

Trumps Glass-Steagall kom fra bankfolk, der er forpligtet over for realøkonomi

6. nov., 2016 – Donald Trumps krav om, at »tiden er kommet til en Glass/Steagall-lov for det 21. århundrede«, som han erklærede i sin tale i Charlotte den 26. okt., har dybere rødder i den side af det amerikanske banksystem, der er forpligtet over for forøget produktion gennem lån til varefremstilling, landbrug og infrastruktur. Dette omfatter tusinder af sparekasser i lokalsamfundene, der er imod Wall Streets kasinoøkonomi.

Disse kræfter kom sammen i Huntington Konventionscenter i Cleveland, Ohio, den 11. juli 2016, for at indsætte Glass-Steagall i Republikanernes partiprogram, forud for Republikanernes Nationale Konvent den 18. – 21. juli. Klummeskriveren John Gizzi afslørede i en artikel i *Newsmax* den 12. juli, med overskriften, »Hvorfor er Bernie Sanders' favoritlovgivning i GOP[1]-partiprogram?«, »Under en samling i Huntington Konvent Center i Cleveland [den 11. juli], vedtog GOP Programkomiteens Underkomite for Reform af Regeringen at i partiets program inkludere en genindførelse af Glass-Steagalls milepæls-lovgivning, der separerer risikabel handel og investering fra traditionelle bankaktiviteter, såsom udlån til erhvervslivet og finansiering til forbrug, efter loven blev vedtaget i 1933.«

Gizzi understregede, »Med hensyn til ... hvordan Glass-Steagall fandt vej til det Republikanske partiprogram, så talte jeg med drivkraften bag dette i GOP. John Lynch, medlem af programkomiteen fra Illinois og tidl. præsident for First Midwest Bank i Chicago, mindede om, at 'Glass-Steagall altid har været den mur, der holdt almindelige bankaktiviteter (dvs., indskudskonti, lån til forbrugere, kreditkort og øvrige

tjenesteydelser til borgerne, -red.), bort fra aktiviteter med stor risiko. Bill Clinton nedbrød denne mur, da han underskrev lovens ophævelse i 1999'.« Gizzi fortsatte med at citere Lynch med, at ophævelsen af Glass-Steagall »eksponerede almindelig bankaktivitet til højere risici i takt med, at visse personer søgte at tjene så mange penge som muligt«.

Lynch havde flere årtiers erfaring som ansat og dernæst i overordnede funktioner i regionale banker i Midtvesten. Han forfremmedes til at blive præsident for Midwest Bank i Illinois, der nu er en lokal bank med aktiver for \$11 mia., med afdelinger i Illinois, Indiana og Iowa.

I sin biografi på LinkedIn nævner Lynch, en stærk tilhænger af Trump, blandt sine udgivelser, »2016 GOP-programmet for Genindførelse af Tillæg til Glass/Steagall-loven af 1933«, som han med sine egne ord definerer som:

»Med det formål at forhindre endnu et sammenbrud af USA's banksystem og en stor recession eller depression, foreslår jeg at genindføre Glass/Steagall-loven af 1933, der blev vedtaget som respons til 5.000 bankers konkurs og den Store Depression, og som forbød kommercielle banker at være engageret i højrisiko-investeringsbankaktivitet, forsikring og anden ikke-bankforretning. Loven blev ophævet under præsident Clinton i 1999 på anmodning fra Citibank og førte sluttelig til finanskollapset i 2008 og en recession, så vel som også til en bailout (statslig bankredning), betalt af skatteborgerne ... Uærlige Hillary ville ganske afgjort stemme imod mit forslag, fordi hun 'ejes' af storbankerne på Wall Street.«

Inden for en uge, den 20. juli, havde et ophidset *American Banker Magazine* en forsidehistorie, »Er Trump de lokale sparekassers kandidat?«

LaRouche-bevægelsens mangeårige, urokkelige kamp for genindførelsen af Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall har skabt kraften og sammenhængen for, at Lynch og andre offentligt kan

fremsætte dette forslag. Dette går langt videre end til Trump, som grundlaget for at vedtage **LaRouches Fire Love** til at igangsætte, og på revolutionerende vis transformere, USA's og verdens økonomi.

Foto: Roosevelt, 1933.

[1] GOP = Grand Old Party; Det Republikanske Parti.

Hun er et falsum! Dø for Hillarys Wall Street, eller vind med LaRouche

4. november, 2016 – Hillarys præsidentkampagne er et intetsigende falsum. Hun satsede sin kampagne på Obamas sataniske arv, først og fremmest ved sin direkte afvisning af Glass-Steagall, især efter, at hun blev udfordret af LaRouche-aktivist Daniel Burke under en tale om sin økonomiske politik ved New School i New York City i juli måned, 2015, hvor hun var for fej til blot så meget som at tale om spørgsmålet.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**I Hamiltons fodspor:
»LaRouches Fire Love for
global,
økonomisk genrejsning
og civilisationens vækst«
Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche;
Tale til Schiller
Instituttets
konference den 29. okt.
i Manhattan, New York**

Men det andet område må komme fra en bevidst beslutning om, at verden behøver et nyt paradigme; at, hvis vi forbliver inden for rammerne af det nuværende paradigmes aksiomer, med geopolitik og globalisering, så mener jeg ikke, at vi kan løse det. Det, vi må gøre, er at skabe en renæssance, en kulturel renæssance, der udgår fra den idé, at mennesket ikke er et dyr, og at, selv om mange mennesker i øjeblikket opfører sig på en dyrisk måde, så er mennesket den eneste skabning, eller den eneste art, der er i stand til at overvinde enhver begrænsning af sit eget intellekt og af teknologiske vanskeligheder. Hvad som helst, menneskeheden ønsker at takle, kan den gøre.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Historien elsker paradokser

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. november, 2016 – Mellem oktober og begyndelsen af november er der opstået et stort paradoks i USA. På den ene side hører vi om millioner af amerikanere, der føler afsky, og endda fortvivlelse, over præsidentkampagnen og kandidaterne. Men samtidig er der en mærkbar forudanelse i nationen om, at den tid ikke er langt væk, hvor Amerika vil blive i stand til at vende sin opmærksomhed på, og sætte alle sine bestræbelser ind på, det »menneskelige, personlige og sociale livs positivt bekræftende mål og behov« – uden at se sig tilbage til Obama/Bush-årenes sorg og skam.

Man havde sandsynligvis aldrig forventet dette, og man kan måske ikke forklare det, men det er uomtvisteligt til stede, når man først har opfattet det. Det skyldes ikke kandidaterne eller kampagnerne – meget langt fra. Årsagen skal findes i selve den menneskelige ånd; årsagen er den »guddommelige gnist«, der findes i mennesket, og som taler gennem det håb, som så mange af vore borgere pludselig opdager, at de er fælles om – tilsyneladende på trods af alt det andet.

Percy Shelly forstod alt dette, da han skrev »Til forsvar for poesien« og andre værker. Det samme gjorde den tyske »Frihedens skjald«, Friedrich Schiller.

Er dette uventede håbets kildevæld i overensstemmelse med virkeligheden? Er muligheden virkelig til stede for en genfødsel af noget, der er endnu bedre end John Kennedys Amerika, der førte verden opad til udforskning af det grænseløse rum, og samtidig førte den mod overvindelse af fattigdom, underudvikling og krig på Jorden? Svaret må blive, ja: dette håb har gyldighed; det bedrager dig ikke. Hvorfor dette er sandt, er et dybtgående spørgsmål – men svaret kan

hurtigt opsummeres ved at bemærke, at lovene for det menneskelige, skabende intellekt, dvs., lovene, som skabes af vores fornuft, er lig lovene for universet.

Der findes ingen garantier; og det vil kræve en enorm, koordineret moralsk og intellektuel indsats, der kan sammenlignes med total krig, men muligheden er til stede, på dette sene tidspunkt, for at redde vores nation.

En vigtig del af omstændighederne for forandringen af vore borgeres mentalitet har været det i sandhed heroiske lederskab, som Ruslands præsident Putin har udvist (uanset, hvad Hillary Clinton måtte sige), og som Kinas lederskab har udvist. De har ført deres nationer op af mudderet og imod stjernerne i vores levetid. Rusland var et forlist vrage efter de såkaldte »reformer« i 1990'erne; se, hvor landet nu er. Kina har løftet 800 mio. af sine borgere ud af fattigdom. Men de kommanderer ikke rundt med andre eller aspirerer til eneherredømme; i stedet tilstræber de samarbejde, på basis af ligeværdighed. Kinas internationale forslag om den Nye Silkevej er en international udviklingsplan, tolv gange så stor som Marshallplanen, og i hvilken der deltager 70 nationer, og med flere, som fremover vil deltage. Og, uden Putins rolle, ville der ikke være noget håb om at undertrykke den terrorisme, som Barack Obama har næret i Mellemøsten, med hjælp fra Hillary Clinton.

Et kritisk element i skabelsen af den nuværende bølge af håb blandt amerikanere, og som vil være nødvendigt for dens succes, er Lyndon LaRouches to år gamle »Manhattan-projekt«. Gennem Manhattan har LaRouche inspireret nøglenetværk i hele nationen, på vegne af de oprindelige principper, på hvilke Manhattans Alexander Hamilton skabte vor nation, og som nu kommer til fornyet udtryk i LaRouches »Fire Love«. Kort beskrevet, så omfatter disse love en genindførelse af Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov; skabelsen af en ny De forenede Staters Bank; en politik for statskredit, der er helliget en forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktivitet; samt et forceret

program for at opnå kontrolleret fusionskraft, med genoplivningen af NASA og USA's rumprogram, som Barack Obama har dræbt.

Til trods for, at ingen så meget som har påpeget, at denne nye, nationale stemning eksisterer, så responderede kandidat Donald Trump ikke desto mindre til den, på sin egen måde, i slutningen af oktober, da han offentligt støttede Glass-Steagall og krævede en genoplivning af NASA og dets forpligtende engagement for udforskning af rummet. Han påpegede også, at en præsident Hillary Clinton ville lancere Tredje Verdenskrig imod Rusland, som Lyndon LaRouche længe har vist.

Vi påpeger dette pga. dets klare relevans; men man må aldrig tro, at det, at trække i håndtaget til fordel for én kandidat, vil redde vor nation på dette fremskredne tidspunkt; det vil det ikke. Dette uforklarlige håb, som du, sammen med så mange andre, pludselig har følt, er en indre hvisken, der ansporer dig til at gøre det, du må gøre; der kommer måske ikke en ny chance.

Foto: Statue af Alexander Hamilton (1755/57 – 1804), USA's første finansminister, foran U.S. Treasury (USA's Finansministerium).

**Vi må genoplive et sandt USA.
Der har aldrig været et
større øjeblik til at udvikle**

LaRouches ideer.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 4. nov., 2016; Leder

Matthew Ogden: Jeg tror, vi helt bestemt kan sige, at vi befinder os i en meget farlig, men afgørende periode i vores historie lige nu; både nationalt og internationalt. Tiden efter valget, der finder sted næste tirsdag, vil fordre et meget fattet, klart og sobert lederskab, som kun LaRouchePAC kan yde. Jeg tror, at vi nu ser den rolle, vi har kunnet skabe; og faktum er, at, umiddelbart efter valget, må vi have en hastedebat i USA's Kongres med en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall, som det første hasteskridt. Det afgørende, første skridt i et helt økonomisk genrejsningsprogram, som må indføres i USA; og der må gribes til afgørende handling for at forhindre præsident Obama i at lancere Tredje Verdenskrig i de sidste uger af hans embedstid.

Tidligere sagde Diane [Sare] – jeg citerer kort og lader hende selv sige lidt mere; men, under en diskussion med hr. og fr. LaRouche kom et meget vigtigt punkt frem. Der er en masse såkaldt »analyse« og propaganda derude i nyhedsmedierne og andetsteds, der siger, at det amerikanske folk er mere splittet end nogensinde tidligere som nation, osv., osv. Men sandheden er, at det amerikanske folk faktisk er mere forenet end nogensinde før, omkring disse to afgørende hovedspørgsmål: den omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og nedlukning af Wall Street; og forhindring af atomkrig, at forhindre, at Obama starter Tredje Verdenskrig. Dette skyldes naturligvis ikke mindst LaRouchePAC's vedvarende indsats i løbet af de seneste år; men hovedsagligt koncentreret i de seneste måneder med det, vi har kunnet katalysere fra vores base i New York City, i Manhattan.

Lad mig blot nævne to ting, som jeg mener, demonstrerer denne

pointe meget klart. Der var en ny opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort i begyndelsen af ugen, og som sagde, at, i nøgle-kampstaterne, må-vinde-staterne – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina og Florida, og et par andre stater – sagde 70 % af de sandsynlige vælgere, der blev spurgt, at Glass-Steagall, med navns nævnelse, var en nødvendighed. De var tilhængere af Glass-Steagall. 68 % sagde, at de var tilhængere af at bryde Wall Street-bankerne op. Dernæst sagde en anden opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort tidligere på ugen – foretaget af Marylands Universitet – at 2/3 af amerikanerne, inklusive 65 % af Demokraterne, ønsker mere samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland; især mht. at løse krisen i Syrien. Det taler netop om den pointe, som du, Diane, fastslog. Men hvad der fortsat er klart, er, at det afgørende program fortsat er LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love; baseret direkte på de principper, som Alexander Hamilton brugte til at opbygge USA. Vi kan inspireres og modellere det, vi må gøre i dette land i løbet af de kommende uger og måneder, ud fra det, der finder sted med et nyt paradigme, der foregår i hele verden i andre lande, inklusive i Kina. Vi har eksempler, som Jason Ross vil gennemgå; meget solide, konkrete eksempler på, hvad man har gjort i Egypten for at bygge den nye Suezkanal, og i andre lande. Det vil Jason Ross fremlægge lidt om senere i udsendelsen; baseret på en præsentation for det Amerikanske Selskab af Civilingeniørers afdeling i New York City for et par uger siden.s

Lad os begynde diskussion herfra.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet, er dagens leder fra LaRouchePAC:

WE'VE GOT TO REVIVE A TRUE UNITED STATES.
THERE'S NEVER BEEN A GREATER MOMENT
TO DEVELOP LAROCHE'S IDEAS.

International Webcast, Nov. 4, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's November 4, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden; and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined

in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science

Team; and via video, by two members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee: Diane Sare, joining us from New York City; and Michael

Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California.

Now, I think it can be said very definitively that we are in

an extremely dangerous but decisive period in our history right

now; both nationally and internationally. The aftermath of this

election coming up next Tuesday is going to require very calm, clear, and sober leadership which only LaRouche PAC can provide.

I think what we're seeing right now is the role that we've been

able to leverage; and the fact is, that immediately following this election, an emergency debate will have to take place inside

the United States Congress with a vote scheduled promptly on Glass-Steagall as the emergency first step. The critical first

step in an entire recovery program that must be instituted in the

United States; and decisive action must be taken to prevent President Obama from launching World War III in the remaining weeks that he has in office.

Now, Diane said earlier – which I just want to cite and let

her say a little bit more on; but during a discussion we had with

Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, a very important point [came up].

There's

a lot of so-called "analysis" and propaganda out there in the news media and elsewhere, saying that the American people are more divided than they've ever been as a nation, etc., etc.

But

in truth, in fact, the American people are more united than perhaps they've ever been around these two key critical issues:

the immediate passage of Glass-Steagall, shutting down Wall Street; and preventing thermonuclear war, preventing Obama from

starting World War III. This is obviously due in no small part

to the consistent efforts of LaRouche PAC over the recent number

of years; but focussed mainly over the recent number of months with what we've been able to catalyze from our base in New York

City, in Manhattan.

Let me just cite two quick things that I think demonstrate

this point very clearly. There was a new poll that came out at

the beginning of this week that said that in the key battleground

states, the must-win states – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, a couple of other states – 70% of the likely voters polled said that Glass-Steagall by name was a necessity. They were in support of Glass-Steagall. 68% said that they were in support of breaking up the Wall Street banks. Then another poll

that came out earlier this week – this one done by the University of Maryland – said that 2/3 of Americans, including 65% of Democrats, want more cooperation between the United

States

and Russia; particularly having to do with resolving the crisis

in Syria. So, I think that speaks exactly to the point that Diane, you were making. But what remains clear, is the critical

program remains LaRouche's Four Economic Laws; based directly on

the principles that Alexander Hamilton used to build the United

States. We can be inspired and model what we have to do in this

country over the coming weeks and months off of what is happening

with a new paradigm happening around the world in other

countries, including China. We have examples that Jason Ross is

going to go through; very solid, concrete examples of what's been

done in Egypt to build the new Suez Canal, and others. So, Jason

will present some of that a little bit later in the show; based

off of a presentation that he made to the American Society of Civil Engineers chapter in New York City a couple of weeks back.

But let me just leave it at that; and I think we can start the discussion from there.

DIANE SARE: Well, I was – as often I am – was inspired by

the local morning news; which both the local New Jersey paper I

get and the {New York Times} had these articles as Matt said

about how divided the population was. The truth of the matter

is, the population is not divided. People are divided over

which

candidate they hate more; and people have enormous hatred for Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. In that regard, I just have to

say that Hillary Clinton – who is the continuation of the Bush/Obama legacy and is a total stooge of the British Empire, George Soros, and everything that represents – and is putting us

on a trajectory for war with Russia; she absolutely has to be stopped. And Obama absolutely has to be thrown out of the White

House; and if that could have happened yesterday, that would have

been excellent. And we do have the Congress coming in the week

after the election. But it's not as if the American people don't

realize that their standard of living has completely collapsed,

particularly in the last 15 years. There is enormous rage at Wall Street; where I think there was another poll where something

over 90% or 94% said that Wall Street bankers should be put in jail. So, the American people are very unified that they think

that the people who actually destroyed the US economy, which is

not – as we're so often told by the Wall Street bankers and billionaires, just as in the time preceding Franklin Roosevelt

–

that the people who caused the depression were all those unemployed working class people. The people who caused this are

the people who run these financial institutions – like the CEO of Wells Fargo, like George Soros; like the people who were behind the assassination of Herrhausen and then took over Deutsche Bank and turned it into a disaster. These people are

responsible for this, and they should be punished in a way that would begin to restore confidence to people that there was justice.

It is also the case that the majority of Americans are tired of war. We have been in perpetual war frankly since the reunification of Germany – which was the intent; but particularly since September 11th. I think people can reflect on what happened with the override of Obama's veto on JASTA; the vote against Obama was 97-1. I would say that's a pretty strongly unified Senate against the Saudi role in terrorism and the cover-up. Whatever occurs on Tuesday and Wednesday, the potential following that is going to be extraordinary for us to pull the nation together and demand that the policy – starting with LaRouche's Four Laws – which is Glass-Steagall and emphatically a system of national banking and credit that allows us to fund the things that are on the most advanced scientific levels. That is, our nation can pull itself together and do this; and it is not going to be a period where people just doze off, because as I said, everyone hates both of the candidates so intensely that no one will feel safe giving them a grace period to see what they do.

So, I think everyone who is watching this, should mobilize; inform yourself of the program, study the material on the larouchepac.com site, and presume that 90% or more of your neighbors on what has to be done to save the nation, and that that's the direction in which we can move.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think there's been a number of cases where people have gone out to the American people and found out what's

actually out there. This is an undeniable characteristic.

