," this to him was the proper goal of life. And that by considering it, you could be

really liberated from things that are merely personal or insignificant. He wrote: "Similarly motivated thinkers of the present and the past, as well as the insights which they had achieved, were friends that could not be lost. The road to this paradise of knowledge was not as comfortable and alluring as the road to the religious paradise; but it has proved itself as trustworthy, and I have never regretted having chosen it."

In his thinking process, Einstein – who was a musician with a deep love of Mozart in particular – didn't believe that thinking required words. He wrote: "For me, it is not dubious that our thinking goes on for the most part without the use of signs or words. And beyond that, to a considerable degree, it takes place unconsciously." He writes that "Through our experiences as we understand conflicts between our thought of how the world works and experiences which counter that, we develop a sense of wonder," which he says is the key to the development of new thoughts. So, how can that be developed? How can that be fostered? Well, he complained about the school in his day; he said there was too much testing and not enough freedom or actual thought for the students. I can hardly imagine what he would say about schools now. He wrote then that "It is, in fact, nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry. For this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and of searching can be promoted by means



of coercion and a sense of duty."

On the kinds of thoughts that make true discoveries, he said that there are two requirements for such a theory. One, it can't be contradicted by observations; and second, he said it has to have an inner perfection. About that, he wrote – sounding very much like Johannes Kepler, the first modern astronomer – Einstein wrote: "We prize a value more highly if it is not the result of an arbitrary choice among theories which – among themselves – are of equal value and analogously constructed." That is, to be right, an idea also has to be necessary; not just in keeping with observations.

In his life, he was a courageous man; he stood up against World War I; even when many great scientists like Max Planck had written a letter supporting the war, supporting Germany's cause in it. Einstein didn't; he wrote a letter opposing it, and even got Max Planck to rescind his support for the war. He stood up against racism in the US in many famous cases such as Marian Anderson, who when she went to perform in Princeton, wasn't able to actually spend the night anywhere; she was turned away by hotels. So, she stayed at Albert Einstein's house, which is where she'd stay whenever she visited that town. And his opposition to the FBI and the thought policing it was doing. When he was coming to the US, they had a list of questions for him; they wanted to do an interview, find out what kind of thoughts Einstein had. He said, I'm not going to answer

these.

If this is the condition for coming to the US, I'm not going to come; forget it. They gave in. So, I'll let those brief words from Einstein stand for themselves.

Let's take a look at the second part, which is a few thoughts about his famous discovery of relativity. As far as the context for this, ever since the general hegemony of Newton's outlook – which didn't have to happen, but it did – according to Newton, when we make observations, when we do science, things take place in a space that is indifferent to those things; it's just there. It existed before anything was in the Universe. According to Newton, space existed before God created everything; it was just the primordial space. Newton also believed that there was a time; a single time, a universal time that flowed on of its own accord, had no particular characteristics and was not dependent on or related to anything that actually took place over time. So, according to Newton, there was an absolute space, an absolute time; and objects in that space at various times. Now, this had already been shown to be wrong by Gottfried Leibniz, who in a debate with Newton, demonstrated that requiring an absolute space and then saying that God created everything somewhere in that space, as opposed to somewhere else; would be a decision without any good reason. And that God couldn't do something like

that; everything in the Universe had a reason for it, and that therefore there couldn't have been this space in the first place.

Newton used the same example to say that shows you how powerful

God is, because He could do whatever He felt like. So, He put the Universe somewhere. Anyway, Leibniz had already shown that

this Newtonian idea was wrong; but Newton gained hegemony.

So,

it has the result that people think of facts, of things taking place in locations at certain times. But Einstein showed that this actually isn't true; that there is no time that any event takes place. That the time an event occurs, depends on who is looking at it. Not in the way of uncertainties or anything like

that; but the time itself doesn't exist as one thing that's independent of who's doing the looking, or of their location.

What he did was, he created a new concept that resolved the contradiction between two concepts that were actually mutually contradictory. So, these two concepts were, first off, relativity; which existed before Einstein as a concept or equivalence. Leibniz believed this, for example; which was that

no matter where you are, or how you're moving – any of those kinds of particular conditions – mind is universal. Mind is everywhere; mind is everywhere in the Universe; mind doesn't have

a speed or motion or anything like that. Concepts that govern how the Universe unfolds – true physical principles – are independent of how you look at any particular fact or observation

that's occurring. So, you can't change mind by moving something

physically – more on that in a minute.

The second concept was that the speed of light is the same

for any observer; and that's not something that was immediately apparent. This was definitely debated. To contrast that, imagine that you're driving on a road and there's a car next to you that's moving at a similar speed. To you, it looks like the car isn't really moving; to a pedestrian, the car is moving at whatever speed you're driving. Light is different than a car moving, where you can catch up with its speed and make it look like it's still. For light, no matter how you're moving, light beams to you all appear to move at the speed of light. So, you can't put those two concepts together; you can't have relativity and a constant speed of light if you have one time and one space. Instead, what Einstein said was that the time between events or the distance between locations can actually differ based on how you're looking at them. So that simply being in motion – it's not perceptible except at very high speeds – but simply being in motion changes the lengths of everything around you, the time between events that take place.

I'll just briefly outline one example of this – we can get into it with some pictures and things on Wednesday. He shows a lot of examples of thought experiments using trains moving through train stations or embankments. He gives one example which is, let's say that as a train is moving, someone on the ground sees flashes of lightning hit both sides of the train at the same time. For them to say "at the same time", what it

means

is if you're standing in the middle, the light from both of those

flashes reaches you at the same time. You say, "I'm in the middle between these two points, therefore they must have happened at the same time and then it took the light a little bit

of time for me to see it." But you'd also recognize that if someone on the train was to see those same two lightning bolts,

which to you occur simultaneously, as the train is moving this way and you picture light moving at a constant speed from your viewpoint, the light that was at the front of the train is going

to be observed first by somebody standing in the middle of the train. Someone on that train would say that those lightning flashes didn't occur at the same time; that one preceded the other. What that means is that there's no simultaneity; there's

no ability to say anything took place at a certain time. Time now depends on who's looking at it. If there's no simultaneity,

then there's nothing instant that can take place in the Universe;

because there's no instant for anything to occur instantly in. So, for example, gravitational pull can't occur instantly; there

can't be an instant action at a distance. In fact, nothing, no

effect could go faster than light; including gravitational changes. It meant a couple of things. One is that you can't separate space and time; but the other thing is that it makes you

really have to reconsider what makes up reality. The idea that

objects at places in times are facts; that's not reality. The thing that's most real is the principles that you're able to

discover that don't change based on how you look at them, or how you're moving. Something like the way that light moves – that's a physical principle; no matter how you look at it, it's the same thing. It's a principle. A distance between two things? That's not a principle; that's not invariant. That can change, depending on how you look at it. So that the naïve sense that we get of the world around us, of our very concept of space, is just not right. Even though it seems totally intuitive and very popular, you have to force a different kind of understanding.

Now, there's a lot more to relativity than that, that's just a component of it. But it's undergone many, many tests over the decades. Things like starlight being deflected as it passes around the Sun; atomic clocks going in airplanes and rockets; light made by stars being a different color by virtue of their gravitation. Gravity waves, recently discovered somewhat directly by the SLIGO experiment, but a paper written about them in the '70s; having discovered indirect evidence for them from a pulsar. So, his thoughts have definitely stood the test of time on this. Nothing shows that he was wrong. So that says something about how we think about the world.

Just to say something about Einstein's courage, on the third topic is the quantum world. In 1900, Einstein later colleague, Max Planck had made a discovery that he was able to explain the

kind of light that hot bodies emit. Something that's hot and glowing like the filament in a light bulb; Planck was able to explain that based on an hypothesis that the way light was emitted from and absorbed by that hot body took place in pieces.

