

Ligesom Knud den Store kan oligarkerne heller ikke standse tidevandet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. november, 2016 – De revolutionære forandringer, der fejer hen over de vestlige nationer, fremprovokerer hysteri blandt de afdankede, miskrediterede nationale ledere i Europa og USA. Brexit, valgnederlaget for Obamas og Hillarys plan for krig med Rusland og Kina, Filippinernes oprør mod Obama, og den ene europæiske nation efter den anden, der afviser de anti-russiske sanktioner og dæmoniseringen af Putin – disse ting og mere endnu repræsenterer en erkendelse i hele Vesten af, at deres lederskab har været kontrolleret af finansoligarker og krigsgale neokonservative, som ikke længere kan tolereres. Imperiet er i færd med at smuldre – men 'the Lords' vil gå til yderligheder, selv til atomkrig, for at redde Imperiet, med mindre de erstattes, før det kommer dertil.

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

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

medskyldighed i ødelæggelsen af Sydvestasien og Europa.

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

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

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

LaRouche-organisationen har initieret og ført kampagne for disse ideer i et halvt århundrede. Nogle mennesker godtager det pessimistiske og løgagtige synspunkt, at en relativt lille organisation ikke kan have været ansvarlig for sådanne globale forandringer – men disse mennesker forstår ikke den kraft til at ændre historiens gang, som ideer er i besiddelse af, og som

er langt større end »forbindelser« til folk ved magten.[1] Sandheden afsløres gennem historiens lange buer, og verden oplever nu den tordnende lyd fra en historisk tidevandsbølge. Hvilken retning, den efterfølgende opvågner vil tage, afhænger af kraften i kreativiteten og den klassiske kultur, som verdens befolkning, og især USA's befolkning, vedtager.

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

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

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

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

Det franske valg ødelægger yderligere briternes og Obamas krigspolitik

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. november, 2016 – François Fillons overvældende valgsejr i søndagens franske primærvalg, til at

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
november 2016:**

**Ny dansk regering//Forsøg på
at underminere Trump//**

**Kinesisk og russisk
teknologisk samarbejde med
udviklingslande**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

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

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast,**



25. november, 2016

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

Dette Nye Paradigme, der i øjeblikket ledes politisk og økonomisk af Rusland og Kina, kommer som et resultat af LaRouche-bevægelsens og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange organisering; der er således nu et Nyt Paradigme, der fører en stadig større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske

politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorisme (JASTA). Og som vi nu står klar til at gøre, med at få Kongressen – under denne overgangsperiode, 'lamme and'-perioden – til at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, det nødvendige første skridt for en økonomisk genrejsning. Glass-Steagall er den lov, som Franklin Roosevelt fik vedtaget, og som skabte 60+ år med stabil, kedelig, stabil, produktiv bankvirksomhed i USA; snarere end den form for spillevirksomhed, vi nu ser.

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

Programmet med nationerne i Ét bælte, én vej [OBOR], der  inkluderer både – der er to komponenter i Kinas projekt i denne henseende; det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, med nationerne vist i blå farve, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej i orange farve. Tilsammen refererer Kina til dette på kinesisk som initiativet med »Ét bælte, én vej«; på engelsk ofte blot kaldt initiativet for Bæltet og Vejen. Med hensyn til det potentiale, som dette har, er her blot nogle af tallene: 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer i Kina, alle bygget inden for det seneste årti – mere end i resten af verden tilsammen; et titals milliarder af dollars i direkte investering i nationerne i området; en forøgelse af kontrakter om tjenesteydelser på over 33 % i løbet af blot ét år langs Bæltet og Vejen; Kinas Eksport/Importbank har udestående engagementer i flere end 1000 projekter og har for ganske nylig underskrevet aftaler om omkring 500 nye projekter i nationerne langs Bæltet og Vejen. Kina er i færd med at  udbygge 150.000 stipendier, som tilbyder uddannelse til 500.000 eksperter til uddannelse i Kina; har etableret 500 Konfucius-institutter i hele verden; har initieret flere end et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i

Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

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

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

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

Jeffrey Steinberg (efterretningsredaktør, EIR): Det er indledningsvist meget vigtigt at indse, at vi befinder os i en periode med forandring. Vi ved visse ting om konsekvenserne af det amerikanske præsidentvalg og andre nationale valg den 8. nov. Jeg mener, at Lozansky og Jatrus gjorde en fundamental pointe meget klart: Der forelå en meget alvorlig fare, baseret på Hillary Clintons kampagneretorik, baseret på politikker, der blev stadigt mere aggressivt forfulgt af præsident Barack Obama mod slutningen af hans otte år i embedet; at vi havde

kurs mod den værste krise mellem USA og Rusland, som vi nogen sinde har oplevet – måske endda værre end Cubakrisen i 1962. Så Hillary Clintons nederlag er virkelig afslutningen af præsidentskaberne Bush' og Obamas 16 år lange tyranni. Hvor hurtigt, vi kan vende politikken omkring under det nye Trump-præsidentskab, og i hvilken retning, udnævnelserne til hans administration vil gå, er alt sammen ukendte faktorer; vi har ingen vished om dem.

Det, vi ved, er, at især i kølvandet på APEC-topmødet, der netop er afsluttet i sidste uge i Lima, Peru, og som dernæst efterfulgtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings statsbesøg til Peru og dernæst til Chile, og forud for topmødet var han i Ecuador; og vi ved, at der er en enorm mulighed derude for USA, under et Trump-præsidentskab, for netop at gå med i det, der altid har ligget på bordet som en åben invitation til USA; nemlig, at USA kan tilslutte sig projektet om Verdenslandbroen. For, uden et USA er det meget vanskeligt at opfatte dette som en Verdenslandbro, hvilket er det, verden virkelig har brug for lige nu. Der har været meget indledende telefondiskussioner mellem nyvalgte præsident Trump og den russiske præsident Putin; de synes at være blevet enige om at have et personligt topmøde hurtigt efter tiltrædelsen – som finder sted den 20. januar. Det er ligeledes tanken, at præsident Trump, efter tiltrædelsen, også ret hurtigt skal mødes med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping. Jeg mener, at Lozansky-Jatrus-ideen om et trilateralt møde ville være ekstraordinært værdifuldt. Det er vigtigt at huske på, at, i 1944, var det præsident Franklin Roosevelts kurs i sine handlinger for at etablere De forenede Nationer – hvilket skete i 1945 – at inkludere både Sovjetunionen og Kina i FN's Sikkerhedsråds fem permanente nationer. Husk på, at Roosevelt forstod, at der var imperiepolitikker, der stadig var kernen i Det britiske Imperium med Churchill, og på lignende måde med Frankrig. Så ideen med at have Rusland – dengang Sovjetunionen – og Kina i dette permanente Sikkerhedsråds kernegruppe, reflekterede den kendsgerning, at Roosevelt dengang så

udsigten til denne form for et alliancesystem hen over Eurasien. Jeg mener, at der er en historisk baggrund, for netop denne form for russisk-kinesiske samarbejde, at se hen til her. I de seneste 15 år har det været en hjørnesteen i Lyndon LaRouches globale politik med et USA-Rusland-Kina-Indien-samarbejde, især omkring videnskabelige programmer; især udforskning af rummet, som basis for global fred og udvikling. Så disse ideer er fremlagt.

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

Der findes altså enorme potentialer; de er i vid udstrækning foreløbigt ikke realiseret med hensyn til den forandring, der kommer med den ny administration. Men, som du sagde, Jason [Ross], så er der ingen grund til at vente til januar. Den nyvalgte præsident Trump krævede udtrykkeligt, i en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Det er i begge de to store politiske partiers valgplatform for dette års valg; både Demokraterne og Republikanerne har vedtaget det. Det var en Trump-delegeret til GOP [Grand Old Party – det Republikanske Parti] komiteen for politisk strategi, der introducerede Glass-Steagall. Der er senatorerne

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

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske banksystem er nedsmeltet. Så Glass-Steagall er altså et presserende hastespørgsmål; og det forudsætter dernæst de andre hovedelementer i LaRouches Fire Love. Det er et

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

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

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

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

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

JASON ROSS: Hi there! Today is November 25, 2016;
and
you're joining us for our regular webcast here from

larouchepac.com. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today.

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

This discussion is taking place 2.5 weeks after the November 8, 2016 Presidential election in the United States. Since then, we've seen a whirlwind of speculation about Cabinet appointments, including some Cabinet appointments for the Trump administration. We've also seen some significant international news, such as the APEC summit which occurred last weekend; the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit that included very significantly new Philippines' President Duterte and Chinese Xi Jinping among the many leaders who were there. At this conference, Duterte again emphasized that the Philippines no longer considers itself to be a US colony; and is pursuing an independent policy economically with China, countering the attempts to create conflict, for example, in the South China Sea. President Xi Jinping went on a tour of Latin America while he was at the APEC summit. So in addition to Peru – which hosted the event – he also visited Chile and Ecuador; where he spoke, among other things, about the bioceanic corridor, a plan for a rail link between the Pacific and Atlantic sides of South America; about setting up science cities. He was greeted by President Correa in Ecuador, who considered Xi Jinping's trip the most significant event to

occur

in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result

of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and

Helga LaRouche; such that there is now a New Paradigm taking an

increasingly larger portion of the world in a very positive direction. Our job at present isn't to get the hottest news on

what Trump's appointments will be, etc. It is to shape US policy; as we successfully did in forcing an override against Obama's veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

And as we stand poised to do now with getting the Congress – during this lame duck session – to implement Glass-Steagall, the

necessary first step for an economic recovery. Glass-Steagall is

the law that Franklin Roosevelt had put in place that created 60+

years of stable, boring, stable productive banking in the United

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

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

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

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

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

this in Chinese as the "One Belt, One Road" initiative; in English, often just the Belt and Road initiative. As far as the potential that this holds, these are just some of the figures: 20,000 km of high-speed rail in China, all built within the last decade – more than the rest of the world combined; tens of billions of dollars of direct investment into nations of the region; an increase in services contracts of over 33% in just one year along the One Belt, One Road; the Export/Import Bank of China has outstanding involvement in over 1000 projects, and just recently has signed up about 500 new projects along the Belt and Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering training for 500,000 for professionals for training in China; has set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has initiated over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade agreements, and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects – including about 20 that were just set up this year among One Belt, One Road nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of the American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called, "The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for Security, Prosperity, and Peace". Two excerpts. They open their

article, "With the defeat of Hillary Clinton by Donald Trump, we may never know how close America and all mankind came to nuclear war." In describing the world situation, they end with a proposal: "President Donald Trump can correct the mistakes of past U.S. presidents. Rather than adversaries Russia and China can become America's essential partners and are, we are convinced, ready to respond positively. It's time for Trump and America to take the initiative for U.S.-Russia-China cooperation towards a secure, prosperous, and peaceful future. A Trump-Putin-Xi 'Big Three Summit' should be a priority for the new U.S. President's first 100 days."