70%

to 80% of the American people agree fundamentally on that; and they also agree that our political establishment – the people who have been run by Wall Street, by this war policy – are bankrupt. There is no trust or commitment towards their ability

to lead the country; that's why you saw such an upsurge in support for populist candidates like Sanders or Trump. And that's why this Hamilton conception – and it stands out more and

more as we get deeper and deeper into this kind of crisis, and closer and closer to where a decision has to be made to address

it – what Mr. LaRouche did on the question of Hamilton.

Because

Hamilton really captures this as an essence of the unification of

the American people around a conception. Hamilton's politics, Hamilton's economic policy recognized the very clear necessity of

every person in the country. Hamilton, as any real economist would, recognized that we had a deficiency of people; we need more immigration, we needed more diversity. We needed different

people from different backgrounds. That's how an actual nation

thrives and functions; there's that commitment.

I think probably the best example we have today on the planet is what you saw from Vladimir Putin's leadership.

Because

Putin came in, he was dedicated to the Russian people; there were

a lot of factions, a lot of anger, a lot of resentment towards

what had happened in Russia. And Putin's commitment – as was Hamilton's, as is Lyn's and is our organization's – is a commitment to the entire development of the entire nation and all of its people. That's what we have to have; you're not going to find – no candidate right now is going to be perfect. That's pretty clear I think to every American. But is there a devotion, a deeper one? What we've referenced in people like Joan of Arc; or what you saw in examples of Abraham Lincoln? Lincoln captured that same Hamilton almost to a deep, profound spiritual commitment to the people of the United States; all of them. There was "malice towards none". That we're going to take the entire population of our country and develop it in a very rapid capability. Any executive, any Presidency that comes in today – and one must – that adopts these programs; the Glass-Steagall, the basic Hamilton Four Laws that Lyn has put forward; our collaboration with Russia on the terrorism question, with China on the economic question will easily gain the favor and support of 70% to 80% if not more of the American people.

I think the one thing that stands out – because we raised this question to Mr. LaRouche over a year ago in discussion. What he raised I think is worth raising here, and I think we can discuss it more. Why do the American people then think there is this separation? How can they be easily deceived into thinking this separation exists? It's because of the attack on the

human
mind going back to the early 20th Century. They took the
human
mind and said, actually there's two different kinds of human
minds. Some people have a left mind and some people have a
right
mind; some people have a math mind, some people have a poetry
mind. They attacked the actual characteristic of human
identity;
that underlying, unifying creative characteristic that makes
us
human. They separated it out into styles and to niches and
categories. Once you have that, you then have all of a
sudden,
people identifying in different factions or categories of
society
based on the way they think their mind works versus the way
somebody else's mind works. That's where you get the
scientific
flaw; that's the fraud. That was the fraud of Bertrand
Russell;
that was the power of the creative genius of Hamilton, or of
Einstein, or of Lyn to recognize the human mind is a universal
characteristic. That's the basis of economics; that's the
basis
of a nation or a political process. That really is the basis
of
real leadership; why Percy Shelley says the poets are the true
legislators of the world, because they identify that human
characteristic in human identity. I think is what is really
critical; that quality of leadership today with this kind of
crisis.

OGDEN: One thing I think, "with malice toward none"
and
with charity towards all; the sense of the development of the
entire nation was a devotion that Abraham Lincoln possessed.

But

the key word is development. When you look at the situation at

this point in the United States, after 15 years of a Bush-Cheney

and Obama policy, you have mass despair, desperation, anger, rage. Why did we reach the point now where we've got an election

which is unprecedented in history? Where you have drug addictions and drug overdoses that are unequalled in recent memory? Where you have no productive work for people to be engaged in? Now the working class is somehow defined as people

who are greeters at Walmart, or work at temporary jobs at Target?

This is not a working class; this is not a skilled labor force;

this is not a population that has a sense that their lives have

consequence, or meaning. I think if you look at the situation in

other countries where you've had real leadership in the recent years – at the same time that we've been suffering under the lack of leadership of the Obama administration – you've had other nations who have had leaders who have been devoted to the

development of their nations. And they took populations that were similarly desperate, demoralized, enraged; take a look at Egypt, for example – and have given them a sense of mission and

purpose. The accomplishments in Egypt, the accomplishments in China; lifting 700 million people out of poverty. The kind of radiation of optimism that has come from nations such as that, through this New Silk Road paradigm and otherwise; this is something which the American people are desperate for access to.

Perhaps they don't realize that that's the key, that's what

they

are seeking. But I'm sure that the expression of despair, demoralization, anger, and rage – the only antidote for that is

a commitment to the development of the nation, much in the way that Abraham Lincoln in his way, applied the principles of Alexander Hamilton and understood that that's how you bridge the

seemingly irreparable fault lines within a people. And that's how you bring people together again, with a sense of commitment

to building the future.

With that said, it would be critical for us to get a sense

of exactly, in detail, what are the particular ways in which that

kind of program could happen, with the commitment from the top,

within days, weeks, and months of a completely new paradigm and

new Presidency in the United States.

JASON ROSS: I've put together a few aids to thinking about this.

In particular, thinking about what the implementation of LaRouche's Four Laws look like. In discussing that, I also want

to think about this in terms of Hamilton. I'm very happy to say,

that Hamilton's four great economic writings, along with the Four

Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, will be available on Amazon {very soon}.

It's been submitted. It should only be a few more days. I'll be

reading some quotes from this.

Let's take a look at what an economic recovery would

look

like, using LaRouche's Four Laws. Let me read what LaRouche said

the remedy to the current situation is. LaRouche writes,

"The only location for the immediately necessary action

which could prevent such an immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S.

government's now immediate decision to institute four specific cardinal measures – measures which must be fully consistent with

the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, as

had been specified by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton

while in office. (1) Immediate reenactment of the Glass-Steagall

Law, instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without

modification as to principle of action. (2) A return to a system

of top-down, thoroughly defined national banking." Skipping ahead: "(3) The purpose of the use of a federal credit system, is

to generate high productivity trends in improvements in employment, with the accompanying intention to increase the physical economic productivity and standard of living of the persons and households of the United States." And "(4)", LaRouche

writes, "Adopt a fusion-driver 'crash program.' The essential distinction of man from all lower forms of life, is that it presents the means for the perfection of the specifically affirmative aims and needs of the human individual and social life."

Let's take a look through some of these Four Laws. The first

step is Glass-Steagall, which I'll just say a little bit

about.

This is something we've discussed frequently [laughs] and to great effect, I think, in our programs and on our website.

Take a look here. [Fig. 1] This is what percent of supposed

U.S. income, what percent of the value added in our GDP, comes from manufacturing – you see that there in blue—vs. "f.i.r.e.,"

which stands for finance, insurance, and real estate. For over 30

years now, the world of finance itself has {supposedly}, according to official thinking, contributed as much to U.S. productivity and economy, as has manufacturing. Flipping houses

– that kind of thing – is now as productive as manufacturing steel, or building things. It's crazy!

Over this period, [Fig. 2] – this is Lyndon LaRouche's Triple Curve, a pedagogical device that he had used to describe

the increase in monetary and financial aggregates, at the same time that the {physical} economic output of the economy was collapsing—something that we've been in a situation of for decades now.

What we need to do, then, is make it {possible} to be able

to finance a recovery. Alexander Hamilton, in his reports on public credit and the national bank and on its constitutionality,

describes the importance of banking. Banks can provide an essential function for the economy. They're not optional. They provide an essential useful function. Now, they're tied up, in a

way, where the potential of the banking sector is impossible right now, because they're involved in all sorts of speculation

and gambling. By implementing Glass-Steagall, we make it possible

for the banking sector to be able to play that useful role, while jailing and shutting down all of the people behind the caused collapse that's been created and the looting that's been taking place via Wall Street.

We've got a lot of very good recent editions to our website.

The Economics Frequently Asked Questions page at larouchepac.com/econ-facts. This addresses some of these questions that come up that {you} may have heard when talking to people about these things. [For example:] "If Glass-Steagall were still law, it wouldn't have stopped the crash of 2007-8." Are you sick of hearing that? Well, you can now just send people the explanations here. You don't really need to waste your time with it. It's very clear.

So, Glass-Steagall's the first step. Step 2 that Mr. LaRouche describes is national banking. This is definitely a more complex concept. I direct people, again, to the works of Alexander Hamilton on this, to get a sense from the beginning, of what it meant to have a national bank, or the role that banking could play in the nation. I'd point to the success of this approach under the administrations of Hamilton, of John Quincy Adams, of Lincoln, and of Franklin Roosevelt, who, in various ways, created the effect, if not in deed, national banking, through a facility for the promotion of credit and directing it in an economy.

One of the most horrific ideas that people have about how

economics works, is that you shouldn't try to direct anything; that government should always stay out; that the "invisible hand"

does everything in the best possible way. This is something that

Hamilton addresses very directly, countering the arguments of Adam Smith's {Wealth of Nations}, for example, in these reports.

Once we decide that we're going to have a national orientation, and actually choose a direction to go, the question

then is, how do we direct this credit in the direction of programs that are going to increase the energy-flux density?

How

then do we understand "energy-flux density?" This is an economics

concept that Mr. LaRouche has employed over the years in his understanding of economy.

We have to think about what is the basis of the transformation of the human species, over time, in a way that's

uncharacteristic of any other form of life. This chart of Population Growth Over the Historical Time Period [Fig. 3] is of

{human} population growth. It couldn't have been the growth of any animal species acting on its own. Animal species don't transform their relationship to nature. They can't discover principles. They might use a tool, like a stick, to do something,

or a rock. They don't use principles as tools.

The beginning of this, the real starting point for this for

us historically, certainly in Europe, or extended European civilization, is Prometheus, the Greek story of Prometheus, who

really created humanity. Before Prometheus, who, as the story goes, took fire from heaven and gave it to mankind, human

beings

were animals. Prometheus describes that when he saw mankind, we

were just animals. We had eyes to see (but we didn't understand);

we had ears, but we didn't understand anything. We lived like swarming ants. What did Prometheus do? He brought fire, he brought astronomy, he brought navigation, he brought beasts of burden, he brought sailing, he brought agriculture, he brought the calendar, he brought poetry, he brought written language, mathematics, science, knowledge, fire. What defines us as a species, as in this original story of the creation of the specifically human species, is this power of fire.

We now consider the different kinds of fire that have been

developed over historical time. Take a look at this [Fig. 4].

This is the Use of Different Forms of Energy over the History of

the United States. Two trends we can see here: (1) the Energy Used per Person has, overall, increased – although not at a uniform rate. It's not increasing now. The other thing that we can notice, is that (2) the Type of Fuel Used has changed, over

time. Wood has very niche applications at present, as a fuel. Wood is used for furniture, not for burning. Coal replaced the use of wood, saving forests, making it possible to not have to cut down all sorts of trees to make metals by making charcoal out

of the wood. Oil and natural gas supplanted the use of coal. Nuclear fission – which never reached its full potential – in this projection, from the era of the Kennedy administration, was

expected to become a primary, dominant form of power for the United States, and, indeed, as seen in the world.

What this shows us, is, yeah, using {more} energy. The other

thing is the {type} of energy. What can you do with that

energy?

Think about what you can do with oil and natural gas that you can't do with coal or wood. You can't run a car with wood. You can't run a car with coal. You can run a car on oil. You can't run a train on wood! You can run a train on coal. What can we do

with nuclear power that we can't do with lower forms? Think about

how with coal we can use wood for furniture instead of for burning. Oil: that's what we make plastic out of. Oil is a useful

substance. It's a wonderful material. It's a great source of carbon, which, by its chemical nature, is able to form {enormous}

molecules. Here it is, sitting in the ground, ready to be used to

make all sorts of products, and we're burning it! It's, you know,

it's stupid!

With the potential that we've got, of shifting to a real

nuclear economy, of developing fusion, we would be reaching another stage of energy-flux density. What's the power, the throughput power of your energy source? And, what qualitative improvements does it bring? What new things does it allow you to do?

You can't have economic development without power, without

energy. Here's a chart [Fig. 5] of Electricity Use per Capita vs.

GDP per Capita. I know GDP per Capita is not the best measure, but it's very clear what you see with these things. If you say,

which parts of the world seen here are relatively wealthy and have higher living standards and life expectancies? Well, it's the places where you see the most light. The places where it's

dark, that's not because people are people are fond of astronomy in that region and keep their lights off at night so that they can see the stars better. It's because there's not development.

Infrastructure itself really serves as the mediator, the great mediator, of higher forms of energy-flux density into the economy as a whole – the mediator of bringing new technologies into achieving a maximal expression in the economy by partaking in almost all of the processes that go on in an economy.

We now consider the fourth of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws, which is the call for a crash program on nuclear fusion. This [Fig. 6] is a chart that was created back in 1976, which frequent viewers of this website no doubt have seen several times. What this chart showed was, based on how much money was devoted to achieving the fusion breakthrough, at what year it was anticipated that the great breakthrough for a commercial fusion reactor would take place. In '76 it was considered that if a maximum possible effort were put into this – something on the scale of the Manhattan Project, or the Apollo Project to go to the Moon – if we took that approach with fusion, it was anticipated that we would have had it over 25 years ago! Even at a moderate level of funding, we should have had it a decade ago, according to this projection, which isn't necessarily exactly right. Actual funding for fusion has been {below the level} that was anticipated in the '70s to {never achieve fusion}. In other words, there has been a decision not to reach the next level of

Promethean fire; not to make that breakthrough on fusion.

Why would that happen? Who would hold back the development

of fusion power? Is it the oil industry trying to make money selling more oil? No; that is way too simplistic. It is the brutish outlook of the British Empire, of Zeus earlier – Zeus, the character from the Prometheus story. Zeus, the tyrannical god who created his own power in part by holding back others.

By

preventing mankind from making this step, this is one of the greatest crimes that has ever been committed; the deliberate underfunding of fusion and the campaign to prevent its development.

I don't want to go on forever; let me just show a few projects that the US ought to participate in with a sane outlook.

There's a different paradigm going on in the world right now, with the BRICS highly representing this; it represents the decades of work by LaRouche and the LaRouche Movement.

Organizing for this World Land-Bridge proposal; something that's

been promoted for decades now. This proposal, the power of this

idea to change the world, is absolutely being realized at present. This concept that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been

organizing for, is now Chinese policy; the One Belt, One Road program that is now bringing together over 70 nations

[representing] the majority of the world's population. The greatest potential for economic growth in the world; this is a policy that is taking place.

Instead, the United States under Obama – who should be thrown out of office yesterday, as Diane said, if not last week,

last month, last year; those would all be even better – is holding these things back. What would it look like if we joined?

One thing would be the Bering Strait crossing; a proposal that was first discussed over a century ago. Really bringing the United States, via land, into coordination and connection with Eurasia and Africa, with the rest of the world in a very serious

way; a new way and a more efficient way than sea-borne shipping.

Within the United States, we've got [Fig. ??] to test your geography here, this is the US on the left; and on the right that

is China. Similar nations. Look at all that high-speed rail in

China that you see in blue, and probably some of the red; since

this map was made, they've probably completed it, they're building it so rapidly. The United States doesn't have a high-speed rail network; we barely have a rail network. Instead,

we use the less-efficient form of road transportation for freight

and for people stuck in traffic jams. What would it mean to build a network that makes the United States more efficient, more

productive? How many jobs would be involved in building new cities, in building the kinds of power plants that would be required? What kind of power could we have over our physical economy with the really full development of control over the water cycle? It is within our means to create desalination right

now in California to provide for coastal water needs if we wanted

to do that. It's within our ability to serious and in-depth research on atmospheric ionization and other technologies to control the water cycle. It's within our ability to transfer water that has already fallen on land; but we need to insure that

there's actually enough to make that a possibility.

So, let me read a couple of quotes from Alexander Hamilton here, in terms of where an understanding of an increase in energy flux density, of where economic growth comes from. It doesn't come from money; it comes from the human mind. Here's Treasury Secretary Hamilton. He's describing in the beginning of his "Report on Manufactures" whether it makes sense to have a manufacturing economy, as opposed to a purely agricultural one; which today seems like a stupid argument to even have, but it was something that Thomas Jefferson didn't get, for example. Because he wanted to keep the American economy from developing; he didn't have that same outlook of human beings – clearly – that Alexander Hamilton did.

So, Hamilton writes that "the work of artificers as opposed to cultivators", that is, manufacturing as opposed to farming, "is susceptible of a greater improvement in a proportionately greater degree of improvement of its productive powers; whether by the accession of skill, or from the application of ingenious machinery" – labor saving. How does the development of a new technology transform the potential of a production in an economy?

This is a quote Matt had used: Hamilton writes – on page 148 when you get the book – "It merits particular observation that the multiplication of manufactories not only furnishes a market for those articles which have been accustomed to be produced in abundance in a country, but it likewise creates a demand for

such

as were either unknown or produced in inconsiderable quantities.

The bowels as well as the surface of the Earth are ransacked for

articles which were before neglected. Animals, plants, and minerals acquire a utility and value which were before

unexplored. Iron ore wasn't iron ore before the Iron Age; it was

a rock. Malachite wasn't copper ore before the Bronze Age; it was just a green rock that Egyptians used for mascara." You

transform the value of the things around you; the mind transforms

what those things are. That rock was transformed into ore by the

human mind. We change the universe through our discoveries; we

transform our relationship to it, we change what it is, what it

can participate in.

Hamilton understood that the purpose of the United States

was nothing less than the promotion of the General Welfare.

This

quote is a bit long to read, but it's on page 187; and it's where

he describes that there shouldn't be a limitation – except what

comes up in the Constitution – that the promotion of the General

Welfare he says "the term General Welfare, doubtless intended to

signify more than was expressed or imported in those parts of the

Constitution and Congress' powers which preceded it. This phrase

is as comprehensive as any that could have been used, because

it

was not fit that the Constitutional authority of the Union to appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within narrower limits than the General Welfare." The real point to take is that it's a different economic outlook. What China is doing is great, but it's not up to the level of what it should be. The concept embodied in the One Belt, One Road project is positive; it's very good. But what really needs to be brought to

this is the explicit understanding of its basis in the human identity. The human ability to make discoveries that transform

our relationship to Nature; that's the key to economics. We see

its effects in various studies we might do about how building a

road transforms the amount of agricultural production in an area;

or how bringing in a stable power supply allows factories not to

have to turn off every three hours when the power goes out – what transformations that has. But the real key is to give a mission to people by participating in the ability to bring that

to a yet higher level of understanding, of living standards, and

of participation in that process. That's the key thing; create a

society where people are able to participate knowingly in that increase.