That the light energy had to interact with that body in individually in quanta, the plural of quantum. A few years later, in Einstein's so-called "miracle year" of 1905, he generalized this and said that's just how light is; it comes in

pieces. Light is not purely a wave; light is also somewhat of a particle. The field developed, and one of the things that came

out of it that Einstein had realized, was a phenomenon called entanglement. To say it very briefly, it's the characteristic where you're able to make two particles, say two photons that have characteristics that are shared. In the case of photons, they have opposite polarizations. Or maybe you can make two electrons that have opposite spins. After you make them, here's

the thought experiment Einstein would say. Let's say you make two of them; you don't look at them, and they go to very different places. One's in Tokyo and one's in New York.

According to the theory, once you measure one in Tokyo and you get some sort of number for whatever its spin is; the one in New

York automatically has the opposite spin. So Einstein said, does

this mean that measuring something in New York changed something

in Tokyo, or vice versa? Could it have an instant effect somehow? How did it change the other particle that's so far away

from it? Nothing can occur instantly anyway, because there are

no instants. What's going on?

What it came to was a debate over decades, that was unresolved. Einstein believed that the way work in this field was going, was that people were giving up on reality; that they were saying that all we really ever know is an observation. That the world doesn't exist in a certain state independent of our measuring it. Not just because our measurements affect things — especially when they're very small; but that even God himself, so to speak, doesn't really know the state of say an atom. It simply doesn't have one; all that is really real is when you observe it later. So, Einstein made a lot of polemics against this, a lot of pedagogies about it, a lot of demonstrations; and although there have been experiments since the decades after his life that shed new light on it, I think the key thing to take from that is that Einstein recognized that there was something a bit unsettling about the way science was going. That people were willing to give up on the idea that things occurred for a reason. To Einstein, that was throwing away reality; bidding farewell to the idea that there is a real world. Some of his thoughts on that, you might have heard him say he'd like to think that the Moon is still there even when he doesn't look at it. But I think the thing to take from that is his courage; even when almost everyone was against him, he stuck to his guns on that.

So, in terms of concluding on that, or drawing a reflection from it, it's a constantly under-appreciated miracle that our minds are able to understand the Universe in a way that gives



us  
power over it. That unlike a koala bear or a grasshopper,  
that  
are unable to use their understanding of nature to change  
their  
relationship to it to transform their species, we're able to  
do  
that. There's something coherent between the way our minds  
piece  
together and understand the world around us through our  
thoughts,  
through our concepts. There is a harmony between those  
concepts  
and the way the Universe actually operates that gives us  
access  
to act on those principles to bring about new states of  
existence; and is the basis of economics. So, I think that in  
addition to a radical transformation and improvement in  
culture  
that's needed, people like to think that they've got a lot of  
scientific knowledge these days; because you own a smart phone  
and you think you know something about science. Or you say  
that  
everybody knows there's global warming and only anti-  
scientific  
people disagree with that. That's not a basis of knowing  
anything; and there's a lot of room for a dramatic  
improvement.

A real renaissance of taking Einstein's identity as an example  
and really developing a fresh and powerful view of science to  
solve many of the problems that we're confronted with right  
now,  
that without a different approach, might never be solved.

So, that's a very inadequate beginning about Einstein;  
but  
it's a job for all of us to do. To figure out who is this  
man;

what can we learn from his approach? I think we'll be hearing more from LaRouche and his thoughts on how he views his importance as an individual for us today.

ROGERS: I think that's very important. What I think is important to go back to in terms of LaRouche's role and what he said in the presentation that we showed earlier. And going to the understanding of what is actually happening with the role that Russia, under President Putin, and the role that President Xi Jinping is playing in relationship to what Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche had set into motion several decades ago with the development of the Productive Triangle, of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the Silk Road Development Plan. This coming into motion now, and at that very time, during that presentation that we saw in the beginning of this program, made the point that these nations would be brought together in collaboration and form a coalition of nations representing nations such as Iran, China, Russia, India, and so forth, to put an end – once and for all – to the British Empire. And the intentions of the British Empire to destroy this very conception of what is the truly human identity; the identity of the creative human process. I think it's very important to look at that from the standpoint of the presentation you just gave, Jason. Because that's what missing.

What we're talking about is not a political fight from the standpoint of how do you bring down one political candidate over the other; but how do you destroy a system, particularly the British Empire, in all of its facets and what it represents,

that

denies this creative human process. Right now, what we're looking at from the United States is that as the rest of these nations are moving in the direction of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, moving with the Silk Road economic development plan;

where is the United States right now? The United States is continuing to go along with the evils and destructive policies of

the British Empire. This has been the case for decades now; this

has been the case under the murderous, insane agenda of President

Obama, who should have been removed a long time ago. Or the policies of the Bush administration, and the lies and the cover-up. Now, we have an opportunity. What we're discussing here is not just some nice scientific ideas, and let's look at Einstein and people think they have their different conceptions

and understanding and "Oh, I studied this in elementary school."

No; the idea is, what has been taken away from society? Why have

we allowed an Empire to dominate our existence and our nation and

culture for far too long?

So, I think it is the case that in 1997, when Mr. LaRouche

made the point that what we're dealing with is nations have to come together to bring about that truly human identity to destroy

this empire once and for all; that's what we're going to use Einstein to do. I'll just make that point.

STEGER: Just to add, because I think it's worth considering; there are so many developments that we're on the verge of. This coming six weeks have such a dramatic nature

that  
we've already seen a certain sense of in terms of a  
consolidated  
effort to end this British Empire system; the very key  
emphasis  
Lyn took up in 1997. That there is now an orientation to  
resolve  
the question of the Balkans, the Caucuses, Kashmir, the South  
China Sea; even North Korea are essentially on the agenda of  
these major nations. To end the potential of world war, and  
to  
really consolidate a new economic system. So, it is kind of  
striking that Lyn's emphasis is, as Matt you raised, on  
Einstein.  
Why the emphasis now? But it's clearly because in the minds  
of  
this collaborative effort among these nations and among any  
patriotic Americans, as we see in the performances we're  
developing in New York around the 9/11 anniversary, the  
question  
has to be the long-term development of mankind. Not one's  
children, not one generation ahead, but the actual ongoing  
development that now is possible to embark upon as a human  
species on this planet. And I think Einstein craved and  
desired  
no less. His discoveries and passion unleashed that kind of  
potential, which he probably saw as a young man himself, and  
that  
quality. It's not just simply a liberal emotion; it is of a  
scientific endeavor which Einstein really captured. I think  
Lyn's comments then and today also do as well.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's with a full amount of  
confidence  
that we can move forward and understand that the epic  
era-changing kinds of developments that are occurring around  
us

right now, are things that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been in the middle of for decades, literally. They've had their fingers on the pulse of history right up to this point. Helga LaRouche pointed out yesterday that the speech that she gave at the Rasina Dialogue in India just a couple of months ago, seems like it's exactly what is now being undertaken by the Indian government in terms of their collaboration with China and Russia to project the Silk Road into the Middle East to resolve this terrible crisis that exists there. And Mr. LaRouche's continuing role in terms of the intellectual sounding board around which the rest of history is continuing to move. It's with confidence that we can look back at that speech and everything else that is on the record in terms of their role. It's an identity which we need to maintain within ourselves and those who are collaborating with us, that yes, your finger is on the pulse of history; the imagination of what the future can become is what is continuing to shape the actions in the present. And it's a moment of decision; it's the {punctum saliens} moment in terms of which direction does mankind go right now. We have a rich potential, and I think it's extremely clear; but it's also extremely dangerous.

I'd really like to thank Jason for giving a little bit of a foretaste of what's going to be elaborated much more, I'm sure, on the show next Wednesday. That's going to be broadcast, and we

would ask you to tune in to that. I also want to encourage people to continue to participate in the process of inundating Manhattan with this new publication, {The Hamiltonian}. This is issue 2, and it continues to be the center of our intervention into shaping the United States and answering the question that Kesha asked: Why is the United States not yet a part of this emerging dynamic on the planet? What must be done to cause that to occur?

So, I'd like to thank all of you for tuning in; and encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com. And we'll see you next week.