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

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

There are certain things that we know about the consequences of the US Presidential elections and other Federal elections on November 8th. And I think Lozansky and Jatruss made one very fundamental point quite clearly: That there was a very grave danger based on the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton, based on the policies that were pursued even ever more aggressively towards the end of his eight years in office by President Barack Obama; that we were headed for the worst crisis between the United States and Russia that we ever experienced – worse

perhaps even than the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. So, the defeat of Hillary Clinton really is the end of the 16-year tyranny of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. How rapidly we can

turn the policies around under the new Trump Presidency, where the Cabinet appointments are going to go, these are all unknowns;

they're not certain to us.

So, we do know that particularly in the aftermath of the

APEC summit meeting that just concluded last week in Lima, Peru,

which was then followed by state visits by Chinese President Xi

Jinping to Peru and then to Chile afterwards; and prior to the summit, he was in Ecuador. We know that there's a tremendous opportunity out there for the United States, under a Trump Presidency, to precisely join in what has always been on the table as an open invitation to the United States; namely, for the

United States to join in the World Land-Bridge project.

Because

without the United States, it's very difficult to conceive of this as a World Land-Bridge; which is really what the world requires right now. There have been very preliminary phone discussions between President-elect Trump and Russian President

Putin; they seem to have reached an agreement that they will have

a face-to-face summit meeting soon after the inauguration – which is January 20th. The idea, similarly, is for President Trump, once he's inaugurated, to also meet quite soon with Chinese President Xi Jinping. I think the Lozansky-Jatrus idea

of a trilateral meeting would be extraordinarily valuable. I think it's important to remember that in 1944, the orientation of

President Franklin Roosevelt in the move to establish the United Nations – which happened in 1945 – was to include both the Soviet Union and China among the permanent five nations of the UN Security Council. Remember, Roosevelt understood that there were imperial policies that were still at the core of the British Empire with Churchill, and similarly with France. So, the idea of having Russia – the Soviet Union at the time – and China in this permanent Security Council core grouping, reflected the fact that Roosevelt at that time saw the prospect of that kind of an alliance system across Eurasia. So, I think that's there's an historical basis to look to here for exactly this kind of Russia-China cooperation. For the last 15 years, a cornerstone of Lyndon LaRouche's of global policy has been a US-Russia-China-India cooperation, particularly on scientific programs; especially space exploration, as the basis for global peace and development. So, those ideas are out there.

On November 20th, soon after he was named by President-elect Trump to be the National Security Advisor, General Michael Flynn, in an interview with Fareed Zakhari on CNN, said that in his view, the only way to deal with the long-term problem of the jihadist, terrorist threat in the Middle East and North Africa, was for there to be a global cooperation on a Marshall Plan – he used that term explicitly. He said, if you look at what Europe was able to accomplish in the aftermath of the devastation of

World War II, and the role that the Marshall Plan played; it was not the whole thing, but it was an important element of the postwar recovery. That kind of perspective is really the winning strategy for dealing with the population growth and this spread of Saudi-sponsored jihadism throughout the Middle East-North Africa region. It extends into Southeast Asia as well.

So, there are great potentialities; they are largely as yet unrealized in terms of the change coming with the new administration. But I think, Jason, as you correctly said, there is no reason to wait for January. President-elect Trump, in a major campaign speech in Charlotte, North Carolina, explicitly called for reinstating Glass-Steagall. It's in the platforms of both major political parties from this year's elections; the Democrats and the Republicans both adopted it. It was a Trump delegate to the policy committee of the GOP who introduced the Glass-Steagall. You've got Senators Elizabeth Warren, and more importantly, Senator Bernie Sanders, saying that they're prepared to reach across the aisle and work with Donald Trump if the issues for collaboration include and really start with Glass-Steagall. So, this is something that does not have to wait for January and the inauguration and the new Congress. There are Glass-Steagall bills in both the House and the Senate. One of the House bills has the identical language as the Senate bill. As we saw with the JASTA veto override vote, if the Congressional leadership gives the green lights, then Glass-Steagall can be brought to the floor of both houses and can be debated and

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

So, we could wake up tomorrow morning, or Monday
morning, or
the middle of next week, and find that the entire trans-
Atlantic
banking system has blown out. So, Glass-Steagall is an
urgent,

immediate issue; and it then begs the other three key elements of LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws. Which is a credit system; investment in major infrastructure projects; and a revival of the most advanced scientific programs, including a major return to space and the work internationally to finally achieve the full breakthrough on fusion. All of these things are on the table, but again, there are no guarantees, there's nothing that's even remotely certain about what's going to come next. We can breathe a little easier because danger of war with Russia, with China is greatly reduced; and there's a lot of potentiality. There's a lot of the kind of transition from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan in the air as a potential; but none of it is fully realized yet. So, people are going to have to realize this is a moment of great opportunity. It's going to be an outpouring of the population under the right kind of leadership, directed at the right policies, that can really seize the opportunity. If we wait until January or February of next year, who knows what kind of sabotage operations are going to be run?

You can go on Craig's List and find George Soros front groups, like MoveOn.org and blacklivesmatter.org, offering \$1500 a week for people to run around like idiots, protesting against the outcome of the election. There's a great deal of uncertainty, in terms of what's going on, at the same time that there's great opportunity. We've got to make sure that we take the lead in seizing the moment.

ROSS: Great! Thanks! In terms of the long-term outlook of where we're going to go, what our policy should be, a major aspect of this goes beyond legislation that affects us only here on Earth. A major component, in fact the fourth component of the Four Laws of Mr. LaRouche, the last one being the fusion driver crash program, is connected with our existence beyond the planet, also out in space. Ben wrote an article that's going to be in the upcoming issue of the *Hamiltonian* about what a U.S. space policy ought to be, and about the really long-term goals that we have to have, and why this is important and essential. So, could you tell us about that, Ben?

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

One thing that's being discussed now, which is interesting and useful, is how much NASA has been hijacked for this global warming crap. A lot of NASA's budget has been redirected to "Earth sciences." Not all Earth sciences are bad. There's a lot of interesting science to learn about the Earth. But Earth sciences is often a front to push this fraud of some man-made global warming crisis. So, there's some discussion about NASA

being redirected away from wasting their time on this phony, phony, fake crisis, which is not something we need to be concerned about, and redirecting back to exploration. Surprise, surprise. The Moon has come back now as a central subject of the discussion. Anybody who had any sense would realize that once Obama was out, this crazy asteroid mission [The Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission] would likely be tossed aside. Anybody who is serious would recognize that the Moon is the next place to get back to.

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

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

This goes directly to the vision of Krafft Ehrlicke, the early

space pioneer who worked very closely with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the '80s, who was one of the leading space visionaries, who had outlined in great detail the initial basis of mankind expanding to really becoming a Solar System species.

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

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

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

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

The real understanding of what qualitative revolutions in infrastructure systems mean for mankind's continual creative progress is not connected to the way most people use that term.

Mr. LaRouche defined the very profound and critical assessment of

looking at the development of human civilization in these stages

of platforms. He said, go back to thousands of years ago, when the dominant cultures were trans-oceanic maritime cultures.

What

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

trans-oceanic civilizations: the development of these inland

waterways. That defined a new platform of activity that supported a qualitative leap in what civilization was able to accomplish.

The next leap came with the development of rail systems, railroads, especially trans-continental railroads, typified by what Lincoln had spearheaded with the trans-continental railroad across America. With these rail systems, with the new technologies of steam engines powering these rail systems, the higher energy-flux density of coal-powered steam engines, this enabled mankind to begin to develop the interior regions of the continent, in completely new ways, and defined a totally new relationship of mankind, of civilization, to the environment around him. It defined a qualitative increase in mankind's "potential relative population density," as LaRouche had developed that metric for understanding the science of economic growth. It made things that were at one point incredibly expensive or challenging or risky, become just day-to-day regular activities.

I think back to the early phases of these frontier explorations of the American Continent. You go back to the Lewis and Clark Expeditions, where to travel from the east coast across the entire mainland of the continent to the west coast required someone like the leading skilled frontiersmen, and a very dangerous, very challenging mission, which was a very brave undertaking for a handful of people to actually be able to accomplish that. Some decades later, with the rail system, with the infrastructure of this railroad platform, any family could

do

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

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

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

different territories.

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

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

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

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

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

In breaking this down, this might not include everything,

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

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

categories of activity – three categories of infrastructure and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Developing resources. Developing the capabilities to utilize the resources available to us throughout the Solar System, not having to take everything with us everywhere we go, but be able to develop the wealth that's available out there; to utilize it on site and transport it around, even bringing stuff back to Earth that we can't necessarily get from Earth.

If you look at these three pillars, these three categories together, and if you make qualitative breakthroughs in each of these together, this really comes together to define a new platform of activity, a new standard that will enable the kind of leap that will transition us from viewing space as a Lewis and Clark style expedition, to a trans-continental railroad style relationship to the Solar System.

I just want to take a couple minutes and go through just some sense of what areas we can see breakthroughs in each of these categories. Go to the first slide we have displayed.

[Fig.

1] It has been said that getting from Earth's surface to low Earth orbit, is half-way to anywhere in the Solar System. In a certain sense that's very true. If you have a sense of the scales, that might sound very, very strange, because, just in terms of distance, low Earth orbit [begins] about 160 km, about 100 miles, up above your head. If you want to travel to the Moon, you're talking about hundreds of thousands of miles. If you want to travel to another planet, you're talking about millions of miles.

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

The graphic here displays this, in terms of travel from Earth's surface to different planetary bodies, measured in the standard terms used for Solar System travel, which is your change in speed. To get into Earth orbit requires not just going up 100 miles, but actually changing your speed, from your current velocity sitting here on the Earth, to something that will allow you to stay in orbit. If you want to change orbits, or travel around, you can measure that, in terms of changes in velocity. So that happens to be the metric here; but you can see the

lowest

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the requirements, and the point is, dramatically increase the accessibility of space to mankind. One technology that has been

discussed for a long time is space planes. Here in the graphic

you can see a relatively recent article covering studies in China

on interest in China to develop what some people call

single-stage-to-orbit space planes. So, you can get on a

plane

on a runway – it's probably going to be a little bit longer than

your standard runway for airplane travel – and you can ride a single space plane from the runway all the way up into Earth orbit. A lot of this depends upon much more advanced engine designs that can utilize the oxygen in the atmosphere at higher

speeds and at higher altitudes to continue to provide thrust. But these things could dramatically lower the cost, the energy requirements of getting people and payloads up into Earth orbit;

far more than a lot of the discussion about these reusable rockets and some of the developments going on in improving rocket

systems to get from Earth's surface into Earth orbit.