OGDEN: As Jason said, the four economic reports that Hamilton wrote were the founding documents of the American republic in a

very real sense; and he was conscious of that. He said, we can

have political independence, but without economic independence

we
are nothing; we won't survive as a country. And there are
scientific principles which need to be understood and applied.
But just as those were the founding documents at that point,
we
now have a founding document of a new era in the economy of
the
United States in this LaRouche Four Economic Laws. It's a
distillation and an elaboration of the principles that
Alexander
Hamilton understood, for the 21st Century, for today. A
commitment to the fusion program, a commitment to space
exploration on a massive scale. The same way that Franklin
Roosevelt had the New Deal, the same way John F Kennedy had
the
new frontiers, we have a new paradigm. And it's a vision of
the
future which, if fully committed to, will absolutely within
the
lifetimes of the people who are living today, transform what
the
human species is capable of. And it's that sense of the
opportunity of an evolution of the entire human species to an
entirely new level of capability; that's what we experienced
in
the aftermath of Hamilton's breakthrough, the aftermath of the
American Revolution. It's an opportunity in perhaps a larger
and
more comprehensive form today, where you have the opportunity
for
a collaboration among nations that is unprecedented in the
history of mankind.

So, if you hold up against that, the kind of
criminality of
Wall Street; the kind of rabid war-mongering and saber-
rattling,
the threat of World War III and thermonuclear war; I think the

gut feeling of the American people around Glass-Steagall, around stopping World War III, this is something which – as Diane said – has the potential to unify the population in a way perhaps we've never seen before or in a long time. But it has to be developed to a level which contains the type of depth that you just witnessed with the presentation that Jason just gave.

SARE: I just want to add – I know we're getting close to the end of our time, but Mr. LaRouche has said on numerous occasions that the American people need to assemble themselves; that they have lost confidence in their own ability to reason through the crisis and to act in their own interest. But I think what we've seen in this presentation is what LaRouche has been putting forward frankly for years; and the material that is on our website allows us to have the program and the conception. Particularly the conception of what it means to be human; which is what the United States is based on, according to Alexander Hamilton and our Constitution. That is something around which the American people can mobilize; just as when the Berlin Wall came down, the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1989. You had an economic system that completely collapsed, and people turned to Beethoven and Schiller. Well, we are seeing such a moment now in the trans-Atlantic system; and we have here Alexander Hamilton and Lyndon LaRouche. I am confident, although we cannot count on anything 100%, that the population of the United States can be mobilized on this level, and not something lower; and that that potential will become very apparent in the next few days.

STEGER: I think it's just worth stating – China just accomplished another major advancement in their space program. They launched the Long March 5 rocket; this is a 25-ton payload rocket. Japan is now going to be working with Russia it looks like, based on the discussion that Putin and Prime Minister Abe will be having in December, of Japan making an even larger investment into the new Cosmodrome, the new space city up in the Far East of Russia near the Pacific. These nations are dedicated to this kind of advancement; and it only condemns further what Obama has done these last eight years. The first initial steps of this Presidency were to tear down the very space program that these nations have now recreated in their own way on an advanced scale. An Apollo project-like scale of development is what you see now in China with their space program. How dare Obama do this? How dare Hillary Clinton think that she can win a Presidency while chaining herself to this insane legacy? The drone killings; the murders; the wars; the bail-outs; the shutdown of the space program as the first act of the Presidency; the failure of Obamacare? Bill Clinton had the intelligence to recognize this Obamacare was the most insane policy anybody ever adopted; and as soon as he said that, I guess he was thrown into the broom closet, because you haven't seen him since. Then you see Obama and Hillary marching hand-in-hand; it really is insane.

Obama should be condemned in every possible way. And if Hillary is going to tie herself to this legacy – blaming the KGB on email leaks from her server? Blaming the KGB and Putin because she has not operated in a way of the dignity of the US Presidency to lead the American people at a time of crisis? To bomb countries like Libya? To support the overthrow of Assad and the possible conflict with Russia?

You have to remind Americans – and I think what Jason's presentation did so well – what the Four Laws indicate; what a real Presidency looks like. What is the true United States? For 30 years, FBI and British factors and our own government, like the Bush family, went after Lyndon LaRouche and our organization. We've lost a sense of what the real United States is; the world has. And during that period of time, the world has gone nearly crazy; barreling towards world war and nuclear destruction. We've got to revive a true United States. We need it in the United States, and so does the world. There's never been a greater moment to develop that around Lyn's ideas.

OGDEN: Good! I think that's a perfect conclusion. So, as Jason said, {The Vision of Alexander Hamilton} book will be available within the coming days. It's something to absolutely purchase and find access to; we'll make that clear. And if you haven't yet, please sign up for the daily emails from larouchepac.com; these are the critical strategic updates that

are coming into your inbox on a daily basis. We make sure that

you have that at your fingertips. Things are going to change very rapidly over the coming days; and you need to be connected.

So, please sign up for the daily LaRouche PAC email list.

Thank you very much for joining us here today; and please

stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Obamas og Hillarys krigspolitik kan overvindes


Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 3. november, 2016 – En revolution finder sted i verden i dag. Den startede i Asien, hvor den allerede er langt fremme, med Kina, Rusland, Indien og i stigende grad også Japan, der samarbejder for at skabe en udviklingsproces for verden som helhed, baseret på videnskab, innovative teknologier, udstrakte, regionale infrastrukturprojekter, store spring fremad i udforskning af rummet og reel udvikling af de forarmede nationer i Afrika, Latinamerika og Asien. Som man vil se af nedenstående rapport, så har denne dag, ligesom stort set hver eneste dag af dette nye paradigme, set et utroligt niveau af nye samarbejdsprojekter, lanceret af disse eurasiske nationer, mellem hinanden indbyrdes, og som rækker ud til udviklingssektoren gennem fælles udviklingsprojekter.

Virksomheden af denne revolution er nu endelig i færd med at nå ind i USA, efter betydningsfulde gennembrud i Europa gennem de

Nye Silkevejsprojekter, der kommer fra Kina og når ind i både Øst- og Vesteuropa. Dette skifte, der nu finder sted i USA, kan spores direkte tilbage til Lyndon LaRouches arbejde.

I takt med, at præsidentvalgkampagnen udviklede sig i løbet af det forgangne år, begyndte alt, Obama rørte ved, at smuldre. Obamacare afslørede som den katastrofe, LaRouche havde forudsagt, den ville være. Modtageren af Nobels Fredspris er blevet afsløret som en massedræber, der har allieret sig med terroriststyrker i hele Sydvestasien for at vælte suveræne regeringer. Det er nu blevet afsløret, at præsidenten, der skulle rydde op i det Wall Street-rod, som George Bush efterlod, har nægtet at sagsøge så meget som én eneste bankier, selv med det faktum, at de forbrydelser, som er begået af Wells Fargo, med HSBC's narkopengehvidvask og med en tilbagevenden af en spekulativ derivatboble i JP Morgan Chase og alle de andre, for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-banker, står klart og tydeligt i offentlighedens lys. Den præsident, der aflagde løfte om at bringe Håb og Forandring, har skabt den største epidemi af opiater og narkotika i nationens historie, i en ungdomsgeneration, der har mistet ethvert håb om en fremtid og vælger narkotika eller selvmord, eller begge dele.

Og Hillary Clinton valgte en kampagne på dette fundament og tilføjede den kendsgerning, at hun er ivrig efter at starte en militær konfrontation med Rusland, som, åbenlyst for alle undtagen de blinde, vil være det samme som at haste hen imod global, atomar udslettelse.

Men, tingene har ændret sig i løbet af de seneste uger. Mange mennesker har stillet spørgsmålstegn ved LaRouches afvisning af at vælge side i dette valg, men i stedet har insisteret på, at hans tilhængere arbejder på at introducere en seriøs politik i en kampagne, der næsten udelukkende har været et afskyeligt, pornografisk slagsmål om at forsøge at rive tøjet af hinanden! Denne seriøse politik måtte begynde med Glass-  Steagall, insisterede han, for at lukke Wall Streets kasinoøkonomi ned og genindføre en kreditpolitik i nationen,

efter Hamiltons principper. Dette betyder at kanalisere statslig kredit gennem en genindført Nationalbank for USA, der skal erstatte det bankerotte Federal Reserve-system (centralbanksystem), med det formål at finansiere en transformation af nationen med videnskab som drivkraft, og som er centreret omkring en genoplivning af NASA's rumprogram, udvikling af fusionskraft og et vidtstrakt program for hård og blød infrastruktur – det, LaRouche kalder sine **Fire Love**.

Donald Trump har krævet en vedtagelse af det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov og fordømt Hillarys (og Obamas) sleskhed over for Wall Street. Han er gået længere end til at foreslå samarbejde med Rusland for at knuse ISIS, hvilket er bemærkelsesværdigt, men utilstrækkeligt, og til at advare om, at, et valg af Hillary vil betyde en atomkrig.

Begge disse spørgsmål identificeres internationalt med Lyndon LaRouche. Hans indsats for at introducere virkelighed i kampagnen har haft en virkning, der kan og må forhindre krig og påbegynde reformen af de kollapsende, transatlantiske økonomier.

I dag talte LaRouche om dette nye potentiale, men advarede om, at tiden ikke er til at »lade vore stemmer trækkes nedad« og falde for at følge en kandidat, men til at optrappe kampen for et revolutionært, politisk skifte i USA, og til at være klar til at handle den 9. november, uanset hvem, der vinder valget, for at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og de Fire Love.

På et tidspunkt som det nu foreliggende, hvor verden, i den umiddelbart forestående periode, vil ændre sig dramatisk, til det bedre eller til det værre, er der ingen plads til pessimisme eller pragmatisme, og ingen grund til at give frygten lov til at afskrække os. Det nye paradigme breder sig i hele verden. Ved at genindføre vore grundlæggende principper, kan Amerika også gøre en ende på den britiske, »unipolære imperieverden«, hvis mentalitet har grebet vores nation, og gå med i at opbygge en verden af suveræne nationer,

der arbejder sammen for menneskehedens fælles mål.

Foto: USS Ronald Reagan (CVN 76) i det Filippinske Hav, oktober 2016. (Foto: U.S. Pacific Fleet Flickr)

Se også f.eks.:

»Tysklands potentielle rolle i udviklingen af Verdenslandbroen« af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

»Potentialiet for Frankrig og hele Europa i opbygningen af Verdenslandbroen«, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

A Renaissance in World Infrastructure: A Presentation to Engineers on the World Land-Bridge, video og engelsk udskrift. □

LaRouchePAC's massive effekt: Kandidater kræver Glass- Steagall

2. november, 2016 – Amerikanerne kræver en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven for at lukke Wall Streets kasinobankvirksomhed ned, i takt med, at de udtrykker stærk opposition til præsident Barack Obamas og Hillary Clintons krig-og-Wall Street-politik

* I en tale i Charlotte, NC, den 27. okt., krævede Donald Trump Glass-Steagall: »Clinton-politikken bragte os den finansielle recession – gennem at ophæve Glass-Steagall [1999], fremme subprime-lånene og blokere for reformer af Fannie og Freddie. Tiden er inde til det 21. århundredes Glass-Steagall og, som en del heraf, en prioritering af hjælp

til, at afroamerikanske virksomheder kan få den kredit, de behøver ... Lige ret, og lige retfærdighed, for alle betyder de samme regler for Wall Street. Obama-administrationen stillede aldrig Wall Street til regnskab.«

* En opinionsundersøgelse, hvori deltog 1000 Demokratiske vælgere i staterne Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida og Missouri, og hvor spørgsmålet lød, »hvad bør der gøres mht. Wall Street-bankerne«, viste, at 70 % sagde, »genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven«. Opinionsundersøgelsen blev rapporteret den 1. november.

* Den 1. nov. opslog kandidaten til Kongressen i Ohios 4. Kongres-valgkreds, Janet Garrett, på sin hjemmeside et krav: »Vi må vedtage Glass-Steagall og lancere en Ny National Infrastrukturbank«. Garrett sagde, »Hvis jeg bliver valgt, har jeg til hensigt at 'lægge kraftigt og omgående ud med' et angreb på det nuværende, økonomiske rod. Jeg vil anråbe ånden fra Franklin Roosevelts Første Hundrede Dage og vil indstille til, at USA's Kongres tager to, omgående skridt, som jeg selv vil deltage i:

»For det første: Vi må i Kongressen vedtage to lovforslag om at genindføre Glass-Steagall, HR 381 og S. 1709. Jeg vil omgående være medstiller af HR 381 ... For det andet: Jeg vil, straks, jeg indtræder i embedet, fremstille lovforslag til skabelse af en ny Nationalbank for Infrastruktur, med de tidligere sådanne succesrige institutioner som model.«

* Ligeledes 1. nov. udstedte den Demokratiske kandidat til Kongressen for West Virginias 1. Kongres-valgkreds, Michael Manypenny, følgende erklæring: »Jeg indstiller til, at Kongressen vedtager Glass-Steagall, samt en National Infrastrukturbank med \$1 billion.« Han sagde, »under Franklin Roosevelt blev nationen totalt genopbygget under New Deal og den efterfølgende krigsoprustning. Utallige broer, veje og offentlige bygninger blev i West Virginia ... bygget med finansiering fra FDR's Reconstruction Finance Corporation

(svarer til en kreditanstalt for genopbygning, -red.) ... Ligesom dengang i 1930'erne, vil en generel politik for en massiv forøgelse af infrastrukturudvikling skabe mange tusinde jobs til arbejdere i mit distrikt og i hele nationen. Én positiv effekt vil blive at gøre en ende på epidemien af selvmord og misbrug af opiater, som resultat af fortvivlelse, fremkaldt af stagnationen.«

Dette er de massive virkninger, i en forandret, politisk situation, af LaRouchePAC's mobilisering for Lyndon LaRouches »fire hovedlove for at redde nationen«.

Glass-Steagall umiddelbart efter valgdagen; Obama kan overvindes

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 2. november, 2016 – Som Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede tirsdag, så vil et oprigtigt valg vise, at amerikanerne afviser Barack Obama og enhver fortsættelse af hans »eftermåle«. De hader dette eftermåle, som er evindelige og kostbare krige, Wall Streets straffrihed, økonomisk stagnation og afindustrialisering og ligegyldighed over den hærgende afhængighed af opiater og heroin, med dens følgesvend, fortvivlelsen. Der er en følelse i den amerikanske befolkning, at, med dette mareridt af et valg bag sig, kan og må de skabe store forandringer. Larouche sagde i dag, at, selv om disse forandringer endnu ikke er afgjort, *så er meget mere nu muligt.*

Blandt millioner af opvakte og intelligente borgere er der nu en underdønning til fordel for at bryde Wall Streets kasino, ved at genvæde Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov – for

juridisk retfærd, og for muligheden for at investere kredit i økonomien, for en produktiv, økonomisk genrejsning.

Dette fremgår af opinionsundersøgelser af det Demokratiske Partis vælgere; af Donald Trumps løfte om at genindføre Glass-Steagall, i en tale den 27. okt.; af partierne valgplatforme; af kandidater i kapløb til Kongressen, og som forpligter sig til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og kredit til infrastruktur, i Hamiltons tradition.

Obama har åbenlyst til hensigt at bruge den 'handlingslammede' ('lame duck') periode, der begynder den 9. november, til at forsøge at tvinge sin sidste fornærmelse igennem Kongressen – en Wall Street-»handelsaftale«, der er blevet afvist af vælgerskaren og kandidaterne generelt. Det er Trans-Pacific Partnerskab, TPP, der tilsigter at være hans våben til at isolere og provokere Kina til krig.

Men, han kan overvindes, hvis amerikanerne i stedet insisterer på, at Kongressen vedtager Glass-Steagall umiddelbart efter valget. Det vil forhindre Obama i at fjerne endnu flere produktive, amerikanske jobs; men det vil gøre mere end det. Det vil åbne døren til det, *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, kalder »fire hovedlove til at redde USA« – begyndende med Glass-Steagall og en nationalbank til produktive projekter med ny infrastruktur, efter Hamiltons principper.

Obamas lydighed over for Wall Street, og så hans konstante krige og dronedrab, hans dødsens farlige provokationer imod Rusland og Kina, er to sider af samme sag. Hillary Clinton fortsætter dem. De er lige så klart fejlslagne politikker, både økonomisk og strategisk – flere og flere asiatiske lande og nogle lande i Europa lægger kursen for deres økonomiske planer om, til at samarbejde med Kina og Rusland – som USA også burde gøre!

Og, lige så klart afviser det amerikanske folk disse

politikker. Med Glass-Steagall kender millioner af amerikanere *begyndelsen* på det, de ønsker i stedet, nemlig udløseren for en tilbagevenden til fremskridt.

Lad os til Obamas eftermæle føje, at han var den præsident, der ikke kunne beskytte Wall Street mod Glass-Steagall.

SUPPLERENDE MATERIALE:

LaRouchePAC's massive effekt: Kandidater kræver Glass-Steagall

2. november, 2016 – Amerikanerne kræver en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven for at lukke Wall Streets kasinobankvirksomhed ned, i takt med, at de udtrykker stærk opposition til præsident Barack Obamas og Hillary Clintons krig-og-Wall Street-politik

* I en tale i Charlotte, NC, den 27. okt., krævede Donald Trump Glass-Steagall: »Clinton-politikken bragte os den finansielle recession – gennem at ophæve Glass-Steagall [1999], fremme subprime-lånene og blokere for reformer af Fannie og Freddie. Tiden er inde til det 21. århundredes Glass-Steagall og, som en del heraf, en prioritering af hjælp til, at afroamerikanske virksomheder kan få den kredit, de behøver ... Lige ret, og lige retfærdighed, for alle betyder de samme regler for Wall Street. Obama-administrationen stillede aldrig Wall Street til regnskab.«

* En opinionsundersøgelse, hvori deltog 1000 Demokratiske vælgere i staterne Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida og Missouri, og hvor spørgsmålet lød, »hvad bør der gøres mht. Wall Street-bankerne«, viste, at 70 % sagde, »genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven«. Opinionsundersøgelsen blev rapporteret den 1. november.

* Den 1. nov. opslog kandidaten til Kongressen i Ohios 4. Kongres-valgkreds, Janet Garrett, på sin hjemmeside et krav: »Vi må vedtage Glass-Steagall og lancere en Ny National

Infrastrukturbank«. Garrett sagde, »Hvis jeg bliver valgt, har jeg til hensigt at 'lægge kraftigt og omgående ud med' et angreb på det nuværende, økonomiske rod. Jeg vil anråbe ånden fra Franklin Roosevelts Første Hundrede Dage og vil indstille til, at USA's Kongres tager to, omgående skridt, som jeg selv vil deltage i:

»For det første: Vi må i Kongressen vedtage to lovforslag om at genindføre Glass-Steagall, HR 381 og S. 1709. Jeg vil omgående være medstiller af HR 381 ... For det andet: Jeg vil, straks, jeg indtræder i embedet, fremstille lovforslag til skabelse af en ny Nationalbank for Infrastruktur, med de tidligere sådanne succesrige institutioner som model.«

* Ligeledes 1. nov. udstedte den Demokratiske kandidat til Kongressen for West Virginias 1. Kongres-valgkreds, Michael Manypenny, følgende erklæring: »Jeg indstiller til, at Kongressen vedtager Glass-Steagall, samt en National Infrastrukturbank med \$1 billion.« Han sagde, »under Franklin Roosevelt blev nationen totalt genopbygget under New Deal og den efterfølgende krigsoprustning. Utallige broer, veje og offentlige bygninger blev i West Virginia ... bygget med finansiering fra FDR's Reconstruction Finance Corporation (svarer til en kreditanstalt for genopbygning, -red.) ... Ligesom dengang i 1930'erne, vil en generel politik for en massiv forøgelse af infrastrukturudvikling skabe mange tusinde jobs til arbejdere i mit distrikt og i hele nationen. Én positiv effekt vil blive at gøre en ende på epidemien af selvmord og misbrug af opiater, som resultat af fortvivlelse, fremkaldt af stagnationen.«

☒ Dette er de massive virkninger, i en forandret, politisk situation, af LaRouchePAC's mobilisering for Lyndon LaRouches »fire hovedlove for at redde nationen«.