---

## **Nutiden har ingen præcedens**

*18. august 2016 (Leder)* – Den nutidige historiske periode er fuldstændig ny i sine karakteristika; den kan ikke sammenlignes med noget andet i menneskehedens hidtidige historie. Af denne grund er det kun nogle få personer, der har været i stand til, i deres intellekt, at frembringe et begreb om, hvad karakteristika er for denne epoke, der intet fortilfælde har: personer som Albert Einstein, Krafft Ehrlicke og Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Fordi det store flertal af almindelige dødelige mennesker ikke i deres erfaringsmateriale har noget sammenligneligt, og intet, som de har hørt eller læst om, har de ingen kriterier, ud fra hvilke de kan bedømme eller forstå det; de er på herrens mark. Af denne grund kan grupper, bestående af så få personer som i Lyndon LaRouches Manhattan-projekt, få en afgørende indflydelse netop på dette tidspunkt. Alene de kan se vejen frem, om end denne vej undertiden kan synes utydelig, og de må famle sig frem. De øvrige går i blinde, eller, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche ofte

siger, »har ikke den fjerneste idé«.

I 2018 vil en kinesisk mission nå Månens bagside – under forudsætning af, at det inden da lykkes os at besejre Det britiske Imperiums kaosmagter. Denne mission vil blive en del af et helt, generelt program for at opdage og udforske de endnu ikke virkeliggjorte implikationer af Einsteins fundamentale opdagelser, som Lyndon LaRouche har påpeget. Og, som rumforskningsgeniet Krafft Ehrlicke – sammen med LaRouche – forudså, så vil den aktuelle energigennemstrømningstæthed, der for tiden står til menneskehedens disposition, være en forløber for fusionskraft, og herfra føre til stof-antistofreaktioner, og herfra atter videre frem til niveauer, som vi i dag ikke engang kan give et navn.

Under forudsætning af, at vi overvinder de aktuelle forhindringer, som repræsenteres af Obama og det Britiske Imperium, så er vi i færd med at glide ind i det, Helga Zepp-LaRouche har kaldt »en æra, i hvilken vi bliver ægte menneskelige«.

På lignende måde er det, man måske kunne have kaldt det »system af alliancer«, der nu spænder over og gennemkrydser Eurasien og breder sig ud herfra, i realiteten slet ikke et »system af alliancer« i den betydning, vi har kendt til fra fortiden. Det er i realiteten snarere en projektion tilbage i tiden og ind i nutiden, fra det fremtidige univers, der inkorporerer de fremtidige opdagelser, der bringes tilbage fra Månens bagside. Putin har, sammen med Kina, inkorporeret principperne fra Den Westfalske Fred, men de er gået langt, langt videre end det. Begynd blot med den ekstraordinære relation, der er opnået mellem Rusland og Kina. Er man klar over, at vi taler om nationer, der så sent som i 1969 udkæmpede en syv måneder lang, ikke-erklæret krig over Ussurifloden? Nu har de ikke alene regelmæssige topmøder mellem præsidenterne, og regelmæssige topmøder mellem premierministrene; det er det mindste af det. Der er ikke mindre end tretten mellemregerings-kommissioner, der hele

tiden er i kontinuerlig kontakt med hinanden. Alle de mange meningsforskelle og uoverensstemmelser – og der er mange – bliver kontinuerligt løst på et både bredt og dybt plan i begge regeringer.

»Og vi finder altid frem til løsninger«, føjede Putin til denne beskrivelse.

Processen med at fuldbyrde denne ekstraordinære relation har været genstand for en dybtgående undersøgelse af Kinas dr. Ren Lin, der talte på Schiller Instituttets konference i Berlin i juni måned, og af mange andre kinesiske og russiske, akademiske lærde.

Fuldbyrdelsen af en sådan relation udgør hjertet af BRIKS-processen og udviklingen af Den nye Silkevej. Det var kernen i Putins forgænger, nu afdøde russiske premierminister Jevgenij Primakovs idé om Den russisk-indisk-kinesiske Strategiske Trekant. Skabelsen heraf går tilbage til ikke alene Lyndon og Helga LaRouches idé om Den produktive Trekant og Den eurasiske Landbro, men endnu længere tilbage, til LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ[1], der havde en formativ indflydelse på Rusland til trods for, at Ruslands daværende leder, Juri Andropov, havde afvist initiativet på vegne af sine britiske herrer.

Dette nye system med fremtidens relationer mellem nationalstater, der går ud over nationalstatsbegrebet, som LaRouche længe har forudsagt, går med syvmileskridt hastigt frem hen over hele det eurasiske kontinent og mere generelt på et tidspunkt, hvor vi nærmer os det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok den 2. – 3. september, FN's Generalforsamling, der begynder den 13. september, og BRIKS-topmødet i Goa, Indien, den 15. – 16. oktober.

*Foto: Portræt af Einstein i 1905, da han offentliggjorde sin opdagelse af den specielle relativitetsteori.[2].*

[1] SE: LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ: En



amerikansk-sovjetisk aftale for fred og udvikling,  
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=6976>

[2] Den specielle relativitetsteori er en fysisk teori, publiceret af Albert Einstein. Den erstattede den Newtonske opfattelse af tid og rum ved at gøre brug af det faktum, at lysets hastighed er konstant (Teorien kaldes desuden for 'speciel', fordi den er et specialtilfælde af den mere generelle relativitetsteori; således ses der bort fra tyngdekraften). Ti år senere publicerede Einstein den generelle relativitetsteori, som medinddrager tyngdekraften. (-red.)

---

## **Det tyske spørgsmål: Gnisten, der udløser krakket – eller en drivkraft for udvikling af verden**

17. august 2016 (Leder) – Hvis Deutsche Bank for lov til at synke ned i et ukontrolleret kollaps, der får den største pulje af derivater blandt verdens banker til at nedsmelte, vil ikke alene den tyske økonomi, men også hele Europa og USA, hermed blive lagt øde. Alligevel er det, hvad der er på dagsordenen, bogstaveligt talt hvad dag, det skal være. Endnu en stemme fra den finansielle elite råber i dag alarm: »Deutsche Bank befinder sig i større vanskeligheder, end folk gør sig klart«, sagde Brad Lamensdorf fra hedgefonden Ranger Equity Bear i et interview med Lodonavisen *The Express*. »Noget er i den grad brudt sammen.«

»Der er intet i det europæiske banksystem, der er stabilt«, var Lyndon LaRouches respons. »Den tyske økonomi er på randen af en eksplosion. Merkel og Schäuble prøver på at håndtere det umulige. De må gå af. Det er kun et spørgsmål om tid, hvornår sammenbruddet vil indtræffe.«

Der findes midler til at løse denne krise, men ikke, medmindre der i Tyskland omgående træder ledere frem, der kan genoprette stabiliteten. Dette kræver for det første en genkapitalisering af Deutsche Bank under en nyt program, der afskriver den værdiløse derivat-boble og genopretter kommerciel bankvirksomhed under en regulering i stil med Glass-Steagall. Hvis dette gøres nu, sagde LaRouche, så kan Tyskland, i samarbejde med Putins Rusland, undgå et pludseligt sammenbrud og blive drivkraften for et nyt paradigme for samarbejde mellem de transatlantiske nationer og det russisk-kinesiske partnerskab, der nu leder verdensøkonomien fremad, det vestlige kollaps til trods.

Ledende kræfter i Tyskland forsøger at forbedre relationerne med Rusland. Udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier mødtes med sin russiske modpart Sergei Lavrov i Jekatarinburg den 15. august, hvor de to enedes om at »tilskynde til kontakter mellem regeringsagenturer for regioner i den Russiske Føderation og Forbundsrepublikken Tyskland«, udtalte Lavrov og tilføjede, at »vi mener, at den interesse for at samarbejde med Ruslands regioner, som Frank-Walter har udvist, fortjener al mulig støtte«. Som rapporteret i TASS, diskuterede de to, ifølge Lavrov, også bilaterale relationer inden for »politiske, kulturelle, humanitære og historiske områder«. Hvor længe kan det vanvittige sanktionsregime og NATO's krigsmobilisering tolereres?