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

DENISTON: Yeah, absolutely. These rocket systems have to carry the oxygen as part of the rocket to combust to provide the thrust. These are more innovative engine designs – air-breathing engines that can use the oxygen in the atmosphere.

As you said, this has been researched in the United States with

different scramjet designs. Yeah, Mr. LaRouche featured some of

this, which he had developed I think in some close discussion

with some Italian colleagues at the time in his collaboration with the Fusion Energy Foundation; and had made it a major part of his "Woman on Mars" mission.

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

The next pillar, the next category is travel in space. And again, this is an issue that Mr. LaRouche has been campaigning on for decades. Space travel requires nuclear reactions; chemical fuel just doesn't have the energy density to provide quick and efficient access to the Solar System. We can get to the Moon; that's OK. It probably would be nice to get there a little bit quicker, but that's our next door neighbor in terms of the

Solar

System. If you want to get to Mars, you want to get around to other places in the Solar System, you've got to get to nuclear reactions. The heart of this is the fact that the energy density, the energy per mass of nuclear reactions is, on average, on the order of a million times greater than the energy per mass in chemical reactions; even as broad categories, setting aside the particular fuel you use in either case.

A million times is just a big number, but for one quick comparison, you take the fuel used for the Space Shuttle launch

– those two solid rocket boosters on either side, the large tank

in the middle filled with liquid fuel. You take the weight of all that fuel together, some of the most advanced chemical reactions we have for fuel for space launch; how much weight of

nuclear fuel would it take to contain the same amount of energy?

You're talking about 10 pounds! One suitcase full of nuclear fuel contains the same amount of energy as all three fuel tanks

of the Space Shuttle. To be fair, you couldn't necessarily use

that fuel the same way to launch the Space Shuttle; you have to

have systems that can actually combust it and get thrust out of

it. It's not just the energy content as the only issue, but that

is the defining characteristic that makes nuclear reactions key

to getting around the Solar System; enabling things like travelling at constant acceleration. Instead of just

initially

firing your thruster and basically floating on an orbit to get to

different planetary bodies – which is what's often proposed for

getting people to Mars; which would take on the order of six, seven, eight months to do. If you had nuclear reactions – especially fusion reactions – you can be accelerating for half the trip, and decelerating the second half of the trip; you can

cut that time down to weeks or even days.

We were all excited that New Horizons got to Pluto. Unfortunately, it didn't have the fuel in it and the engines to

slow down when it got there; which is too bad, because it spent

ten years getting there, and even just passing by in the course

of a couple of weeks, found amazing things. Imagine if it actually got to stop and stay? If you had nuclear reactions, that the type of stuff you could be doing. If you had one-gravity acceleration, so you're constantly accelerating, providing the thrust that creates the equivalent of one Earth gravity for the crew on the space ship, it would literally take

16 days to get to Pluto. Compared to New Horizons taking ten years to get there; that's when the orbits are closest, but maybe

a few more days in sub-optimal conditions.

You're talking about a complete revolution in our ability to

efficiently get around the Solar System; travel to different planetary bodies; visit multiple locations. If you want to send

people to Mars, this is the way to do it. If you want to send people out to other places, this is the way to do it. Even robotic missions; you want to get around and do way more

exploration. There's so much we don't know about all these planets, about their moons; there's just so much to figure out.

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

And again, the third category is developing the resources in space; developing the ability to utilize what's available to us

on the Moon, on Mars, on different asteroids. This is something

we don't really do at all, yet. So, you have to bring basically

everything with you through that very costly energy-intensive first hurdle of getting from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit,

through travelling the vast distances of space. This is just this very early pioneer style mode of activity. Whereas, if

we're going to be serious about this, we need to develop the capabilities to utilize the resources that are there; and

eventually look to serious industrialization and development of

advanced systems out in space, on-site at different planetary bodies. One critical driver to this whole thing that we've put a

major focus on is the development of helium-3 from the Moon.

Helium-3 being an absolutely unique, excellent fusion fuel; which

is basically absent on Earth, but relatively abundant all over the lunar surface, and could be an excellent fuel for fusion propulsion in space and also to provide electricity energy back

here on Earth. There's been years of serious study and designs

and investigations of how to go to the Moon, develop the systems

to process the regala[ph], extract the helium-3; and initiate

real industrial-style processes; developments on the lunar surface. That's just one example. You want to get oxygen, hydrogen, metals; asteroids are also potentially very useful places to develop the resources. So, as a third category, the general idea of developing advanced capabilities to utilize and create what we need in different regions of the Solar System.

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

We were talking about this with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, and he again said, "Your starting point is Krafft Ehrlicke." And Krafft Ehrlicke's industrialization of the Moon really I think is the critical driver program that can get a lot of this going. As I said, we have helium-3 on the Moon; that puts fusion directly right there on the table. You're talking about developing

industrial capabilities and mining capabilities on the Moon. If you're serious about doing this, you want to increase our access to space from the Earth's surface. So, it is excellent that we're seeing a lot of discussion about the Moon coming on the table again; but I think the issue is, are we going to pursue this Krafft Ehrlicke vision for a real industrial development? Although he might have used different terms in discussing it, he had exactly the same conception that Mr. LaRouche has: That this is the basis for mankind's much broader expanse. Really the essential nature of the type of qualitative changes that mankind goes through in his natural growth and development as a very unique species on this Earth and hopefully tomorrow in the Solar System.

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

ROSS: Mhmm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good. I think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying to develop that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast that with what China is able to do now with building rail

networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it made it possible to open up the interior of the continents. And with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or more regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip.

The other aspect, which you talked about is, if you look at what's going on with the New Paradigm in the world; what China's doing, with the way things are being reshaped politically also around Russia. And then you look at the scientific advancements that are being made, where China's got a very top-line in the world super-conducting tokamak for fusion research. The major breakthroughs in terms of lunar exploration – that's China right now; China's going to be landing on the far side of the Moon; China had the first soft landing on the Moon in decades. This is really a potential. With their far side of the Moon landing, China will be able to take the first photographs of our universe in the very low radio range; it's never been done before. We'll have access to a whole new sense of sight about the universe around us.

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

thrilling than most of the discussion that takes place about this policy or that policy, when you think big like that.

DENISTON: Mr. LaRouche's platform concept is so key. People just don't have the idea of this type of qualitative leaps that are natural for mankind. People are so accustomed at this point to just slow, incremental progress if there's any progress at all. It's going to be a fight to get people to think on this level again.

ROSS: Yes! So much of what is considered to be progressive or useful is only nudging people toward being better savers or something; compared to the kinds of huge changes that are going to be needed. I think that's a very good image that we've given people. Let's end it with that. I think the thing to take from this also is that we have got a lot that we need to do; a lot of policies to put into place; and a wide open opportunity to make it happen right now. Including, as Jeff was emphasizing, Glass-Steagall is absolutely doable during this session of Congress; even before the inauguration of the next President and the next Congress in January. This is something we can do right now, next week, in this period.

The ability to understand this concept of the platforms, of the history of economic development of the United States, a real

major aspect of economic science, comes through studying Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with

—
if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to join

us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself. The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the USA

Now. And you don't have to get into a fistfight at a Walmart parking lot to pick it up, either.

Let's end it with that. Please sign up through our website

if you haven't already, to find out how to get involved with us.

Get our daily email, join us via the action center; let's be in


touch, and let's make this happen right now. There is nothing to

wait for; the situation is open. So, thank you for joining us;

thank you to Ben and Jeff. Thank you for all the work that you

have done and that you will do in the period immediately ahead.

Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love for produktivitet

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

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

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

En undersøgelse af det 20. århundredes tyske, russiske og amerikanske ballistiske missilprogrammer, der gik forud for og lagde fundamentet til de efterfølgende rumprogrammer, viser os historiens mest storstilede, vertikale og horisontale integration af mange tusinde menneskers bestræbelser inden for

talrige videnskabelige, tekniske og industrielle discipliner og områder. Og dette glidende, integrerede design, den tekniske udarbejdelse, produktion og afprøvning, blev alle fundamentalt baseret på nye, fysiske principper. De kulminerede alle i et unikt system – aldrig før set – utroligt komplekst, bestående af tusinder af dele, og som alligevel ikke tolererer selv én eneste fiasko.

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

Man kunne se topingeniører og designere i intens diskussion med maskinarbejdere i mange af værkstederne; disse tekniske arbejdere rådslog igen jævnligt i komiteer, og i mere intime sammenhænge, med de mest berømmede ledere af teoretisk videnskab. Den horisontale integration gennem dusinvis af institutioner og fabrikker var lige så intens. Det er forbløffende, at dette overhovedet kunne finde sted under Sovjetunionens system med centralplanlægning – som Anden

Verdenskrigs hårde skole havde nødvendiggjort – men det er en anden historie. Men det begyndte alt sammen at falde fra hinanden efter en stor, tragisk ulykke i 1960, og dernæst raserede Det britiske Imperiums agenter for Thatcher-politikken alt, hvad der var tilbage af sovjetisk videnskab i 1990'erne.

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

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 24. november 2016:

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

En Hyldest: Mozarts Rekviem

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

Den 18. januar 2014, nøjagtig 50 år efter dagen, hvor Mozarts

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

Vi håber, I finder tid til at lytte til denne opførelse i løbet af helligdagen og dele oplevelsen med jeres venner. Ligesom mordet på Kennedy for vores befolkning markerede en nedstigen til de helvedesagtige vilkår, der har karakteriseret vores umiddelbare fortid, således vil, hvis vi omfavner den mentale tilstand, som både selve Mozarts messe og de intellektuelle udfordringer stillet af vores tidligere præsident, fremkalder, en langt bedre fremtid vise sig inden for vores rækkevidde, lige over horisonten.

Tidl. USA-ambassadør Chas Freeman: Forkert af USA at behandle Kina som en fremvoksende militærmagt

23. nov., 2016 – Den tidlige amerikanske ambassadør Chas Freeman kommer i dag med en analyse, der »rammer plet«, af Amerikas fejlagtige politik over for Kina i Del II af sit interview med *The Nation* »The Militarization of Diplomacy and

Other Corruptions of U.S. Empire« (Diplomatiets militarisering og anden amerikansk imperiekorruption).

Efter at diskutere Amerikas enorme militære industrikompleks' historie tilbage til præsident Eisenhowers tid, siger Freeman, at USA måtte »opfinde en ny fjende, eller finde én, for at retfærdiggøre de udgifter, man havde, og gøre det, man gjorde, med militæret«.

Freeman fortsætter, »Andy Marshall [der var leder af det amerikanske forsvarsministeriums Office of Net Assessment, Pentagons interne 'tænketaank', 1973-2015], opfandt et vidunderligt koncept kaldet 'peer competitor' (ligeværdig konkurrent). Den ligeværdige konkurrent var en fiktiv, hypotetisk skabelse, der, uanset, hvad man gjorde i den militære sfære, ville gøre noget, der ville udkonkurrere én. Dette er en perfekt drivkraft for et program, fordi uanset, hvad man gør, så må man gøre mere, fordi der potentielt set er nogen derude, der med held kan konkurrere med det, man har gjort. Dette koncept blev sluttelig anvendt på Kina. Det har været drivkraft bag en masse afskrækkelse i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer«.

