

Den rette tid at leve i, er lige nu

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 2. april, 2017 – Når vore modstanderes scenarie – »russerne gjorde det« – er offer for nådesløs latterliggørelse foran et massivt publikum, er tiden inde til at indse, at kampen om USA's fremtid endnu ikke er afgjort – den er snarere ved at blive afgjort, netop i dette øjeblik. Afgørelsen svinger frem og tilbage over afgrunden.

Den dristige og modige, men samtidig kompetente og klarhjernede vurdering af de aktuelle forhold i verden, lyder, at verdenshistorien står og vipper frem og tilbage i disse aktuelle uger. Vi har nået et punkt, hvor afgørelsen må træffes, og denne afgørelse kunne falde ud til både den ene og anden side.

På modstandernes side finder vi de kræfter og institutioner, der myrdede John Kennedy for over halvtreds år siden. Men ånden i John Kennedys tradition, som var den patriotiske ånd i traditionen efter Franklin Roosevelt og Alexander Hamilton før ham, døde aldrig. Netop, som de, der har verdslig visdom, mindst ventede det, dukkede ånden efter John Kennedy atter op som en eksistentiel trussel mod Det britiske Imperium, i form af præsident Ronald Reagans samarbejde med Lyndon LaRouches »Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ«, 23. marts, 1983. Det britiske Imperium forsøgte at dræbe Reagan; de troede, de kunne holde LaRouche fængslet, til han døde i fængsel. Det mislykkedes.

Jo, det lykkedes dem måske nok at trampe gnisterne ned for en tid, men nu blusser ilden op, højere end før. Nu kan Lyndon LaRouches politiske forslag få succes på kort sigt. Det britiske Imperiums blodige genfærd, og den historiske blindgyde, som hele det oldgamle imperiesystem udgør, kan meget hurtigt blive afskaffet. USA kan gå sammen med Kina og Rusland i det storslåede projekt for den Eurasiske Landbro,

som LaRouche-parret var de første til at foreslå. Vi kan videreføre John Kennedys og Krafft Ehrickes opdagelsesrejse ud i Solsystemet, og hinsides dette.

Glem ikke, at jeres børnebørn vil udspørge jer længe og intenst om, hvor I var i 2017, og præcis, hvad I gjorde.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump ser ud ad det Røde Værelses vindue, på Det Hvide Hus' sydlige søjleterrasse.

Washingtons Nationale Symfoniorkester gennemfører sandt diplomati i Rusland

2017, 1. april – Washingtons Nationale Symfoniorkester, der ledes af Christoph Eschenbach, opnåede en betydningsfuld, diplomatisk succes med sin koncert den 29. marts i Moskva, til ære for afdøde Mstislav Rostropovich, den berømte cellist, der havde dirigeret NSO i Washington, rapporterede Anne Midgette i en forsideartikel i *Washington Post* i går.

Midgette, der er *WP's* musikkritiker, udtalte, at denne første opførelse i Rusland af symfoniorkestret i næsten et kvart århundrede, »viste, at, i en tid, hvor den politiske retorik er ophedet, kan musikken muligvis tilbyde det sande, diplomatiske sprog ... Det var faktisk ikke klart, om folk klappede ad det, de netop havde hørt, eller ad det, som dette besøg repræsenterede«.

Det Nationale Symfoniorkester tog til Rusland for at ære sin afdøde musikdirektør, Mstislav Rostropovich, på den årlige festival, som hans datter Olga skabte på det, der ville have

været hans 90-års fødselsdag. Rostropovich var leder af det Nationale Symfoniorkester i 17 sæsoner, efter han var blevet sendt i eksil fra USSR for at støtte Alexander Solsjenitsyn.

Midgette skrev: »Russerne bemærker bestemt de symbolske implikationer af, at et amerikansk orkester kommer for at ære en russer og bogstavelig talt spiller under et *enormt* banner, dekoreret med et portræt af Rostropovich over konservatoriets scene ... På et andet plan kan man se det Nationale Symfoniorkestrets opførelser som et levedygtigt alternativ til politisk diplomati og viser folk fra forskellige samfund, der bringes sammen gennem en fælles kærlighed.«

USA's ambassadør til Rusland, John Tefft, sagde, »Kultur hæver sig stolt over den larmende politik. Den gør ting, som traditionelt diplomati ikke kan.« Den russiske ambassadør til USA, Sergej Kislyak, sagde, »Turneen er et af de mest strålende elementer i vore aktuelle relationer«.

Ved slutningen af Schuberts »Niende Symfoni«, »byggede klapsalverne op til rytmiske, dundrende klapsalver« for en *encore*, som, skriver Midgette, skulle udtrykke, »Vi ønsker at kunne lide musik. Vi ønsker at kunne lide hinanden.«

Foto: Mstislav Rostropovich dirigerer.

Det Nationale Symfoniorkester vil give tre koncerter i løbet af den internationale Rostropovich-festival. 29.-30. marts spiller orkestret i Moskvas Tjajkovskij-konservatorie, og den tredje koncert bliver i Skt. Petersborgs Sjostakovitj Filharmoniske Akademi. Orkestret vil især spille Picker, Elgar, Sjostakovitj og Schubert.

**RADIO SCHILLER 3. april,
2017:**

**Vinder Trump eller
efterretningstjenesterne?
Vil Trump alliere sig med
Kinas opbygningspolitik?**

Politisk briefing ved formand Tom Gillesberg.

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/vinder-trump-eller-efterretningstjenesterne-vil-trump-alliere-sig-med-kinas-opbygningspolitik

**»Krafft Ehrickes vision for
menneskehedens fremtid«
Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på
Schiller Instituttets
konference
i München, Tyskland, den 25.**

marts, 2017

Jeg er også sikker på, at, hvis Krafft Ehrlicke havde været her i dag, eller havde levet i vor tid, så ville han have været utrolig optimistisk med hensyn til, at hans vision, som i hans levetid ofte blev bekæmpet – ikke kun hans livs vision, men fortsættelsen af rumfart i det hele taget mødte utrolig meget opposition og modarbejdelse – at han ville erkende, at vi i dag virkelig har den strategiske konstellation, som bringer realiseringen af hans vision inden for rækkevidde. Det er allerede, i forbindelse med en tale om det kinesiske rumfartsprogram, blevet sagt, at »frøspringet« nu virkelig kommer, for kineserne har en vision om at udvinde helium-3 på Månens bagside til den fremtidige fusionsøkonomi på Jorden. Det bliver endda også diskuteret af ESA, men jeg mener, at Kina på verdensplan uddanner flest forskere og videnskabsfolk inden for rumfart, og derfor er jeg optimistisk over, at denne »leap-frogging«, altså frøspring, vil fortsætte.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Repræsentant for det danske
Schiller Institut**

på LaRouchePAC Manhattan- møde:

**Hvordan ser I virkningen af
dette skifte
i USA's politik på resten af
verden,
der endnu ikke er i det nye
paradigme?**

... Men i Europa har vi et politisk lederskab, som man kunne sige ligesom sidder fast i en tidslomme. I denne tidslomme går resten af verden fremad, og de sidder fast i denne tidslomme, denne glasklokke, som de bliver ved med at støde hovedet imod. Og derfor spiller vores organisation, Schiller Instituttet og vore allierede organisationer i Europa, en nøglerolle som lederskab for at bringe Europa ind i dette nye paradigme.

Næstformand Michelle Rasmussen havde følgende indlæg og spørgsmål på LaRouche PAC's borgermøde på Manhattan, New York, lørdag, 1. april:

Jeg er Michelle Rasmussen, og jeg arbejder for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og er her på besøg. Jeg vil gerne give et øjebliksbillede af, hvordan tingene ser ud fra Europa, for det er ligesom folk i Europa står på usikker grund: På den ene side har man, mod øst, det nye paradigme, der anføres af Kina med Rusland og de andre centraleurasiske lande, der er involveret i Bælt & Vej-politikken. Og på den anden side, mod vest, har man potentialet for, at USA rent faktisk ændrer sin politik. Mod øst har vi en konkret transformation. Mod vest ville jeg sige, at der mest er et potentiale for en

transformation, med tale om det Amerikanske System, infrastruktur, Glass-Steagall, med ideen om at få et nyt forhold til Rusland; samt de meget spændende udsigter med topmødet mellem Xi Jinping og præsident Trump; Trumps NASA-tale, osv.

Men i Europa har vi et politisk lederskab, som man kunne sige ligesom sidder fast i en tidslomme. I denne tidslomme går resten af verden fremad, og de sidder fast i denne tidslomme, denne glasklokke, som de bliver ved med at støde hovedet imod. Og derfor spiller vores organisation, Schiller Instituttet og vore allierede organisationer i Europa, en nøglerolle som lederskab for at bringe Europa ind i dette nye paradigme. For vi har en lille organisation i nogle af landene, og vores politik har altid været, at vi ikke nødvendigvis forventer, at de europæiske lande vil vise vejen, men at vi måtte så frøene for LaRouche-programmets politik for den dag, hvor USA tager skridt til det. Så måtte vi have sået frøene, så de europæiske lande kunne komme med.

Det er, hvad vi gør. Vi har, f.eks., ganske kort, i Italien haft omkring 12 forskellige lovforslag for Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i løbet af de seneste tre år. Alle partierne, undtagen det førende parti, er for Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, og for blot to uger siden begyndte man omsider at drøfte det i parlamentsudvalget.

I Frankrig har vi en enorm chance i de næste fire uger, med Jacques Cheminades kampagne, der er i færd med at opbygge en national bevægelse. De har kontaktet 30.000 borgmestere for at skaffe 500, der ville støtte Jacques. Han vil få massiv lejlighed til at komme i medierne. Hans program vil blive uddelt til hver eneste husstand i Frankrig. Dette sker inden for de næste fire uger.

I Tyskland har vi netop haft en vellykket Krafft Ehrlicke-konference om udforskning af rummet. I Berlin har vi en valgkampagne.

I Sverige er Glass-Steagall netop blevet diskuteret i det svenske parlament, for en eller to uger siden; forslaget blev nedstemt, men det blev diskuteret. Og vore folk i Sverige lavede en indsats for at forsøge at standse krigen mod Yemen, og vi har Hussein, vores leder i Sverige, der arbejder med den arabiske version af vores Verdenslandbro-rapport.

Og i Danmark, som I hørte for et par uger siden, havde vi et vidunderligt gennembrud med koncerten for en dialog mellem kulturer, hvor folk hang oppe under loftet, så mange mennesker kom; og den vidunderlige udveksling af traditionel musik fra hele verden, inkl. fra Rusland og Kina, og også med europæisk opera og klassisk musik.

I parentes bemærket, så blev Alexander Hamilton født i Vestindien; han blev født på en britisk ø og voksede op på Sankt Croix, som var en dansk ø. Den danske statsminister, der netop har mødt Trump, besøgte i denne uge Jomfruøerne, fordi det er 100 år siden, danskerne solgte Jomfruøerne til USA. Alexander Hamilton voksede op på Skt. Croix [USVI], der dengang var en dansk koloni, og det har en vigtig indflydelse i amerikansk historie, for Alexander Hamilton var ikke fra nogen delstat! Alle de andre kæmpede for deres egen del, vores stat først, vores stat først. Men Alexander Hamilton stod over dette, han opererede ud fra standpunktet om principperne for frihed, og hans bestræbelser på at etablere en centralregering har forbindelse til dette: han var ikke bundet til en bestemt delstat. Det var blot en parentes.