Den strategiske fare for krig: Skænderi mellem USA og Tyrkiet over timing for kampen om Raqqa

Tirsdag, den 1. nov., 2016 – Samtidig med, at irakiske styrker går ind i Mosul i en langvarig kamp for at uddrive Islamisk Stat fra dets irakiske hovedbastion, er der udbrudt en voldsom debat mellem USA og Tyrkiet over timingen og strategien for at drive ISIS ud af Raqqa i Syrien. Den 28. okt. meddelte den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ash Carter, at USA stod over for at lancere et angreb på Raqqa »om nogle få uger«. Dette frembragte stærke klager fra Tyrkiet, som pressede Washington for at udsætte kampen om Raqqa, indtil Mosul er blevet generobret og de tyrkiske styrker har fuldført deres »Eufrat-skjold«-operationer for at sikre grænseområderne i Syrien.

Det underliggende spørgsmål i skænderiet er den kendsgerning, at USA har til hensigt at bero svært på det Kurdiske YPG's (Folkets Beskyttelsesenheder) styrker, som udgør hovedparten af den Syriske Demokratiske Styrke. I en briefing fra Bagdad til Pentagon-reportere for nylig, forklarede generalløjtnant Stephen Townsend, øverstbefalende for den Kombinerede Fælles Specialenhed – Operation 'Inherent Storm', at der er solide efterretninger, der indikerer, at ISIS planlægger store, nye, globale terrorangreb ud fra sit Raqqa-hovedkvarter, og at lanceringen af angrebet på Raqqa ikke bør udsættes.

Sidste onsdag, den 26. okt., talte præsidenterne Obama og

Recep Tayyip Erdogan fra Tyrkiet sammen i telefon, og iflg. Det Hvide Hus' redegørelse, sagde Obama udtrykkeligt, at USA støttede den Syriske Demokratiske Styrke (SDF), som er den eneste, pålidelige kampstyrke, der er i stand til at anføre angrebet på Raqqa. Erdogan insisterede på, at YPG – hovedstyrken i SDF – er den syriske gren af det terroristiske Kurdiske Arbejderparti (PKK) og ikke bør støttes af Washington.

Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry, der er i London for at modtage en pris fra Chatham House for sit og den iranske udenrigsminister Javad Zarifs arbejde med P5+1-aftalen, gjorde det klart, at han er forpligtet over for den samme form for tålmodigt diplomati, der også skaffede Iran-aftalen for Syrien. Han påpegede korrekt, at krigen i Syrien i realiteten er en række krige, der overlapper hinanden – og som alle udspilles på syrisk territorium, hvilket gør det langt vanskeligere at løse dem.

Foto: Obama og Erdogan er ikke helt enige i, hvordan, hvornår og ved hvilke midler, krigen i Syrien skal takles ...

FN's særlige udsending for Syrien anklager jihadister for krigsforbrydelser i det østlige Aleppo

30. okt., 2016 – Jihadisters tilfældige beskydning af det østlige Aleppo med missiler og kemiske våben er det samme som krigsforbrydelser, sagde Staffan de Mistura, FN's særlige udsending for Syrien, som erklærede, at han var »chokeret og

oprørt« over de angreb, som terrorister har lanceret i løbet af de seneste tre dage mod Aleppos civile befolkning. Selv Amnesty International har krævet et omgående ophør af beskydningen.

I løbet af de seneste tre dage har en brutal offensiv fra Jabhat-al-Nusras og dets allieredes (inklusive den såkaldte moderate opposition) side for at bryde den syriske hærs belejring af det østlige Aleppo dræbt 84 mennesker og såret henved 300, rapporterede Syriens Sana nyhedsbureau. En erklæring, som den syriske generalkommando udstedte i dag, anklagede, at terroristerne affyrede flere end 100 mortérrunder, 50 Grad-missiler og 20 gascylindre, lavet til våben, mod beboelsesområder i Aleppo, ud over at udføre snigskytte-angreb. De fleste tab, siger den, var blandt kvinder og børn. Søndag rykkede oprørere frem til nabolaget al-Hamadaniyeh, som udgør frontlinjen, i tanks og andre pansrede køretøjer, men brugte også selvmords-bilbomber til at bryde hærens forsvarslinjer. Flere borgere blev behandlet for åndedrætsbesvær og kvælning som følge af giftgas.

Mens dette skrives, har den syriske hærs styrker bremset terroristernes offensiv, hvor de nu kun delvis har kontrollen i nabolaget Dahiyet al-Assad, som de trængte ind i sidste fredag.

Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov advarede i dag om, at de uger, hvor Rusland og Syrien indstillede luftangrebene over Aleppo, har givet USA og dets allierede mere end tilstrækkelig tid til at tvinge den »moderate« opposition til at bryde med terroristerne. At de ikke har gjort dette, erklærede han, betyder nu, at »vore tidligere vurderinger må revideres«. Hvor Rusland tidligere sagde, at det syntes, som om USA og dets allierede ikke var i stand til, eller ikke ønskede, at adskille de moderate fra Jabhat al-Nusra, »så bør vi nu allerede sige, at de *i virkeligheden ikke ønsker at gøre dette* ... vi håber, at selvopholdelses-instinktet vil sejre, eftersom at søge venskab med terrorister og forsøge at bruge

dem til sine egne formål aldrig har ført til noget godt«. Alle militante kæmpere, der stadig er tilbage i det østlige Aleppo, advarede Lavrov, vil blive anset for at være al-Nusras medskyldige.

I en af sine periodiske, mentale lapsusser, som han lider under, når han gentager Obamas løgne, sagde udenrigsminister John Kerry til et publikum i Londons Chatham House i dag, at russerne ønskede at »sønderbombe Aleppo, hvor de hævder at ramme terrorister, hellere end at de accepterer den kendsgerning, at der er en opposition dér, der er parat til at efterleve våbenhvilen«. Er det ikke den opposition, som de Mistura anklager for krigsforbrydelser?

Foto: Staffan de Mistura.

Lyndon LaRouche: At tolerere Obama og Hillary bringer blodsudgydelse og krig

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. november, 2016 – Data fra opinionsundersøgelser viser, at vælgere i de afgørende svingstater i overvældende grad støtter Glass-Steagall og andre metoder til at bryde de store Wall Street-banker op. Ifølge en opinionsundersøgelse, foretaget af Lake Research Partners, ønsker 70 % af vælgerne i Florida, Pennsylvania, Missouri og Ohio en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall nu. Opinionsundersøgelsen konkluderede, »Den offentlige frustration over Wall Streets hensynsløshed og grådighed er stor og går på tværs af det politiske spektrum. Uanset, hvem, der vinder dette valg, så bør han/hun højt prioritere at gøre dette oprør til en reel forandring.«

Tirsdag tog Lyndon LaRouche dette argument til dets logiske konklusion: Alt dette had er i realiteten rettet mod præsident Obama, hvis katastrofale politik har bragt os helt frem til denne eksistentielle krise. Hillary Clinton er en forlængelse og en fortsættelse af denne Obama-politik; beskyttelse af Wall Street; passivitet i forhold til en landsomspændende epidemi af ulovlige medikamenter (narkotiske stoffer); en fortsættelse i det uendelige af udenlandske krige, der koster skattebetalerne billioner af dollars; den totale ødelæggelse af det amerikanske sundhedssystem under Obamacare; en dæmonisering af Rusland, der driver os hen imod en atomar Tredje Verdenskrig.

Et oprigtigt valg den 8. nov. vil vise dette had til Obama og til alt, han har gjort mod USA på vegne af sine britiske herrer. Britiske interesser har styret Obama fra den første dag, han gik ind i politik. Hillary Clinton ødelagde sig selv gennem sin kapitulation til Obama, og det er grunden til, at hun er forhadet. Ethvert forsøg på at skjule dette på valgdagen, vil føre til blodsudgydelse.

Dette er dødelig alvor. Vi konfronteres ikke alene med udsigten til national blodsudgydelse, men også med den reelle mulighed for krig. Vi befinder os allerede på randen af Tredje Verdenskrig pga. Obamas politik med at provokere Rusland, en politik, som Hillary Clinton har udviklet til en endnu mere obscøn yderlighed.

*Foto: Præsident Obama rådslår med udenrigsminister Clinton under NATO-topmødet i Strasbourg, Frankrig, i april 2009.
(Foto: Pete Souza)*

Hillarys plan for regimeskift i Syrien betyder atomkrig med Rusland

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 31. oktober, 2016 – Én ting, som Donald Trump har ret i, er, at Hillary Clintons plan om at gennemtvinge en flyveforbudszone i Syrien og at prioritere »regimeskift« imod Assad frem for samarbejde med Rusland for at knuse ISIS, er en åbenbar og farlig vej til krig med Rusland, en krig, der hurtigt ville blive atomar.

Er amerikanere så demoraliserede og bange, at de ville ignorere denne ekstreme fare og tillade Hillary at blive præsident? Hillarys desperate respons i dag var at udgive en annonce, der sammenligner Trump med Barry Goldwater, der har kløe i fingeren for at trykke på knappen, på trods af Trumps gentagne opfordringer til at samarbejde med Rusland om at bekæmpe ISIS, og på trods af, at det står i åbenlys modstrid med hendes egne fejlslagne forsøg på at fremstille Trump som Putins naive fjols!

Den omskiftelige situation i USA blev eksemplificeret af udgivelsen af en meningsmåling i dag fra *ABC/Washington Post*, der viser, at Trump haler ind på Hillary nationalt og kun er 1 % bagefter. Den samme meningsmåling viste for kun en uge siden, at Trump var 12 % bag efter Hillary! Alt imens pressehistorierne kun peger på FBI-direktør James Comeys meddelelse om, at de vil genåbne undersøgelsen af Hillarys brud på loven om hemmeligholdelse i sin brug af e-mails, så er den uerklærede kendsgerning den, at Donald Trump den forgangne uge tog en skarp vending ved direkte at identificere Hillarys politik i Syrien som en sikker vej til krig med Rusland samtidig med, at han udtrykkeligt krævede genindførelsen af en version for det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov, indført af Roosevelt i 1933, og som adskiller spekulative og kommercielle

banker.

Den advarsel om truslen om krig, der kommer fra Obama og hans klon Hillary, så vel som kravet om Glass-Steagall, erkendes begge internationalt, og især i den amerikanske Kongres, som spørgsmål, der er introduceret og tvunget ind på den nationale og internationale dagsorden af Lyndon LaRouche. Alt imens borgerne bestemt føler afsky for Hillarys nonchalante misbrug af klassificeret materiale, så har hun i langt højere grad miskrediteret sig selv gennem sin krigsmagervirksomhed og sin underdanighed over for Wall Street. Det er i denne henseende, at hendes svaghed er afsløret, både politisk og intellektuelt, samt moralsk.

Foto: Den russiske præsident Putin inspicerer nyt militærudstyr på den 393. Flyvebase.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterer det Ny Silkevejsparadigme på fredskonference i Tyskland

31. okt., 2016 – Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche var en af de førende talere på et panel om de fremtidige relationer mellem Europa, USA og Rusland, der fandt sted den 30. okt. på konferencen, »Den store fred« i Auerstedt, Tyskland. Andre talere på panelet var professor Gerhard Schreiber (Dresden), en mangeårig ekspert i militærstrategi i flere topudnævnelser i østtyske militære institutter før 1989 og nuværende konsulent i sikkerhedspolitik; prof. Natalya Bubnova, ekspert i russiske

relationer med Vesten, og som arbejder ved Primakov Nationale Forskningsinstitut for Verdensøkonomi og Internationale Relationer i Moskva; Klaus-Dieter Böhm, direktør for den private station Salve.TV i Erfurt (den eneste tyske Tv-station, der fast kører nyhedshistorier fra RT). Konferencestedet i byen Auerstedt, i nærheden af byen Jena i Thüringen, var scenen for et stort slag i 1806, hvor Napoleons hære slog de preussiske hære. »Den store Fred« afholdtes for fjerde gang dér.

Helga havde allerede præsenteret den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen, da flere initiativer blev introduceret lørdag eftermiddag, hvor der blev vist et kort klip om emnet, som blev vel modtaget af tilhørerne. Endnu engang, på panelet om søndagen, talte hun om betydningen af det nye paradigme til at gå i stedet for den akutte fare for atomkrig. Denne akutte trussel om atomkrig stammer fra det faktum, at det transatlantiske finanssystem er dømt til undergang, og at visse vestlige ledere nægter at indgå i samarbejde med kineserne og BRIKS. Hun advarede også om, at Hillary Clinton på det seneste er blevet en total krigshøg, og at hendes valg til præsident udgør en betydelig risiko for en verdenskrig. Professor Schreiber, der talte om NATO's oprustning og ekspansion mod Rusland efter 1990, med særlig henvisning til EU's skadelige rolle, inklusive udløsningen af Ukraine-krisen, støttede [det kinesiske] Ét bælte, én vej (OBOR) som et fredsopbyggende, nyt paradigme, som Europa bør tilslutte sig, og sagde på et tidspunkt, at »det er fordi, USA's politik er imod den Nye silkevej, at amerikanerne hader Dem så meget, fr. Zepp-LaRouche«.

Prof. Bubnova, der talte om de falske billeder, som Vesten har opbygget om Rusland, men som også gav udtryk for bekymring over, at Rusland er i færd med at blive trukket ind i en strategisk konfrontation, sagde mht. USA's drømme om fortsat verdensherredømme, at det ikke vil fungere, fordi store dele af verden er uenig og ikke ønsker at gå den vej, USA siger, de

skal gå. Schreiber gjorde også meget ud af at påpege, at multi-polaritet er verdens fremtid, og at det vil erstatte den unipolære periode, som har eksisteret siden Sovjetblokkens opløsning for 25 år siden. Böhm talte om den amerikanske hånd bag bin Laden, al-Qaeda, al-Nusra og IS og sagde, at disse er blevet opbygget for at levere et nyt fjendebillede, efter at Sovjet-fjenden forsvandt efter 1990.

<http://der-grosse-frieden.org/referenten-2016-helga-zepp-larouche/>

RADIO SCHILLER den 31. oktober 2016: Valget i USA: Glass/Steagall- bankopdeling og faren for 3. verdenskrig er nu blevet hovedtemaer

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

»Lad os bygge det Eurasiske Tog for Fred imod truslen om en Ny Verdenskrig«

Erklæring af Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Jacques Cheminade, 21. oktober, 2016

Som patrioter og verdensborgere i traditionen efter de Gaulles og Adenauers Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa, appellerer vi til vore regeringer om omgående at tilslutte sig disse fremvoksende magters indsats, og at kræve af USA og Storbritannien, at de begraver Imperiets stridsøkse.

Vi bør omgående positivt respondere til tre store projekter, der foreslås, og som alle befinder sig inden for vor rækkevidde og direkte vedrører vore nationale interesser:

(På sidelinjen af Schiller Instituttets konference i Essen, Tyskland, den 21. oktober, 2016, om de fremtidsudsigter for Europa, som Kinas politik for den Nye Silkevej tilbyder, udstedte Helga Zepp-LaRouche, præsident for Schiller Instituttet, og Jacques Cheminade, fransk præsidentkandidat, følgende erklæring:)

På intet tidspunkt siden 1945 har verden været så tæt på en ny verdenskrig, der i dag ville blive en atomkrig. Men samtidig har mulighederne for at grundlægge en ny verdensorden for fred og udvikling imidlertid aldrig været så store.

Faren for krig kommer fra et forsøg fra de vestlige magters side på, for enhver pris at opretholde deres eneherredømme over verden, på trods af den kendsgerning, at de ikke har andet at tilbyde end krige og finansiel udplyndring. Det store

håb kommer fra en fremvoksende gruppe af lande, Rusland, Kina, Indien og BRIKS, der kæmper for en verden, hvor alle har ret til fremskridt gennem udvikling inden for videnskab, avanceret teknologi og industri; en verden med fred og stabilitet, baseret på organisationen for international lov, der voksede frem af sejren over nazismen, og som er inkorporeret i FN's Charter.

Det eneste alternativ til politikken med Washington-konsensus, der har ført os frem til den nuværende krise, er Kinas forslag om projektet for den Nye Silkevej, som en politik for fred og samarbejde i hele verden. Dette projekt, som allerede er en realitet for de 70 lande, der er med i det, er det største projekt for industriel, økonomisk genrejsning, der nogen har eksisteret på planeten, og som mobiliserer tæt ved \$1 billion til videnskabelig forskning og store infrastrukturprojekter i Eurasien, Latinamerika og Afrika.

Som patrioter og verdensborgere i traditionen efter de Gaulles og Adenauers Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa, appellerer vi til vore regeringer om omgående at tilslutte sig disse fremvoksende magters indsats, og at kræve af USA og Storbritannien, at de begraver Imperiets stridsøkse.

Vi bør omgående positivt respondere til tre store projekter, der foreslås, og som alle befinder sig inden for vor rækkevidde og direkte vedrører vore nationale interesser:

1. Frankrig og Tyskland må, sammen med Kina, påbegynde konstruktionen af Silkevejens godstog for fremtiden, der kommer fra Kina og forgrener sig ud til forskellige lande i Europa. Der eksisterer allerede konvojer, men de har store vanskeligheder med at krydse alle grænser. Vi må nu forudse et Silkevejstog, der kører i et eurasisk kontinent, der 30 år frem i tiden vil være lige så udviklet, som Kina er i dag. Denne jernbanelinje, der kører på enkeltstandard-enhedsspor, og som møder minimale grænsekontroller, må, i traditionen efter

Lincolns Transkontinentale Jernbane og den Transsibiriske Jernbane, være en trans-eurasiske jernbane, bygget af Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa. Det vil blive nødvendigt, at Kina, Rusland og alle de andre lande, som toget kører igennem, indgår en aftale.

2. Frankrig og Tyskland må respondere til Kinas og Ruslands indsats for at bringe de mellemøstlige ødelæggelseskrige, der er anstiftet af de vestlige magter, til en afslutning, og for at påbegynde genopbygningen. Denne politik er ikke alene den eneste, humane respons til ikke alene den forfatning, disse lande befinder sig i, men også til den stadigt voksende strøm af immigranter til vore lande.
3. Frankrig og Tyskland må arbejde hen imod store fællesprojekter med Kina og Afrika. En fælles rammeaftale til dette formål blev allerede underskrevet af Frankrig og Kina den 30. juni, 2015. Prioriteringen må være infrastrukturprojekter i stor skala: dæmninger, jernbaner og energi, inklusive kernekraft.

Når de vestlige eliter ikke har nogen anden politik end den, at gennemtvinge brutale nedskæringer over befolkninger for at redde en finansverden, der har været død siden krisen i 2008; når den eneste måde, hvorpå vesten kan opretholde sit eneherredømme, er gennem deployering eller tolerance af blodige nazister i Ukraine og grusomme jihadister i Mellemøsten, kan vi med Kina klart sige, at, dersom Vesten ønsker at bevare Himlens mandat til at regere, må den forandre sig.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Foto: Tysklands Conrad Adenauer og Frankrigs Charles de Gaulle mødes i Paris i september, 1963.