Intervieweren Patrick Lawrence vender sig derefter mod Kina med reference til Chas Freemans bog fra 2013, *Interesting Times: China, America and the Whifiting Balance of Prestige* (Kina, Amerika og antydningen af prestigebalance). Lawrence siger, »Jeg syntes, ordet »prestige« var besynderligt – det drejer sig om magt – men alene titlen siger en masse om ens syn på dynamikken i det fjerne stillehavsområde. Efter min mening har vi et meget godt greb i den gale ende. Vi bør samarbejde med Kina for at lette en overgang til det, jeg anser for at være en uundgåelig udvikling af relationerne i Stillehavet. I stedet synes vi at udkæmpe en krig, der ikke kan vindes, for at kæmpe mod Kinas fremvækst ... «

Chas Freeman responderer, at Amerika blev den dominerende militærmagt i Stillehavet efter sejren over Japan og påpeger

den efterfølgende, økonomiske vækst i Japan, Sydkorea og andre lande. Men, siger Freeman:

»Nu står vi over for realiteten med Kina, som er vokset frem i bemærkelsesværdigt tempo og grundlæggende set hævder sin historiske position i området, og som nu grundlæggende set er alles største handelspartner; alles største kilde til ny investering; alles største marked – ingens politiske model, for resten – og vi behandler det som en militær udfordring, fordi det er, hvad vi gør. Jeg vil tro, det først og fremmest er en økonomisk udfordring. Det er ikke en politisk udfordring, med mindre og indtil kineserne opfinder et attraktivt, politisk system, hvilket de ikke har gjort. Det er i færd med at blive en militær udfordring, og er nu en militær udfordring, *primært, fordi vi valgte at gøre det til en sådan*, siger Freeman. (fremhævelse tilføjet)

*Foto: Tidl. amerikansk ambassadør til Saudi-Arabien (1989-92)
Chas Freeman.*

NYHEDSORIENTERING november

2016:

Donald Trump og det nye paradigme

Etablisementet i både USA og Europa er rystet over Donald Trumps valgsejr, men rystelserne ender ikke der. I lighed med Reagan efter valget i 1980 vil han indtage Det Hvide Hus med sit helt eget team og egne nye rådgivere. Derfor er en helt ny politik mulig, hvor USA finder sin naturlige plads i et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina – og forhåbentlig dropper

Bush/Cheneys og Obamas krigs- og konfrontationspolitik. Danmark og Europa skal dermed også finde en helt ny udenrigspolitik frem. Samtidig kommer Trump så til at skulle slås med et finanskrak større end i 2008, men hvis han lytter til Lyndon LaRouche, som Reagan delvist gjorde det i 1981, så er der med LaRouches Fire Love en vej ud af moradset. Dette er en redigeret udgave af en tale, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets formand, holdt den 21. november 2016, og som kan høres på www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

»Jeg er enig i kongresmedlem Lieus juridiske analyse. Jeg mener imidlertid, at denne sags mere praktiske aspekt er den juridiske afsløring af vore mest højtplacerede embedsfolk, der

styrede vore militærfolks handlinger. Ifølge den præcedens, der blev sat af den Amerikanske Krigsforbryderdomstol i sagen mod den japanske general [Tomoyuki] Yamashita efter Anden Verdenskrig, kan den øverstkommanderende retsforfølges for generelle, kriminelle handlinger, begået af den øverstkommanderendes underordnede. Dette gælder for handlinger, som han kendte til, eller burde have kendt til.

Amerika har i vid udstrækning ladet hånt om internationale normer for opførsel i sine aggressionskrige imod Serbien, Irak, Libyen, Syrien og nu Yemen. Visse handlinger fremstår som forbrydelser iht. international sædvanelov – såsom vores afvisning af at acceptere oberst Gaddafis overgivelse, da han tilbød at forlade Libyen. USA, Storbritannien og Frankrig skal have ført rådslagning, før de besluttede at ignorere hans tilbud om at abdicere, og fremmede i stedet mordet på ham.

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

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

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

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

Endnu mere afgørende er kampen for at genoprette kreativ tænkning i de vestlige nationer, efter årtiers intellektuel gift fra Hollywoods og rock-narko-sex-modkulturens vold og perversion. For tre år siden, på 50-års dagen for mordet på John F. Kennedy, præsenterede Schiller Instituttet, stiftet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, en mindekoncert for JFK med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem-messe i D-mol i Washington-området, som efterfulgtes af en gentagelse af koncerten i Holy Cross katedralen i Boston, hvor, 50 år tidligere, Richard Cardinal Cushing holdt en mindehøjtidelighed for JFK med en højtidelig pavemesse, missa solemnis rekviem, hvor det samme,

intense udtryk for klassisk skønhed var blevet præsenteret og fulgt på fjernsyn i hele verden. Det er netop skønhedens identifikation med sandhed, der er gået tabt i Vesten, og som må genoprettes for at bringe verden sammen for fred gennem fælles og samarbejdende udvikling.

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

Lyndon LaRouche interview til amerikansk radiostation

20. nov., 2016 – Lyndon LaRouche blev lørdag interviewet af strateg i det Republikanske Parti, Roger Stone, på dennes radioshow, »Stone Cold Truth«. Stone indledte interviewet med en lang introduktion af hr. LaRouche og bemærkede hans præsidentkampagner fra 1976-2004, samt hans tætte relation til præsident Ronald Reagan. Stone var nordøst-koordinator for Ronald Reagans præsidentkampagne i 1980, og han forklarede sine lyttere, at han personligt vidste, at Reagan og LaRouche udviklede en venskab under denne kampagne. Han citerede Reagan for i en personlig samtale at sige, at, alt imens han ikke var enig med alt, LaRouche sagde, så var han enig i meget af LaRouches politik og anså ham for at være en ven.

Under samtalen gjorde LaRouche det klart, at valget af Donald Trump var et nederlag for dem, der, ligesom præsident Obama, søgte at fremprovokere en verdenskrig med Rusland. I en udveksling om Bill Clintons præsidentskab gjorde LaRouche det klart, at Clinton blev angrebet af den britiske Dronning og befandt sig under et stormløb, da han kapitulerede over for ophævelsen af Glass-Steagall, samt at Hillary Clinton bidrog

til Clinton-præsidentskabets afgang. Stone var enig i denne vurdering.

Stone viste enorm respekt for hr. LaRouche under hele interviewet og frydede sig over det faktum, og visse folk på Wall Street vil gå bersærkergang over det faktum, at LaRouche optrådte på Stones radioshow. Mod interviewets slutning bad han hr. LaRouche om at sige noget omkring det aftalte, politiske spil for at lukke munden på ham, og LaRouche tilskrev præsident George H.W. Bush de falske anklager mod ham, i hvilket Stone, forfatter af en nyligt udkommet bog om den »kriminelle Bush-familie«, erklærede sig helt enig.

LaRouche gentog, at Trumps valgsejr repræsenterede et globalt nederlag for dem, der fremprovokerer krig med Rusland, og at, alt imens det endnu ikke vides, hvad Trump vil præstere i embedet, så er opbremsningen af fremstødet for krig i sig selv et betydningsfuldt bidrag.

Stone gjorde det klart, at et af de spørgsmål, han er sikker på, Trump vil forfølge, er genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall, en politik, som Stone bemærkede, Lyndon LaRouche længe har promoveret.

På et tidspunkt bemærkede Stone, at han har været en ven og nær samarbejdspartner til Donald Trump, siden Reagan-kampagnen i 1980, da Trump og hans far, Fred Trump, var tidlige stærke, politiske og finansielle støtter til Reagan.

Se også: LaRouches 40-year Record: A New International Economic Order, <https://larouchepac.com/new-economic-order>

Kun globale løsninger baseret på nye principper kan virke

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

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

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

Tyskland kan blive et centralt element i disse ændringer, men kansler Merkel må holde op med at beskytte den transatlantiske

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Lyndon LaRouche:
Menneskeheden må
ændre Universets adfærd som
sådan**

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

Spørgsmålet er, hvad menneskeheden kan gøre for at ændre universets adfærd som sådan«.

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

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

»Jeg mener, vi nu er vidne til en fortsættelse af det meget høje tempo i den dynamik, der har været den fremherskende i de seneste to en halv måned, eller lidt længere, begyndende med Vladivostok-mødet; integrationen af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union (EAEU) og Ét bælte, én vej; fortsættelsen heraf ved G20-topmødet i Hangzhou; og dernæst ved ASEAN-mødet i Laos; efterfulgt af BRIKS-konferencen i Goa, Indien, i oktober måned; og nu, under APEC-mødet i Lima, Peru.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Det, vi gør, er godt, i vid udstrækning; i visse dele af verden og inden for visse af livets aspekter. Men, det er ikke det, menneskeheden rent faktisk har behov for. Mennesket må vide, hvad begrundelsen for mennesker, for menneskelige

væsner, er, noget, der aldrig bliver forstået af blot og bart dødelige mennesker, der ser på sig selv i en sådan kategori ...

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

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

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

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

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

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

Foto: Mennesket og Universet – Universet, og mennesket.

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

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

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

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

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

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

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

APEC-topmødet

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kina byder USA under Trump velkommen til at gå med i AIIB

19. nov., 2016 – Kina har hilst den antydning, baseret på udtalelsen fra James Woolsey, der har rådgivet Donald Trump i udenrigspolitik, om, at den nye amerikanske administration kunne tænkes at tilslutte sig Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), velkommen. Woolsey har henvist til

Obamas afvisning af at tilslutte sig AIIB fra starten, som en »strategisk fejltagelse«.

China Daily skriver i dag i en lederartikel, at amerikansk politik selv var skyld i, at Kina tog initiativ til AIIB, ved at »trække IMF's kvote-reform ud, hvorved udviklingslandene ville få mere indflydelse i denne organisation«. Lederartiklen fastslår, at USA »tilskrev sin opposition mod at tilslutte sig den nyligt dannede investeringsbank bekymring for, at banken ikke ville leve op til eksisterende, internationale standarder, til trods for, at bankens medlemmer har forpligtet sig til at samarbejde for at sikre, at den følger de bedste ledelsesstandarder og -praksisser, gennemskuelig og spørgsmål vedr. miljø og arbejdsmarked. Den holdning, som den afgående administration vedtog, afslører ganske enkelt dens sande bekymring for, at AIIB ville udfordre eller reducere de amerikansk dominerede Bretton Woods-institutioners, såsom Verdensbankens, indflydelse.