Men, hvordan ser I virkningen af dette skifte i USA's politik på resten af verden, der endnu ikke er i det nye paradigme?

Diane Sare: Jeg tror, det bliver meget ulige fordelt, for steder synes at have en masse fraktioner, som vi ser det i Tyskland, hvor der er folk, der virkelig gerne vil arbejde sammen med Rusland, især industrifirmaer osv. – og så er der Merkel. Så jeg tror, det bliver et *chok*, hvis vi får USA til at skifte politik, det bliver et virkeligt chok. Og jeg tror,

det vil styrke folk, der ved, hvad der er rigtigt. Som ikke ønsker krig, som mener, de bør orientere sig mod Rusland, som ikke har haft mod til at sige det. Jeg tænker – da jeg var i Sverige sidste efterår, talte vi om, at hjernevasken imod Rusland var spektakulær! Man tror, det er slemt her, og det er slemt her, men jeg havde en nær ven, der boede på Gotland, denne ø mellem Sverige og de baltiske lande, og hun var fuldstændig overbevist om, at der er russiske spioner overalt på øen! Og det svenske militær må opruste for at forberede sig på en russisk invasion.

Jeg mener, at et skifte i USA sluttelig kunne give en masse optimisme. Men det bliver interessant; jeg tror, det bliver meget ulige fordelt, og jeg tror, det vil forårsage nogle uventede resultater.

<https://larouchepac.com/20170401/manhattan-town-hall-event-diane-sare>

Michelle start på 46 min.

Overvind staten i staten for at sikre det nye paradigme. LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 31. marts, 2017; Leder

Aftenens udsendelse falder i to dele. Første del handler om det, der kaldes Trumpgate; eller ideen om, at Vladimir Putin ikke alene satte Trump ved magten, men rent faktisk styrer

Trump-administrationen og bestemmer politikken. Vi havde tidligere på dagen et interview med pensionerede CIA-analytiker Ray McGovern, som har arbejdet for CIA i mange årtier og er en af medstifterne af VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). Lad os starte med det første klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern:

Jason Ross: Godaften. Med mig i studiet i dag er chef for EIR's Washington-afdeling, Bill Jones.

Aftenens udsendelse falder i to dele. Første del handler om det, der kaldes Trumpgate; eller ideen om, at Vladimir Putin ikke alene satte Trump ved magten, men rent faktisk styrer Trump-administrationen og bestemmer politikken. Vi havde tidligere på dagen et interview med pensionerede CIA-analytiker Ray McGovern, som har arbejdet for CIA i mange årtier og er en af medstifterne af VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). Lad os starte med det første klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern:

Udskrift af webcast, engelsk:

DEFEAT THE DEEP STATE TO ENSURE THE NEW PARADIGM!

JASON ROSS: Hello. It is March 31, 2017; and you're joining us for the weekly Friday LaRouche PAC webcast. My name is Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio today by {EIR}'s Washington DC Bureau Chief Bill Jones. We're going to have two main parts to the discussion tonight. The first aspect we're going to be dealing with is what's called Trumpgate; or the idea that Vladimir Putin not only put Trump in power, but is actually running the Trump administration and setting policy. To discuss that with us, we had an interview earlier today with retired

CIA

analyst Ray McGovern; who worked in the CIA for multiple decades

and is one of the co-founders of VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). So, let's go ahead and get the first

clip from the interview with Ray McGovern.

ROSS : First off, setting the stage, ever since Trump was elected, and especially since his inauguration, there has been a growing chorus of claims about Vladimir Putin putting Trump in office by directing the election; and of even directing

Trump's policy. That, in effect, Vladimir Putin is running the

United States government. So, first off, is this true?

RAY MCGOVERN: Well, if it is, then I don't know anything

about Russia or the Soviet Union. I was counting up the years that I've been immersed in Russian studies; it goes back 59 years

when I decided to major in Russian, got my graduate degree in Russian. Taught Russian; was the head of the Soviet foreign policy branch at the CIA; briefed Presidents on Gorbachev. I like to think I learned something about how Russian leaders look

at the world. When I heard this meme going around that Vladimir

Putin clearly preferred Donald Trump, my notion was, well, here's

Vladimir Putin sitting with his advisors, and he's saying "That

Trump fellow; he's not only unpredictable, but he's proud of it.

He brags about it, and he lashes out strongly at every slight; whether it's real or imagined. This is just the guy I want to

have his finger on the nuclear codes across the ocean." It boggles the mind that Vladimir Putin would have had any preference for Donald Trump. That's aside from the fact that everyone – and that would include Vladimir Putin, unless he's clairvoyant – knew that Hillary was going to win.

So, just to pursue this thing very briefly, if the major premise is that Vladimir Putin and the terrible Russians wanted Trump to win; then you have a syllogism. Therefore, they tried to help him; therefore, they did all kinds of But if you don't accept that major premise, the whole syllogism falls apart; and I don't accept that major premise. Putin said it himself: "I don't have a preference." And I didn't have any preference; I happened to be in Germany during the election, in Berlin. It was exciting, because the German anchors didn't know what to say, to make of it; and my German friends were saying "We have a German expression here; the choice between Trump and Hillary Clinton is eine wahl zwischen Pest und Cholera." That means it's a choice between plague and cholera. I said, "You know, I kind of agree." That's why I not only voted for Jill Stein; but was proud to – on the environment, on all the major issues, she had it right. The others did not. That's the way I looked at it. I kind of think that's the way Putin looked at it; and when he said "I don't have any preference," he probably meant he didn't have any preference. So, that syllogism falls down.

Now, just pursue that one little bit here. Everyone

expected Hillary to win; everyone. We're talking Summer; we're talking Fall as Trump disgraced himself in one manner or another.

He could never win, right? And nobody thought that Hillary was such a flawed candidate that nobody trusted her; that she might lose. So, you hear what I'm saying? "Well, it looks like Hillary is going to win. Looks pretty sure she's going to win.

So, why not hack into her mechanism there in the Democratic National Committee? If I get caught, well she may be angry with me, but what's to lose?" I don't think so. Putin is a very cautious fellow. If he thought Hillary was going to win, like the rest of us did, the last thing he would want to do is hack into their DNC apparatus and be caught; because he would likely be caught. And have an additional grievance for Hillary to advertise against him. So, it falls down on logic alone.

Now, luckily, you mentioned Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We are the beneficiary of a membership whose expertise in intelligence matters just won't quit. This includes four former high officials in the National Security Agency – retired; one of whom devised all of these collection systems that NSA is still using. His name is Bill Binney. He and I are very close. He writes for us; and he helps me write things. What he has said from the outset – and this is five months ago – is that this could not be a hack; it had to be a leak. And for your listeners or your viewers, a hack goes over the network.

ROSS: You're speaking of the DNC?

MCGOVERN: Yeah, I'm talking about the Russians – thanks for interrupting; the Russians are accused, of course, of hacking into the Democratic National Committee emails and they're also accused of surfacing the Podesta emails. Bill says, "Look, I know this network; I created pretty much the bones of it. And, I'm free to talk about it. Why? Here are the slides that Ed Snowden brought out; here are the trace points, the trace mechanism. And there are hundreds in the network. So, everything that goes across the network, Ray, and I know this is hard for you to believe, and you're looking at me real strange, but {everything}. You know where it starts and you know where it ends up; everything." So, if this was a hack, NSA would know about it. NSA does not know about it. As a matter of fact, the CIA and the FBI said "We have high confidence that the Russians did this." The NSA, which is the only real agency that has the capability to trace this, said "We only have moderate confidence." In the Army, we called that the SWAG factor – it's a Scientific Wild-Assed Guess. So, NSA doesn't have the information. If they had the information, I'm pretty sure they would release it; because this is not rocket science. Everybody knows how these things work, particularly since Ed Snowden revealed the whole kit and caboodle.

ROSS [live]: This is part of the interview; the entirety of

which will be available on the website coming soon. It was an hour-long discussion with Ray McGovern. Just to follow up on that, or continue, the British origin of the attacks on Trump were seen in the dossier that was compiled by former MI-6 operative Christopher Steele; who put together the large dossier

of supposedly compromising material on Donald Trump that was first published in its entirety on BuzzFeed, but which had been

spoken of in anonymous sort of way by press outlets before that.

The incredible assault on Trump here, this doesn't represent a Democrat versus Republican type of conflict; what this represents

is whether we're going to have the elected government. Donald Trump is the elected President of the United States; he was elected. He won the election; he was elected. Whether we're going to have an elected government run the United States, or whether the Deep State – the intelligence agencies in the United

States and in Britain, very significantly – are going to have their way in determining what our policy will be. Specifically

in seeing the Trump openness in resetting the relationship with

Russia, with an openness towards China and with an increasing adoption of the American System outlook, this is not the type of

policy orientation that this Deep State apparatus; hence, the attacks.

Ray McGovern and Bill Binney co-authored an article three

days ago, called "The Surveillance State Behind Russia-gate".

I just wanted to read a very short part of this. They write:

"Although many details are still hazy because of secrecy

and further befogged by politics it appears House Intelligence

Committee Chairman Devin Nunes was informed last week about invasive electronic surveillance of senior U.S. government officials and, in turn, passed that information onto President Trump.

"This news presents Trump with an unwelcome but unavoidable choice: Confront those who have kept him in the dark about such rogue activities or live fearfully in their shadow.

"What President Trump decides will largely determine the freedom of action he enjoys as president on many key security and other issues. But even more so," write Ray McGovern and Bill Binney, "his choice may decide whether there is a future for this constitutional republic."

Very strong words. In the past month, on March 4th, we saw Trump's announcement that he was surveilled by the outgoing Obama administration; he used the word "wiretap" at times, for which he was attacked for his choice of language. But the statement still stands about surveillance. On March 20th, FBI Director Comey testified that he was investigating the Trump administration; guess he didn't have any time to investigate the Saudis. Just today, Wikileaks came out with a report in which they released the latest section of what they are calling "Vault 7"; which is a collection of material from the CIA – documentation and source code. What this latest release showed was "Project Marble", as the CIA called it; which revealed a program that they had to

obfuscate their own creation of cyber weaponry of malware and other types of attacks, and the ability to easily attribute such attacks to other state actors. Including the ability to – while making it look as though an attack came from Russia, also include a seeming cover-up of Russian tracks; so that a security researcher might feel that they had stumbled across a clue by finding Russian language comments in this cyber attack weapon, when really it had been planted from the beginning. This of course raises the question of attribution at all, and in particular about the DNC hacks. The FBI never investigated the DNC computers; and all the complaints about Russian involvement and Russian malware came from CrowdStrike, an independent firm.