Trumps vending mod Glass-Steagall åbner feltet for LaRouches Fire Love

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. oktober, 2016 – I sidste uge fremførte kandidat Donald Trump et direkte krav om gennemførelse af det 21. Århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov samtidig med, at han udstedte en ligefrem advarsel om, at Hillary Clintons sindssyge dæmonisering af Vladimir Putin og hendes krav om militær konfrontation med Rusland og Syrien allerede har bragt verden til randen af atomkrig. Hvad så siden Trumps motivation er, så har dette placeret de spørgsmål, som med Lyndon LaRouche er blevet internationalt fastlagt, i centrum for den amerikanske, politiske krise.

I dag responderede LaRouche til dette skift under en diskussion med sine medarbejdere, ni dage før det amerikanske præsidentvalg:

»Trump er kommet ud med Glass-Steagall. Han fremlagde argumentet. Desuden hader han Hillary Clinton og foragter Barack Obama. Trump har et enormt ego, og det betyder, at han ønsker at gøre noget stort og vigtigt. Men alt dette betyder, at der er noget, vi potentielt kan arbejde med. Dette betyder, at det vigtigste er det, som vi må sige den til kommende administration om det, der må gøres. Det faktum, at Trump støtter Glass-Steagall, er nu en fastslået kendsgerning, og dette er et sted at begynde, men kun et sted at begynde. Vi forstår, hvad der må gøres, overordnet set, for at vedtage en politik i Hamiltons tradition for at redde USA. Det er, hvad


der virkelig tæller. Og dette budskab giver genlyd.«

Situationen i USA er fuld af dæmonisering og frygt i takt med, at amerikanske familiers levestandard i hastigt tempo kollapser, og i takt med, at borgerne ikke ser noget håb i valget.

LaRouche bemærkede:

»Situationen her er så rådden, at det giver anledning til stor bekymring. Den typiske, amerikanske borger har ingen stolthed eller tro på sig selv. Der findes ingen pragmatiske løsninger. Der findes intet i USA, med undtagelse af det, vi stiller krav om som presserende løsninger, og som begynder med Glass-Steagall, men dernæst fortsætter med en omgående lancering af massive kapitalinvesteringer af statslig kredit til infrastruktur og andre projekter, for at styrke økonomiens produktivitet som helhed. Dette betyder en genoplivelse af et statsligt, nationalt banksystem efter Hamiltons principper. Sådan skal det være.«

*»Der er en reel fare for afslutningen af civilisationen. Der findes ingen andre muligheder end afgørende handlinger, af den art, som jeg har forklaret i mine **Fire Økonomiske Hovedlove**. Det er den virkelige proces.«*

Disse Fire Hovedlove begynder med Glass-Steagall, sammen  med en tilbagevenden til et Nationalt Banksystem i Hamiltons tradition, som middel til at udstede kredit til realøkonomien, der som sin spydspids og drivkraft har videnskab, med udvikling af fusionskraft og en genrejsning af NASA og rumforskning og rumfart.

»Vi er på vej ind i noget, vi aldrig før har set – lige nu«,
sagde LaRouche.

»Der findes ingen vilje inden for det transatlantiske område til at handle for at løse nogen af disse problemer. Det er i

Eurasien, at vi finder den reelle indsats. Det er dér, de store initiativer finder sted. Putin gør vigtige ting, men han er også bevidst om sin egen positions svaghed, og han medregner dette i sine beslutninger og handlinger.»

Det er presserende nødvendigt at dumpe Obama, men tiden er knap. Vi må omgående, nu, såvel som også dagen efter valget, handle på det skift, som Trumps initiativ har skabt, uanset udfaldet af valget – at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og det fulde LaRouche-program for at genindføre en **politik efter Hamiltons principper.**

**Det kommende verdenslederskab
udgøres af Glass-Steagall
og LaRouches Fire Økonomiske
Love.**

**Dansk uddrag af LaRouchePAC
Internationale Webcast, 28.
okt., 2016.**

Dette er ikke noget, der kun er vigtigt for den nationale scene; men dette er i færd med at udforme et paradigmeskifte, som i øjeblikket finder sted på den internationale scene. For to uger siden så vi det dramatiske skift, hvor Filippinerne, med præsident Dutertes besøg i Kina, ændrede sin kurs til at komme på linje med Kinas; hvor han siger, at han nu ændrer sit

lands kurs i overensstemmelse med den ideologiske strømning i de eurasiske, allierede lande, der nu er i færd med at skabe et nyt, økonomisk paradigme. Vi så dette meget tydeligt i en tale, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holdt ved Valdai-diskussionsklubbens årlige sammentræf 2016 i Sotji, Rusland. Vi vil gå nærmere i detaljer med dette, men Putins understregninger er meget klare, og jeg mener, at de omfatter nogle af de spørgsmål, vi vil diskutere i aften. For det første, faren ved NATO's/Obamas holdning, der nu har bragt os i farlig nærhed af et udbrud af Tredje Verdenskrig; en krig, som ingen på den russiske side søger, som Putin gjorde det meget klart. Og ligeledes det presserende nødvendige, totalt nye, økonomiske paradigme for at slå bro over svælget mellem et lille antal meget rige Wall Street-spekulanter, og et meget stort antal fattigdomsramte, ikke alene mennesker, men hele nationer; og desuden, at bringe teknologisk fremskridt til alle og gøre dette til paradigmet for relationer nationerne imellem.

Matthew Ogden: Jeg tror, vi kan sige, at vi befinder os ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt i verdenshistorien, og ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt for vores nation. I løbet af de seneste uger har vi, som I har kunnet følge på LaRouchePAC's webside, mobiliseret en national mobilisering for at sætte hr. Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske program på dagsordenen, under betegnelsen 'De Fire Hovedlove; de Fire Nye Love til USA's økonomiske genrejsning', og disse love er baseret på Alexander Hamiltons fundamentale principper og hans arbejde med at etablere en videnskab om økonomi, der opbyggede USA. Vi har lanceret en kampagneside for mobilisering, og jeg vil direkte fremhæve, at det er vores dagsorden at bringe det amerikanske folk ind i denne mobilisering for at gøre jeres forståelse af, hvad det er for økonomiske principper, som Hamilton skabte, dybere; og hvad det er, som hr. LaRouche har inkorporeret i disse Fire Love.

Dette er ikke noget, der kun er vigtigt for den nationale

scene; men dette er i færd med at udforme et paradigmeskifte, som i øjeblikket finder sted på den internationale scene. For to uger siden så vi det dramatiske skift, hvor Filippinerne, med præsident Duterte's besøg i Kina, ændrede sin kurs til at komme på linje med Kinas; hvor han siger, at han nu ændrer sit lands kurs i overensstemmelse med den ideologiske strømning i de eurasiske, allierede lande, der nu er i færd med at skabe et nyt, økonomisk paradigme. Vi så dette meget tydeligt i en tale, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holdt ved Valdai-diskussionsklubbens årlige sammentræf 2016 i Sotji, Rusland. Vi vil gå nærmere i detaljer med dette, men Putins understregninger er meget klare, og jeg mener, at de omfatter nogle af de spørgsmål, vi vil diskutere i aften. For det første, faren ved NATO's/Obamas holdning, der nu har bragt os i farlig nærhed af et udbrud af Tredje Verdenskrig; en krig, som ingen på den russiske side søger, som Putin gjorde det meget klart. Og ligeledes det presserende nødvendige, totalt nye, økonomiske paradigme for at slå bro over svælget mellem et lille antal meget rige Wall Street-spekulanter, og et meget stort antal fattigdomsramte, ikke alene mennesker, men hele nationer; og desuden, at bringe teknologisk fremskridt til alle og gøre dette til paradigmet for relationer nationerne imellem.

Vi vil komme ind på disse spørgsmål, men først og fremmest spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall; nødvendigheden af at nedlukke det, der nu tydeligvis er det bankerotte Wall Street-regime, og spørgsmålet om, hvad der nødvendigvis må efterfølge denne nedlukning. De Fire Love efter Hamiltons principper, som hr. LaRouche har udarbejdet, er nu helt klart på dagsordenen, mener jeg. Jeg vil bede Jeffrey Steinberg lægge ud med en kort briefing om nogle af de spørgsmål, som vi har drøftet med hr. LaRouche i løbet af de seneste 24 timer, og dernæst kan vi fortsætte med en diskussion over implikationerne af disse udviklinger.

Jeffrey Steinberg: Der er fire eller fem ting, som jeg gerne

vil sætte fokus på mht. signifikante, nye udviklinger blot siden sidste fredags webcast. For det første, som Matt netop påpegede, så holdt præsident Putin en meget magtfuld tale under den afsluttende session af Valdai-konferencen, der fandt sted i denne uge i Sotji, Rusland. Tilstede var repræsentanter fra hele verden, inkl. i hvert fald flere folk fra Kina. Jeg mener, at det, som præsident Putin gjorde, ikke så meget var at bryde ny jord, som det var at gøre det meget klart, at Rusland, og han selv, fuldt ud har helliget sig til at gå fremefter med samarbejdet med Kina og de andre BRIKS-lande om at virkeliggøre et nyt paradigme for relationerne nationalstaterne imellem. Dette nye paradigme er baseret på en politik for klar forebyggelse af krig, opbygget omkring kooperative økonomiske investeringer i store projekter – inklusive betydelige fremskridt inden for videnskab, som inkluderer fremme af menneskets herredømme over rummet. På en vis måde forstærkede Putin det, vi så på BRIKS-topmødet for statsoverhoveder for nylig i Goa, Indien. Rusland er helt med her, og han pointerede meget klart, at det vestlige finanssystems kollaps er den hovedfaktor, der driver verden hen imod en ekstraordinært farlig situation, hvor der kunne komme et udbrud af en verdenskrig – endda en atomar verdenskrig – som følge af provokerende handlinger, der er affødt af desperation. Jeg mener, at dette er et af de elementer af det, der virkelig er forandret i løbet af denne seneste uge.

Jeg har tilbragt de seneste 48 timer – onsdag og torsdag i denne uge – med at deltage i en årlig konference i Washington, D.C., i det Nationale Råd for Amerikansk-arabiske Relationer. Der var omkring 1000 mennesker til stede dér, og der var stort fremmøde fra det diplomatiske samfund, især det arabiske, diplomatiske samfund; og fra den amerikanske erhvervssektor, der handler med Golfstaterne. Ved slutningen af konferencen, torsdag aften, var der en afsluttende hovedtale af general David Petraeus – tidligere chef for Centalkommandoen, og tidligere direktør for CIA. Han fremlagde en række meget

dristige forslag, som desværre meget præcist faldt i tråd med den slags ting, vi har set komme fra Hillary Clinton og Clinton-kampagnen i hele denne præsidentvalgkamp. Det, som general Petraeus krævede, var både oprettelsen af sikkerhedszoner på suverænt, syrisk territorium, skabelsen af en flyveforbudszone over en stor del af syrisk territorium, og han opfordrede til, at USA skulle bruge både sø- og landbaserede krydsermissiler til at tilintetgøre det syriske luftvåben. Se, han sagde meget henkastet, at dette selvfølgelig fremkalder faren for en krig med Rusland; men det fejede han til side og sagde, at Vladimir Putin responderer til magt, og responderer til alvorlige trusler om magtanvendelse. Putin vil derfor, konfronteret med denne form for handlinger, trække sig, sagde Petraeus.

Vi taler her om, at amerikanske og russiske aktiver fra luftvåbnene, der engagerer sig på en meget afgrænset skueplads for handling, hvor vi hidtil har undgået en betydelig hændelse, der kunne have ført til generel krig, pga. en aftale om dekonfliktion (fælles forholdsregler, der skal sikre, at en optrapning pga. fejlregninger eller misforståelser ikke finder sted, -red.), som heldigvis stadig er i kraft mellem den amerikanskledede koalition på den ene side, og Rusland på den anden. Men det, der her foreslås, er en total omstødelse af denne politik. Vi ved, at dette er præcis, hvad Hillary Clinton kræver i sine egne taler i præsidentkampagnen. Der har været nylige undersøgelser, fremlagt på vegne af Clinton-kampagnen af Centret for en Ny Amerikansk Sikkerhed og Centret for Amerikansk Fremgang, der udtrykker noget nær den samme ekstremistiske holdning, som general Petraeus udtrykker i sine udtalelser. Faren for krig kan slet ikke undervurderes; og faktum er, at præsident Putin – i sin Valdai-tale – var meget klar omkring denne fare.

Se, med hensyn til det overordnede spørgsmål om, hvor umiddelbart forestående, nedsmeltningen af det transatlantiske finanssystem er, så sidder alle virkelig på kanten af deres

stol over det faktum, at det amerikanske Justitsministerium og Deutsche Bank stadig befinder sig i en afparering frem og tilbage og endnu ikke er nået frem til en beslutning omkring den foreslåede bøde på 14 mia. euro for Deutsche Banks kriminelle aktivitet under krisen omkring værdipapirer med sikkerhed i ejendoms papirer, som var forløber for krisen med nedsmeltningen i 2008. Deutsche Bank befinder sig på randen af kollaps; dette anerkendes bredt. De førende, tyske finansmedier, med *Handelsblatt* i spidsen, skriver om dette stort set hver eneste dag. Vi ved, at det italienske banksystem også befinder sig på randen af nedsmeltning, med lån, der ikke giver afkast (insolvente lån), til nominelt 360 mia. euro på regnskaberne i de store, italienske banker. Så det er absolut sandt, at vi befinder os på den yderste kant af en potentiel finansiel nedsmeltning, der er langt værre end Lehman Brothers i 2008.

Det er i denne sammenhæng, at, mener jeg, det er meget vigtigt at mærke sig den kendsgerning, at Donald Trump tidligere på ugen holdt en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, hvor han udtrykkeligt krævede, at man implementerede en Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede. Han advarede også om, at, hvis Hillary Clinton bliver valgt til præsident, vokser chancerne for, at vi meget snart vil stå over for Tredje Verdenskrig, enormt; og han nævnte begivenhederne i Syrien, som jeg allerede har omtalt, som en slags hovedelement i denne situation. Mange mennesker klør sig i hovedet og siger, hvor kom dette fra, mht., at Trump pludselig går ind for Glass-Steagall? Det er kun 12 dage før præsidentvalget, at han kommer med denne tale.

Jeg fik mulighed for at tale med nogen, der har været involveret i Washington-politik som en slags insider i meget lang tid; og det var hans anskuelse, at han havde forventet, at noget i denne retning ville komme fra Trump-kampagnen, fra Donald Trump. Det kunne have været mere effektivt, hvis det var sket i september, men hvad enten han er opportunistisk, eller han reelt mener det alvorligt, så er det en

kendsgerning, at spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall nu er blevet gen-indsprøjtet i præsidentvalget i en afgørende form for nedtælling til den 8. november. Og der er faktisk ingen ulemper forbundet med dette; uanset, hvad resultatet af valget bliver, så er Glass-Steagall et afgørende, politisk spørgsmål, der omgående må implementeres. Det er første skridt i hr. LaRouches Fire Hovedlove, udtrykkeligt baseret på de fire hovedrapporter til Kongressen, som Alexander Hamilton skrev, da han var finansminister. Vi søger altså tilbage til en politik, der har en mangeårig historie for beviselig succes. Donald Trump udbrød ikke bare lige pludselig, »Lad os få Glass-Steagall«. Ifølge beretninger fra mennesker, der fulgte denne tale på tæt hold nede i Charlotte, så var dette den mest gennemkomponerede og velorganiserede tale i hele hans præsidentkampagne. I et Tv-interview med Fox den næste morgen bekræftede Wilbur Ross, der tilhører en gruppe af »milliardærer«, som udgør Trumps økonomiske hovedrådgivere, den pointe, som Trump kom med dagen før i Charlotte. Her følger et kort uddrag af ordvekslingen mellem Fox News' Maria Bartolino og Wilbur Ross:

Bartolino: I går krævede Donald Trump en version for det 21. århundrede af Glass/Steagall-loven fra 1933, der kræver en opdeling mellem kommerciel bankvirksomhed og investeringsbankvirksomhed. Fortæl os om dette, for vi ved alle, hvad Dodd/Frank-loven har gjort ved sektoren for finansielle tjenesteydelser; og det er blevet vanskeligere at låne penge. Det er blevet ét af spørgsmålene i denne økonomi. Fortæl mig om en Glass/Steagall-version for det 21. århundrede.

Ross var fuldstændig klar og på det rene med det, som Trump refererede til aftenen før. Han sagde:

Ross: Altså, bankerne. Det er ikke så meget det, at de er for store; det drejer sig om, at de er for komplekse. For komplekse, og for komplicerede internt. Tænk over, hvor meget storbankerne – man må kende alt til verdens geografi; man må

kende hver eneste obskure form for produkt på derivatmarkedet. Det er en voldsomt stor menu for en person at absorbere. Vi mener, at det kunne være bedre for bankerne at holde sig til udlån, og, i stedet for at indføre flere restriktioner på pengeudlån, at gøre det lettere for dem at udstede lån. Tænk over det. Når man lægger sag an mod bankerne hver dag for de lån, de udstedte dagen før, så er det ikke måden at opmuntre dem til at udstede nye lån. De er i færd med at gøre bankerne pistol-sky.

Dernæst spørger hun, »Siger du, at der bør være mere opdeling?«

Ross: Jeg mener, at det, der er vigtigt, er fornuftig regulering frem for regulering for reguleringens skyld. Når man tænker efter, med alle disse bøder for subprime-udlån, kan du nævne en eneste person, der nogensinde er blevet sat ud af sit hus, som ikke rent faktisk havde et huslån, og som ikke var bagud med sine betalinger på lånet og fortjente at blive sat ud? Der er ikke et eneste tilfælde, hvor dette er blevet bevist, så det er altså strafferegulering, det er straffelovgivning snarere, end det er noget, der er fornuftigt.

Dette var helt klart ikke bare et slag ud i den tomme luft. Vi ved ikke, om dette er en seriøs forpligtelse til denne politik. Men vi ved, at der er massiv folkelig opbakning til Glass-Steagall. Det er derfor, det endte i både det Demokratiske og det Republikanske partiprogram. Vi ved, at der fandt en intern kamp sted i Hillary Clintons kampagne, hvor flere af hendes hovedrådgivere indtrængende opfordrede hende til også offentligt at støtte Glass-Steagall, hvilket hun nægtede at gøre. Bernie Sanders' tilhængere, Elizabeth Warrens tilhængere, de, der er det Demokratiske Partis kernevælgere, er lige så ubøjelige mht. behovet for Glass-Steagall, som nogle på den Republikanske side.

Så spørgsmålet er, at dette nu er lagt direkte frem på bordet. Vi er i de sidste ti dage før præsidentvalget, og øjeblikket

er derfor inde til at vinde dette spørgsmål, meget aggressivt, og til, at Kongressen tager dette spørgsmål op som sin første regulære forretningshandling, når den vender tilbage efter valget den 8. november, uanset udfaldet. Mandatet foreligger. Det er nu et fundamentalt spørgsmål i den præsidentielle debat i disse sidste dage. Igen, hvad enten Trump er seriøs om det her, eller det var et politisk stunt, så er spørgsmålet ikke desto mindre blevet særdeles markant indsprøjtet i denne præsidentkampagnes slutfase, og der er ingen bagside ved, at dette er sket.