Tiden er knap. Putin har ramt Obamas krigsplan på to sårbare flanker: først i Syrien, hvor han under international lov har arbejdet med Syriens suveræne regering om at besejre terrorist-apparatet på forskellige fronter i Syrien, og således udstillet Obama som en promoter af de saudisk-

kontrollerede al-Qaeda-netværk for at fuldbyrde hans aggressioners mål om kriminelt regimeskifte; og for det andet, så har Putin bragt Tyrkiet til fornuft og afsluttet Obamas brug af landet til at kanalisere våben og terrorister ind i Syrien.

Obama har reageret ved at sætte neonazistiske bander ind i Ukraine for at udløse terroristangreb i Krim – dvs. på russisk territorium – og optrappe krigen i Donbas-regionen. Putin meddelte, at det planlagte møde i Normandiet-gruppen (Frankrig, Tyskland, Rusland og Ukraine) ved det kommende G20-møde i Kina, med henblik på at forsøge at redde Minsk-aftalerne, var meningsløst nu, hvor Kiev har satset på terror på russisk territorium. Hollande, Merkel og Porosjenko talte i telefon i dag – uden Putin – og opfordrede til at fortsætte med Normandiet-processen. Andre har foreslået, at Tyskland og Rusland fortsætter på egen hånd for at løse problemet med Ukraine, og for at kræve en afslutning på Kievs Obama-støttede provokationer.

Der er krig på dagsordenen – en krig, der hurtigt ville blive global og atomar. Alt imens Tyskland, under et nyt lederskab, og i tandem med Rusland, kan forhindre det økonomiske kollaps og standse den fremstormende krig, så vil det kræve mod af amerikanske statsborgere at standse Obama (og hans håndlanger Hillary Clinton) i at udsætte USA for Wall Streets destruktion af den fysiske økonomi og føre verden ud i krig. Disse beslutninger skal træffes nu – ikke igennem et svindelvalg mellem to fjender af det Amerikanske System, men nu, ved forfatningsmæssige midler, der fjerner Obama for hans flere mange forbrydelser mod Forfatningen og mod menneskeheden, og som indfører Glass-Steagall, genopretter nationalbankvirksomhed og genopretter Amerikas forpligtelse til en fremtid på Jorden og i rummet med fusionskraft.

Ingen »praktiske«, delvise forholdsregler vil lykkes.

*Foto: Præsident Putin og den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-*

*Walter Steinmeier trykker hinanden i hånden efter et møde den 23. marts, 2016.*

.

---

## **Sergei Glazyev, rådgiver til Putin, taler om Ukraine og Ruslands orientering mod øst i interview**

*17. august 2016 – Sergei Glazyev, en rådgiver til den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, gav et interview til det russiske nyhedssite Russkaya Vesna, som blev udlagt i går.*

Efter at have beskrevet, at Ukraine kontrolleres af nazisterne, der i realiteten agerer som en besættelsesmagt for USA, samt andre meget barske udtalelser om Ukraine, kommenterede Glazyev Ruslands ekspanderende samarbejde med Tyrkiet og Kina. Han blev spurgt, om de forbedrede relationer mellem Rusland og Tyrkiet »er et strategisk initiativ fra de to landes myndigheders side, og endnu et opportunistisk fænomen? Og hvor store var chancerne for en russisk-tyrkisk økonomisk union på længere sigt?« Glazyev svarede:

»Med hensyn til målene er vore økonomiske interesser i samklang, således, at udviklingen af det russisk-tyrkiske handels- og økonomisamarbejde går rigtig godt. Vore partnere fra Kasakhstan i EAEC (Eurasisk Økonomisk Fællesskab) har

fremSAT et initiativ om at indgå en præferencehandelsaftale med Tyrkiet. Dette er imidlertid uforeneligt med Tyrkiets aspirationer om optagelse i EU. Hvis Tyrkiet er ude af EU og NATO, kan samarbejdet vokse mange gange, og politiske uoverensstemmelser kan med lethed løses.« [Medlemmer af den Europæiske Union har ikke lov til uafhængigt at tilslutte sig en anden handelsblok. Tyrkiet er selvfølgelig endnu ikke i EU og kan meget let tilslutte sig en hvilken som helst handelsblok eller indgå handelsaftaler med andre lande, hvilket det da også allerede har gjort.]

Forespurgt om sin evaluering af de aktuelle kinesisk-russiske relationer, og om det repræsenterer politik for en total »orientering mod øst«, sagde han: »Dette er et gensidigt ligeværdigt, strategisk partnerskab, i hvilket vore lande har det samme mål. Der har fundet en orientering mod øst sted i den globale økonomi, og vi må aspirere til fuld deltagelse i denne nye orientering i verdensøkonomien, det fremvoksende Kina og andre lande i Sydøstasien.«

Russkaya Vesnas engelske site: <http://rusvesna.su/english>

Artiklen kan læses her:  
<http://www.fort-russ.com/2016/08/glazyev-ukraine-under-us-occupation.html>

*Foto: Sergei Glazyev (venstre) med Vladimir Putin.*

---

# En orientering mod Stillehavsområdet:

# Det Eurasiske System. Video

Alt imens de asiatiske Stillehavsnationer har brug for den videnskabelige viden, teknologi og fordele ved vores form for regering, såsom et statsligt kreditsystem efter Alexander Hamiltons principper, så står det klart, at, med hensyn til inspiration, så må vi nu se hen til Stillehavsområdet.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

*Titelfoto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Kinas kyst, »Den Eurasiske Landbros Terminal Øst«, 1996.*

---

## Med nedsmeltningen af derivater under anmarch, må Vesten slutte sig til Putins verden

*16. august 2016 (Leder) – Den Internationale Betalingsbank (BIS) har forberedt et dokument til det forestående G20-topmøde for statsoverhoveder i Kina, med en advarsel om, at en nedsmeltning af derivatmarkedet kunne ske når som helst, og at clearinghouse-systemet (CHIPS) er totalt uforberedt til at håndtere et sådant chok. Husk på, at Deutsche Bank har den største eksponering til derivater af alle banker i verden, og*

den har modparts-kontrakter med næsten alle TBTF-banker i USA, Europa og Japan – og Deutsche bank er korrekt blevet beskrevet som en »dead bank walking« (en 'bank på dødsgangen'). De bedste estimater lyder, at den globale derivathandel stadig ligger på et godt stykke over en milliard dollar, selv efter tab i år, der allerede har hobet sig op.

På dette sene tidspunkt er der kun én mulighed tilbage for det gennemført bankerotte transatlantiske system: Genindfør Glass-Steagall, afskriv alle derivatkontrakterne, gå tilbage til et fastkurssystem à la Bretton Woods, og lancer en massiv anlægsinvestering i projekter, der understøtter reel produktivitet gennem statslige bankmetoder i traditionen efter Hamilton, inklusive en forceret indsats for at opnå fusionskraft. Dette er hjertet i Lyndon LaRouches Fire Kardinallove.

Det betyder, med hensyn til den virkelige verden, at Vesten må opgive det afdøde, britiske system og endelig tilslutte sig det nye, eurasiske-centrerede system, der hastigt er ved at manifestere sig, under Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putins overordnede lederskab og gennem virkeliggørelsen af Kinas program for 'Ét bælte, én vej' (OBOR). I mandags startede det første kølegodstog ud fra den kinesiske havn Dailan, med destination Moskva, en rejse på 8.600 kilometer, som vil blive klaret på henved ti dage. Dette er den seneste gren af OBOR og sætter fokus på samarbejdet mellem Rusland og Kina.