Which, if it's up against the CIA and a colossal program to be able to obfuscate the actual origin of internet attacks, makes it very unlikely; in addition to, as Ray McGovern said, all signs point to this and the Podesta emails being leaks rather than hacks anyway.

So, let's hear our second clip that we have for the program from Ray McGovern.

MCGOVERN : I think Nunes wants to do the right thing. Whether he'll succeed or not is anybody's guess. All I can say is, he's up against formidable opponents; witness what the ranking member or minority leader of the Senate, Chuck Schumer, has said outright to Rachel Maddow.

ROSS : Yeah. It puts the ranking and ranking.

MCGOVERN: Yeah, you got it!

ROSS: I think this story or picture that you've painted really gives us something that we need to do; because if this is to be fought out only among institutional layers, it's a tough fight. It's something where if people are aware, as we're able to make known to the population more generally that this is a fight; that this isn't about Democrats versus Republicans. This is really much more about Deep State versus the potential of elected government to determine our course. The threats of say, blackmail via the FBI or other intelligence agencies, the dossiers that no doubt exist on these elected officials; that stands as a threat if people aren't aware of that being the MO [modus operandi-ed.]. I think people are more familiar with the way the FBI targetted Martin Luther King; urged him on more than one occasion to commit suicide to prevent these kinds of documents from getting out. I think it really means that there's something for all of us to do in terms of making sure that this is known; making sure that the terms of the fight are known, to make it possible to win this one.

MCGOVERN: Exactly; and those were wiretaps, back in the late '50s, early '60s, those were real wiretaps. You're quite right; that was heinous. Now, I asked Colleen Rowley, who's as I say, the expertise we have available to us at Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity won't quit. Colleen was the counsel of the Minneapolis division of the FBI; she was

the

one who wrote memos to the Director saying this is how we screwed

up on 9/11. She's got guts that won't quit as well. I said, "Colleen, Robert Kennedy – my God! Robert Kennedy, Attorney General, allowing, authorizing the FBI to try to persuade Dr. King to commit suicide? How do you figure that, Colleen?" And

she said, "Ray, wiretapping; J Edgar Hoover. Bobby Kennedy would

know that J Edgar Hoover has lots of information on all those pretty girls that he and Jack used to invite to the White House

pool and all of that stuff." She's imagining this; but the reality is, Robert Kennedy would know that J Edgar Hoover would

have lots of material to blackmail not only him, but his big brother.

That's big; and that's why when all this came out in the mid

'70s, they created these laws and created these Oversight Committees, which for a while, did their job. Now, they're hopelessly unable, unwilling; they don't want to know this stuff,

and they don't know it for that matter. The intelligence officials say "They don't want to know this, so why should we tell them?" As for citizens, I would emphasize that this whole

business when Edward Snowden came out with his revelations in June of 2013, what happened? Well, people say, "Well, isn't this

interesting? Everything, they intercept everything! Emails, telephone calls, wow! Luckily, I have nothing to hide." So, we

asked someone from the Stasi – Stasi is the old East German secret service; and if people have seen "Das Lieben Der Anderen"

– "The Lives of Others" – an Academy Award film about East Germany and the Stasi. The Stasi was their KGB. You get a picture of what they did. Wolfgang Schmidt – his real name by the way – a Stasi colonel, is interviewed. One of the Americans sits down and asks, "Wolfgang, what do you think about people in America when we say 'We have nothing to hide'?" Schmidt says, "This is incredibly naïve. Everyone has something to hide. You don't get to decide what they get on you. The only way to prevent it from being against you, is to prevent it from being collected in the first place." Beautiful, you know? If they collect it, they can use it. They don't read it all; they don't listen to it all. But they put it into these little files – they're not files, but they're ...

So, yeah, {all of us}. What Edward Snowden said about "turnkey tyranny." If you have these kinds of private information about {everyone} including the President and Michael Flynn and all his associates, back in October-November-December; well, you have the ability, if not to win the election, then to at least to destroy or make these folks seem beholden to the {Russians}, of all places, and disarm the attempts that Trump wants to make, vis-à-vis Russia.

Now, I would have to tell you, that I am against everything Trump stands for, internally. I think he's not only unqualified to be President, but all his instincts are terrible. Okay, so put that on the record. I think I already said I voted for Jill Stein. That said, even a broken clock is right how many times

a
day?

ROSS: Twice a day.

MCGOVERN: Yeah. He's right about Russia. If he were to say to Vladimir Putin, "Look, I don't think we need to put more troops in the Baltic states or Poland; so why don't I pull out those troops, and you pull out the troops on the other side? It's a deal?" I'm morally certain Putin would say, "It's a deal!" Now, what would that mean? That would mean what Pope Francis, to his credit, called "the blood-drenched arms traders" would lose out, big time. Peace: bad for business. Tension: very good for business. So, there's a lot at stake among very, very powerful people; and if Trump can make this stick – this is not a puny, incidental issue, it's a transcendental one.

I was more afraid that Hillary would bring us to a nuclear confrontation than Trump. I didn't like Trump on the environment, because I have nine grand-children. Don't Senators and Congressmen have grand-children? Don't they give – So, for me it was a choice between pest and cholera. But, here we have a possibility for a new what the Germans call {ostpolitik} – a new policy, looking to the east. Take my word for it; I've looked at what the Russians have done. I've looked at heyday of the relationship of the United States and Russia, which goes back to October of 2013 when Putin pulled Obama's chestnuts out of the fire by persuading the Syrians to destroy or (have destroyed)

all
their chemical weapons {on U.S. ships}. Okay? Nobody knows
about
that but the United States.

But the neo-cons, the people who want to create a
{bad}
atmosphere in relations between the United States and Russia –
they know about it. It only took them six months to mount a
coup
on Russia's doorstep in Kiev, Ukraine. And that's where all
this
trouble started: Russians accused of invading Ukraine – not
true; of invading Crimea – not true. All that stuff was
artificially pumped up. It's just as easily tssuuuu, deflated.
And Trump, if he's willing to do that, well, that would be a
biggie.

So, being right two times a day is better than never
being
right.

ROSS [laughing]: Well put.

MCGOVERN: I think.

ROSS: Great! Thanks very much, Ray. Thanks.

MCGOVERN: You're most welcome. Thanks for asking. It's
very
rare that I get a chance to review what I observe. LaRouche
PAC
Friday Webcast, March 31, 2017

ROSS: To fill in one thing on that, regarding Sen.
Schumer:
in January, Schumer was on the Rachel Maddow Show, and he said
he
thought Trump was "really dumb" for taking on the intelligence
agencies, because "they've got six ways from Sunday to get

back

at you." Schumer was saying, "Don't get on the bad side of the intelligence agencies, or they're going to make you pay for it."

A very direct and cowardly and craven admission that there is a power in government besides the elected government. Just a disgusting thing to say.

Let's shift now to our other topic, which is where we {can}

go in the United States, once we throw off the yoke of this opposition to collaboration in the world. The promise that we see, for example, in the upcoming meeting taking place April 6-7

next week at Mar-a-Lago with President Xi Jinping of China and President Trump. Bill, what's the import of this meeting happening? Where could we go if this shakes out well?

BILL JONES: It's a very significant meeting. It is a watershed meeting in a variety of ways. First of all, the two major countries in the world – China and the United States – getting together in this way at the highest level, is, of course, something that affects the entire world. But it's important, especially now, because you have a new administration, with a new policy, with a new direction, trying to revive the U.S. economy, trying to bring back a lot of the economic growth that has been lost over the last few decades. The question for the Chinese, is what is that policy, what effect does it have on us, and how do we fit in? It's going to be a meeting that doesn't lead to any specific what they call "deliverables." You're not going to have

communiqués saying we're going to do this, we're going to do that, coming out of the meeting.

The Trump administration is still getting itself organized.

Many of the issues, including the issues that are matters of controversy between China and the United States, have not been worked out, because the people are not in place in the departments at this point. Those include the South China Sea, the

Korean nuclear question, the trade issue – which is very important, of course, for the Trump administration. These things

still have to be worked out. They will be discussed. In fact, they will, probably, have at the top of the agenda, of going through them one by one, to determine this is where we stand, where do you stand? – to try to get an understanding of where the two sides lie on issues that to some extent separate them.

The importance of the meeting, if it is successful – and I

think it will be successful; it's happening at a very early stage

in the administration. It's not so often that a summit of this nature will be held – what is it? – two-three months from the inauguration of the President. Both sides agreed that they wanted

to have this. Both of them felt that there was a necessity of getting together at the highest level in order to really get to

know where the two stand, and really getting to know each other

in a very different sense. They've had communication from the get-go. There were two phone calls. There were a number of letters that went back and forth; so they're not strangers to each other. But it's that time of {meeting}, where they can talk

one-on-one, or with people that they decide to have with them at

any particular point. Probably will be a one-on-one meeting with interpreters at some point. They will get to learn the mind of the other person.

This is extremely important because during the course of the election, as is often the case, many things are said which don't necessary don't reflect anything on policy. We've had the uncertainties about the Taiwan issue. At one point it was unclear for the Chinese if the One-China policy was still going to be followed by the Trump administration. And certain things that were tweeted or said in the spur of the moment were taken seriously by Beijing; and so there was a lot of uncertainty and a certain amount of trepidation. Most of that has been cleared up. The One-China policy stands fast. This, President Trump has made clear.

More importantly, on the lower level of high-level meetings between Secretary of State Tillerson and his counterpart, Foreign Minister Wang Yi, he did something that no other official has ever done. He reiterated what has been the explicit Chinese position with regard to the China-America relationship. He said, "No conflict, no confrontation, mutual respect, and win-win cooperation." He's taken a lot of heat for doing that, because that has not been what the United States has said; it's what the Chinese have said and indicated this is what they want. By saying it, Tillerson indicated that the United States was on board these

basic policies.

On the basis of that, they are able to have their meeting. I

think it will be a good meeting, because President Trump is a very good host. He has shown that in a lot of the summits that he's had. President Xi is also – although these are two very different personalities – they're both really "people persons."

They know how to talk to people in all categories of life.

President Xi is really unique in one sense among many Chinese leaders, some of whom are much stiffer, because he {does} go to

the people; he {does} know them; he {has} worked amongst them.

President Trump, although he was an industrialist, a very wealthy

man, he could go onto the work sites, he could talk to the people

down there, he could get a feeling for what they were all about.

I think these characteristics will allow them to establish a

rapport, perhaps even a warm relationship, in understanding each

other. That is extremely important because as we move into the administration, as policy takes place, a lot of these difficult

issues, like the issue of trade, will be coming up. President Trump, of course, was very explicit on that in his campaign.

He

wants to have fair trade; he's not a "free-trader," letting the

market decide. He has made references to the American System of

Henry Clay. He probably will move to tariffs on certain products,

in order to create a basis for industrial production in those areas where the United States has lost jobs to low-wage

producers. It's a new element that the Chinese also have to take into consideration.