Ogden: Hr. LaRouches ideer er meget magtfulde, og de står for sig selv. Hr. LaRouche responderede ikke på tidernes skiften. Han har i årevis været meget, meget klar mht. den *presserende* nødvendighed af Glass-Steagall og har forudsagt, at vi faktisk igen ville komme til dette punkt. Deutsche Bank er ved at nedsmelte. Det er værre end Lehman Brothers i 2008. Det faktum, at Glass-Steagall ikke blev genindført, som hr. LaRouche krævede, umiddelbart efter sammenbruddet i 2008, er det, der har bragt os til dette punkt. Kesha [Rogers] var involveret i en højt profileret kampagne til Senatet og flere højt profilerede kampagner til Repræsentanternes Hus. Andre medlemmer af LaRouchePAC Policy Committee stillede også op til valg til Kongressen for fire og seks år siden, på et Glass/Steagall-valgprogram, og gjorde dette til det afgørende, nationale spørgsmål. I det omfang, hvor der har været nogen seriøse diskussioner i denne præsidentkampagne, så har det været omkring spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall. Det blev bragt på bane i den Demokratiske debat af to kandidater – Martin O'Malley, og også Bernie Sanders; Hillary Clinton sagde »Nej!«.

Dette er nu det *afgørende* spørgsmål. Og som du sagde, Jeff, så viser det, at der er en *overvældende* folkelig opbakning: og begge partiprogrammer. Vi har nu en situation, hvor genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall i bogstavelig forstand er fremherskende i hele verden. Det ville være tragisk, hvis

Kongressen ikke omgående griber til handling for at genindføre loven – vent ikke på den officielle indsættelse [af den nye præsident] – omgående, ved Kongressens tilbagevenden til Washington. Glass-Steagall må ubetinget genindføres, for, hvis vi venter, og Deutsche Bank eller én af disse andre banker nedsmelter, så kan jeg garantere jer for, at vi befinder os i en langt værre situation end den, vi befandt os i, i sammenbruddet i 2008.

Så jeg mener, at det afgørende spørgsmål er lagt frem. Nødvendigheden af de dybtgående principper efter Hamilton – som hr. LaRouche har gjort meget klart – står for sig selv. Det er ikke et spørgsmål om, at nogen har erklæret Lyndon LaRouches [love for] gyldige; spørgsmålet er, at Lyndon LaRouches ideer står for sig selv, og har udgjort de afgørende spørgsmål, og nu har nået et punkt, hvor det er et indiskutabelt verdensledende spørgsmål – og det punkt, hvorfra det ikke er muligt at vende tilbage, kommer meget snart, med mindre man handler på disse ideer.

*Hele webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, kan høres/læses her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=15628>*

Alexander Hamiltons vision & LaRouches Fire Love – afgørende redskaber til at

redde USA.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 28. oktober, 2016

»Jeg tror, vi kan sige, at vi befinder os ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt i verdenshistorien, og ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt for vores nation. I løbet af de seneste uger, som I har kunnet følge på LaRouchePAC's webside, har vi mobiliseret en national mobilisering for at sætte hr. Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske program på dagsordenen, under betegnelsen 'De Fire Hovedlove; de Fire Nye Love til USA's økonomiske genrejsning', og disse love er baseret på Alexander Hamiltons fundamentale principper og hans arbejde med at etablere en videnskab om økonomi, der opbyggede USA. Vi har lanceret en kampagneside for mobilisering, og jeg vil direkte fremhæve, at det er vores dagsorden at bringe det amerikanske folk ind i denne mobilisering for at gøre jeres forståelse af, hvad det er for økonomiske principper, som Hamilton skabte, dybere; og hvad det er, som hr. LaRouche har inkorporeret i disse Fire Love.«

Engelsk udskrift:

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast October 28, 2016

**ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S VISION & LAROCHE'S FOUR LAWS –
ESSENTIAL TOOLS TO SAVE THE UNITED STATES**

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's October 28, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us here for our
Friday

evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the
studio

tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence
Review}, and we have via video, Kesha Rogers, a member of the

LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, former candidate for the United States Congress and United States Senate, joining us from Houston, Texas.

I think it can be said that we are at a very dramatic turning point in world history and a very dramatic turning point for our nation. Over the last several weeks, as you've been following the LaRouche PAC website, we have mobilized a national mobilization to put on the agenda Mr. Lyndon LaRouche's economic program; this is under the name of "The Four Cardinal Laws; the Four New Laws for the Economic Recovery of the United States", and it's grounded in the fundamental principles of Alexander Hamilton and his work establishing a science of economics which built the United States. We have launched a mobilization page, and I'll say right up front that our agenda is to bring the American people into this mobilization to deepen your understanding of what the economic principles are that Hamilton created; and what Mr. LaRouche has embodied in these Four Laws.

This is not something which is only important for the national stage; but this is shaping a paradigm shift which is currently ongoing on the international stage. We saw two weeks ago the dramatic shift, the realignment of the Philippines with President Duterte's trip to China; saying that he is realigning his country with the ideological flow of the Eurasian allied countries that are now creating a new economic paradigm. And we saw this expressed very clearly in a speech that Russian

President Vladimir Putin gave at the 2016 annual Valdai international discussion club proceedings. We'll get into some of the details of that, but Putin's emphases are very clear, and I think they include some of the subjects that we will be discussing here tonight. Number one, the danger of the NATO/Obama posture which has now brought us perilously close to the outbreak of World War III; a war that nobody is seeking on the Russian side, as Putin made very clear. And also, the urgent necessity of an entirely new economic paradigm to bridge the gap between a small number of very wealthy Wall Street speculators and a very large number of poverty-stricken, not only people, but also nations; and to bring technological progress to all, and to have that be the paradigm for relations among nations.

So, we'll get into those subjects, but I think first and foremost, the issue of Glass-Steagall; the necessity of shutting down what is now clearly the bankrupt Wall Street regime, and what has to necessarily follow after that. The Hamiltonian Four Laws that Mr. LaRouche has specified, I think is now very clearly on the agenda. So, I'm going to ask Jeff to just start with a quick briefing of some of the matters that we've discussed with Mr. LaRouche over the last 24 hours, and then we can proceed with a discussion of the implications of these developments.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I think that there

are

four or five things that I would really highlight in terms of significant new developments just in the time since last Friday's

broadcast. Number one, as Matt indicated, President Putin delivered a very powerful speech at the closing session of the Valdai conference that took place this week in Sochi, Russia. There were representatives there from all over the world, including at least a number of people there from China. I think

what President Putin did was not so much break new ground, but make very clear that Russia and he himself are fully committed to

moving ahead with the collaboration with China, with the other BRICS countries on bringing about a new paradigm of relations among nation-states; based on a policy of clear war avoidance built around cooperative economic investments in great projects

– including major advances in science, including the advancement

of man's mastery over space. So, Putin in a certain sense, reinforced what we saw at the G20 meeting in Hangzhou in China;

what we saw at the BRICS heads of state summit meeting more recently in Goa, India. So, Russia is all-in on that, and he made the point very clearly, that the collapse of the Western financial system is the principal factor driving the world towards an extraordinarily dangerous situation, where you could

have an outbreak of world war – even thermonuclear world war – as the result of provocative actions born of desperation. I think that whole picture is one element of what's really changed

in this last week.

Now, I spent the last 48 hours – Wednesday and Thursday of

this week – attending an annual conference in Washington, DC

of
the National Council on US-Arab Relations. There were about
1000
people there, and it was widely attended by the diplomatic
community, particularly the Arab diplomatic community; by the
US
business sector that deals with the Gulf States. At the very
closing of the conference, Thursday evening, there was a
concluding keynote presentation by General David Petraeus –
formerly the head of the Central Command, formerly the
Director
of the CIA. He made a very bold set of proposals that
unfortunately dovetailed very precisely with the kinds of
things
that have been coming out of Hillary Clinton and the Clinton
campaign throughout this Presidential election. What General
Petraeus called for was both the creation of safe zones inside
Syrian sovereign territory, the creation of a no-fly zone over
a
large portion of Syrian territory, and he called for the
United
States to use both sea-based and air-based cruise missiles to
knock out the Syrian air force. Now, he very cavalierly said
of
course this brings on the danger of a war with Russia; but he
brushed that aside, saying, Vladimir Putin responds to power,
and
responds to serious threats to use power. Therefore, in the
face
of these kinds of actions, Putin will back down.

Now, we're talking about American and Russian air
assets
engaging in a very limited theater of action, where we've so
far
avoided a major incident that could have led to general war
because of a deconfliction agreement that fortunately still
remains in force between the US-led coalition on the one side,

and Russia on the other. But what's being proposed here is a complete overturning of that policy. We know that this is exactly what Hillary Clinton is calling for in her own Presidential campaign speeches. There have been recent studies presented on behalf of the Clinton campaign by the Center for a New American Security and the Center for American Progress, that go almost as extremist as General Petraeus' statements. Basically, the war danger cannot in the least underestimated; and the fact is that President Putin – in his Valdai speech – was very clear about that danger.

Now, on the larger issue of the immediacy of the blow-out of the financial system of the trans-Atlantic region, everybody is really on the edge of their chairs over the fact that the US Department of Justice and Deutsche Bank are still parrying around back and forth and have not reached a decision yet on a proposed 14 billion euro fine for Deutsche Bank's criminal activity during the mortgage-backed securities crisis leading into the 2008 blow-out. Deutsche Bank is on the edge of collapse; it's widely acknowledged. The major German financial press, led by {Handelsblatt}, writes about this virtually every day. We know that the Italian banking system is also on the verge of a blow-out with 360 billion euro in non-performing debt on the books of the larger Italian banks. So, it is absolutely true that we're on the precipice of a potential financial blow-out far worse than Lehman Brothers in 2008.

It's in that context, that I think it's very important to take note of the fact that earlier this week, Donald Trump delivered a speech in Charlotte, North Carolina, in which he explicitly called for the implementation of a 21st Century Glass-Steagall. He also warned that if Hillary Clinton is elected President, the chances grow enormously that we will be facing World War III at some point very soon; and he cited the Syria events that I've already talked about as a kind of a key element of that situation. Many people are scratching their heads and saying, where did this from in terms of Trump suddenly coming out for Glass-Steagall? It's only 12 days before the Presidential election that this speech came out.

I had the opportunity to someone who's been involved in Washington politics as a kind of insider for a very long time; and his view was that he was expecting something like this to come out of the Trump campaign, out of Donald Trump. It could have been more effective if it had happened in September, but whether he's being opportunistic or whether he genuinely means it, the fact is that the Glass-Steagall issue has now been basically re-infused into the Presidential elections at a critical kind of countdown moment before November 8th. And there's really no downside to that. Whatever the outcome of the election, Glass-Steagall is an essential policy issue that must be implemented immediately. It's the first step of Mr. LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws for how to carry out an economic recovery; and Mr. LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws on based explicitly on the four key reports to Congress by Alexander Hamilton when he was Secretary of the Treasury. So, we're reaching back for policies that have a long-time proven track record of success. Donald Trump didn't just simply blurt out "Let's have Glass-Steagall." By accounts of people who closely

watched that speech down in Charlotte, this was the most thoroughly composed and well organized speech of his entire Presidential campaign. The next morning, in a TV interview with Fox, Wilbur Ross, who is one of a group of "billionaires" who are key economic policy advisors to Trump, basically reinforced the point that Trump had made the day before in Charlotte. This is a bit of an exchange between Fox News' Maria Bartolino and Wilbur Ross:

BARTOLINO: Donald Trump yesterday called for a 21st Century version of the 1933 Glass-Steagall law that requires the separation of commercial and investment banking. Talk to us about this, because we all know what Dodd-Frank has done to the financial services sector; and lending has become tougher. That's become one of the issues for this economy. Tell me about the 21st Century version of Glass-Steagall.

Ross was absolutely clear and familiar with what Trump was referring to the night before. He said:

ROSS: Well, the banks. It isn't so much that they're too big; it's that they're too complex. Too complex and too complicated internally. Think about how much the big banks – you have to know every geography in the world; you have to know every kind of obscure kind of product in the derivatives market. That's an awful big menu for anybody to absorb. We think it might be better for the banks to stick to lending, and instead

of
making more restrictions on lending, make it easier for them
to
make loans. Think about it. When you were suing banks every
day
for the loans that they've made the day before, it's not the
way
to encourage them to make new loans. They're making banks
gun-shy.

And she asks, "Are you saying there should be more
separation?"

ROSS: I think the more important thing is sensible
regulation rather than just regulation for the sake of
regulation. When you think about it, with all these fines
over
sub-prime lending, can you name a single person who was ever
dispossessed from a house that didn't actually have a
mortgage,
wasn't delinquent on it and deserved to be foreclosed? There
isn't one case where that's been proven, so it's punitive
regulation, it's punitive law enforcement rather than anything
very sensible.

This was clearly not just simply a stab in the dark.
We
don't know whether this is a serious commitment to the policy.
But we do know that there is mass popular support for
Glass-Steagall. That's why it wound up in the platforms of
both
the Democratic and Republican Parties. We know there was a
fight
inside the Hillary Clinton campaign, in which a number of her
key
advisors urged her to also come out and support Glass-
Steagall,
which she refused to do. The Bernie Sanders supporters, the

Elizabeth Warren supporters, those who are mainstay voters for the Democratic Party, are as adamant about the need for Glass-Steagall as some on the Republican side.

So, the issue is that this now squarely on the table. It's the final ten days before the Presidential elections, and so therefore, now is the moment for this issue to be driven home, forcefully, and for Congress to take this up as their first order of business when they return after the November 8th elections, regardless of the outcome. The mandate is there. It's now a fundamental issue in the Presidential debate in these closing days. Again, whether Trump is serious about this, or this was a political stunt, nevertheless, the issue has been injected very substantially into the final moments of this Presidential campaign, and there's no downside to that having happened.

OGDEN: Mr. LaRouche's ideas are very powerful, and they stand on their own. Mr. LaRouche has not responded to the change of the time. He has been very, very clear for years, on the {urgent} necessity of Glass-Steagall, and has forecast that we would in fact reach this point again. Deutsche Bank is blowing out. It's worse than Lehman 2008. The fact that Glass-Steagall was not reinstated, as Mr. LaRouche called for, immediately following the 2008 crash, is what has brought us to this point. Kesha was involved in a high-profile Senate campaign, several high-profile House campaigns. Other members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee also ran for federal office four, six years ago, on a Glass-Steagall platform, and made that the definitive national issue. To the extent that there's been any serious

discussion in this Presidential campaign, it has been around the question of Glass-Steagall. This was brought up in the Democratic debates by two candidates – Martin O'Malley, Bernie Sanders also brought it up; Hillary Clinton said, "No!"

This is now the {defining} question. And as you said, Jeff, what this shows is that there is {overwhelming} popular support:

both Party platforms. Now you have a situation in which the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall is virtually hegemonic. It would

be tragic were the Congress not to take the immediate action to

reinstate this – do not wait for the inauguration – immediately

after returning to Washington. Glass-Steagall has got to be reinstated, because if we wait, and Deutsche Bank or one of these

other banks blows out, I guarantee you, we are in a far worse situation that we were, even in the Crash of 2008.

So I think the defining question is there. The necessity for

the depth of the Hamiltonian principles – which Mr. LaRouche has

made very clear – stand on their own. It's not a question of has

somebody validated Lyndon LaRouche; the question is Lyndon LaRouche's ideas stand on their own, and have been the defining

questions, and have now reached the point where it's undeniably

hegemonic, and the point of no return is coming very soon, unless

these ideas are acted on.

STEINBERG: Let me throw something else in on this. I think there's an important lesson to be learned from the just-concluded, successful fight over the summer into September, around first, the release of the 28 pages from the original Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11; and then what followed after that, with the overwhelming House and Senate override of President Obama's veto of the JASTA Bill, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. As was the case for some time with JASTA, the issue is that once it was going to come to a vote, there was no question that there was overwhelming support for it. There was a political mobilization. LaRouche PAC led that fight, along with the families and survivors of 9/11, and others as well, to make sure it was actually brought to a vote. The same is true of Glass-Steagall right now. There's got to be a groundswell of pressure on the leadership of the House and Senate, to bring it to a vote.

I have no doubt whatsoever that given all of the factors that we've been discussing, that if a vote were allowed to be taken, say on November 14-15, whatever it is the day that the House and Senate return to Washington for the beginning of the "lame duck" session, that should be on the table. It should be brought to the full floor of the Senate and the House. The bills exist in both Houses. The language is compatible. This could be done in a very short period of time. If you look at the way that the JASTA vote proceeded just before the recess, the whole

thing
took place in the course of {one day}. There was a morning
vote
and debate in the House. It went immediately to the Senate in
the
afternoon; because the leadership recognized that the American
people {demanded} that this happen. There was a mobilization.
There was a sense of timing. And there is no reason in the
world
that the same thing can't happen before the middle of next
month
with respect to Glass-Steagall.

As Matt just said, and as Thomas Hoenig, [vice
chairman of
the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] has been arguing
for
years, Glass-Steagall has to be put in place {before} the
blow-out, because once you get that blow-out, Congress will be
stampeded by Wall Street and London into another bail-out, and
you're going to be off to the races. It's going to be a
disaster.

This is something where the will of the American
people has
to be heard. That's the context in which we're looking at the
fact that Trump chose at the last moment to inject Glass-
Steagall
into his campaign rhetoric for the final countdown days before
the election.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. I think it's important to
understand that
LaRouche "drew the line in the sand" a long time ago. He set
the
standard of the Glass-Steagall representing the first step to
bringing down Wall Street, this financial speculation, and the
continued protection and defense of Wall Street, of this
British

imperial system of the City of London, meant the death of the nation and society as a whole, because we're seeing what this is doing to impact the United States through the continued economic collapse that's devastating the entire nation, the rate of increase in poverty. This has all been a product of Wall Street's total destruction of our nation.

And so, this fight for Glass-Steagall – LaRouche has led it in the highest terms possible, because it represents a saving of the American people. It's the identity of what has to shape the future for this nation. I think it's really important that, as we've continued to have discussions with Mr. LaRouche – the Policy Committee and others – he defined very clearly that the issue at hand is, what is going to be necessary and the standard set for creating a standard by which credit is defined. And this is what he has gone back to, with implementing the Hamiltonian standard for the United States and for the world with his Four Laws. Representing the context by which we can instill in the American people a standard of economic value which is not based on money, not based on the idea that you can just pump money into small infrastructure projects here and there. But he made very clear that you have to have an international program based on the principle of a credit policy as Alexander Hamilton understood – and this is why he has been very emphatic; that the American people have to read, master and understand the works of Hamilton

today as never before. This is what Franklin Roosevelt understood. People are adopting and taking up the policy for restoring Glass-Steagall which LaRouche has made a household name. Franklin Roosevelt really understood the enemy. He understood that this house of cards of Wall Street was crumbling, it had to be brought down; just as LaRouche understands today. Many people who've put their name on the docket for Glass-Steagall have been called by Wall Street "Public Enemy Number One," and so forth.