Under diskussioner med europæiske kolleger den 15. august erklærede Lyndon LaRouche, at vi befinder os på randen af en stor sejr for menneskeheden. De eurasiske nationer, forklarede han, er i færd med at etablere en gruppering, centreret omkring ledende nationer i det asiatiske Stillehavsområde, nationer, som er i voldsom vækst, i skarp kontrast til andre områder af verden, der er syge og døende rent økonomisk. Sydamerika er blevet overtaget af voldtægtsforbrydere, Frankrig er en fiasko, Spanien er en katastrofe. Fokus må være på de ledende nationer, som har taget initiativet i denne

udviklingsproces. Putin, fortsatte LaRouche, er trådt frem som en drivkraft i denne eurasiske alliance. Der er kræfter, der er i bevægelse internt i USA, især i Manhattan, og som kan tilslutte sig indsatsen under anførsel af Eurasien for at knuse det britiske system, der har været menneskehedens fjende i de forgangne århundreder. Tyskland må, hvis det ønsker at overleve, tilslutte sig denne eurasiske udvikling, hvilket betyder at dumpe enhver politik associeret med Merkel og Schäuble.

Den russiske præsident Putin har, i løbet af de seneste år, spillet en afgørende rolle i organiseringen af en magt, hovedsageligt bestående af nationer centreret i Eurasien, og som er i færd med at få karakter af en militærmagt, der kan ændre alt og kan vinde krigen for fred.

I de kommende uger vil denne fremvoksende alliance være i centrum for en række historiske møder: Det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Rusland; G20-mødet for statsoverhoveder i Kina; Kina-ASEAN-mødet for statsoverhoveder i Laos; FN's Generalforsamling i New York City; og BRIKS-mødet for statsoverhoveder i Indien. Denne aktivitetstæthed fra nu og frem til midten af oktober byder på en enestående mulighed for, at dette nye, fremvoksende, globale lederskab kan fastlægge historiens kurs og gøre en ende på det bankerotte, britiske system.

---



# **Video, 5 minutter: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig**

Den 28. juli 2016, v/næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

»Jeg inviterer dig til at lære Schiller Instituttet at kende og til at kontakte os.

Verden er i en dyb krise, en civilisationskrise. Det er en brydningstid. Det kan blive meget værre, med et fuldt finanssammenbrud, måske sat i gang af de italienske banker, som er i krise, eller sågar af Deutsche Bank, som står øverst på listen over de store, systemiske krisebanker, og som teknisk set faktisk er bankerot.

Det kan også være krig med Rusland og Kina, ført af dem, som gerne vil forhindre, at disse nationer fører an i skabelsen af en alternativ økonomisk politik.

Vi oplever efterdønningerne efter Brexit-afstemningen i Storbritannien, og det har rystet hele EU. Men det giver os nogle muligheder. En ting, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, er en redningsplan for Deutsche Bank, men på betingelse af, at Deutsche Bank vender tilbage til den ånd, der var, da Alfred Herrhausen var chef i 1989, hvor han havde en produktionsbaseret politik for banken, og hvor han kom ud med et krav for gældssanering for de fattigste lande og for udvikling af Østeuropa. Dengang var Berlinmuren endnu ikke faldet.

Vi kan takke ja til samarbejde i stedet for krig med Rusland og Kina, om at bygge en Ny Silkevej hele vejen fra Asien til Europa. Vi kan udvide det til at blive en Verdenslandbro, en bro over land, gennem Sydvestasien og hele vejen ned til Afrika. Vi kan følge den tråd, der for nylig er kommet frem,

med Saudi-Arabiens rolle bag angrebene den 11. september 2001, og følge denne tråd helt til det nuværende Britiske Imperiums fraktions rolle bag terrorisme; og så kan vi takke ja til samarbejde med Rusland om at bekæmpe terrorisme.«

Præcisering: Chefen for Deutsch Bank, Alfred Herhausen, blev dræbt af terrorister den 30. november 1989. Berlinmuren faldt den 9. november 1989. Hvis han, som var en ledende rådgiver til den tyske kansler Helmut Kohl, havde levet, ville verden have set anderledes ud.

Denne video blev lavet i forbindelse med omdeling af Schiller Instituttets materiale i jyske og fynske byer.

Kontakter i Jylland:

Kolding: Preben Samsøe, 4146 4714

Aarhus: Hans Schultz, 4841 4096; 6016 4096

Randers: Poul Gundersen, 2082 0350

Her er nogle vigtige links:

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Menneskehedens skønne fremtid – hvis vi undgår dinosaurernes skæbne.

Hovedtale på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni, 2016

Baggrundsmateriale:

Lyndon LaRouches 3-punktsprogram for genopbygning af realøkonomien:

1. Hvorfor en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling ville løse

finanskrisen og ødelægge Wall Street

2. Hvordan man skaber ikke-inflationære kreditter gennem et nationalt kreditsystem

3. Infrastrukturprojekter og fusionsøkonomi

---

## **Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: BRIKS har en politisk rolle at spille**

*16. august 2016* – Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov sagde til TASS, at det forestående BRIKS-topmøde for statsoverhoveder (der skal afholdes i Goa, Indien, 15. – 16. oktober), vil hæve alliancen op fra at være et overvejende økonomisk partnerskab til at blive en politisk alliance.

»I betragtning af, at BRIKS repræsenterer nationer fra alle udviklingsområder i verden, er dette en ekstremt betydningsfuld organisation, der kan bringe fremgangsmåder for løsning af internationale hovedproblemer på linje inden for sine rammer«, lød det fra Lavrov. Initiativet til den foreslåede udvidelse kom fra andre BRIKS-medlemmer, ikke Rusland, sagde Lavrov til TASS. Selv om der ikke vil blive optaget nye medlemmer ved det forestående topmøde, så opfordrede Lavrov »meningsfæller« til at samarbejde med blokken.

*Foto: Mangueshi Tempel, et hindutempel i Gamle Goa, Indien.*

*Det 8. BRIKS-topmøde for statsoverhoveder skal afholdes i delstaten Goa den 15. – 16. oktober, 2016.*

---

## **»Med Verdenslandbroen vil alle have et job.« Lyndon LaRouche**

Det følgende videoklip er et meget kort uddrag af en tale, som hr. LaRouche holdt ved et forum i Washington i 1997 i sammenhæng med *EIR's førsteudgave* af specialrapporten om den Eurasiske Landbro. Denne præsentation var en del af en række af såkaldte »udviklingskonferencer«, der blev afholdt i Washington i løbet af disse år – 1996, 1997 og 1998 – og jeg vil mene, at det, I får at se i denne video, er Lyndon LaRouches »marchordre«. Det var på en måde hans kreative vision om, hvilken rolle, som Kina, med den Nye Silkevej, og ligeledes hvilken rolle Rusland ville komme til at spille i den totale omformning af den strategiske geometri i verden.

Her følger det korte uddrag:

Lyndon Larouche: Der er kun to respektable nationer tilbage på planeten, dvs. nationer med en respektabel magt: det er USA, nærmere bestemt ikke det USA, der repræsenteres af Kongressen, men af præsidenten. Det er USA's identitet, der udgør en politisk magt, ikke en eller anden sammenkædning af dens bestanddele. USA repræsenteres i dag udelukkende af dets præsident, som en politisk institution. Kongressen repræsenterer ikke USA; de er ikke helt sikre på, hvem, de repræsenterer nu om stunder, eftersom de ikke har besøgt deres vælgere for nylig.

Præsidenten som institution er legemliggørelsen af USA i internationale relationer. Det kan Udenrigsministeriet ikke gøre; Justitsministeriet kan ikke gøre det; intet andet ministerium kan gøre det; kun USA's præsident kan, under vores forfatning, repræsentere USA som en enhed – hele dets personlighed, dets sande interesse, dets hele folk.

Der findes kun én anden magt på denne planet, der kan være ligeså respektløs (arrogant) over for andre magter, og det er Den kinesiske Folkerepublik. Kina er i øjeblikket engageret i et stort projekt for konstruktion af infrastruktur, i hvilket min hustru og andre i en årrække har haft et uophørligt engagement. Der finder en stor reform sted i Kina, som er en »reform af vanskeligheder«. De forsøger at løse et problem. Det betyder ikke, at der ikke er et problem. Men de forsøger at løse det.