And, of course, it seems to me that if there is this understanding, and President Trump wants to move forward on maybe being less open in terms of trade on certain products, there is a possibility of giving the Chinese added capabilities, because they may lose some of the market on certain trade, but they can, for instance, have a larger market in terms of investment in infrastructure. President Trump also has committed to \$1 trillion in infrastructure in the United States, to rebuild the roads, rebuild the highways, rebuild the cities, and the infrastructure. \$1 trillion. He is not going to get that from industry; industry is not generally interested in waiting 10 years to get a payback on investment that they make. Unfortunately, the United States no longer has the types of institutions that could finance this. That may change; if Trump goes with the American System, maybe he will move in the direction that Lyndon LaRouche has indicated in his four points, by setting up an infrastructure bank or a development bank like the Hamiltonian bank; like the First Bank of the United States, to finance this. But, in that case, you have China also with a lot of capital that they could invest and {would like to invest} in the United States; which could assist

President Trump in his attempt to rebuild infrastructure.

This came up in a meeting today at CSIS; I raised that type of a trade-off, and the people generally were positive to this notion. If some kind of infrastructure bank or a group or fund in which the Chinese could go and invest, were set up; this would be a possibility for them investing in the United States. There are many difficulties with that, but it may also be something that the Chinese are interested in. In fact, the question of taking much of their capital, which has hitherto been invested in Treasury bills, and putting that into a fund for infrastructural investment has been mooted both privately and in public in the media in China. So, there may be a possibility that the Chinese leader coming here, will also have something to offer; may make a proposal of this nature, which would then set the stage for moving further.

So, I think this is an important meeting, because it will really provide the basis for economic development; and the Chinese are in the forefront of this economic development. Not simply by having become a major – in fact, the second major – economic power in the world; but through their Belt and Road Initiative, they have then offered this type of development to the other countries of the world – especially in the developing sector. All countries are invited to this; including the United States. So, if you have some kind of an agreement in regard to

these issues on infrastructure, trade, the United States can then become a part of the Silk Road here in the United States itself.

ROSS: Bill, could you tell us more about what lessons we could learn from China on financing? China has been putting a tremendous amount of money into infrastructure. They have a wonderful high-speed rail network, the most extensive in the world; which is going to be doubled within a decade or so in terms of its extent. You had mentioned something about the opportunity to invest Treasury bonds in something more productive. What can we learn? How are they doing this? What can we do here?

JONES: Well, obviously, what the Chinese are doing is what the United States used to do. You go back to the FDR period, and you will see that this is what was done. The institutions that were established to build the TVA, to finance development; to create the industries at the point in time when we were in the Great Depression, were all here as institutions which promoted the development of private industry. But creating the basis on which that private industry can move in. This is the Hamiltonian system; this is the way the United States was created. We were not based on free trade; we fought against free trade. Hamilton introduced tariffs in order to prevent the British from dumping their products on the US economy; making it impossible for us

to

produce our own products and ever becoming an industrial nation.

That was reinstated at various times in our history when the free trade mania took place, leading to devastation; it was revived at various points. Abraham Lincoln did it; President McKinley did it. Roosevelt in his own way did that; and it's been a very successful model. The Chinese have used that, given

their own specific circumstances, with largely state-controlled

industries, they nevertheless have used this Hamiltonian or you

called it a Listian model; since the influence of Germany on the

Chinese economy was very great in the last century. They used this policy in order to develop their industries. They have a free market; they have individual entrepreneurs; they're very successful in computers and other fields. But there is a government which is responsible for the good of the people; for

the people's welfare – or as the Chinese call it, the people's livelihood. Therefore, they must make sure that things work so

that these industries operate to the benefit of the people.

We

had that system, too; we have it in our Constitution. The Federal government is responsible for the General Welfare; that

is a broad notion. That means that people cannot be put on the

scrap heap, they can't be out of work a long period of time; there must be measures that are taken to assure them that they can survive and their families can survive. We've gone away from

that system; we've become much more anarchistic in this free market system, and a lot of people have suffered.

When President Trump was elected, to the surprise of the large majority of the citizenry and of the world, it was simply by appealing to the changes that were necessary to move away from that type of system toward one which could secure a livelihood for the American people. The Chinese can serve as a model for that; it's a little bit different, but the principle is the same.

The principle of this Hamiltonian system. We have to begin to reconstitute institutions that can provide credit guarantees to our industries, to our construction companies; so we can build those roads, highways, nuclear power plants, things like that which we need. We also have got to reinstitute the tried and true separation of speculators from the legitimate commercial bankers; that's called Glass-Steagall, and that was the law between 1933 and 1998. It meant that the speculators, the gamblers, those who want to make quick bucks in a short time, even though there's tremendous risk, they cannot go into the banks and take Grandma's money and use that for the speculation to the detriment of Grandma if they lose. And the losses, of course, in the financial system have been extremely great.

So, that has to be reinstated again. We have to prevent the Wall Street culprits, the pirates, from stealing our wealth and the wealth of people who have invested in their banks. If that is done, then we cut off the fluff that is the fictitious growth of the paper economy, and have the capability of using the funds that are available to extend a credit system in the United States to build and to create greater wealth tomorrow as a result of this investment today.

ROSS: So, once we get Glass-Steagall passed, once we trim off this cancerous speculation and make it possible for credit to be going into productive purposes, what do you see as the potential physical types of cooperation with China? You had mentioned earlier that if Trump puts up tariffs, China may see this as acceptable from the context of Chinese businesses being able to open up in the United States as well. When you think about the kinds of physical investments that need to be made on things like railroads in particular, something where China has a great deal of home-grown expertise at this point, including the development of maglev rail; or nuclear plants, which China is building the most of in the world, most of them are being built in China right now. What do you see as the need or the potential for physical economic cooperation with China, for us to have a physical economic recovery here?

JONES: There are a variety of way they could do this. There could be direct investment – look, they made a proposal to build high-speed rail in California going from LA to Las Vegas. They also invested in Las Vegas a lot, too; there's a lot of infrastructure there. However, that didn't go through, because there were concerns whether it's security or whatever concerns; maybe because it was a state-owned enterprise. But those things are going to happen. I think the important thing is, if the

rules are lifted, so that China has a greater possibility of direct investment; they could do that. There's also another option; and some people are concerned that if China owns our railroads, where do we stand and what does this mean for the United States? We can get around that through this idea of creating this fund or a national bank. The national bank of Alexander Hamilton, the money was lent from international lenders; it was really the Dutch who were doing this. We owed them the debt, and by creating a debt repayment plan, they were willing to put more money into the United States. The bank could accept money from US people; it could also potentially accept money from foreign investors as well. This would be a way for China – and this has actually been proposed by the head of the China Central Investment Corporation; who said we have all this money in Treasury bills, and we're getting maybe 1% or 2% interest on the Treasury bills. We would be just as happy to invest this in an infrastructure fund, where we might get 2% or 3% – a low interest rate it has to be, because it's long-term; but better than they're doing now. That money would then be readily available for the United States also, if they have the capabilities; if we have the workers and the materiel and everything to do it ourselves. But they could also contribute as well; they could contribute with their expertise as they have done in Africa, in Asia and Latin America. They know the ropes in terms of high-speed rail; they know the problems involved in it. They know all the technicalities of it because they've built so many of those; but we haven't built any high-speed rail, so we're kind of starting from scratch. They could come to offer their technical assistance, or even offer capital to try and

get

these things started. There are many ways that this can be resolved, and there are ways that have been indicated clearly by

Chinese representatives that they would be happy to do things like this. So, the only thing is, we have to have a situation where the only thing that is done on trade – and nothing draconian should be done, because that would cause a major problem. But whatever is done on trade, there is a quid pro quo;

something that China gets to their advantage so that you have a win-win situation as people are saying.

With regard, of course, to the summit, what has been emphasized by the Chinese, of course, is that element of mutual

respect; and this is absolutely key, this is why there is a certain amount of trepidation. China is a major country; it is

effectively a great power at this point. They are a very proud

people, and they have a right to be; as Americans are a proud people. But in the United States, this is not so well understood

because of the attitude toward China and the Chinese which existed during the entirety of the 1800s going into the 1900s with the Chinese Exclusion Act and all these measures that were

taken to keep the Chinese – who built our Transcontinental Railroad – out of the country. People saw them as people who didn't have a culture, who lived at a very low level; and they just did not understand the greatness that was China. We understood that in the beginning in the American Revolution; Benjamin Franklin was the first major Sinophile, the lover of China. He wanted to introduce many of these projects that Confucius – the great Chinese philosopher – had been talking about in terms of creating a leadership. He wanted to

implement

that here in the United States; but that was lost. And that is a

big loss, because things may go well at the top level, but there

also has to be this understanding between the peoples.

There's

going to be more exchanges; there are going to be exchanges on the economic side. If these programs go through, you will

have

Chinese technicians and engineers coming and helping in the United States; you'll have more Chinese tourists – and there are

many of them coming in today. And hopefully, you'll have more American tourists going to China to learn the culture and the society; to get to know it better. Because as they get to know

it better, they will understand the importance of the nation and

the importance of the relationship that we have with China.

So, much can come out of this summit meeting, and I'm relatively confident that it will be successful; at least to the

extent that the two leaders of the two major nations in the world

will have a greater understanding of the other's views, of the other's wishes, of the other's motivation. If you have that, then

you have the basis on which these other problems – trade, South

China Sea, the Korean nuclear program – can be more readily resolved.

ROSS: Thank you very much. On the aspect of moving forward

and China's role in developing new things, I know that China has

made a push on changing the conception of "Made in China" meaning some cheap junk, to "created in China"; to the fact that there's a development of an ability to create new products. You brought up the entrepreneurship in many fields; we see it in the high-speed rail, for example. You definitely see it in the Chinese space program and Chinese efforts towards fusion research.

I wanted to let our viewers know and ask you to say a bit about a conference that was held last Saturday in Munich, Germany. A conference on March 25th for the 100th anniversary of the birth of the German space visionary, space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke. I know that Bill, you were fortunate to be able to attend this conference; and the videos of it will be posted on the Schiller Institute site in a somewhat short period of time, I hope. Could you tell us a bit about it from your firsthand experience?

JONES: This is an attempt to revive an understanding of a person who really was undoubtedly one of the greatest of the space pioneers who worked in the US space program. He was a part of the German team that came over from Peenemünde. Everybody knows Werner von Braun, but nowadays they don't know Krafft Ehrlicke; which is a shame, because he was one of the most genial of all of those pioneers. He was thinking hundreds of years ahead; he was thinking already in the 1950s of building colonies on the Moon. He actually had correspondence between him and Werner von Braun on how to get to Mars; both of them had

written

books on how to get to Mars. They had exchanges now and then where Krafft would make suggestions on how you would do it; and

von Braun would respond. But he was also a very unusual individual, because he believed that the nature of man is that of

a creative being; that man cannot stand still. He must always pursue the search for the new frontiers; this is in the fundamental core of human nature, that they must seek the new and

develop the new. Because of this, of course, he came into contact with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; and they just hit it off

from the get-go. They were like souls. The last part of his life, he was working with the Schiller Institute and with the LaRouches to fight the zero-growth movement. When we came into

contact with Krafft, during the period of transition from the great heyday of the space program to the low level of the zero-growth, back-to-nature movement, Krafft was conducting a lone fight in order to fight the philosophy that was being foisted upon the American people with the zero-growth movement.