Artiklen fortsætter, »Fakta er, at den tilgængelige finansiering fra Verdensbanken og Asiatisk Udviklingsbank slet ikke er tilstrækkelig for det massive behov for infrastruktur i Asien. Snarere end at konkurrere med disse institutioner, er AIIB udtænkt til at kompensere for den utilstrækkelige, internationale, finansielle støtte til infrastrukturudvikling og regional sammenhængskraft i Asien. Den foreslåede investering i de asiatiske sektorer for transport, energi og telekommunikation tilbyder ligeledes enorme erhvervsmuligheder for selskaber fra medlemslandene – hvilket er én af grundene til, at mange af Washingtons allierede i Vesten, såsom Storbritannien, Italien og Tyskland, har tilsluttet sig AIIB, på trods af opposition fra USA.«

Artiklen konkluderer: »Men, som det kinesiske mundheld siger, så er det aldrig for sent til at udbedre folden, efter man har mistet et får.« USA har intet at tabe ved at blive medlem af AIIB, der bygger på præmisserne om åbenhed, inklusion og gennemskuelig. USA kan også spille en mere konstruktiv

rolle ved at blive medlem end ved at stå udenfor. At gå med i AIB ville være et godt signal fra den nye Trump-administration om, at USA er mere villig til at agere som en ansvarlig, global magt.«

Foto: Jin Liqun, AIIB's første præsident, forlader talerstolen under åbningsceremonien for AIIB i Beijing den 16. januar, 2016.

Trump vælger Michael Flynn som national sikkerhedsrådgiver

18. nov., 2016 – Den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps overgangshold meddelte i dag, at, blandt andre udnævnelser, har Trump valgt den pensionerede generalløjtnant fra hæren, Mike Flynn, som sin nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver.

»Det glæder mig, at generalløjtnant Michael Flynn vil være ved min side i arbejdet på at nedkæmpe radikal, islamisk terrorisme, styre geopolitiske udfordringer og sikre amerikaneres tryghed hjemme og ude«, sagde nyvalgte præsident Trump, iflg. en udtalelse, der er udlagt på overgangsholdets webside. »General Flynn er en af landets fremmeste eksperter inden for militære spørgsmål og efterretningsspørgsmål, og han vil blive et uvurderligt aktiv for mig og min administration.« Flynn er »den bedste efterretningsofficer i sin generation«, sagde pensionerede general Barry McCaffrey til NBC News i går, da muligheden for Flynns udnævnelse første gang blev rapporteret. »Han er en god fyr. Han er objektiv. Han er barsk.«

Flynn kom tidligt ud som verbal tilhænger af Trump, og nyhedsmedierne er tydeligvis ikke glade for dette, hvilket ganske tydeligt fremgår af flere rapporter siden i går. *Washington Posts* rapport om Flynn, f.eks., er typisk derved, at den ikke er meget andet end en lang liste af fordømmelser.

Men det, de måske i virkeligheden er vrede over, er, at Flynn var med til at afsløre præsident Obamas rolle i at sprede jihadisme i hele Mellemøsten, med den hensigt at bruge det som et instrument til regimeskift. Flynn udtalte sig offentligt, efter at en rapport fra Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) i 2012, der forudsagde spredningen af jihadisme i stil med ISIS som en konsekvens af USA's politik, blev udgivet i 2015 via Loven om Informationsfrihed. »Der er en mulighed for, at der etableres et erklæret eller ikke-erklæret, salafistisk fyrstendømme i det østlige Syrien, og det er nøjagtigt, hvad de magter, der støtter oppositionen, ønsker, men det formål at isolere det syriske regime«, lød det i DIA-rapporten. I et interview på Al Jazeera Tv 29. juli 2015 sagde Flynn, at han var overbevist om, at Obama-administrationen med vilje ignorerede DIA-rapporten.

»Det var en overlagt beslutning om det, de gør«, sagde han. Han fortsatte i samme interview med at fordømme den irakiske invasion i 2003 som en »strategisk fejltagelse«, og at den følgende besættelse skabte betingelserne for jihadi-gruppernes opkomst, inkl. ISIS, og som USA nu bombarderer. »Der er ingen tvivl om, at det irakiske fængselssystem (kørt af det amerikanske militær) blev udklækningsanstalter for det, vi står overfor«, sagde han.

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: USA's politik for spændinger med Rusland ikke godt for det amerikanske folk

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

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. november, 2016; International Webcast – Det står nu helt klart, at hele det tidligere regeringssystem, det gamle system, brat og endegyldigt har nået slutningen. Men spørgsmålet lyder stadig: Hvad skal erstatte det? Og dette er langt fra konkret eller afklaret på nuværende tidspunkt. Det lederskab, som LaRouchePAC har ydet, og fortsat yder, udgør den afgørende faktor i dette spørgsmål – både på den nationale og den internationale scene. Det er meget tydeligt, at dynamikken nu er skiftet over mod det, Xi Jinping har anført med den Nye Silkevej og med samarbejdet med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin omkring skabelsen af en ny, strategisk og økonomisk, international orden; og det er bestemmende for verdensbegivenhederne i øjeblikket, og som går langt ud over noget, der finder sted på den hjemlige front, internt i USA. Spørgsmålet er, hvordan responderer vi til det?

LaRouchePAC fortsætter med at lede; og, som vi diskuterede i mandags, så var dette en meget vigtig uge. Kongressen samledes igen – selv om det kun var for nogle få dage; men, på stedet dér, for at byde medlemmerne af USA's Kongres velkommen, så snart de vendte tilbage til Washington, var nogle af vore førende aktivister fra Larouche Political Action Committee (LPAC). Vi havde en dag med aktioner på stedet ved Capitol Hill onsdag; og vi mødte ganske afgjort en totalt rystet og langt mere åben situation, end vi har set i de seneste måske 16 år i Washington, D.C. Både det Republikanske lederskab og

absolut det Demokratiske lederskab har fået alvorlige tæsk; og de mest mentalt sunde aspekter i begge partier er ved at indse, at tiden er inde til at forlige sig med det. Hvor skal de se hen for lederskab? Til LaRouche Political Action Committee.

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

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

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast November 18, 2016

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

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 18, 2016. My

name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio by

Benjamin Deniston, and via video by members of our Policy Committee: Diane Sare, joining us from New York City; and Kesha

Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We had the opportunity just now to have a discussion with

both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, and I think Mr. LaRouche's

point

is very clear. It is decisively determined that the entire reigning former system, the old system, has abruptly and decisively come to an end. But the question still remains:

What

will replace it? And that is far from concrete or finalized at

this point. The leadership that the LaRouche PAC has delivered

and continues to deliver, is the deciding factor in that – both

nationally and on the international stage. It's very clear that

the dynamic is now shifted towards what Xi Jinping has led in China with the New Silk Road and in collaboration with Russian President Vladimir Putin in creating a new strategic and economic

international order; and that is what is determining world events

right now, far beyond anything that's happening domestically from

within the borders of the United States. The question is, how do

we respond to that?

The LaRouche PAC continues to lead; and as we discussed on

Monday with the Policy Committee, this was a very important week.

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

leading activists of the LaRouche Political Action Committee.

We

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

and we definitely met a completely shaken up and much more

open

situation than we have faced in perhaps the last 16 years in Washington, DC. Both the Republican leadership and absolutely the Democratic leadership have received a severe drubbing; and the most sane aspects of both parties are realizing that now is the time to come to terms with that. Where else can they turn for leadership? The LaRouche Political Action Committee.

So, what we're going to do right now is play a short excerpt from a discussion that was led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche. These are remarks that she delivered to those activists as sort of marching orders before they went to Washington, DC. I think she gives a very clear overview of exactly the situation we find ourselves in, and the responsibilities that we have. Coming out of that short audio clip, we will continue the discussion with some more elaborated views of what we have now been able to accomplish, and what the challenges still are ahead of us. So, let me play that clip for you right now:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE : OK. So, first of all, I want to say hello to you. Obviously, this is a very important intervention because the election results in the United States, which many people did not anticipate, is really part of a global process. It's not something which is accountable in all the explanations given by the US media; for the most part, the cover-up or some phony explanation like it was the FBI who cost Hillary the election and so forth and so on. What really is

going on strategically is that the masses of the population of the trans-Atlantic sector in particular – also in some other parts of the world, but in Europe and the United States in particular – have really had it with an establishment which has consistently acted against their interests. People in those states which are not represented by the anti-establishment, they know that; because for them, the working and living conditions in the last decades one can say, but in particular in the last 15 years, have become worse and worse. People have to work more jobs; they still can't make ends meet. They have many cases where their sons and sometimes even daughters have gone to Iraq for five times in a row, to come home to be completely broken. So, people have experienced that life is just getting worse for them; and they do not have any hope in the Washington-New York establishment. You had the same phenomenon leading to the Brexit vote in Great Britain in June; which also was not just the refugees and most of the obvious issues – even though they did play a certain catalyzing role; but it was the same fundamental sense of injustice. That there is simply no more government which takes care of the common good. Whatever explanations they now come up with, this will not go away until the situation is remedied, and good government is being re-established in the United States, in Europe, and in other parts of the world.

One immediate next point where the same kind of resentment probably will show is with the referendum in Italy where on the 4th of December – that is, in 2.5 weeks from now – they will have a referendum about a change in the constitution which as

the sentiment now goes, will be also a vote against the Renzi government. Even so, he promised he would resign; now, he doesn't want to resign. But in any case, this type of a process will continue until a remedy has been put in.

Now, obviously, the situation is that the Trump victory is an open question. It's not yet clear what this Presidency will become; but as Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized emphatically almost every day since the vote, this is not a local US affair. This is a global issue; it's a global international question because one major reason why Trump won the election is because especially in the last period, he had emphasized that Hillary Clinton would mean World War III because of her policy concerning Syria. She demanded the no-fly zone and was proposing a head-on confrontation with Russia. That was absolutely to the point, because we were on an absolutely very dangerous road to a confrontation with Russia and with China.

Trump in the election campaign had said repeatedly that he would have a different attitude towards Russia; and he said something more kinetic[?] things against China. But since he has been elected, he has been on the phone with Putin and Xi Jinping; and in both cases, said that he would work to improve the relations between the United States and Russia or respectively with China. Now that is obviously extremely important; and the other extremely important question is will he carry through

with

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

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

stops and terminates the casino economy which is really the cause

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

Obviously,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in

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

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

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

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

which basically says that we cannot get an increase in the productivity of the economy unless you go for a crash program of

fusion power, and you go for a crash program of international cooperation for space research. Only if you do these kinds of avant-garde leaps in the productivity – like fusion technology brings you in a completely economic platform with the fusion torch. You will have energy security for the whole planet; you

will have raw materials security because you can use any waste and differentiate out the different isotopes and reconstitute new

raw materials by putting the isotopes together in the way required. So, it's a gigantic technological leap; and the same

thing goes for space technology. It will have exactly the same

impact as during the Apollo program when every investment in space technology, in rockets and other new materials, brought 14

cents back from each cent of investment. Everything from

computer chips to Teflon cooking ware to all kinds of benefits occurred as a byproduct from space research. To get the world economy out of this present condition – especially in the trans-Atlantic sector – you need that kind of reorientation towards the scientific and technological progress, increases in energy flux density. All of this Green ideology which is really no development ideology has to be replaced; and the world has to go back in a direction where the real physical laws of the physical universe are the criteria for truth, and not some ideology."