Hvis derfor USA, eller USA's præsident(skab), og Kina, deltager i at begunstige *dette* projekt, der undertiden kaldes Silkevejsprojektet, undertiden Landbro-projektet, som, hvis dette projekt med udviklingskorridorer over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika, ind i Nordamerika, udvides, så er dette projekt tilstrækkeligt til at sætte hele denne planet på en kurs for økonomisk genrejsning. Jeg vil gå lidt i detaljer med dette for at gøre det mere konkret.

Kina har i nogen tid haft et samarbejde med Irans regering. Iran har faktisk været i gang med at fuldføre en række jernbaneforbindelser, der er en forlængelse af Kinas Landbro-program (eller Silkevejsprojekt). For nylig har vi fra Indien set, at det indiske lederskab er mødtes med repræsentanter for Kina for at påbegynde en indledningsvis rute, blandt landruterne, under Landbro-programmet. Én rute går ind i Kunming i Kina. Under Anden Verdenskrig, i dette område, Myitkyina (Burma/Myanmar), havde vi fly, der fløj ind i Kunming, »over Knolden«, som de plejede at sige dengang. Jeg er ganske godt bekendt med dette område.

Men, hvis man har vandvejsforbindelser, kanalforbindelser, og jernbaneforbindelser fra Kunming gennem Myitkyina – dette område – tværs over Bangladesh og ind i Indien, igennem Pakistan og ind i Iran, op til området lige over Teheran, syd for det Kaspiske Hav – så har man en forbindelse til Mellemøsten; man har forbindelse til Centralasien; man har forbindelse til Tyrkiet; man har forbindelse igennem til Europa.

Dernæst er der den nordlige rute, der stort set er den samme rute som den transsibiriske Jernbane, der blev bygget under amerikansk indflydelse og amerikansk rådgivning, af Rusland. Så har man en mellemliggende rute, der er i færd med at blive udviklet, i Centralasien, med Kina og Iran.

Indien arbejder på en plan, der blot involverer at tilføje nogle få hundrede kilometer jernbanelinje – der var mange andre forbedringer langs med den lige linje – og som ville forbinde området nord for Teheran, gennem Pakistan, gennem Indien, gennem Bangladesh, gennem Myanmar og ind i Kunming, ind i Thailand, ind i Vietnam, ned gennem Malaysia og Singapore, over stræderne via en stor bro og ind i Indonesien.

Der er ligeledes en plan for udviklingen af jernbanelinjen gennem det, der var det nordlige Sibirien, over Beringstrædet og ind i Alaska, og herfra ned og ind i USA. Der er en forbindelse til Mellemøsten – flere forbindelser – fra Europa, og også fra Kina; men fra Kina en forbindelse til Mellemøsten og ind i Egypten, ind i hele Afrika.

Så hvad vi har her er en række projekter, som ikke blot er transportprojekter, ligesom den transkontinentale jernbane i USA, der var forløber for denne idé tilbage i slutningen af 1860'erne og 1870'erne. Man har »udviklingskorridorer«, hvor man i et område, der strækker sig 50-70 kilometer på hver side af jernbaneforbindelsen, har olie- og gasledninger, og så fremdeles. Man udvikler dette område med industri, minedrift, alle sådanne ting. Og det er sådan, man *betaler* for

transportforbindelsen, pga. al den rige, økonomiske aktivitet, der skabes. Med en indbyrdes afstand på nogle kilometer langs hele denne forbindelse foregår der noget, en eller anden økonomisk aktivitet. Folk, der arbejder, folk, der bygger ting, folk, der gør ting. For at transformere denne planet ved hjælp af store projekter for byggeri af infrastruktur, som vil skabe store industrier, nye industrier, nyt landbrug og de andre ting, vi har så desperat brug for. *Der er ingen som helst grund til, at noget menneske på denne planet, der kan arbejde, skulle være arbejdsløs.* Så enkelt er det. Og dette projekt er midlet til dette mål.

Hvis nationerne – som nu omfatter Rusland, Iran, Indien og andre nationer – kommer overens med Kina, og engagerer sig i en forpligtelse til dette projekt, som de bygger hver dag; hvis USA – dvs. USA's præsident, Clinton – forsætter med at støtte denne indsats, som han har gjort, i det mindste rent politik, hvad får man så? Man får USA og Kina og nogle andre lande, der går i samlet flok op imod den største magt på denne planet, som er Det britiske Imperium, kaldet det Britiske Commonwealth (statssamfund). Det er fjenden!

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Resultatet vil så være, at en sådan meddelelse en skønne søndag morgen med sikkerhed vil få »snakkehovederne« på Washington Tv til at 'spinne'. Men bortset fra det, så betyder det, at hele systemet, fra dette øjeblik, har været en tur i guillotinen, og at hovedet ruller hen ad gaden. Alan

Greenspans hoved, måske.

Det betyder, at vi nu har tilskyndelsen til omgående at opbygge et nyt finansielt og monetært system. Når man skal genrejse et selskab, der er bankerot, til en levedygtig form, hvad gør man så? Man må finde de erhvervsaktiviteter, som selskabet skal gøre, hvilket danner grundlaget for at skabe den nye kredit, der skal få firmaet til at køre igen.

Programmet for Landbroen, med sine globale implikationer, er det store projekt, der direkte og indirekte vil afkaste tilstrækkelig med aktivitet, så at sige, i alle dele af verden til, at vi atter kan få denne verden tilbage på et sundt fundament.

Matthew Ogden: Som man kan høre, så afslører denne tale stor forudviden; og det er i realiteten Lyndon LaRouches aktive indgriben, med rejser til Rusland, med hans hustrus rejser til Kina i denne periode, og med udgivelsen af *EIR's* specialrapport om den Eurasiske Landbro, der har formet den nuværende situation, vi befinder os i. En ting, der er interessant at fremhæve, er de kort, I så. Dengang var mange af disse jernbanelinjer og andre olie/gasledninger blot forslag; men nu er flere af dem faktisk under opførelse.

Jeg mener, at det, 20 år senere, står klart, at dette er det dominerende system, der er ved at vokse frem på denne planet. Samtidig står det transatlantiske system foran en umiddelbar nedsmeltning. En umiddelbart forestående implosion af gæld og eksponering til derivater i betalingsstandsning til billioner af dollars projiceres nu ind i alle storbanker i hele det transatlantiske system.

*For et engelsk udskrift af hele fredags-webcastet, se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14279>*



---

# Propagandaen om 'Den russiske Trussel' er intet nyt; det har Storbritannien kværnet ud i århundreder

14. august 2016 – En artikel fra 12. aug. på Sputniks nyhedstjeneste, skrevet af Nikolai Gorshkov, skyder på briterne som hovedkilden til den anti-russiske propaganda, som går flere hundrede år tilbage i tiden og begynder med den foragt, som engelske ambassadører og navigatører gav udtryk for i 1500-tallet, hvor de beskrev russere som »et folk, der går fra at være ubehøvlet og til hang til fæle laster«, og helt frem til regeringsmemoer fra 1980'erne, som for nylig er blevet frigivet af UK's nationalarkiver, og som opfordrer Margaret Thatcher til at føre en kampagne imod den »russiske trussel«.

»Den første afbildning af Rusland som et vildt bæst fremkom i 1500-tallets Polen, der forsøgte at etablere dets indflydelse over dets 'mindre europæiske' brødre. Men det var englænderne, der mestrede denne kunst næsten til perfektion«, skrev Gorshkov. »Den allerførste allegori med Rusland som en bjørn fremkom i en serie af engelske kobberstik, 'Den europæiske Race', og som startede i 1737. *The Punch*, der blev etableret i 1841, gjorde denne allegori til hvermandseje. Fra da af har man fremkaldt billedet af det vilde bæst, hver gang, Vesten ønskede at skildre Rusland som et land af vilde.«

Således også under Krimkrigen: »Det var England, især indenrigsminister Lord Palmerston og den britiske presse under anførsel af *The Times* og det satiriske blad *Punch*, der gjorde

stærkest fremstød for, at de vestlige magter skulle erklære Rusland krig.« (Gorshkov havde ikke nødt til at trække en parallel fra sin bemærkning om Krimkrigen frem til nutiden, den, at »briterne ligeledes var nedladende over for deres tyrkiske allierede, hvem London angiveligt ville 'redde' fra den russiske 'bjørn'«.