Of course, when he came into contact with the LaRouches, he realized that there was a greater forum on which he could operate; so they became very good friends. He went on tours together with them in order to talk about the space program; to

try and revive an interest in space in those days.

The reason we're reviving it is not simply that it's his

100th birthday; he would have been 100 years old this week, if he

had lived. He died at a very early stage; he was in his sixties

– 1984 – he was still a relatively young man, but he had a

serious ailment and he passed away at that time. We felt it was necessary not only to honor him and to raise an understanding in the broader public about his importance. But also given the fact that President Trump has expressed the intention of moving back into space in the message that he sent that he sent last weekend – in fact, the same day as the conference. We were able to put that on the film at the end of that; it had come in in the morning, and the conference went until the afternoon, so we showed that; and people of course were very surprised. They thought this was a conspiracy between us and President Trump; it wasn't that, it was just coincidence. But because this is now the re-orientation of the United States, it has created a new capability of moving in that direction that we lost many years ago. And that therefore the work of Krafft Ehrlicke, which again still remains to be realized, now becomes of practical importance for moving back into space. So, there was a kind of dual purpose for the conference.

ROSS: Great. I think if we compare the two images that we've been discussing tonight – the attempt to prevent by any means a shift away from the anti-Russia, anti-cooperation policy that had dominated the thinking of the previous administration; we compare that with the potential that we have in cooperating with and working with the New Paradigm created by the

LaRouches

over the decades, and being spearheaded right now on a policy front by China, we really have a great potential in store for us.

These assaults on Trump – Trumpgate – the idea that Vladimir Putin is destroying the United States; this stuff really will not

blow over. Given that Trump has attempted to turn the tables on

this by calling out the wiretapping, by calling out the surveillance, by taking on these institutions – domestic intelligence agencies and, of course, the British; this means it's possible to actually defeat this control or grip over the government of the United States and make it possible to set our

own policy, and a very good policy. And develop a future that we

can be proud of. So, we have a great deal of material about this

on our website; we've been almost every day continuing with updates to keep you informed about what can be done on this fight

against the Deep State here and in Britain. We will continue to

have more on that; and we need your help, we need everybody's help to make sure that we have the potential to be freed up to join the future that could be ours if we take up that chance.

So thank you, Bill, for joining us today.

JONES: Thank you for having me.

ROSS: Thank you for joining us, and we will see you next time.

USA: Vil I have FBI til at køre dette land?

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 30. marts, 2017 – Lige siden den 4. marts, da præsident Trump korrekt sagde, at han var blevet »aflyttet« (overvåget) af Barack Obama, har der været et voksende anfald af frygt blandt nogle af vore senatorer og andre. De foregiver måske noget andet, men man kan læse virkeligheden i deres ansigter: de er rædselsslagne. Under dagens farceagtige høring i Senatets Efterretningskomite, om angivelige russiske, »aktive forholdsregler« imod USA, så vi senatorer, der svedte af frygt, i en grad, hvor de var totalt døve over for virkeligheden, pligt og fornuft. De havde fået at vide, at de skulle indbringe nogle vidner, som i størst mulig grad havde bidt på Ruslands-maddingen, som de kunne finde, til denne høring – men senatorerne overgik selv, i deres rædsel, ofte deres egne vidners frygtmagere.

Vær ikke en tåbe: Dette er ikke et spørgsmål og Demokrater versus Republikanere. Det er meget mere end dette, og af langt større betydning for vort land. Hvis man ser på disse senatorers ansigter, ser man to ord: »hemmelige filer«. Hvilket er præcis det, præsident Trump talte om den 4. marts, og ikke tilfældigt. Hver og én af dem ved, at deres mest personlige misgerninger findes i en fil, elektronisk. Ét enkelt fejltrin, én forkert bevægelse, og sådan, så vil deres hustruer eller ægtemænd, og deres vælgere, være overrasket over at finde deres småsynder på aftenyhederne. Dette er, hvad vi simpelt hen plejede at kalde »FBI-filer«; FBI har altid specialiseret sig i afpresning. Husk, hvad de gjorde mod Martin Luther King, for gentagende at forsøge at drive ham til selvmord.

Det er ikke kun FBI – det er hele den nuværende form af det britiske imperieapparat i USA, som Barbara Boyd dissekerer det i *EIR's* udgave af 31. marts.[1] Men det er desuagtet FBI, med deres svulmende filer for afpresning mod alle og enhver.

Den 20. marts aflagde FBI-direktør Comey forklaring om, at han var i færd med at foretage en undersøgelse af USA's præsident. Hvem Helvede tror han, han er? Det er ganske enkelt forræderi.

Der er ting, vi endnu ikke ved; der er stadig ting, der skal frem om denne ondskab, men så meget er sikkert: Vore valgte repræsentanter – uanset parti – er ofre for FBI's afpresning. Hvordan vil de respondere? Og, mere præcist, og mere omgående – hvordan vil DU respondere? Som amerikaner og patriot, ligesom Martin Luther King, jr.? Eller ... som den beklagelsesværdige kujon, New York-senatoren Chuck Schumer, der sidste januar, den 3., instruerede et landsdækkende fjernsyns Publikum om, at Donald Trump var »virkelig dum« for at have kritiseret USA's efterretningstjenester, fordi de har »hundrede og sytten måder at hævne sig på dig«.

En uge fra i dag, den 6. april, vil Kinas præsident Xi Jinping komme her til et todages topmøde med præsident Trump. Sammen med præsident Xi kommer hele den Eurasiske Landbros eurasiske udviklingsplan for verden, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har kæmpet for i årtier. Hvilket Amerika vil Kinas præsident finde her? Martin Luther Kings Amerika? Eller de af frygt svedende kujoners Amerika?

[1] [The Insurrection Against the President, And Its British Controllers – Or, Who Really is George Soros, Anyway?](#)

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Rusland parat til at udvikle relationer med Washington

30. mrs., 2017 – I et vidtrækkende interview med magasinet *National Interest*, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at Rusland er parat til at etablere gode relationer med USA, alt imens han afslørede Hillary Clintons rolle i lanceringen af en anti-russisk kampagne i Vesten så tidligt som i 2012.

Da han blev spurgt om sine forventninger og mål med hensyn til forholdet til USA's udenrigsminister Tillerson, og til præsident Donald Trump, svarede Lavrov: »Efter de amerikanske valg, kort tid efter valgdagen, talte præsident Putin og nyvalgte præsident Trump sammen over telefon. Det var en god, men meget generel diskussion, om hovedspørgsmål i vore relationer og selvfølgelig internationale hovedspørgsmål. De aftalte at holde kontakten ved lige, og efter indsættelsen talte de igen sammen, og de genbekræftede behovet for at udforske måder til faktisk løsning af internationale problemer, og selvfølgelig se på, hvad der kunne gøres for at bringe de bilaterale relationer ind i en normal tilstand. De aftalte også, at hr. Rex Tillerson og jeg selv skulle se på en mere detaljeret dagsorden og også diskutere forberedelsen af mødet mellem præsidenterne, som bør finde sted, når begge lande, begge ledere, føler sig trygge ved det.«

»Vi mødtes med Rex i midten af februar i Bonn, på sidelinjen af G20-ministtermødet, og kom godt omkring mange spørgsmål i den bilaterale dagsorden. Jeg briefede ham om relationerne med Obama-administrationen omkring bilaterale spørgsmål og de problemer, der akkumuleredes i denne periode. Vi gik ikke i

dybden med dette, jeg briefede ham blot, så hans team, der stadig var ved at blive sammensat, kunne se på disse spørgsmål og beslutte, hvad deres holdning til dem ville være. Og vi diskuterede Syrien, Iran, den Koreanske Halvø og Mellemøsten generelt, relationer mellem Rusland og Vesten. Det var en meget generel, men temmelig væsentlig diskussion. Det var selvfølgelig den første kontakt, og hr. Rex Tillerson er først ved at træde sine sko til, i sin nye kapacitet. Vi diskuterede muligheden for personlige møder, og vi har fortsat disse diskussioner. Så snart, vi har diskuteret spørgsmålet færdigt, bliver det annonceret.«

På et spørgsmål om, hvad han anså for »normale« relationer med USA, sagde Lavrov:

»'Normal' er at behandle sine partnere med respekt, ikke forsøge at gennemtvinge nogle af sine egne ideer uden at tage deres synspunkter og interesser i betragtning, altid forsøge at lytte og høre, og forhåbentlig ikke satse på et overlegenhedskompleks, hvilket åbenlyst var tilfældet med Obama-administrationen. De var besat af deres exceptionelle position, af deres lederskab. USA's grundlæggende fædre talte også om deres lederskab, og de mente, at den amerikanske nation var exceptionel, men de ønskede, at andre blot skulle tage den amerikanske erfaring som et eksempel og følge det. De indikerede aldrig, at USA skulle gennemtvinge, inkl. ved magt, sine værdier over andre.«

»Obama-administrationen var tydeligvis anderledes. Faktisk var der, længe før Ukraine, længe før Krim, i begyndelsen af december 2012, et OSCE-ministtermøde i Dublin. Og Hillary Clinton var udenrigsminister og ledede delegationen. Vi havde et bilateralt møde med hende. Hun forsøgte at overbevise mig om noget, som var et vanskeligt spørgsmål på dagsordenen, men jeg husker denne situation, for, på sidelinjen af dette ministermøde, deltog hun i et møde på Dublins Universitet, og hun holdt et foredrag, hvor hun sagde noget i retning af: 'Vi er i færd med at finde effektive måder til at forsinke eller

forhindre bestræbelserne på at gen-sovjetisere det tidligere sovjetiske område.' December 2012!«

»Hvad det var for handlinger, hun tænkte på, som bestræbelser på at gen-sovjetisere området, kunne jeg virkelig ikke forstå. Jo, der var diskussioner om, at Ukraine, Kasakhstan, Belarus og Rusland skulle danne en Toldunion, og hvis dette var årsagen, så viste det selvfølgelig den meget åbenlyse og reelle holdning hos Obama-administrationen til det, der foregik i det tidligere sovjetiske område og i området for Samfundet af Uafhængige Stater – dens åbenlyse ønske om at overtage dette geopolitiske område rundt om Rusland, uden overhovedet at bryde sig om, hvad Moskva måtte mene.«

»Dette var årsagen til krisen i Ukraine, hvor USA og EU ligefremt sagde til ukrainerne: enten er i med os, eller også er i med Rusland, imod os. Og den meget skrøbelige ukrainske stat kunne ikke klare denne form for pres, og det, der skete, skete: kuppet, og så videre og så videre ... Men min pointe er, at de anså for normalt, at folkene i Obamas team skulle bestemme, hvad der skulle ske, hvor som helst i verden, inklusive omkring så stort et land som den Russiske Føderation. Og det er absolut abnormt efter min mening.«

Lavrov talte om de åbenlyse operationer imod Trump: »Jeg forstår, at der findes folk i USA, der ønsker, at dette skal blive en forhindring, og som ønsker at binde præsident Trumps team på hænder og fødder mht. det russiske spørgsmål, og jeg mener, at dette er en meget ondsksfuld politik, men vi ser, at det finder sted«, sagde Lavrov.