OGDEN: Now, Helga LaRouche also delivered an equally inspiring, but much more extensive speech at a very important conference this week that occurred in Peru. This was the 23rd National Congress of the Association of Economists of Peru, that was held in conjunction with the APEC meeting which is occurring over this weekend in Lima, Peru. The title of the conference was "The Peru-Brazil Bi-Oceanic Train; the Impact on the Economy of the Amazon Region and the Country". So, this is Peru-Brazil transcontinental railroad. Helga LaRouche's presentation was the keynote address; and she delivered it at the opening session. It was titled, "The New Silk Road Concept; Facing the Collapse of the World Financial System". This APEC summit which will be occurring this weekend, will be hosting world leaders including Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping. There has been a major surge in interest and engagement between China and these countries of South America, around the idea of expanding the New Silk Road

into South America. That would also obviously have to include North America. This is the vision that Helga LaRouche has been

emphasizing, and what she laid out in a very inspiring way in this speech in Peru; the idea of the New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge. The organizers of that conference – this national congress of economists, the economists' association in

Peru – drafted their own copy of a 60-page pamphlet that they distributed to all the participants of this conference, that was

based on excerpts from this report by {EIR} – "The New Silk Road

Becomes the World Land-Bridge". It also included a printing of

Lyndon LaRouche's Four New Laws concept. So, this is obviously a

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

But what I can say is, we have now set the agenda.

What's

happening now is that the world is being forced to respond to the

agenda that has been set over decades – but really in the last few months – by the LaRouche Movement internationally. You can

see this by the flurry of coverage of Glass-Steagall inside the

United States, and the fact that there's open discussion including from the new leadership of the Democratic Party: Warren, Sanders, Keith Ellison, and others. Now is the time to

put Glass-Steagall on the table and get out in front of this.

But the other element of this is the discussion of so-called "infrastructure". Now infrastructure can mean a lot of

different

things, and I'm sure that people watched the victory speech by President-elect Trump where he talked about building rail, building bridges, building airports, and so forth.

The latest development in that discussion is an article that

is featured on the front page of the {New York Times} today, called "Trump-size Idea for a New President; Build Something Inspiring". Good headline, and the article starts off pretty inspiringly; it says the only way that you're going to be able to

unify a bitterly divided America, is by building great infrastructure projects. Not just painting rusty bridges, or laying a few miles of asphalt, but "Build something awe-inspiring. Something Americans can be proud of. Something

that will repay its investment many times over for generations to

come. Build the modern-day equivalent of the Golden Gate Bridge,

the Hoover Dam, the Lincoln Tunnel " All of which were built by

Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal administration. Then the article does also say, "Can anybody remember anything that came

out of Obama's \$800 billion [stimulus package]? I don't think

so." So, this article usefully cites what Franklin Roosevelt did

with the PWA, the WPA: 700 miles of airport runways; 650,000 miles of rail; 78,000 bridges; 125,000 military and civilian buildings, [including] 40,000 schools. This is massive. The

article also usefully says the idea that any infrastructure project today could pay for itself through user fees is a ridiculous prospect. But the alternative that this article poses

is just as bad; saying, the way to do it is for government to

borrow most of the money from investors.

So, I think this demonstrates that we have a lot of work to

do with putting the full concept of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws

on the table. Now, this article cites a few useful infrastructure projects: a new rail tunnel under the Hudson River; California high-speed rail; a Northeast mag-lev corridor;

a Miami sea wall; so forth and so on. But if you look at the vision that's presented in this pamphlet – "The United States Joins the New Silk Road: a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance" – with the Bering Strait tunnel rail project to connect Eurasia with the North and South American mega-continent.

If you look at the amount of high-speed rail, if you look at the

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

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

And, there are some much deeper scientific points that have

got to be addressed. 1. The understanding of what Alexander Hamilton actually did; and 2. What Lyndon LaRouche's science of

economics defines as real productivity from the standpoint of increases in energy flux density. So, I think that sets up the

discussion that we can have here right now. Ben, Diane, Kesha,

and I think we should maybe expand from there.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think it's very important that Mr.

LaRouche, increasingly in the last couple of months, has said

over and over again, "Productivity; productivity; productivity."

We have to start thinking about not just providing jobs, not just

providing needed infrastructure projects. I think it's worth making a distinction between on the one side things that are just

needed to maintain what we have. We have a massive deficit just

to maintain the standard – I think the appropriate term is "platform" as Mr. LaRouche had introduced a couple of years back

– about how to think about infrastructure and the real development of a national territory in a scientific way. You have a certain platform of activity, a standard of activity level

that maintains a specific level of existence for your society; directly connected to the potential relative population density

of your society. We should always be looking to push to higher

and higher platforms; higher levels of activity. Our current platform is degraded; much of the infrastructure we live upon was

built largely under Franklin Roosevelt and a few spurts of activity following him on that. So on the hand, yeah, we need to

rebuild some of these things. Our existing dam systems, transport systems, even soft infrastructure like health care systems are in need of repair. But we also need to push to a higher level; we need to go to a new platform which has higher degrees of productivity per capita. Higher degrees of ability to

support a larger population in new area, new territories of the

country; increase the productivity of existing territories, and

that begins to create real growth. You're not going to get real growth just by rebuilding what you have; although you need to do

that, because we've been letting this decay for decades now.

But you also need to create real economic value, real economic growth. And that goes to this issue of, are you increasing the productive powers of your labor force? Are you increasing the ability of your productive sector to produce the

physical goods needed to support society more efficiently and at

higher qualities with less physical input per capita, you could

say? Can you measure those kinds of steps of growth? Are you taking that metric into account? That's critical right now; and

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

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

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

what are the essential principles of human economic growth?

And

that's why Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws in totality is so crucial.

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

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

small part of the population even in that specific endeavor; but you're pushing the frontiers of engineering capabilities, scientific capabilities. That actually has the most important radiating effect on the entirety of the economy, the entirety of the productive capabilities of the labor force.

You absolutely need this science driver, this high-technology, high capital-intensity driver program to really push the whole program forward. The depth of the crisis that we've gone into just makes it that much more important that we have that element up there, front and center. Since Mr. LaRouche put out this Four Laws document, he has also obviously been increasingly focussed on the role of space in that focus, in that goal. That is another absolutely critical element of this. It was not an incomprehensible or miraculous thing that John F Kennedy's Apollo program had such a massive spin-off effect in terms of payback to the US economy from the investments that were made. The studies not that long after the project finished, were already showing a 14-1 payback in terms of the totality of increases of productivity of industries that were not part of the space program; but acquired technologies. Precision engineering capabilities; high-precision control systems for production; various things that were created out of necessity to make this super-advanced Moon mission work. But that increased the ability of mankind generally to be more productive in his production capabilities. That was then able to be applied throughout the economy generally.

So, those are the kinds of things that we absolutely need right now; not just repairing our existing degraded infrastructure. We're going to have to do that, sure; but how do you create the growth where you can afford to do that, and afford to make completely new investments? Part of this infrastructure discussion should be opening up new territories of the country. A major part of this pamphlet that we put out, and a huge part of Mrs. LaRouche's focus, has been new cities. You've got huge territories in the United States that are not developed. Let's develop the nation; let's expand new territories; let's create huge areas of new growth. That's the kind of stuff that's going to drive the whole process forward. We're in a real need for some precise, clear, authoritative leadership on these issues, because these things are not understood. We're not just going into this in a vacuum; we have a completely broken down system; not just in the financial sector, but in the physical economy, too. So we need clear, precise, immediate action. We don't have years for somebody to figure this thing out over time; people's lives are on the line right now in terms of what's needed to turn the US economy around.

DIANE SARE: Well, I'd like to just put this in a context; because we're not having a discussion here in the abstract. And

I want to go back to what Mr. LaRouche did in the 1970s with the creation of the Fusion Energy Foundation, and his role in being brought into a team to create a Presidency. I want to be very clear with the people watching this that what we are doing is not an academic discussion of nice things that we, sitting in a little corner, want to do. Mr. LaRouche – as you heard from what Ben laid out – had a very clear conception of the necessity of fusion energy at that time. Also, people remember the Jimmy Carter Presidency; small is beautiful. I think we were talking about global cooling back then, and now it's global warming. [One sentence paraphrase because of bad audio] What we needed to do, in collaboration with Edward Teller, was to take the Mutually Assured Destruction doctrine off the table. The only deterrent to a nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union was who could blow up the world more times over. What happened was, in the process of this, Ronald Reagan as a candidate and then as President, was recruited to this idea; and I think we've been told there a number of things which Mr. LaRouche was working on with the Reagan administration. Not the least of which was the SDI, which the Soviets rejected and Reagan announced, which led in a not-so-indirect way to the Berlin Wall coming down. Also, there was discussion of a meeting between President Reagan and Indira Gandhi, former prime minister of India who had been

leader

of the Non-Aligned Movement. Reagan, as people recall, was shot

in '82; Indira Gandhi was assassinated; Mr. LaRouche was put in

prison. I'm not saying that to say that we're worried about it;

there's all kinds of questions of security and safety. But my point is that LaRouche personally has played a major, important

role in shaping the institution of the Presidency; and his incarceration was timed for when we had earlier another such great opportunity, which was when the Soviet system collapsed economically as he warned it would. He was in prison, and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche put on the table with him the Productive

Triangle and so on. We know what happened; that was sabotaged by

a series of wars. The Balkans; the first Iraq War; we later had

9/11 and so on.

What we are doing today is to shape the American [nation] in

participation with what is a New Paradigm; which LaRouche and his

wife personally have been very much involved in creating. Two years ago, Mr. LaRouche announced that we should move the center

of our American operations to New York City; which was done.

In

the last three or four months, we have begun circulation of a newspaper appropriately titled {The Hamiltonian}. I'll just say

I found it ironic that the {New York Times} today has these headlines about infrastructure. They also have articles about how school children in Estonia and Latvia were terrified that Hillary Clinton was going to drag them into the middle ground

of

a war between NATO and Russia. It's very interesting.

The big title on {The Hamiltonian} this week is "We Are Facing a New Epoch for Mankind"; the subtitle is "The New York Times Has Become Irrelevant". So, they may be scrambling to make

themselves relevant. But what you also see, is we have printed

now, four weeks in a row, Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws. They have no

excuse to be so idiotic on their proposals; both for how you fund

this, and how they're thinking about it, which is all domestic.