Gorshkov peger på briterne som kilden til udbredelse af anti-russisk propaganda i USA på diverse tidspunkter i nyere historisk tid, fra udbredelsen af en anti-sovjetisk dækning i 1920'erne og til McCarthy-perioden, hvor »selv Hollywood-krigsfilm om den anti-nazistiske alliance med Moskva, bestilt af Det Hvide Hus, blev erklæret for pro-sovjetisk propaganda. Den russiske bjørn sprang fra briterne og ud af de amerikanske avissider ... «

»Siden da har Rusland aflagt sin kommunistiske fortid, men Vesten synes ikke at være rede til at droppe sin propagandakrig.«

('A People Passing Rude': Brief History of Anti-Russian Propaganda)

<http://sputniknews.com/analysis/20160812/1044174982/uk-anti-russian-propaganda.html>

---

# Europa er ude af trit med tidsånden: Den nye Silkevej viser vejen! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Tyskland og de andre europæiske nationer må omorganisere deres rådne finans- og banksystem og derefter, med perspektiverne for den Nye Silkevej, samarbejde om at opbygge verden. For at dette kan lykkes, må vi alle se ud over vores egen, europæiske næsetip og ærligt med hinanden diskutere spørgsmålet om, hvorfor vi er havnet i denne krise, og åbne os for den vision, der ligger i samarbejdet med Den nye Silkevej.*

*I Friedrich Schillers ånd: Alle kan bidrage med noget!*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Det drejer sig om produktivitet; Vi skal op på højde med Kina og den 'eurasiske magt'

*15. august 2016 (Leder) – Vil USA genoplive videnskabelig kreativitet og økonomisk produktivitet for på lang sigt at samarbejde fredeligt med Kinas fremskridt?*

Vil Europa beslutte at opgive det, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche kalder »selvmordspagten« med Obama og en NATO-ledelse, der planlægger krige med både Rusland og Kina? Hvornår vil Europa i stedet gå med i Eurasiens Nye Silkevej med store infrastrukturprojekter – for ikke at tale om udforskning af rummet og udvikling af fusionskraft?

Dette er de virkelige spørgsmål, som borgere bør engagere sig i – og ikke de katastrofer, der i USA p.t. stiller op til præsidentvalget.

Meddelelsen i dag om, at tyske fusionsforskere går sammen med et statsligt, russisk laboratorium om udvikling af et nyt »polariseret deuterium«-brændstof til fusionskraft viser f. eks. den kreative retning for Europas bedste kapaciteter. Resultatet kan overhale det nylige gennembrud i Tysklands fusionsprogram – men disse resultater er allerede langt overgået af Kinas resultater. Kina gør teknologisk innovation og vækst til temaet for G20-mødet, som det vil være formand for 4. – 5. september i Hangzhou. Det samme gælder for Putins Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok 2. – 3. september.

De eurasiske nationer rykker sammen i en proces, der kan vinde freden så vel som udvikling; og det er lederskabsinitiativer, taget af Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin, der i vid udstrækning har gjort denne proces mulig.

Det har placeret USA foran et valg – og det er ikke et valg til præsident mellem to Dick Cheney-imitatorer.

Den 12. august forudsagde IMF, at Kinas årlige økonomiske vækst ville falde til 6 % frem til 2020. Hvis dette skulle vise sig at være sandt, så kunne USA – dersom det blev ledet af et revolutionerende nyt præsidentskab, der udsteder statskredit til ny infrastruktur, rumforskning og fusionsteknologier – *håbe* på til den tid at nå op på siden af Kinas vækst!

Amerikanske regeringsfolk og folk fra Federal Reserve

(centralbanken) har langt om længe for nylig indrømmet, at de er bekymret over den amerikanske økonomis meget lave produktivitet, såvel som over økonomiens meget lave vækst. Økonomien under Obama har vist en hidtil uhørt lav vækst i produktiviteten, uanset, hvordan man måler den.

En almindelig måde at måle »produktivitet« på er simpelt hen at dividere BNP med præsterede arbejdstimer. Målt således har væksten i arbejdskraftens produktivitet aldrig nået en årlig rate på blot 1 %, siden Obama i sit første år i embedet underskrev sin »stimuleringslov«. I de seneste 12 måneder har USA's økonomiske vækst udgjort sølle 1,2 %.

Men reelle forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktivitet kommer fra videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt, og fra uddannelse. Den rapport, som blev udgivet af Statskontoret for Forskning i Økonomi (NBER) over den meget store vækst i produktiviteten under Franklin Roosevelts præsidentskab, siger: »Dette skyldtes en meget stærk vækst i generering og distribuering af elektricitetskraft, transport, kommunikation, civilingeniørers og strukturingeniørers arbejde inden for broer, tunneller, dæmninger, hovedveje, jernbaner og systemer til transmission; samt privat forskning og udvikling.« Udfordringerne i al dette moderne infrastrukturbyggeri frembragte teknologiske fremskridt inden for et stort antal industrier, og forskning og udvikling blev stærkt forøget.

Økonomer rangerer 1930'erne, '40'erne og '60'ernes Apolloprojekt som toppunkterne for reel vækst i produktivitet i USA's historie – med en forbedring i produktiviteten på næsten 3 % om året.

Ifølge San Francisco Federal Reserve og NBER var der under George W. Bush' otte år en stigning i denne vækst på 1,0 % om året; og under Obamas snart otte år, 0,75 %.

Tiden er inde til et nyt præsidentskab, og til at indhente Kina.

*Foto: De kinesisk producerede højhastighedstog afventer afgang fra jernbanestationen i Hankow, 19. april 2016.*

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 15. august 2016: Det forestående G20-topmøde i Kina: Mulighed for et faseskifte**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# **BRIKS' politik efter Hamiltons principper har tvunget det Britiske Imperium ud i tovene**

*15. august 2016 (Leder) – »Putin er allerede den fungerende præsident for et nyt univers«, hævdede Lyndon LaRouche i sin ugentlige diskussion med Manhattan-projektet d. 13. august. »Putin har opbygget en meget respektabel organisation, som nu optager en stor del af hele planeten! ... Putins*

indflydelsessfære er ikke kun Rusland; det er andre dele af hele det asiatiske område.«

LaRouche uddybede det med, at Putin, der arbejder i alliance med Kina, Indien og andre nationer, er i færd med at opbygge et alternativ til det rådende transatlantiske system i form af en global fremgangsmåde efter Hamiltons økonomiske principper. »Man er ved at få noget, der er lig Alexander Hamilton, for Rusland; og ikke kun for Rusland, men for Asien! For hele Asien, praktisk talt. Det er en temmelig stor post.«

De næste 60 dage er fuld af farer, og også muligheder. Vi stirrer nu direkte ned i kanonløbet på en global finanskriser, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion med medarbejdere i dag, en krise, der meget vel kunne komme over os i løbet af september-oktober. Inden for samme tidsrum kommer der en række internationale konferencer – der kulminerer med det 8. BRIKS-topmøde i Indien i midten af oktober – som kan udgøre rammerne for en implementering af det påkrævede, politiske skifte, der er udtænkt af LaRouche, såfremt der mobiliseres tilstrækkelig international politisk vilje for at skabe dette revolutionerende Nye Paradigme.

Kina fortsætter med at udfolde den rigtige fremgangsmåde: »Tiden er inde til at uddanne videnskabelige og teknologiske hjerner,« udtalte Li Zhimin, direktør for Udviklingscenter for Videnskab og Teknologi ved Uddannelsesministeriet, i forbindelse med annonceringen af udgivelsen af Statsrådets plan om dramatisk at forøge proportionen af statsborgere i Kina med videnskabelige færdigheder ved år 2020.

Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping har ligeledes gjort det klart, at hans ven og strategiske allierede, den russiske præsident Putin, vil være æresgæst nummer ét ved det kommende G20-topmøde i Kina d. 4.-5. september – til det Britiske Imperiums og dets stikirenddreng Barack Obamas store rædsel. Kineserne er i færd med, i tæt samarbejde med både Rusland såvel som Indien, at koordinere strategien for G20-mødet og

det efterfølgende BRIKS-topmøde i Indien d. 15.-16. oktober. Deres erklærede politik er at imødegå »de udfordringer, som den globale økonomi i øjeblikket står overfor« ved »at sikre en succesfuld organisering af G20- og BRIKS-topmøderne.«

Denne succes vil blive målt på, at man *omgående* begraver det nuværende dødbringende og bankerotte finanssystem og erstatter det med et system efter Hamiltons principper, der bygger på LaRouches design, som det specificeres i hans **Fire Love**.

Det reelle spørgsmål, som USA og verden står overfor i dag, er en omskabelse af det amerikanske præsidentskab omkring denne politik – og ikke den galskab, der finder sted i den amerikanske valgkampagne. LaRouche udtalte:

*Vores præsident er Satans stedfortræder. De ledende kandidater er frygteligt korrupte; så I vil bekymre jer om, hvilken kandidat, I skal vælge? Når I ved, at, i hovedsagen, alle de kandidater, der er på tale, er eksemplarer på ondskaben! At de, på den ene eller anden vis, forkaster deres ansvar som menneskelige væsener for denne proces. Så vi må komme ind til årsagen til problemet ... og sørge for at fjerne denne årsag.*

---

## **Analyse i det italienske nyhedsmagasin L'Espresso:**



# Rusland-Tyrkiet-Iran vil løse krisen i Mellemøsten

13. august, 2016 – Det er nu det italienske nyhedsmagasin *L'Espresso*, der skriver en mere realistisk analyse af topmødet d. 9. august, mellem den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin og den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Men, som Lyndon LaRouche kommenterede, mangler deres analyse den pointe, at der allerede, under præsident Putins lederskab, i hele Centralasien er vokset en ny kombination af lande frem for fred og udvikling, og som Tyrkiet nu har tilsluttet sig.

»Modviljen og harmen imod Vesten er den reelle basis for tilnærmelsen mellem Rusland og Tyrkiet«, siger artiklen i *L'Espresso*.

»Moskvas primære mål er at redefinere det eksisterende system af alliancer, der er fuld af uklarheder og befinder sig i en dyb krise, samt at opnå anerkendelse i Mellemøsten, og videre endnu«, alt imens Ankara ønsker at »slippe ud af den karantæneisolation, som det har befundet sig i efter regeringens reaktion på det fejlslagne kup i landet. Samt at finde så mange allierede som muligt i området, hvor det shiitiske Iran, samtidig med, at Syrien er ved t blive ødelagt, vinder momentum«.

*L'Espresso* fortsætter, »Moskva-Teheran-Ankara-trioen vil nu løse problemerne i Mellemøsten. Noget, som hverken Washington eller EU aldrig kunne have forudset for et år siden, da de underskrev en aftale om Irans atomprogram, som hævdede alle sanktioner, der var relateret hertil, fra Teheran, så det kunne vende tilbage til systemet af internationale relationer.« Selvfølgelig har dette ikke behaget Saudi-Arabien, »Irans ærkefjende.«

Topmødet mellem Putin og Erdogan har sendt et stærkt signal

til både EU og USA. Europa er hermed blevet fortalt, at det »ikke længere er universets centrum.«

»Det europæiske lederskab befinder sig under nye vilkår, og bør nu flytte sig hurtigere og på mere effektiv vis finde frem til de rette beslutninger,« siger artiklen.

Budskabet til USA er, at Tyrkiet har »andre strategiske optioner på bordet.«

Som LaRouche tilkendegav, undlader *L'Espresso* at se det meget større strategiske billede. Hvad de kalder for Rusland-Iran-Tyrkiet kombinationen har ikke alene blikket rettet hen imod at løse den Syriske krise, men også at stabilisere hele strækningen gennem Kaukasus og ind i Centralasien mod øst og det Indiske Ocean mod syd. Tyrkiet kan bidrage til at løse krisen om Nagorno-Karabakh mellem Armenien og Aserbajdsjan, hvilket ville stabilisere Kaukasus og muliggøre en afgrening mellem Sortehavet og det Indiske Ocean af Nord-Syd Korridoren, der allerede er under udvikling i et samarbejde mellem Rusland, Aserbajdsjan og Iran. Dette kunne fuldføres ved at genåbne jernbanen gennem Armenien fra Aserbajdsjan og Tyrkiet, hvilken forbindelse har været blokeret på grund af den uløste Nagorno-Karabakh konflikt, og derved muliggøre nye transportkorridorer i forbindelse med Silkevejen, og en bevægelse henimod integration af hele den centraleurasiske region.

---

**Putin og Kina imellem –**

# Indser I ikke, hvad der er sket med verden som helhed?

*11. august 2016 (Leder)* – Dette er på ingen måde spontane udviklinger. De er resultatet af intervention, foretaget af menneskets kreative intellekt – Vladimir Putins.

Præsidenterne fra Rusland, Iran og Aserbajdsjan mødtes den 8. august, i et møde, der især drejede sig om den Nye Silkevejs internationale nord-sydgående transportkorridor. Herefter vil disse tre landes transport-, energi- og udenrigsministre mødes i Teheran for at forberede endnu et trilateralt topmøde, denne gang i Iran.

Efter mødet den 8. august fulgte også Putins topmøde med den armenske præsident Serzh Sargsyan i Kreml i går. De diskuterede Armeniens integration i den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, og hvordan en løsning på striden om Nagorno-Karabakh mellem Armenien og Aserbajdsjan kunne opnås, i lyset af Putins nylige topmøde med Aserbajdsjans præsident Aliyev i Baku og hans øvrige diplomati.

Putins historiske topmøde den 9. august i Skt. Petersborg med den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan – hvor de indgik aftaler om kernekraft, øget handel og gasledningen Turkish Stream – efterfulgtes af et møde i dag mellem de to landes udenrigs- og forsvarsministre, samt landenes efterretningschefer. Forventningerne var, at de ville forsøge at koordinere deres handlinger i Syrien, inklusive i den igangværende kamp om Aleppo, nær den tyrkiske grænse.

Det er ingen tilfældighed, at Obama netop nu, med hjælp fra sin medhjælper, Hillary Clinton, pludselig har gjort truslen om krig i Europa større. I går afslørede Ruslands Statslige Sikkerhedstjeneste (FSB), at den havde opsnappet to ukrainske rekognoscerings- og sabotagegrupper i Krim i dagene 7. og 8.

august, hvor de arresterede syv personer, med to russeres liv som indsats (en FSB-officer og en soldat). En af arrestanterne har på russisk fjernsyn tilstået, at de blev sendt af den ukrainske militære efterretningstjeneste for at sabotere infrastruktur.

Putin sagde i går aftes, at den planlagte sabotage havde til formål at destabilisere Krim, der forbereder sig til valg. Han afviste forslaget om at mødes i regi af Normandiet-firkløveret (Rusland, Frankrig, Tyskland, Ukraine) over Ukraine, på sidelinjerne af G20-topmødet i Kina til september, og sagde, at det ikke længere giver nogen mening, når Kiev afviser kompromis til fordel for terror. Og Putin ved, hvad den krimiske premierminister sagde højt: at Kiev ikke ville have gjort dette, uden at have fået grønt lys fra Washington – dvs. fra Obama. Og Obama støttes højlydt i sit fremstød for krig af Hillary Clinton.

»Putin har pludselig fået kontrollen med store udviklinger i verden, og disse karle er gået amok«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. »Det betyder ikke, at han er perfekt, men han har kontrollen, og de andre flipper ud, og de ved ikke, hvad de skal gøre ved, at de flipper ud. Putin vil gøre, hvad han er nødt til at gøre – forvent, at der viser sig alle mulige former for ondskab. Nu har endnu et angreb vist sig – ikke fra Ukraine, men andetsteds fra, gennem Ukraine.«

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Putin med Irans præsident Hassan Rouhani, 8. august 2016. [kremlin.ru]*