Trump-præsidentskabets kamp handler om det Amerikanske vs. det Britiske System – Afgørelsen vil komme snart

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 29. marts, 2017 – Britisk Efterretning er drivkraften bag den fortsatte optrapning af en ekstraordinær kampagne fra efterretningstjenester, der har streng kontrol over de store medier, for at drive præsident Trump ud af embedet på en fantasianklage om, at han skulle være kontrolleret af Putins Rusland.

I USA og Europa kæmper to narrativer mod hinanden, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter, opsummerede her til morgen. Den første narrativ er, at Putin stjal det amerikanske valg, at Trump er illegitim og må fjernes. Den modsatte narrativ er, at »deep state« – »staten i staten« – efterretningskræfterne i London, NATO, NSA og CIA udfører et angreb mod præsident Trump i et forsøg på at tvinge ham til at træde tilbage eller blive stillet for en rigsret.

Én af disse narrativer bliver den fremherskende inden for de kommende uger; og, for den Amerikanske Forfatningsmæssige Republiks skyld, og for den internationale freds skyld, må vi hellere sørge for, at det er Trump-præsidentskabet, der overlever, og det bliver de Fem Øjnes efterretningstjenesters »deep state«, der afsløres i sine kriminelle handlinger.

Valget af Trump var ikke et simpelt resultat i et nationalt valg. Det var en del af en verdensomspændende bølge af vælgere, der afviser »globaliseringens« og frihandelens økonomiske fiasko, som er centreret omkring City of Londons

politikker; og de afviser konstante amerikanske krige for regimeskifte og provokationer for krig med Rusland og Kina. Det er en bølge, som London, Bruxelles og NATO raser for at stoppe gennem dæmonisering af Rusland og Kina. Desuden er Trump blevet den første præsident i et århundrede, der holder taler om »det Amerikanske Økonomiske System« – det system, der gik til modstand mod og bekæmpede det britiske frihandelssystem, fra Alexander Hamilton og hele vejen til præsident Franklin Roosevelt.

Britisk efterretning lancerede »Trump-Rusland-skandalen« sidste år, med MI6-agenter, der udførte »politisk oppositionsresearch« i det amerikanske valg. Denne oprindelige, britiske skabelse, FBI – som aldrig var god til at fange forbrydere, men dygtige til at skaffe sig af med uønskede politiske ledere og samfundsledere – betalte for deres beskidte arbejde, og forsøger i øjeblikket at torpedere den ubejlejlige formand for Husets Efterretningskomite, Devin Nunes fra Californien, der har opdaget en bombe af en afsløring af efterretningssamfundets »deep state«.

Præsident Trump skal afholde et topmøde med Kinas præsident Xi inden for 10 dage om økonomisk udvikling og handel; dernæst ønsker han at gå videre til et tilsvarende møde med præsident Putin, ligesom han allerede har mødt Japans præsident Abe, om de samme spørgsmål. Britisk efterretning er fast besluttet på, at præsidenten skal tvinges ud nu, før han kan realisere disse møder.

Hvis det lykkes for efterretningstjenester og pressen og Demokrater, som de har pisket til en hob i McCarthy-stil, og de bringer denne præsident til fald, så vil ikke kun den Amerikanske Republik befinde sig i alvorlig fare for et kup, grundlæggende set. Truslen om Tredje Verdenskrig med Rusland og Kina være tilbage på niveauet for Bush' krigskatastrofer og Obamas direkte krigsprovokationer imod de eurasiske magter.

Meget afhænger nu af Trumps, og Nunes', faste beslutning om at

kæmpe. Det afhænger af Lyndon LaRouches bevægelse – der selv blev udset og angrebet af disse netværk, af de samme grunde, i 1980'erne, og overlevede og blev fremherskende – for at gennemtvinge den politik, der faktisk repræsenterer det Amerikanske System i dag.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump og vicepræsident Mike Pence møder modtagere af Æresmedaljen, 24. marts, 2017. Medaljen er den højeste æresbevisning for mod over for fjendtlige styrker, skabt af en lov, der blev underskrevet af Abraham Lincoln.

USA's Udenrigsministerium bekræfter topmøde mellem Trump og Xi Jinping i næste uge

29. marts., 2017 – USA's Udenrigsministerium har nu officielt meddelt, at et møde mellem præsidenterne Trump og Xi Jinping vil finde sted den 6.-7. april. Dette blev meddelt i en officiel telefonisk briefing til pressen i går. Udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson vil deltage, hvilket faktisk var meddelelsens indhold.

Den kinesiske, engelsksprogede CCTV-station bragte ligeledes en meddelelse om topmødet i dag, i forbindelse med promovering af et umiddelbart forestående interview med den amerikanske transportminister, Elaine Chow. CCTV understregede, at fr. Chow er en af de mest indflydelsesrige amerikanere af asiatisk oprindelse, og at hun vil være centralt placeret i planer for infrastrukturinvesteringer – som kunne involvere kinesisk deltagelse.

Mange artikler om amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde om Bælt & Vej-initiativet, og om en genopbygning af USA's økonomiske infrastruktur, dukker op i kinesisk, engelsksproget presse. En slående artikel på CCTV's site begynder med at citere den store videnskabsmand og grundlægger af det Amerikanske System, Benjamin Franklins ekstraordinære respekt for konfucianisme.

»Den store opfinder og diplomat, Benjamin Franklin, grublede over en »amerikansk civilisation«, der ville være baseret på hans studier af kinesisk civilisation. Han formanede til konfucianismens dyder. I 1737 introducerede han til læserne af avisen Pennsylvania Gazette en serie noveller, 'Fra Konfucius' moral'. Han skrev, at konfuciansk filosofi var »den port, gennem hvilken man må gå for at komme til den højeste og mest perfekte visdom'.«

Med henvisning til en kilde i USA's Efterretningstjeneste rapporterede *South China Morning Post* om topmødet, at præsident Xi ikke vil gøre andre ophold i USA (dvs., ikke vil møde kongresmedlemmer). Artiklen kom også med spekulationer om, at den usædvanlige, officielle tavshed omkring topmødet betyder, at forberedelser af spørgsmål og mulige aftaler fortsætter helt frem til sidste øjeblik før mødet.

Yemen: Vil Trump dykke ned i det saudiske hængedynd?

28. mrs., 2017 – Ifølge flere nye rapporter skulle Trump-administrationen være i færd med at overveje, eller har allerede besluttet, at øge USA's militære støtte til den saudiskledede koalition, der har været i krig i Yemen i de sidste to år. *Wall Street Journal* rapporterede her til morgen,

at administrationen allerede er i færd med at optrappe sin støtte til saudierne og de Forenede Arabiske Emirater (UAE), især mht. efterretningsstøtte og logistisk støtte. Trump-administrationens primære interesse siges at være at bekæmpe al-Qaeda på den Arabiske Halvø; sekundært, at imødegå iransk indflydelse i landet.

Washington Post rapporterede den 26. marts, at forsvarsminister James Mattis i sidste uge har udfærdiget et memo til generalløjtnant H.R. McMaster, Trumps nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, der søger at fjerne restriktionerne, som blev gennemført af præsident Obama i 2016, for militærstøtte til koalitionen, med det formål at gøre det muligt for en operation fra UAE at indtage havnebyen Hodeydah fra Houthisammemilitserne, men memoet foreslår ikke at støtte ethvert aspekt af den foreslåede UAE-operation. Ifølge *Washington Post* vil (USA's Sikkerhedsråds) principkomiteen træde sammen i denne uge for at overveje Mattis' memo; det er uklart, om det bliver vedtaget.

Et forslag om at levere amerikanske specialstyrker på jorden ved Det røde Havs kyst »var ikke omfattet af Mattis' anmodning«, sagde en højtplaceret embedsmand i administrationen til *WP*. Da UAE kom med en tilsvarende anmodning sidste år, blev den blokeret pga. bekymring over dens usandsynlige succes, og over, at det kunne forværre den allerede katastrofale, humanitære situation. Visse af præsident Trumps rådgivere deler disse samme bekymringer, sagde en højtplaceret embedsmand.

»Det er endnu ikke blevet besluttet, om [restriktionerne] vil blive ophævet. Der er bestemt generel uenighed i vores regering.« Der er også bekymring over, at en forøget, amerikansk støtte mere generelt kunne underminere de diplomatiske bestræbelser, der befinder sig i et dødvande, på at afslutte krigen.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump med sin nye forsvarsminister,

Anti-Trump-intrige ønsker Tredje Verdenskrig, advarer fremtrædende tysk forfatter

29. mrs., 2017 – Wolfgang Bittner, fremtrædende forfatter af bøger og artikler i Tyskland, havde nogle barske kommentarer til NATO og anti-Trump-kampagnen i et interview med *Deutsche Wirtschaftsnachrichten*. Han advarer om, at den igangværende NATO-oprustning i det østlige Europa ikke skal tages let, og at der altid er en fare for en direkte konfrontation med Rusland, og bekræfter, at Mikhail Gorbatsjov med god grund har advaret om, at Tredje Verdenskrigs Damoklessværd hænger over planeten.

Den farligste, mest akutte trussel kommer fra USA, advarer Bittner: »Man kan frygte, at militærindustriens hardlinerne og lobbyister i USA's Kongres faktisk satser på krig. Efter regeringsskiftet i Washington, D.C., er et skifte i relationerne med Rusland blevet antydnet. Hvorvidt den nye præsident Donald Trump kan virkeliggøre sine ideer er imidlertid et stort spørgsmål. Allerede nu, få uger inde i hans embedsperiode, er det åbenlyst, at hans fjender, som han beskyldte for dårlig ledelse og korrupsion i sin indsættelsestale, er i færd med at forhindre det lovede tårbrud og fortsætter med at hælde benzin på bålet, igen og igen.«

»Der synes at eksistere en slags separat regering i USA, der består af storfinansielle interesser i forbindelse med det

militær-industrielle kompleks, efterretningstjenesterne, Federal Reserve og andre institutioner i magtapparatet. De ønsker ikke fred i verden, og heller ikke et fredeligt og fremgangsrigt Europa.«

Geopolitikere som John McCain, tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende, general Philip Breedlove, Hillary Clinton og George Friedman (politolog) har altid haft denne strategi, siger Bittner, og påpeger en tale, som Friedman engang holdt, hvor han åbent erklærede, at USA gik med i to verdenskrige for at forhindre en alliance mellem Tysklands teknologi og Ruslands udstrakte råmaterialer.

Bittner angriber mainstream-medierne for deres propagandafremstød mod Rusland og siger, at mange journalister er ansat af, eller i det mindste står i nær forbindelse med, NATO-propagandanetværk, såsom Atlantic Bridge, Goldman Sachs Foundation, American Interest, Tysk Udenrigspolitisk Sammenslutning, Atlantic Initiative og München Sikkerhedskonferencen.