The world now, what Mrs. LaRouche described in her speech in Peru, was that Xi Jinping made his announcement of this in September of 2013. In those three years, he travelled to 37 nations; he made bilateral agreements with 56 nations; 39 new cargo routes have been opened. These are major international transportation corridors; 98 airports. The magnitude of this completely boggles the mind. It really is in keeping with what

Hamilton would have envisioned; what you saw with Henry Carey, or

John Quincy Adams in terms of their role in the United States. And I would say geographically, if you could step away, if you could get on a space ship and look at the Earth from a distance;

or just take out a globe and look at what the United States is,

where we are between the Atlantic and the Pacific. What North America is, and South America now getting involved, we have a great opportunity before us to play an absolutely strategic role

in this. Our intent is to bring this about, which is why it's so

crucial that everybody watching this, makes it a point to master the principles in Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws. Particularly the fourth principle, and also particularly the principle of credit; which is in a sense tied to the increase of productivity. We're not going to fund so-called infrastructure by tolls; we're not going to build a new bridge, a tunnel under the Hudson and charge people a toll and that's going to pay for it. No, if your population is able to produce orders of magnitude more than it is currently producing, that is a net increase in the wealth of the nation. It has nothing to do with tolls, or tickets for public transportation; which are all sort of a form of tax farming and looting.

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

KESHA ROGERS: Just to follow up on that, another important aspect of the fight waged by Mr. LaRouche and his wife Helga, going back to the 1970s around the fight that you just mentioned, Diane, of the Fusion Energy Foundation, was the fight against

this apparatus of a zero-growth or no-growth culture. He was very instrumental with Mrs. LaRouche and also their collaboration

with space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – who we've mentioned a lot –

on taking on this degeneracy of the attack on population reduction that was being promoted and continues to be promoted to

this day. Many people may remember that there was a book put out

in the 1970s by two men, Dennis Meadows and Jay Forrester.

Jay

Forrester just died recently at 98 years old. He was instrumental in putting out the computer models which indicated

that there was a certain relationship between the limited resources on Earth and the production of food to how many people

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

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

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

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

your economy per capita, and per land area.

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

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

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

program

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

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

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

these scientists who came with von Braun, like Krafft Ehrlicke and

others, from Germany; who helped to shape the US space program.

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

I think it's also important to look at the space program and

the integration of the classical culture as the expression of a

higher identity of what it means to be human, and the inspiration

and optimism that's been missing from the population. There's a

few more things we can say on this; I think it's also

important
to recognize the importance internationally of what China is
doing. We can say more on this later, but the fact that when
you
talk about inspiration and optimism, we have now the Shenzhou
11
space crew, the crew in China who just docked 33 days ago to
the
Tiangong 2, the space lab for China. They're doing
experiments
that are quite phenomenal; but what they're really expressing
—
they're going to continue doing these experiments in space.
One
of the things we saw back in 2013, when you had the astronauts
docking the first space lab for China, videoing this and
beaming
it back to Earth; and 60 million children watching it.
They're
going to do something similar for this space experiment. This
is
something that we have to go back to right now; the space
program
is not just some abstract thing on the side for gurus who like
it. We have to make it part of the culture; we have to make
it
something that inspires and uplifts the population again, but
is
instrumental in the development of the increases of the
productivity of society and increases in the platform. So
that
means that the population has to come to a higher level of
understanding of their identity; and the way to do that is
really
an integration of culture, as Mr. LaRouche has made clear.

OGDEN: One thing you brought up, and I thought it was

good

to go back to; the conjunction of Kennedy's space program, the kind of inspiration and culture needed. This was something very

conscious to the Kennedy administration; not only did they bring

Pablo Casals to the White House, but this was part of a broader

discussion between John F Kennedy, Jackie Kennedy, and Pierre Salinger, who was the Press Secretary. But before he became Kennedy's Press Secretary, had been a child prodigy; had been a

concert pianist, a composer. He had discussions with Jackie Kennedy which he records in his book, where Jackie Kennedy said

the role of the White House should be to set a tone for the arts

which will encourage great culture, classical culture around the

country. And we should exhibit the finest of culture, of art; we

should set the standard which everybody else can then rise to that level.

It is good that you brought up, Kesha, in conjunction has

happened politically, where New York City has definitely become

the center of gravity of the political universe of the United States. It's not just Trump; Clinton was also New York City.

It

was a strategic decision to center a very active organization in

New York; but that entire process has also happened in parallel

with what Diane has been leading there with this revival of Classical music and culture. That's very important, even from the standpoint of what is our idea of man; and the dignity of

human beings. Yes, granted, there were dark tones during this Presidential campaign which is not acceptable. But the idea of

the dignity of man, and the creativity of the entire human species is what is embodied in the greatest of Classical music.

It's one thing to point actually, Diane; that first Messiah concert which launched the New York City renaissance project, happened in the context of this racial tension that was heating

up in New York at that time. So, this still is a very important aspect of addressing that.

SARE: I just wanted to add one quick thing on that note;

which is a musical question actually, if you think about a symphony orchestra or a chorus and the role that individuals play

as part of that body; where the whole is definitely greater than

the sum of its parts. Were we to launch a transformation of society along the lines of what Mrs. LaRouche outlined in Peru;

that is, the US to become integrated in part of the Belt and Road

program, then I think we would quickly discover that we actually

don't have enough people in this country. So that all the things

that people are afraid about, about who's going to be excluded,

who's going to be deported, etc.; you will find yourself looking

at your fellow human beings with new eyes because of the creative

potential of each individual which will be necessary to

transform

the nation and the world in the immediate future.

OGDEN: Ben was just referencing some of Mr. LaRouche's early writings on economics which really get to the question of how do you measure productivity. This is not just raw labor power; this is not just the number of jobs. But it is the question of generation upon generation, can you produce more than is consumed? But can you do it in a way where the power of the human species actually is transformed almost as a species characteristic, step by step? I've found it very inspiring that during those opening remarks that we played by Helga, she went back to the discussion of what we used to call the isotope economy. What power can mankind wield if we penetrate not just to the molecular level, but to the very atomic level? Fission power is breaking apart the atom; fusion is an entirely different matter, where you actually have the ability to create new elements. You have the ability to create new isotopes of any given elements, which have very differing characteristics. It's the promise of Promethean fire, which mankind has been working towards over millennia; but we have not yet achieved. This is an inspiring subject, but the ability of mankind to wield power at the very basic level of the fabric of matter; that's an entirely new power.

DENISTON: Yeah, and it's a huge subject that could be

probably taken up in much more detail. It really goes to the question of what is a resource? What do we consider as a resource; and how that continually changes as mankind develops.

Once you go to this level of an isotope conception of resources,

we don't use up isotopes. When you use petroleum or wood, anything you use – unless you're actually doing fission and fusion, when the total amount of matter you're working with is very small – you're not actually destroying the elements themselves. You might be acting on a state of organization that's been created. We might be looking for certain states of

organization to utilize the properties of that as a resource at a

certain point. But I think this goes right to the issue of the

isotope economy, the intimate connection with energy flux density

where we could begin to create those states of organization ourselves; or work with lower states of quality of concentrations

of ores and various things. Where things that were not economical before to do, or not even possible to do before; if you get a higher energy flux density, a higher energy throughput,

you can begin to manage in a completely new way. Separating the

quality of resource elements that we want; organizing them in new

ways.

Helga mentioned this very exciting prospect that's been

talked about to some degree for years of this fusion torch idea.

That you could take stuff that now is just trash, trash is fundamentally everything we use; that's why it's our trash.

It was something that we were using that was useful to us. Now, we might have degraded it in some way and put it in a landfill; but the fundamental constituents of what made it useful are still there. So, it's not inconceivable to think of mankind progressing to a point where we could reprocess even these landfills. That might be a little ways away; there will be some steps along the way to get there. But those are the kinds of complete transformations in what mankind can do to recreate the cycles of productivity that support, again, larger populations at higher living standards; and really going in the opposite direction than we've been going in for decades.

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

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

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

ROGERS: Yeah, it's also important to note that as Mr. LaRouche said, in the calling for the implementation and enactment of the Four Laws that he's put on the table as an urgent necessity, Glass-Steagall being the first and urgently needed measure, is not an option or a compromise with the Wall Street bankers. He indicated that it has to be the Franklin Roosevelt; and it can't be a watered-down Dodd-Frank compromise or anything of that nature. There's only one way you're going to

wipe out this casino economy, Wall Street speculation; and I think that goes the same for the measures needed with the development of the types of density and increase in energy source and fusion economy as Mr. LaRouche is calling for. There's a lot of compromise out there about that, too. "Fusion is a long way away; it's never going to happen. The politicians aren't going to let it happen." All of this stuff.

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

Once again, the point was, a lot of people want to compromise on these things. There cannot be compromise because

there is a global shift underway; and that global shift is requiring an increase in the highest levels of scientific development that has to be implemented immediately. This is why

Mr. LaRouche's fourth law in terms of fusion driver program, is

something that – just like Glass-Steagall – cannot be compromised on; and is absolutely fundamental for pushing forth

the breakthroughs which are necessary.

OGDEN: Well, that was Helga LaRouche's point during the

opening segment that we played today; that it is incumbent on all

the activists, all the viewers of this broadcast, to master the

contents of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. This might seem

like a short document, but it's a very dense document; and a lot

of the subjects that Ben has brought up here today in terms of the definition of economic productivity and what the nature of mankind is. Kesha, what you were saying; there really are no limits to growth. This is not some kind of thing, where when we

reach our carrying capacity, that will be it. It's mankind transforming its own species; transforming the universe, and transforming our relationship to the universe. That's what's addressed in this policy document by Lyndon LaRouche. You have

to set the bar that high; it cannot be any lower than that level

from which you're going to effect the kind of revolution in policy that's necessary for the entire planet at this time.

So, we have a lot of work to do. The Congress was only in

session for a day and a half this week. But what that means, is that they are back in their districts; and I'm telling you, it's not going to be like business as usual. This is not what the conditions were before this election. It's all the more important to think from the standpoint of what Diane was mentioning in the beginning of the show: Our role is – and has always been – to shape the institution of government of the United States from the very highest level. This is not coming in from the outside; this is not a voice calling in the darkness. This is working with the leadership of the nations of the planet and creating the dynamic that you now see taking over. This has been decades in the making; but I can guarantee you, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played a role that has been central to this reality now coming into being. I'm talking about the New Silk Road; I'm talking about this trilateral relationship between Russia, China, and India, creating a new dynamic on the Eurasian continent. Everything that's happening in South America right now is something that Lyndon LaRouche was personally involved in over decades; and now South America coming into the New Silk Road and joining this new World Land-Bridge is something that is very real.

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

the
present tense for a reason.