How do we really look at this, from the standpoint of what we're dealing with a population that has lost a sense – and Mr.

LaRouche really captured this today, very profoundly – of their

own mind; the ability of their own mind to actually know how to

fight this enemy and know how to create the future which they so

desperately desire and need? What you really see right now is that they're being given an opportunity to participate in something very profound and unique. If we look at what's being presented by LaRouche's policies being adopted throughout the world right now, the standard that's been set in China. The standard for the future that's been set in Russia to defy and to

deny this policy of thermonuclear war and destruction. Of going

after the future and the youth of the nation, that the international standard that's being set right now for a program

based on these Hamiltonian principles, can {clearly} be seen by

what China is doing and actually representing for a total revolution, total renaissance for generations to come, in the standards they're setting with their space program.

Because when Mr. LaRouche said you have to have an international program that defines an economic standard of value, of credit, in this nation and across the planet, that's the first thing to look at. The fact that China just launched a new initiative, a total breakthrough putting them front and center stage in the development of their space program; when Obama has continued to kill the space program with the egregious budget cuts, with the turning over our space program to the private sector in the United States. The policy to continue to bail out Wall Street financial speculation instead of actually giving a national mission, as Kennedy understood was absolutely important, is something that can no longer be tolerated.

The inspiration is the crucial key at hand right now. People have lost faith and confidence and inspiration in this nation, in the system of this nation, because it has become a system of gambling, of debt, and it has gone away from the principles which were defined by our US Constitution. So when you look at the inspiration you're seeing from China, with the just launching of their spacecraft with two tyconauts from China, the Shenzhou-11 to dock with the Tiangong-2 space lab, what we have now seen China do is to actually create an international process of collaboration and development. Just as they've offered for the United States to cooperate, in a win-win strategy for the Silk Road, which nations around the world are taking up. This is defining a new standard of value and wealth.

Now, what's the standard in the United States? Jeff can say

more on this, because he just did a presentation that I would encourage people to look at on the website. It's death. The drug overdoses. If you don't have a policy of inspiration for your youth and for the nation, what are people going to turn to? What is going to be the standard and value and the understanding of the creativity, the creative potential of their own minds? I'll just say, before I got on this discussion, I was speaking to a lady 40 years old; she has a 23-year old son who she's paying thousands of dollars to get him off of drug overdoses from prescription medicines and pills. Three of his friends who she knows very closely just died within the last year of drug overdoses from heroin. First starting with painkillers, then finding this heroin, just as you said, Jeff. Because people have been denied a future that they can have a sense of their truly human identity; that they have a purpose and reason to live. Wall Street can and must be brought down, because the fight that was won with JASTA was just the beginning. If we don't finish off this policy of the British Empire and the Saudis funding of terrorism and funding of drug epidemics in the United States coming from Afghanistan, the drug trafficking, everything we've been seeing as the destruction of this nation, then we won't have a nation. We're seeing that very rapidly take place; this dark age has to be stopped.

I think a lot of people are understanding that LaRouche is giving them an opportunity for life and for determining and fighting for a future.

OGDEN: Yeah, I do want Jeff to say more about that interview, that short statement that he posted on the website. Let me just underscore what you just said; I think it's extraordinarily important. People lack the confidence in their own mind; they lack the confidence in their own ability to positively imagine and create and define a future. What comes in the void of that? It's anger, it's fear, it's demoralization. Our job is to give people their dignity back. We have to give them the confidence in themselves as meaningful human beings. I think that was very clearly demonstrated with what we accomplished – the Schiller Institute along with the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – with this extraordinary series of concerts over the weekend of the 15th anniversary of September 11th in New York City. This was a presentation of Mozart's {Requiem} and four African-American spirituals at four different venues across New York City and New Jersey. The confidence and the dignity that gave to people, including people who were engaged as you said, Jeff, in the fight, the victorious fight to declassify the 28 pages and to pass the JASTA bill and override the White House's veto, I think speaks directly to that point.

Coincidentally, there's one very short passage in this speech that Putin gave at the Valdai discussion which says almost exactly what you just said, Keshia. He said, "It is very clear that there is a lack of strategy and a lack of ideas for the future. This creates a climate of uncertainty that has a direct

impact on the public mood. Sociological studies conducted around the world show that people in different countries and on different continents tend to see the future as murky and bleak.

This is sad. The future does not entice them, but rather, frightens them."

So, our job is to create a potential for a future which entices the creative dignity of people and allows them to escape this – as you eloquently said – dark age of drug overdoses, death, and depression.

STEINBERG: I think it's important to also take note of the fact that just in the past two weeks, millions of American households have received word that their Obamacare health insurance premiums are going up by 20%, 30%, 50%, in some cases I know of directly, 70-80%. The administration was facing a torrent of news coverage admitting that Obamacare was finished.

Insurance companies are pulling out of the pools, and Obama came

out with this completely vacuous, lying statement claiming he'll

create some kind of a federal pool so that people can get reasonably-priced health insurance. The fact of the matter is,

at the very outset of this whole business, Obama shut the door on

expanding Medicare for all; shut the door on any other formulation of a single-payer plan. The cutbacks in the amount

of money being spent on health care has meant that by Hill-Burton

standards – in other words, the physical requirements; how many hospital beds, how many doctors, how many nurses, what kinds of specialty care have to be made available – the physical infrastructure of health care has collapsed under Obama, as people are finding their rates skyrocketing through the ceiling.

Obama personally came out with another lie to cover for the reality of what he created; namely claiming that the premium increases for most people will be covered by increases in taxpayer subsidies. But what he failed to say was that the only people who qualify for those subsidies are people who are living at or below one and a half times the poverty rate. So, anybody in the middle class, anybody even barely above that 1.5 times the poverty rate is out of luck; and they're being confronted with a choice – health care vs. housing; health care vs. food; in many, many cases health care vs. whether you can get your kids a college education. So, you've got that phenomenon that's staring the American people in the face; it's the collapse and disintegration of Obamacare, which is what Lyndon LaRouche warned about and forecast all the way back in 2009 when this thing was first started.

Then you've got the second phenomenon. Remember that President Obama, during his initial campaign for office back in 2008, basically distanced himself from the Bush-Cheney Iraq war,

but took full ownership of the Afghanistan war; which he called a war of necessity as opposed to a war of choice. Well, we're now eight more years into it, and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime last week came out with a report that Afghanistan – under US and NATO occupation – has produced a bumper crop of opium; up 43% to 4800 tons of pure opium produced this year. We know the consequences of that; cheap heroin is flooding onto the streets of the United States in every community, not just inner-city ghetto areas, but middle-class suburbs, rural areas. There is not a county in the United States that is not experiencing an opioid epidemic; and that's not our words, those are the words of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention – "epidemic".

You've had a major increase every year under Obama of deaths by opioid overdoses. It goes hand-in-glove with the shutdown of the health system, the flooding of the country with illegal drugs, the refusal of the Obama administration, number one, to crack down on HSBC – the British Opium War bank that was caught by the United States Senate as the number one drug-money launderer for the Latin American drug cartels. Nothing was done; a slap on the wrist. They've even violated the deferred prosecution agreement, but we hear nothing about the consequences. Secondly, the big pharmaceutical companies and the major drug distribution companies are flooding the black

market

with oxycontin and other opioids. This is also being done under

the watchful eye of the Department of Justice that has refused to

prosecute big Pharma and these big drug distribution companies for the same argument that they make why they won't prosecute and

criminally jail major bankers; they're too big to jail. The too-big-to-fail banks, the giant pharmaceutical companies that are pumping out these opioids; they are above the law, at least

under the policies of the Obama administration.

So, you've got a track record of death, destruction, and

despair emanating from the policies of the White House for the past eight years. Now we are at a crisis point, a social and economic crisis, a crisis of the morale of the population; yet there are clear and obvious solutions to all of these problems.

It doesn't take brain surgery to figure out that Glass-Steagall

and the other core principles put forward by Mr. LaRouche, which

are a revised version of the core ideas on which this economy of

this great nation was built in the first place, under the leadership of Alexander Hamilton. So, these things {can} be

done. One of the biggest obstacles is the fact that the collapse

of the health care system, the mass opioid addiction that's been

basically allowed to occur as an Opium War against the American

population, has reached the point where it's created a morale crisis. And that's got to be reversed.

Matt just referenced the impact of the concerts

commemorating the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks that took place in the greater New York City area the weekend of September 11th. Those kinds of things can be replicated everywhere. We can turn the situation around very quickly. We can end the scourge of Wall Street and the City of London; we can end these wars. You've got with Russia, with China, with India, with the other countries in Asia – Japan, Southeast Asia; they're all coming together around a new economic paradigm that's built on cooperation among nations for great projects across a vast area. The United States desperately needs to get in on this; and President Xi Jinping's standing invitation, delivered to President Bush face-to-face, still stands. The United States should join in and become part of this World Land-Bridge process; and if you do that, then the folly of these continuing wars and this confrontation with Putin and Russia become very obvious. It's completely ludicrous. We can move on and participate in this alternative paradigm which is right there; it's not a theoretical, it's not something in abstraction. It's going on every day of the week across all of Eurasia down into Africa. China is building a trans-continental railroad across South America. The plans for that railroad were in place in the 1870s, when American rail engineers who worked on the transcontinental railroad in the United States, went down to Peru, and went down to Brazil, and were working on those projects. The time is long overdue for the United States to get on board on something that

we, as a nation, forged as key concepts back during a better period in our history.

ROGERS: And what you're dealing with is a cultural transformation. I just wanted to add that this is not something that is up to people "Oh, this is a problem I'm having in my family. The drug overdose or something that I have to deal with." You have people who have health care premiums that are going up to \$1500-2000 per month, and then they're spending thousands of dollars to get their kids and loved ones off of these drugs, and you have no help from society because the society is completely degenerating. It's only going to be through a cultural transformation based on the beauty that was exemplified and continues to be exemplified by what we're representing with these {Requiem} concerts in New York; with a commitment towards a revival of truly Classical culture. One person I was talking to, who was going through such a crisis, was saying it would just be so beautiful and so important if you can come into my area to sing; because these people desperately need beauty. It's not going to just take each individual; but as Putin recognized, you have to have a total transformation of the culture. I was just thinking at the very end, that Matt you brought up a few quotes earlier of this speech, and I don't want to read long quotes; but I think this captures what we were just discussing very well. At the very end of Putin's speech at Valdai in Sochi, he said: "In short, we should build the foundation for the future world today by investing in all priority areas of human development. And of course, it is necessary to continue a broad-based discussion of our common future, so that all sensible and promising initiatives are

heard."

This is absolutely what has to be the standard of the United States right now; shaping that future that must be brought into existence.

OGDEN: Yeah, I would recommend people read some more extensive excerpts of this speech; it's very all-encompassing. But at the same place where he said what you just cited, he called for a Marshall Plan to rebuild the war-torn areas – especially in the Middle East and North Africa; but a Marshall Plan type of approach. He called for a New International Economic Order, which would make the fruit of economic growth and technological progress accessible to all. He celebrated the joining together of the Eurasian Economic Union with the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road policy of China, to create an integrated Eurasian space where these kinds of massive development projects can take place, as Jeff just cited. He said that the major question, the principle, has got to be how do you develop human potential? He said, "An important task of ours is to develop human potential. Only a world with ample opportunities for all, with highly-skilled workers, with access to knowledge, and a great variety of ways to realize their potential, can be considered truly free. Only a world where people from different countries do not struggle to survive, but lead full lives, can be stable."

I would recommend going back and reading some of the excerpts from Alexander Hamilton's "Report on Manufactures", because he makes exactly the same point. He says it's only a

world where the diverse talents of the various of your society can be developed to their fullest potential through the application of technology, and the availability of this on the widest possible scale, that you can create the future potential

for the creative labor, not just the manual labor, but the creative labor of your labor force, of your workforce, of your citizenry, which increases the potential population density of your nation; increases the productive powers of that labor force,

and improves the quality of the lives of all. And only a society

like that can be defined as truly free. In Hamilton's time, it

was the fight against slavery; it was the fight against the manual, bestial labor of the African slaves imported to the southern states of the United States. In our time, it's the fight for a Hamiltonian policy in the present period; and I think

we just keep coming back to the point. This is the Four New Laws

of LaRouche; this is the principle of Alexander Hamilton. It is

happening on the international stage, as Jeff said. The One Belt, One Road policy from China; this new economic paradigm; these are taking place every single day.

The defining question is: Will the United States join that New Paradigm?

STEINBERG: It's ironic that one of the cornerstones, in light of what's going on in the real guttural side of this Presidential campaign, one of the cornerstones of Hamilton's concept in the "Report on Manufactures" was immigration; mass immigration. His policy was, bring 'em in; we'll educate them;

we'll make productive American citizens out of them, no matter where they come from. That idea that there's always a shortage of precious creative labor. I think it's another point very much worth reflecting on; rather than thinking about walls and things like that. He just said, we've got to bring more people in here; because we've got productive work for them to do to build a nation.

OGDEN: Right; apropos. I just want to read the one section from the Putin speech where he says this specifically. He says, "We cannot achieve global stability unless we guarantee global economic progress. It is essential to provide conditions for 'creative labor' and economic growth at a pace that would put an end to the division of the world into permanent winners and permanent losers."

On that note, I want to just announce to people that {Executive Intelligence Review} is putting out a republication of the four economic reports of Hamilton. These will be available in book form, hopefully coming up the beginning next week. It's titled, {Alexander Hamilton's Vision}, and it's a republication of these four central economic reports; the "Report on Public Credit", the "Report on Manufactures", the "Report on National Banking", and Hamilton's argument "On the Constitutionality of the National Bank". As an appendix to that book, we also include the full text of Mr. LaRouche's new economic laws. That is

also

the headline of a special double edition of the {Hamiltonian} which came out at the beginning of this week – "The Four New Laws to Save the USA Now!" This is edition 10 of the {Hamiltonian}, and included in this is also an elaboration of some of the principles of the "Report on Manufactures", which I

wrote up; "The LaRouche-Hamilton Science of Physical Economy", and there's also an article on the background of Alexander Hamilton's fight against slavery and his establishment of a new

political order for the United States through the founding of this science of economics. There's also a very entertaining cartoon which was drawn by a member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, Dave Christie, called "Obamandias" based on "Ozymandias" which was a famous sonnet by Percy Bysshe Shelley.

So that's available on the LaRouche PAC website.

So, I think we have definitely defined the fact that we are

at a turning point in the history of this country and the history

of the world. This is certainly not business as usual; and the

hegemony of the principles that Mr. LaRouche has put on the table

as the urgent steps to create an economic recovery for this country now, has certainly been demonstrated very clearly.

It's

our job to continue to draw people towards the mobilization page

on the LaRouche PAC Action Center; this is

actioncenter.larouchepac.com/four laws. You can sign up directly

on that website; you will receive an email, you will become part

of our national network of activists. You can participate in

the weekly activists calls that we hold every Thursday night – our Fireside Chats. You can submit reports of activities that you've engaged in. You can have all of the background material available there – Hamilton's four economic reports are linked on that page – and you can become part of this movement which is clearly defining world history.

So, thank you very much, and I'd like to thank both Jeff and Kesha for joining us here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Thank you and good night.

Obamas krige i Mellemøsten forårsager udbredt lidelse i civilbefolkningen

26. okt., 2016 – Den selvretfærdige propagandastorm, der er blevet rettet imod Rusland og Syriens Bashar al-Assad-regering over den angiveligt tilfældige bombing af civile i det østlige Aleppo, har, måske endda med overlæg, haft den virkning, at det har dækket over den udbredte lidelse i civilbefolkningen, der er et direkte resultat af præsident Obamas og hans britiske herrers politik for 'evindeligt krig'. Et ukendt antal dødsfald blandt civile er ikke alene et resultat af den direkte virkning af våben, der kastes fra krigsfly og affyres fra artilleri, men også af krigens ødelæggelse af midlerne til opretholdelse af et normalt liv.

Syrien

Amnesty International har fremført, at Pentagon ikke tager tilstrækkeligt ansvar for de civile tab, som dets bombekampagne i Syrien forårsager. Ifølge *Washington Post* skønner Amnesty, at en række angreb fra september 2014 til juli 2016 dræbte omkring 300 civile.

»Det er vores opfattelse, at der har været langt flere civile dødsfald, end der findes oplysninger om«, sagde Neil Sammonds, en Syrien-efterforsker hos Amnesty. »For det meste ser det ikke ud, som om de har foretaget tilstrækkelige, grundige efterforskninger, så vi vil gerne forvisses om, at disse vil blive gennemført.« CENTCOM har fuldført 62 efterforskninger af angivelige, civile dødsfald og har konkluderet, at i alt 55 mennesker døde i disse angreb. »Det bekymrer Amnesty International, at CENTCOM i væsentlig grad synes at undervurdere den grad af skade på civile, som dets gennemførte operationer på civile mål har gjort«, sagde Amnesty.

Men at kaste bomber ned over civile er ikke den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan slå dem ihjel i krig. RT's Murad Gazdiev besøgte en cancerklinik for børn i Aleppo og fandt, at disse børn risikerer at dø udelukkende, fordi USA/EU-sanktionerne mod Syrien har gjort det umuligt for klinikken at få de former for medicin, som behandlingen af patienterne kræver. »Næsten alle de børn, der døde af cancer, døde pga. europæiske sanktioner. Vi anmoder den Europæiske Union og humanitære organisationer om at ophæve disse sanktioner og lade medicin mod cancer komme ind, fordi børn lider«, sagde Mizzna al-Ulabi, en leder af Cancer Care Syria, til RT.

Irak

Selvfølgelig har det meste af nyhedsmediernes fokus i Irak, omkring den amerikanskledede kampagne for at genindtage Mosul, været på de grusomheder, som ISIS har begået mod civile. Men

de kan muligvis blegne i sammenligning med det, USA foretager sig dér. Jürgen Todenhöfer, den tyske journalist, der er berømt for at have tilbragt flere uger i det ISIS-besatte Syrien i 2014-2015, skønner, i et vredt opslag på sin facebookside, at 15.000 civile i Mosul allerede er blevet dræbt pga. USA's bombning, som nu har varet i over to år, og dog er verden, ligesom i Aleppo, tavs. Magtbalancen mellem ISIS-styrkerne i Mosul og den brogede hær af 90.000 tropper, bakket op af amerikansk luftstøtte, kan udgøre så meget som 100 til 1, eller endda 1000 til 1, siger han. Endnu ti tusinder af civile vil dø, siger han. Amerikanske bombardementer har allerede ødelagt forsyninger af elektricitet, gas og vand, såvel som også hospitaler og universiteter. Todenhöfer siger, at, siden 2014, er 50.000 civile blevet dræbt af USA's bombning i Irak (inklusive Mosul), og de byer, der tidligere er blevet »befriet« fra ISIS, ikke så meget er blevet befriet, som de er blevet ødelagt, med intet, som deres tidligere indvånere kan vende tilbage til.

Generalløjtnant Sergej Rudskov, chefen for den Russiske Generalstabs Afdeling for Hovedoperationer, talte i går om den amerikanske kampagne i Mosul i lignende vendinger.