Foto: Wolfgang Bittner.

RADIO SCHILLER 29. marts,

2017:

**Pressen mørklægger Trump og
USA's nye visioner**

i et forsøg på at forhindre det nye paradigme

v/ formand Tom Gillesberg

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/pressen-morklaegger-trump-og-usas-nye-visioner-i-et-forsog-pa-at-forhindre-det-nye-paradigme

Hvordan får vi ryddet op i rodet? Gå i offensiven mod FBI!

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 28. marts, 2017 – Der er et enormt grundlag for optimisme i USA, som det så levende blev demonstreret af præsident Trumps smukke krav om at vende tilbage til rummet i sin ugentlige tale, den 25. marts.

Men, hver gang, amerikanerne vender sig om, oppiskes der en ny, beskidt operation, der nærer den britiske »farvede revolution« imod Trump-administrationen!

Hvad skal man gøre? Hvis der er tvivl, så gå efter FBI!

Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag, da han blev briefet om de seneste nyheder om griseriet, »FBI er noget skidt. Det er åbenlyst; argumenter er overflødige.« Selv om FBI sandsynligvis har fået sin kapacitet reduceret, »er det stadig en skidt faktor«.

Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, er en ond, forræderisk organisation, der i mere end 70 år har opereret på vegne af Wall Street-financierer og Det britiske Imperium. Trump-

præsidentskabet blev valgt af de amerikanske vælgere for at knuse dette imperium. For at sikre, at denne bestræbelse vil lykkes, at den Amerikanske Republik og dens Økonomiske System i Hamiltons tradition vil blomstre, må FBI's nationale Gestapo knuses.

Det, som amerikanerne står overfor, er en endeløs strøm af konstruerede »skandaler«, der er fabrikeret over den simple formel: 1) kom med anklager imod Trump og hans kolleger, over forbindelser til Rusland; 2) fremfør, at Rusland er den onde fjende. Modus operandi er inkarneret i en hovedoverskrift i går aftes på CNN, én af floklederne, og som erklærede, »De mørke stormskyer, der trækker op over Rusland, hænger nu over Trump-kredsen«.

Den seneste beskyldning i dette forskruede sludder er mod Trumps svigersøn, Jared Kushner, for at have mødt den russiske ambassadør til USA Sergei Kislyak to gange under overgangsperioden til Trumps indsættelse, og for at have mødtes med en repræsentant for den russiske, statsejede udviklingsbank, Vnesheconombank. Det er meningen, man skal tænke, at dette er forkasteligt. Kushner tilsluttede sig omgående den voksende række af personer, der forlanger at aflægge forklaring for Kongressen for at gøre rent bord. Han meldte sig endda frivilligt til at træde for Senatets Efterretningskomites høring torsdag, der i øvrigt ser ud til at blive et cirkus, over spørgsmålet, »Disinformation: En begynderlærebog om russiske, aktive fremgangsmåder og kampagner for at øve indflydelse«.

Men flokken for farvet revolution udser sig nu ledere af selve Efterretningskomiteen som deres målskiver. Dagens planlagte møde bag lukkede døre i Husets Efterretningskomite kunne ikke gennemføres, fordi vidnerne, FBI-direktør James Comey og NSA-direktør Michael Rogers, sagde, de havde et problem med deres mødekalender.

I går kom formand for Husets Efterretningskomite, Devin Nunes

(R-CA), under voldsomt angreb. Han blev bedt om enten at træde tilbage eller blive erstattet i sin stilling af en bande, der inkluderede Demokraterne, senator Charles Schumer (NY) og kongresmedlem Nancy Pelosi (CA), og mange Republikanere. Blandt de heksejagt-anklager, slyngtet mod Nunes, er tabersagen, at han sidste tirsdag arrangerede det, så han kunne læse hemmeligstemplede efterretningsdokumenter; og at han dernæst briefede præsidenten den næste dag. Kendsgerningen er, at Nunes gør sit arbejde. Han forfølger sporet for, hvordan efterretningsfolk afslørede – »fjernede masken for hans sande karakter« – pens. generalløjtnant Michael Flynn, der blev udsat for udspionering under processen med amerikansk overvågning af udenlandske personer. Nunes' anklagere siger, det 'ikke er fair' af Nunes at forfølge dette.

Nunes fortsætter imidlertid sine bestræbelser i denne uge og anmoder om, at de selv samme efterretningsdokumenter gøres tilgængelige for hans fæller i Kongressen, så de kan læse dem. *EIR* har af en uafhængig kilde fået at vide, at en person, der var til stede ved NSA/efterretningsmødet, hvor det blev besluttet at begå den illegale afsløring af Flynn, faktisk lakkede forbrydelsen, dvs., var 'whistleblower'.

På Senatets side går Charles Grassley (R-IA) direkte efter bæstets hjerte – FBI og briterne. Som formand for Senatets Efterretningskomite afslørede Grassley i går indholdet af sit brev af 24. marts til skidt-til-hyre-organisationen, Fusion GPS. Det er firmaet med base i Washington, D.C., der indgik en underentreprise med et britisk efterretningsfirma om at producere skidt imod Trump. Fusion indgik en kontrakt med det London-baserede Orbis Erhvervsefterretning, som er oprettet (i 2009) af to såkaldte eks-MI-6-agenter, Christopher Steele og Christopher Burrows (der begge er gået under jorden). De producerede det »upålidelige dossier« i 2016 om Trump.

Grassley har inden 7. april krævet alle detaljerne om, hvordan Fusion var involveret med Orbis, Steele og FBI, og før dette, hvordan Fusion arbejdede for Hillary Clinton-demokrater, og

før dette, arbejdede for anti-Trump-republikanere. Dette viser britisk og FBI-indblanding i de amerikanske valg, for nu at slå hovedet på sømmet.

Grassleys brev går efter FBI's involvering og siger, »Når politisk research fra oppositionen bliver grundlaget for lovens håndhævelse og efterretningsindsatser, så rejser det vægtige spørgsmål om lovhåndhævelsens og efterretnings politiske uafhængighed ... «

Vi har en præsident i USA, og det er udgangspunktet for handling. Gå efter FBI! Sæt forbryderne i fængsel!

Foto: J. Edgar Hoover FBI-bygningen i Washington, D.C.

De værste 'falske nyheder' er, at medierne nægter at informere befolkningen om det Nye Paradigme, der finder sted

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 27. marts, 2017 – Otteogfyrre timer efter præsident Donald Trumps ugentlige tale, der inspirerer Amerika til at genoprette vor nations tabte dedikation til at udvide menneskets viden om Universet og om selve livet, er denne historiske videoudsendelse fortsat næsten ikke blevet rapporteret i de amerikanske medier. Det er ikke engang blevet nævnt i *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times**

eller på de store Tv- og radiostationer. I stedet er medierne fulde af historier om, at Trump er en »fiasko«, fordi en (dybt fejlbehæftet) sundhedslov blev nedstemt, og af hysteri à la McCarthy-isme om Rusland, der stjæler det amerikanske valg, og af selv tilbagevendende henvisninger til »lugten af forræderi, der hænger over Trump-administrationen«.

På ét niveau er dette simpelthen nonsens. Men det sker også samtidig med, at en masse undergravende, »farvede revolutioner«, som den, der gennemføres mod Trump-administrationen, viser sig i hele Europa – i Balkanlandene, i Belarus (med direkte støtte fra de neonazistiske brigader i Ukraine), og, hvad der er vigtigst, i Rusland, hvor den med Soros forbundne Alexei Navalny har aktiveret et par tusinde demonstranter for at fremprovokere et par arrestationer, der skal gøres til avisoverskrifter i hele verden.

Og, hvad der er lige så vigtigt, så har præsident Trumps nylige vedtagelse af en politik for en tilbagevenden til det »Amerikanske System«, noget, der næsten udelukkende identificeres med Lyndon LaRouche, fået samme behandling af mainstream-medierne. Den faste skribent, der går under navnet Virgil på Breitbart-websitet, som tidligere blev ledet af Trumps chefstrateg, Steve Bannon, har udgivet to stærke rapporter, den ene om Trumps besøg i Michigan i denne måned [»Donald Trump, Rosie the Riveter, and the Revival of American Economic Nationalism« (Donald Trump, nitte-arbejderen Rosie og genoplivningen af amerikansk, økonomisk nationalisme)], og den anden om Trumps krav om at genindføre det Amerikanske System [»Trump Connects to the Taproot of American Economic Nationalism with Henry Clay's 'American System'« (Donald Trump skaber forbindelse til roden af amerikansk økonomisk nationalisme med Henry Clays 'Amerikanske System')].

Virgil bemærker, at disse taler af præsidenten »uden for enhver tvivl rejser den vigtigste, økonomisk-politiske idé i amerikansk historie«, og dog »var der ingen omtale af det i *Politico*, og heller ikke i hverken *Washington Post*, *New York*

Times eller CNN«.

Løgnene, der udbredes som kendsgerninger af sofisterne på disse britiskkontrollerede og Wall Street-kontrollerede medier, er frastødende og ødelæggende, men ikke nær så ødelæggende som bestræbelserne på at forholde de amerikanske (og andre) masser, at den igangværende økonomiske og moralske transformation af vores nation i det hele taget finder sted. Forestil jer, at Jack Kennedys krav om, at mennesket skulle tage til Månen, »ikke, fordi det er let, men fordi det er svært«, blev udelukket i de amerikanske medier. Denne særlige 'behandling' er velkendt af Lyndon LaRouche, hvis udviklende rolle i begge disse videnskabelige og økonomiske innovationer er åbenlys for alle, der kender ham, men som er blevet systematisk forholdt størstedelen af det amerikanske folk i 50 år, som en bevidst, åbent erklæret politik fra de såkaldte mainstream-mediers side.

Men denne evne til at udøve mind kontrol over befolkningen via medierne, er ved at blive brudt. En præsident, der taler direkte til befolkningen, og som nægter at bøje sig for myten om, at »den offentlige mening«, som den defineres af medierne, må tilbedes, har nu indtaget embedet. Det er langt fra klart, om han vil lykkes, men potentialet er stort, hvis befolkningen lever op til lejligheden. Lyndon LaRouche er i hvert fald af den overbevisning, at Trump ved, hvad han taler om.

Lyndon LaRouche har altid hævdet, at »den offentlige mening« og »at være praktisk« (pragmatisk) er menneskehedens, og i særdeleshed kreativitetens, største fjender. I denne tid med revolutionære forandringer, i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln og Franklin Roosevelt, er det nye paradigme fuldt ud opnåeligt. Verden vender sig mod Kinas Nye Silkevejsproces, som markerer afslutningen af »nulsums-geopolitik« under Det britiske Imperium, der har domineret moderne historie siden mindst 1900. Ideen om en global renæssance – inden for videnskab, kunst og politisk økonomi – er den nødvendige og passende mission, der nu er forelagt os

alle.