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

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

DENISTON: We want high productivity, and it doesn't
mean
that.

OGDEN: You'll turn out like Gary Johnson and have an
"Aleppo moment".
OK. We'll take that as a concluding point here. Please stay
tuned. We will make the full speech that Helga delivered in
Peru
available. The audio at least, or maybe the video. There was
also a very productive dialogue that occurred with the
participants of that meeting with Helga, following her keynote
speech. So, that's an important thing to stay tuned for.
Also,
we will be producing a feature video – about 10 or 15 minutes
in
length – on the content of the Four New Laws. That fleshes
out
some of the Hamiltonian aspect of that; and it's an
educational
tool to teach yourself and to teach everybody else real
economics. So stay tuned for that; that will be coming to the
website soon.

Thank you for watching; please subscribe to our
YouTube
channel and our daily email updates. All of the information

is

available in the description of this video available below the video in the YouTube player. Thank you and we'll talk to you soon. Stay tuned.

Global betydning af diskussion mellem Putin og Trump

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

Rapporten over mødet fra Trumps kontor lød som følger:

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

Den nyvalgte præsident Trump bemærkede over for præsident Putin, at han ser meget frem til at få en stærk og holdbar

relation med Rusland og det russiske folk.«

Den russiske præsidents kontor udstedte denne kommentar:

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

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

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

Rumforskning og klassisk kultur

– vi må genoprette den degeneration hos det amerikanske folk, der har fundet sted under Bush og Obama


Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 17. november, 2016 – I hele nationen, og i hele verden, træder ledende personer nu frem for at fastslå det potentiale, der nu præsenteres for USA og verden, for at gøre en ende på den død og ødelæggelse, der er blevet gennemtvunget under administrationerne Bush og Obama. General Harald Kujat, tidligere stabschef for det tyske Bundeswehr, har påpeget de drastisk forbedrede relationer mellem USA og Rusland, som Trump og Putin har sat i gang som grundlaget – og det eneste grundlag – for at løse de uhyrlige kriser i Ukraine og Syrien. Tidligere amerikanske ambassadør Chas Freeman, der også tidligere har været viceforsvarsminister, sagde i et interview med Ron Paul, at Trump »bør erindre sig, at han grundlæggende set har anført en revolution – han anførte en flok mennesker, som Hillary Clinton kaldte ynkelige, til at komme ud til stemmeurnerne og markere deres afvisning af 'politik som hidtil' i Washington, og til den rent ud sagt degenererede atmosfære i vores politiske kultur«. Han roste Trumps stærke insistensen på, at USA må gå sammen med Rusland og fokusere på at knuse ISIS i Syrien snarere end at vælte Assad for regimeskift i Syrien og tilføjede, at det var »rent ud sagt vanvittigt, at USA prætenderer, at vi har absolut fortrinsret i havene ud for Kina på ubestemt tid«

Fremkaldt af valgchokket er en politisk følsomhed ved at overvinde den amerikanske befolknings og de europæiske befolkningers accept af ledere, der sanseløst dræber hundreder af tusinder af mennesker og ødelægger hele nationer samtidig med, at de fordriver millioner fra deres hjem som flygtninge.

Men, hvad er da årsagen til denne tidligere blinde accept af sådan ondskab? Den må fastslås som værende lokaliseret i befolkningernes degenererede intellekt, i ødelæggelsen af de menneskelige, skabende evner hos folk, der i to årtier har været underkastet et kulturelt forfald. Når troen på menneskets videnskabelige evne til at »underlægge sig hele naturen«, både på Jorden og i Universet, fordømmes af 'de grønne' som en ødelæggelse af Moder Jord, og underholdning reduceres til narkotika, vold og perversionser; når skøn musik erstattes af pulserende støj – da er det muligt at overbevise folkeslagene om at lukke deres øjne for den rædsel, der begås i deres navn.

Nu er disse sind ved at blive vækket, både gennem den økonomiske ødelæggelse af deres liv, og gennem den revolutionerende ændring via valget, der giver et glimt af håb.

Som Lyndon LaRouche har sagt i mere end fyrre år, så er det i et sådant skæbnesvangert øjeblik i historien, at den optimistiske tro på menneskehedens potentiale for fremskridt kan og må genoprettes og sikre en fremtid for alle mænd og kvinder på vores planet, gennem videnskabelige fremskridt, der løfter vort blik mod stjernerne, og gennem skønheden i klassisk kunst og musik, »ved hvilken man kommer til frihed«, som Friedrich Schiller sagde.

Frihed, fra City of Londons og Wall Streets destruktive magt over de vestlige regeringer, er nu inden for rækkevidde i takt med, at parlamentarikere, slagte af forbløffelse, i Europa og USA konfronteres med det eneste alternativ til det bankerotte, vestlige finanssystems ukontrollable kollaps: en 

Glass/Steagall-reform for at lukke de for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-spillebuler på Wall Street ned, og med en kreditpolitik i Hamiltons tradition, med princippet om national, dvs. statslig, bankpraksis til genrejsning af økonomien, rumprogrammet, videnskabelig forskning og internationalt samarbejde omkring nationsopbygning i hele verden, hvor den Nye Silkevej bringes til hele menneskeheden. (LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love til USA's – og verdens – omgående redning.)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYvdB5j1Flk>

Helga Zepp-LaRouche diskuterer strategi med aktivister fra LaRouchePAC, der er på vej til Washington, D.C., hvor hun understreger, at Trumps sejr og Clintons nederlag må ses som en del af et internationalt kursskifte. Det er nu op til os at sætte dagsordenen, begyndende med LaRouches Fire Love i traditionen efter Hamilton.

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

Det, der i virkeligheden finder sted rent strategisk, er, at befolkningsmasserne i den transatlantiske sektor – i Europa, og i USA i særdeleshed – nu virkelig har fået nok af et Establishment, der vedvarende har handlet imod deres interesser. Det, de kalder »overløberstaterne« – menneskene i disse stater er ikke repræsenteret af det transatlantiske etablissement. Dette ved de, fordi, for dem, er livs- og arbejdsvilkårene i løbet af det seneste årti, kan man sige, men i realiteten i løbet af de seneste 50 år, kun blevet værre og værre. Folk er nødt til at have flere jobs samtidig for at få økonomien til at hænge sammen. Der har været mange

tilfælde, hvor deres sønner, og undertiden endda deres døtre, er blevet udsendt til Irak fem gange i træk og er kommet hjem, totalt nedbrudte. Så folk har oplevet, at livet bare bliver værre for dem, og at de med Washington/New York-etablissementet intet håb har.

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

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

Trumps valgsejr er selvsagt et åbent spørgsmål, for det står endnu ikke klart, hvad hans præsidentskab vil blive for ét; men, som Lyndon LaRouche har understreget næsten hver dag siden valget, så er dette ikke et lokalt, amerikansk anliggende. Dette er et globalt anliggende; det er et internationalt spørgsmål.

En af de væsentligste grunde til, at Trump vandt valget, er, at han, især i den seneste fase, havde understreget, at Hillary Clinton ville betyde Tredje Verdenskrig pga. hendes politik for Syrien, fordi hun ... foreslog en frontal

konfrontation med Rusland. Det var præcist at ramme hovedet på sømmet, for vi befinder os på en meget, meget farlig kurs for konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.

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

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

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

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

lobbyvirksomhed.

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

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

Så det repræsenterer et gigantisk, teknologisk spring. Det samme gælder for rumfartsteknologi, for det vil få samme virkning som under Apolloprogrammet, hvor hver investering i rumteknologi, i raketter, i andre nye materialer, gav 14 cents tilbage for hver cent, der blev investeret. Og alt fra computerchips til Teflon-køkkengrej, og alle mulige gavnlige resultater, opstod som biprodukter af rumforskning.

Og for at få verdensøkonomien ud af den nuværende tilstand, især i den transatlantiske sektor, må man have denne form for kursomlægning i retning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk

fremskridt og en forøgelse af **energigennemstrømningstæthed**. Og hele denne Grønne ideologi – som i virkeligheden er en ikke-udviklingsideologi – må erstattes; og verden må komme tilbage til den kurs, hvor det fysiske univers' virkelige, fysiske love er kriteriet for sandheden, og ikke en eller anden ideologi.«

Foto: Besætningen fra ekspedition 49, Shane Kimbrough, NASA-astronaut, sammen med Roscosmos-kosmonauterne Sergej Ryzhikov og Andrej Borisenko, og som alle i øjeblikket befinder sig om bord på den Internationale Rumstation, hvor de har arbejdet sammen i over fire måneder i kredsløb. [foto: NASA]

Bashar al-Assad: Trump kunne blive Syriens naturlige allierede, hvis han gør alvor af sit løfte om at nedkæmpe terrorisme

16. nov., 2016 – Den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad sagde i går i et interview til Portugals RTP statslige Tv-station, at USA's nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump vil blive en »naturlig allieret«, hvis han gør alvor af sit løfte om at nedkæmpe »terrorister«, iflg. en iransk Tv-nyhedsrapportering samme dag, som rapporterede om Assad-interviewet.

Assad uddybede: »Vi kan ikke sige noget om, hvad han vil gøre, men hvis ... han vil bekæmpe terroristerne, vil vi selvfølgelig blive allierede, en naturlig allieret i denne henseende med russerne, med iranerne og med mange andre lande.«

Assad sagde, at han bød Trumps kampagneløfte velkomment, om, at USA skulle fokusere mere på at bekæmpe Daesh (ISIS) terrorgruppen. Selv om Trumps kampagneløfte var lovende, spurgte Assad: »Kan han levere? Hvad med de udlignende kræfter i administrationen og massenyhedsmedierne, der var imod ham? Hvordan kan han håndtere dette?«

Assad tilføjede: »Det er derfor, vi er meget forsigtige med at vurdere ham, især, da han ikke tidligere har haft en politisk position.«

Nyheden rapporterede ligeledes, at, i et interview i marts måned, sagde Trump, at USA's »fremgangsmåde med at bekæmpe Assad og Daesh samtidigt var vanvid, idioti. Man kan ikke bekæmpe to mennesker, de bekæmper hinanden indbyrdes, og bekæmpe dem samtidigt. Man må vælge den ene eller den anden«.

Foto: Syriens præsident, Bashar al-Assad.

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

Syrien

16. nov., 2016 – *Washington Times* rapporterede i går, at den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump overvejer at genoplive planen om fælles militære operationer med Rusland imod al-Nusra-terrorgruppen. Udenrigsministrene for USA og Rusland, hhv. John Kerry og Sergej Lavrov, havde udarbejdet aftalen sidste september efter måneders forhandling, men den blev næsten omgående saboteret af forsvarsminister Ash Carters Pentagon med bombardementet af syriske tropper i det østlige Syrien mindre end en uge efter, at aftalen trådte i kraft.

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

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

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

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

revidere den eller fuldstændig skrotte den«.

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