»Vi kender til flere fakta om den amerikanskledede koalitions luftangreb imod beboelseskvarterer, skoler og andre civile infrastrukturbygninger, både i Mosul og i andre bebyggelser i Ninive-distriktet«, sagde Rudkov. »Alene i løbet af de seneste tre dage blev flere end 60 civile, inklusive børn, ofre for disse luftangreb. Flere end 200 mennesker er blevet såret.« Den Amerikanske Centralkommando har hidtil blot responderet ved at bede russerne om mere information om disse specifikke dødsfald.

Yemen

I Yemen hænger hungersnød landet som et resultat af den

amerikanskstøttede, saudiske krig imod det, der i forvejen var et af de fattigste lande i den arabiske verden. Reuters rapporterer om en 18-årig pige, der var svært underernæret, i Hodeida-havnebyen ved det Røde Hav, og som udelukkende overlever på en diet bestående af juice, mælk og te, iflg. hospitalspersonalet på det hospital, hvor hun ligger. »Hendes billede er en påmindelse om den humanitære krise i den Arabiske Halvøes fattigste land, hvor mindst 10.000 mennesker er blevet dræbt i kampe mellem den saudiskledede, arabiske koalition og den iranskledede houthi-bevægelse«, siger Reuters.

»Hungersnøden vokser hver dag, og folk har opbrugt alle deres overlevelsesstrategier. Millioner af mennesker kan ikke overleve uden hjælp udefra«, sagde Muhannad Hadi, Verdensfødevareprogrammets direktør for Mellemøsten og flere andre regioner, i går. Torben Due, VFP's Yemen-direktør, advarede om, at »en hel generation kunne blive invalideret af hungersnød«. Tidligere på året havde FN skønnet, at flere end 14 millioner mennesker, omkring halvdelen af landets befolkning, lider af hungersnød, inklusive 370.000 børn, der direkte trues af sultedød. Før krigen var Yemen for 90 % 's vedkommende afhængig af fødevareimport, men saudierne gennemtvang en økonomisk blokade mod landet, da krigen begyndte i marts 2015, en blokade, som skibe fra den amerikanske flåde har været med til at opretholde.

Foto: En yemenitisk mand i sorg ... (Reuters)

Putin i Valдай: Ny

verdensorden, 'der gør økonomisk og teknologisk fremskridt tilgængeligt for alle'

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 27. oktober, 2016 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin leverede i dag afslutningstalen ved Valdai Internationale Diskussionsklub i Sotji, Rusland, hvor han præsenterede både en indsigtfuld fordømmelse af den kollapsende, transatlantiske orden, og også en bevægende vision om den fremtid, som det er presserende, at hele menneskeheden opbygger. Hans bemærkninger tog udgangspunkt i – og videreudviklede – de centrale ideer fra topmødet for G20-nationer den 4. – 5. september, 2016, i Hangzhou, Kina; de gav, sine steder, udtryk for de samme ideer, som den mexicanske præsident José López Portillo præsenterede i sin historiske tale til FN's generalforsamling i 1982 (der var meget stærkt influeret af hans udvekslinger med Lyndon LaRouche); og de gjorde det i øvrigt klart, hvorfor temaet på dette års møde i Valdai-klubben, med rette, lød, [»Udviklingen af fremtiden: At udforme morgendagens verden«](#).

I sin tale forklarede Putin, at den transatlantiske økonomi befinder sig i en »systemisk krises« kvælergreb, der driver verden til krig, og at en totalt ny fremgangsmåde kræves for at redde menneskeheden:

»Ødelæggelserne, i mammut-skala, kræver, at der udarbejdes et langfristet, omfattende program, en slags Marshallplan, for at genoplive det krigs- og konflikthærgede område. Rusland er helt bestemt villig til aktivt at gå med i disse teamindsatser.«

»Vi kan ikke sikre global stabilitet, med mindre vi sikrer globalt, økonomisk fremskridt. Det er af afgørende betydning at skabe betingelser for kreativt arbejde og økonomisk vækst i et tempo, der ville gøre en ende på opsplittningen af verden i permanente vindere og permanente tabere. Spilletts regler bør i det mindste give udviklingslandene en chance for at indhente de lande, vi kender som udviklede økonomier (lande) ... [og] gøre frugterne af økonomisk vækst og teknologisk fremskridt tilgængelige for alle. Dette ville især gøre end ende på fattigdom, ét af nutidens værste problemer.«

Putin understregede Ruslands alliance med Kina for at bygge en sådan ny verdensorden: »Det er sådan, vi arrangerer den Eurasiske Økonomiske Unions arbejde og fører forhandlinger med vore partnere, især mht. koordination med projektet for det Nye Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, som Kina er i færd med at gennemføre. Vi forventer, at det fremmer et vidtrækkende, eurasiske partnerskab, der er løfterigt mht. at udvikle sig til ét af de formative centre i et udstrakt, eurasiske integrationsområde ... Én af vore vigtige opgaver er at udvikle det menneskelige potentiale. Kun en verden, hvor der er rigelige muligheder for alle, med højtuddannede arbejdere, adgang til viden og en stort udbud af måder til at realisere deres potentiale, kan anses at være virkeligt fri.«

Putin erklærede, at *manglen* på en sådan politik for fremtiden er i færd med at ødelægge selve sjælen i den transatlantiske verden. »Der er en mangel på strategi og ideer for fremtiden ... Fremtiden er ikke fristende for dem [folket], men er skræmmende for dem ... Folk stemmer slet ikke sådan, som de officielle og respektable medier råder dem til, og heller ikke, som mainstream-partierne råder dem til.« Han fordømte en amerikansk præsidentvalgkamp, der »simpelt hen overskrider alle grænser« mht. at diskutere substantielle, politiske spørgsmål.

Et potentielt nyttigt afbræk i denne triste affære kom i går i en tale af den republikanske kandidat Donald Trump i

Charlotte, North Carolina, hvor han gav »ophævelsen af Glass-Steagall« skylden for finanskrisen i 2008, og dernæst erklærede, at »tiden er kommet til at indføre en Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede«. Lyndon LaRouche kommenterede, at vi på nuværende tidspunkt ikke kender arten af seriøsitet eller hensigt bag Trumps bemærkninger, men de har i det mindste lagt spørgsmålet frem på bordet, så man ikke kan undvige det. Hvorom alting er, så er det centrale, at den eneste, faktiske løsning på den systemiske krise, som Putin identificerede, er *LaRouches Fire Love, inklusive Glass-Steagall*. Og vi ved helt præcist, hvad vore intentioner er, og hvad, der må gøres – inklusive den omgående fjernelse af Obama fra embedet, som den eneste, effektive måde at stoppe Obama-Clinton-fremstødet for atomkrig med Rusland og Kina.

Foto: Vladimir Putin tog del i den afsluttende session på Valdai Internationale Diskussionsklubs 13. årlige møde, som i år valgte temaet 'Udviklingen af fremtiden: At udforme morgendagens verden'. 27. okt., 2016 [kremlin.ru]

Breve til redaktør af Washington Post reflekterer debat om Obamas sindssyge politik i Syrien

26. okt., 2016 – To breve til redaktøren, som er blevet udgivet i Washington Post den 25. okt., reflekterer den debat, der finder sted i og omkring Washington om Obama-administrationens sindssyge politik for Syrien.

Robert E. Hunter, en tidligere amerikansk ambassadør til NATO

og tidligere embedsmand i det Nationale Sikkerhedsråd for Mellemøsten og Europa, responderede i sit brev til lederen i *WP* den 23. okt., skrevet af John Allen og Charles R. Lister, hvor de kræver, at USA's rolle i Syrien udvides betydeligt, inklusive at udføre målrettede angreb imod syriske militære faciliteter, gennemtvinge flere sanktioner mod Syrien og Rusland og intensivere en gennemgribende undersøgelse af oppositionsenheder, blandt andre ting.

Hunter advarer om, at de to forfattere »laver den samme afgørende fejl, som Obama-administrationen har lavet: de kom ikke med nogen realistisk plan for, hvad der ville ske i Syrien efter afsættelsen af præsident Bashar al-Assad«. Han påpeger, at hverken USA eller andre »foreslår forholdsregler til at beskytte alle de forskellige trosretninger i Syrien, inklusive alawitterne«. Uden dette »vil hr. Assad og hans folk fortsætte kampen«. Desuden, tilføjer han, vil den enkle »Assad må væk«-holdning alliere USA »med sunni-staters geopolitiske mål og fastholde det i den regionale sunni-shia-borgerkrig ...«

I den samme ånd advarer Robert R. DePetris fra organisationen Defense Priorities om, at Allen og Lister bør erindres om, at Rusland har etableret en snubletråd i Syrien, »som, dersom den overskrides, automatisk fører til krig, og i atomalderen, med mulige terminale konsekvenser. Forfatterernes forholdsregler kan ikke undgå at udløse russernes snubletråd«, advarer han.

Defense Priorities siger i sin hensigtserklæring, at den som prioritet har at informere »borgere, ledere inden for tankegang og politiske beslutningstagere om betydningen af et stærkt, dynamisk militær – der anvendes på en mere klog og forsigtig måde for at beskytte Amerikas snævert definerede, nationale interesser – og for at promovere en realistisk, overordnet strategi, der prioriterer tilbageholdenhed, diplomati og frihandel for at sikre amerikansk sikkerhed«.

Amerikanerne må imødegå deres frygt; den uafklarede katastrofe kan overvindes

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 26. oktober, 2016 – Erkendelsen af, at verden er på randen af verdenskrig, er nu ved at komme åbent til udtryk i den amerikanske og europæiske befolkning. Breve til avisredaktører skrider, at Obamas rænker for at optrappe krigen i Syrien vil bringe os i konflikt med Rusland. LaRouchePAC-aktivister på universitetsområder rapporterer, at studenter pludselig rejser børster, med angstelige diskussioner om truslen om krig. Selv Donald Trump, der vil bruge enhver mere eller mindre fornuftig, populistisk idé til at fremme sin kampagne, har nu advaret om, at valget af Hillary Clinton, med hendes trusler om krig mod den syriske regering, vil antænde gnisten til »Tredje Verdenskrig«.

Borgerne er med rette bange. Obama fortsætter i embedet, trods det, at alt, hvad han har rørt ved, er brudt sammen: Obamacare er kollapsede i takt med, at forsikringselskaberne dropper ud og præmierne stiger til tårnhøje niveauer, i nogle stater med næsten 100 %; Deutsche Bank og Italiens Monte dei Paschi er ved at kollapse i Europa, samt med smitten, der er klar til at ramme Wall Street, hvor Obamas obstruktion af Glass-Steagall har skabt en boble, der er langt større end den var ved sammenbruddet i 2008; narkotika truer nu med at ødelægge en generation af unge, alt imens præsidenten prædiker legalisering og »ingen retsforfølgelse« af banker, der er taget i hvidvaskning af narkopenge; og med Bush' og Obamas »uophørlige krige«, der nu truer med at blive til atomkrige.

Der er grund til at være bange. Begge kandidater har allerede vist sig at være totale fiaskoer, en kendsgerning, som næsten alle amerikanere og det meste af verden erkender. Men, insisterede LaRouche i dag, katastrofen kan afværges ved netop at fjerne Obama, før han kan trykke på knappen; og ved at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og et kreditsystem for udvikling efter Hamiltons principper – nu, før sammenbruddet af finanssystemet fører til kaos. Både det Republikanske og det Demokratiske Parti vedtog Glass-Steagall i deres valgplatform – ikke, fordi kandidaterne støttede det, men for at formilde de enorme understrømme i befolkningen, som er rasende over statens redning af Wall Street (bail-out), og som kræver, at spekulanterne nu afvises. I dag responderede Trump atter til det folkelige raseri og krævede gennemførelsen af en version af Glass-Steagall »for det 21. århundrede«.

For at opnå dette, må vi inspirere folk til at rejse sig og erklære, »Jeg nægter at være bange«. Det skete i september måned, da, på trods af, at Obama, Wall Street og saudierne kørte en frygtkampagne, det amerikanske folk fyrede op under deres repræsentanter i Kongressen med henblik på at tilsidesætte Obamas veto af JASTA-loven, som giver ofre for de saudiskledede terrorangreb på USA den 11. september (2001) mulighed for at lægge sag an imod dem, der var ansvarlige i den saudiske regering og det saudiske kongehus.

I normale tider vil dagene efter et præsidentvalg være kendetegnet ved en forlænget pause, en 'afdragsfri' periode, mens den nye præsident udvælger en administration og formulerer en politik, og mens borgere tager mål af denne politik. Men dette er selvfølgelig ikke normale tider. Begge kandidater er så forhadte af befolkningen – der i de fleste tilfælde hader begge kandidater lige meget – og deres politik er så moralsk depraveret og morderisk, at dagen efter valget vil blive en dag med raseri, måske endda kaos. I endnu højere grad end før valget, vil der hos de fleste amerikanere findes en forudanelse om den fare, som konfronterer Amerika og

verden. Den kendsgerning, at der kun findes én løsning – nemlig, at Obama fjernes, og **LaRouches uopsættelige love** gennemføres – vil ikke ændre sig på grund af valget, men vil være endnu mere indlysende og nødvendig.

I hele den næsten to år lange valgproces har der stort set været nul dækning af det faktum, at verden uden for det transatlantiske område er blevet transformeret, et spørgsmål, der nu aktivt diskuteres på Valdai Internationale Diskussionsklubs 13. årlige konference i Sotji, Rusland. BRIKS, den Nye Silkevejsproces og de nye internationale finansinstitutioner, der er etableret af Kina, Rusland og deres partnere på alle kontinenter, har bragt resten af verden sammen omkring et nyt paradigme for harmoni, udvikling af infrastruktur, samarbejde om rummet og en fælles front mod den terroristsvøbe, som er skabt af de amerikanske og britiske, ulovlige krige i Sydvestasien. Viden om dette nye paradigme, som **EIR-rapporten *Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen*** indfanger det, udgør den gnist, der behøves for at vende frygt og raseri til optimisme og kreativ tænkning, med henblik på at bygge en fremtid for menneskeheden.

Vi har intet valg.

Foto: Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt udsender sin første 'Fireside Chat' om bankkrisen, fra Det hvide Hus, Washington, D.C., 12. marts, 1933.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 26.

oktober 2016: Obamas eftermæle er død, ødelæggelse og økonomisk ruin

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

N.B.: Pga. en teknisk fejl er der ingen video denne gang.

Lyd:

Tidligere topdiplomater for Korea mødes med nordkoreanske regeringsfolk i Malaysia

24. okt., 2016 – De relativt fornuftige, amerikanske embedsfolk fra diplomatiet, der forhandlede den generelle rammeaftale i 1994 under Bill Clinton (som endegyldigt kunne have afsluttet »Koreakrisen«, hvis ikke Dick Cheney havde taget over og lukket det ned), og som repræsenterede USA under sekspartsforhandlingerne under George W. Bush, holdt et todages møde under et 'sekundært spor' (dvs., uformelt og uofficielt) med nordkoreanske topregeringsfolk i Malaysia sidste fredag og lørdag. Robert Gallucci, der ledede 1994-forhandlingerne; Joseph R. DeTrani, som var stedfortræder under sekspartsforhandlingerne; og dr. Leon Sigal, en koreaekspert ved Social Science Research Council i New York, mødtes med Pyongyangs viceudenrigsminister, Hang Song Ryol, samt andre delegerede.

Sigal sagde til pressen i dag, at gruppen havde til hensigt at formulere et forslag til den næste amerikanske administration, der skulle erstatte den mislykkede Obama-politik med »strategisk tålmodighed« (som var vanvittig – at nægte at forhandle, før Nordkorea opgav sit atomprogram. Det var udtænkt med overlæg for at gøre det muligt for Nordkorea at udvikle atomvåben, der skulle retfærdiggøre en amerikansk militær opbygning rundt om Kina -red.).

Nordkoreas erklærede holdning var, iflg. Ryol, at en fredstraktat skulle underskrives, før man diskuterede atomprogrammet. Forslaget, som blev opkastet af det amerikanske hold under tidligere fora, går ud på, at en fredstraktat (især et løfte om ikkeinvasion) skulle forhandles, mens en indefrysning af Nordkoreas atomprogram er på plads, som skulle føre til senere forhandlinger om at lukke atomprogrammet ned.

Prøveaffyring af missil fra Nordkorea, set fra Sydkorea.

Duterte vs. Obama: Bloomberg truer med militærkup, Danny Russel truer med økonomisk straf

24. okt., 2016 – Hysteriet i Washington stiger over den filippinske præsident Rodrigo Dutertes modige handlinger. Obama og Hillarys inddæmning af Kina – omdrejningspunktet for Asien – er tydeligvis blev udmanøvreret og grundlæggende set besejret af Dutertes totale afvisning af Obamas krigspolitik og imperiediktater til hans land, og af hans besøg i Kina,

hvor han for fuld damp tilsluttede sig det nye, globale paradigme for udvikling og samarbejde om den Nye Silkevej.

Responsen er trusler og flere trusler fra Wall Street og fra Wall Streets marionetter i Washington. Den 23. oktober udgav Bloomberg News en »redaktionel lederartikel«, der, alt imens man foregav at ønske et fortsat venskab med Filippinerne, gjorde det klart, at dette krævede fjernelsen af præsidenten, død eller levende.

»På et bestemt tidspunkt i sidste uge«, begynder artiklen, »syntes den filippinske præsident Rodrigo Duterte at have orkestreret et af de mest dramatiske skift i Asien, siden afslutningen af den Kolde Krig – ved at opgive USA, sit lands mangeårige allierede, til fordel for rivalen Kina.« Men, der er ingen grund til bekymring, mener de: Kinas løfter om infrastruktur og lempelige lån vil aldrig komme igennem, alt imens Duterte »vildt oppuster sit lands globale relevans« ved at tale om samarbejde med både Kina og Rusland.

Så kommer truslen: »Det filippinske militær her en historie med kup – og liden interesse i at erstatte amerikanske våben, logistisk støtte og uddannelse med russisk og kinesisk teknologi ... Amerikanske øverstbefalende minder utvivlsomt allerede deres filippinske modparter om, at et radikalt brud i relationer ville få strategiske konsekvenser.«

I mellemtiden sagde Danny Russel, Obamas viceudenrigsminister for Asien, som tilbragte en weekend i Manila med at forsøge at finde ud af, hvad man skulle gøre mht. Duterte, til pressen, at Duterteres handlinger har »skabt forvirring i en række lande, ikke kun mit. Og ikke alene blandt regeringer, men også i andre samfund. Og også i selskabers bestyrelseslokaler.« (Hvilke selskaber? Dope, Inc., måske?)

Hverken truslen om et kup eller om økonomisk krigsførelse vil forstyrre Duterte. Han og hans kabinet har allerede erklæret, at USA næsten udelukkende investerer i minedrift og

callcentre, alt imens Kina og andre ønsker at investere i at opbygge den filippinske realøkonomi. Alt imens truslen om mord (begået af den mytiske »enlige morder«) er meget virkelig, så er en gentagelse af det amerikanskorkestrerede kup imod Marcos i 1986 ikke andet end Obamas og hans neokonservatives fantasifoster.

Foto: Præsident Rodrigo Duterte.