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson møder Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i Beijing, Kina, den 19. marts, 2017. [State Department photo/Public Domain]

Trump og LaRouche-bevægelsen inspirerer til en tilbagevenden til menneskehedens mission i rummet

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 26. marts, 2017 – Lørdag, den 25. marts, udsendte præsident Donald Trump en stærk og inspirerende, fem minutter lang video som sin ugentlige tale, hvor han bebuder sin plan om at føre nationen tilbage til rummet, efter Obamas syv års ødelæggelse af NASA og nationens rumprogram. Trump lod sig inspirere af Hubble-teleskopet, der i 1995 skuer ud i tomrummet, for blot at opdage, at der er endnu tusinder, eller millioner – eller flere – nye galakser at opdage. Som Trump sagde: »Denne opdagelse var fuldstændig utrolig. Men det uforglemmelige syn tilfredsstillede ikke vores dybe hunger efter viden. Denne hunger voksede til stadighed, og endnu mere, og mindede os om, hvor meget, vi ikke ved om rummet; ja faktisk, hvor meget, vi ikke ved om livet.«

Alle borgere på Jorden må få lejlighed til at se denne video:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=ZGt6lkLApuo

Det er måske ikke et tilfælde, at Schiller Instituttet og Fusion Energy Forum, stiftet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, på samme tid afholdt konferencer i München, Tyskland, og i Houston, Texas, for at ære den store, tysk-amerikanske rumforsker og visionære person, Krafft Ehrlicke, der blev født for 100 år siden, den 24. marts, 1917. Alt imens flere fremlæggelser i München diskuterede Ehrlickes ekstraordinære liv og karakter, og hans tætte relation til hr. og fr. LaRouche, så viste en fremlæggelse af en schweizisk astronaut, professor Claude Nicollier, der havde besøgt Hubble-teleskopet under sine fire missioner i rummet, flere spektakulære Hubble-fotografier af galakser, som teleskopet havde opdaget.

☒ Blot få minutter senere, da Trump-videoen blev sendt til konferencen umiddelbart efter videoen blev udsendt af Det Hvide Hus, blev publikum slået af målløshed og inspireret af at se mange af de samme, smukke billeder af vort univers, som de netop havde set under den schweiziske astronauts fremlæggelse.

Med ganske få undtagelser har mainstreammedierne i USA, der er fikseret på at ødelægge den amerikanske præsident, baseret på britiske imperieløgne om, hvor farlig Rusland er for verden, totalt ignoreret denne historiske videopræsentation. Ikke siden John F. Kennedys program for at tage til Månen, og siden Ronald Reagans program for et samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland om skabelse af et strategisk forsvar i rummet, imod atomvåben, har en præsident således inspireret nationen – og dog vil de fleste mennesker ikke engang høre det, med mindre vi påtager os, som vores ansvar, at sørge for det.

Ligesom Ronald Reagans program for SDI, 'Strategic Defense Initiative' (Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ[1]), var direkte inspireret af Lyndon LaRouche, så ser vi nu præsident Trump bevæge sig imod vedtagelse af en politik, der er blevet initieret og forsvaret af LaRouche – og i de fleste tilfælde, udelukkende af LaRouche – i løbet af de seneste 50 år. Tag LaRouches video fra 1987, »Woman on Mars« (Kvinden på Mars);

hans brochure, 'War on Drugs' (Krig mod narkotika), fra 1980'erne; hans program for det Amerikanske System, for en genindførelse af Alexander Hamiltons (økonomiske) opdagelser; hans fremgangsmåde med Store Projekter for global udvikling; hans politik for de Fire Magter, for en forening af USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien; hans bog, »There are No Limits to Growth« (Der er ingen grænser for vækst), fra 1983 – alt dette reflekteres i stigende grad i de politikker, som Donald Trump vedtager.

Vil de lykkes?

Det vil være afhængigt af menneskehedens evne på globalt plan – og ikke kun amerikanernes – til at hæve sig op på et højere eksistensniveau – 'værens-niveau' – til det, Helga Zepp-LaRouche kalder menneskehedens »modne alderstrin«, baseret på den menneskelige arts harmoni gennem skabende samarbejde for at fremme vores tilstand af viden, og af kultur. Denne harmoni er den Europæiske Renæssances rod, som den blev inspireret af Nicolaus Cusanus – Nikolaus von Kues – af Brunnelleschi og andre; og som ligeledes er roden i Song-dynastiets Konfucianske Renæssance, inspireret af Zhu Xi, såvel som den nye Konfucianske Renæssance i dag, inspireret af Kinas præsident, Xi Jinping.

Vi oplever for tiden en revolution i civilisationen. Som Lyndon LaRouche altid har hævdet, så, når dette øjeblik kommer, vil tiden ikke være til heppekor, eller til at følge flokken. Det er en tid for lederskab og personligt ansvar for menneskeheden som helhed.

Den tid er nu kommet.

Foto: Screenshot fra præsident Trumps ugentlige tale, den 25. marts, 2017, om NASA Authorization Bill, med Hubble-teleskopets, og dets efterfølger, James Webb-teleskopets utrolige succeser.

[1] Se artiklen: »LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ: En amerikansk-sovjetisk aftale for fred og udvikling«

Hundredeåret for den tysk-amerikanske rumfartspioner: Virkeliggørelsen af Krafft Ehrickes vision for menneskehedens fremtid

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. marts, 2017 – Det følgende er invitationen til konferencen for at mindes hundredeåret for den visionære rumfartspioner Krafft Ehrickes fødsel, den 24. marts, 1917, afholdt den 25. marts i München, Tyskland. Endags-konferencen blev sponsoreret af Fusion Energy Forum, Schiller Instituttet og Sammenslutningen for Rumforskningens Fremme. Hovedtalen blev holdt af Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Den 24. marts, 2017, ville rumfartspioneren dr. Krafft Ehricke være blevet 100 år. For at ære hans livsværk og udbrede hans skønne ideer om menneskehedens fremtid i universet, vil Fusion Energy Forum, Schiller Instituttet og Sammenslutningen til

Rumforskningens Fremme sponsorere en international konference i München med fremtrædende deltagere, om de fremtidige perspektiver for rumrejser, videnskab og teknologi. Krafft Ehrlicke var kendt for sin maksime: »Man har sagt, 'Hvis Gud havde ønsket, mennesket skulle flyve, ville Han have givet mennesket vinger.' I dag kan vi sige, 'Hvis Gud havde ønsket, at mennesket skulle blive en art, der rejser ud i rummet, ville Han have givet mennesket en Måne.'«

For Krafft Ehrlicke var koloniseringen af rummet den næste, naturlige fase i menneskehedens evolution. Han anså industrialiseringen af især Månen for at være et springbræt for menneskets ekskursioner ud i Solsystemet, og potentielt hinsides dette. Han var overbevist om, at det kun var gennem bemanded rumfart, at den menneskelige arts evolution ville nå frem til sin modne alder, og at den »udenjordiske forpligtelses store udfordring«, som han kaldte det, ville hæve mennesket op til sin sande bestemmelse.

Dr. Krafft Ehrlicke helligede hele sit liv til dette mål og bidrog signifikant til John F. Kennedys Apollo-program. Efter mordet på Kennedy blev hans, og mange rumfartsentusiasters, vision desværre ikke forfulgt. Amerika satte den første mand på Månen, men forfulgte ikke yderligere udforskning af Månen, med udsigt til at erobre vores Solsystem.

I dag har vi, takket være Kinas politik, endelig muligheden for at genoptage denne opgave. Kina planlægger yderligere missioner til Månen, inklusive den første landsætning af et rumfartøj på Månens bagside, og har yderligere planer for udvikling af Månens potentiale, såsom udvinding af helium-3 for at løse menneskehedens energispørgsmål på Jorden i kommende årtusinder, ved hjælp af fusionsenergi.

Her på Jorden er Kina i færd med at bygge sin infrastruktur på ligeså dynamisk vis. Hvert år føjes 2.000 km højhastighedsjernbane til det nationale jernbanenet, der allerede er vokset til 20.000 km og skal vokse til 50.000 km

frem til 2030, hvor alle større byer i Kina vil være forbundet gennem højhastighedstog.

Det er ligeledes Kinas plan at sikre sin energiforsyning ved at udvikle kernekraft. Faktisk bygger Kina flere nye kernekraftværker end nogen anden i verden, hvilket står i skarp kontrast til Tysklands energipolitik, hvor kernekraft, efter planen, skal være helt udfaset frem til 2022. For at forhindre denne politik i at føre til en katastrofe som i 1930'erne, må vi vende den såkaldte »energi-overgang« omkring og bygge sikre, nye kernekraftværker, såsom den indbygget sikre højtemperaturreaktor, samtidig med en massiv forøgelse af finansiering til forskning i fusionskraft. Igen, i dette felt øger Kina, til forskel fra den vestlige verden, hvert år finansieringen til forskning i fusion.

Men Kina udvikler ikke kun sin hjemlige økonomi; det investerer også massivt i andre lande. I løbet af de seneste tre år har Kina, stort set upåagtet af de vestlige medier, udviklet en helt ny strategisk orientering med det Nye Silkevejsinitiativ, som omfatter samarbejde med flere end halvfjerds nationer og omfatter to tredjedele af Jordens befolkning, 75 % af energiresurserne og over 70 % af det globale BNP.

Forbes-magasinet skrev om den nye alliance: »Det er potentielt et opbrud, der kan ryste jorden og bryde paradigmer, og som, på en mere flydende måde, ville forbinde de økonomiske giganter Kina, Rusland, Iran, Indien og Europa i en løst sammensluttet, geo-økonomisk blok, der kunne ændre den globale magtbalance.«

Alliancen er mere end det. Kinas tilbud om »win-win«-samarbejde er inkluderende: dvs., det er et konkret perspektiv for at hæve sig over det geopolitiske niveau og virkeliggøre et nyt paradigme for menneskehedens fælles mål. Eller, som præsident Xi Jinping udtrykte det i sit nytårsbudskab, det er baseret på den overbevisning, at menneskeheden er et

fællesskab for en fælles bestemmelse, der kan transformere vores planet til et fredeligt og fremgangsrigt sted.

For Tyskland og andre europæiske nationer tilbyder disse strategiske forandringer ekstraordinære muligheder, og samarbejde, frem for alt inden for områderne fusionskraft og rumforskning, åbner mulighed for konkret at sætte mange af Krafft Ehrickes visioner på dagsordenen. Denne konference vil således ikke alene ære hans bidrag til videnskabens historie, men søge at inspirere nutidens og fremtidens praksis.

Læs også: *EIR*-artikel: [Krafft Ehricke og Lyndon LaRouche: »At løfte den menneskelige art ud af sin almindelige eksistens«](#)

Krafft Ehricke og Lyndon LaRouche: At løfte den menneskelige art ud af sin almindelige eksistens

Det måske største, mest altomfattende aksiom, der har forurennet menneskers evne til at tænke klart i nu et halvt århundrede, er, at der er »grænser for vækst«, en øvre grænse for den menneskelige befolkningstilvækst – hvilket vil sige, at der sluttelig er et loft over menneskets evne til at gøre fremskridt. Der er mange manifestationer af dette falskneri: troen på, at befolkningstilvækst er iboende ondt; at vi bør stræbe efter at reducere vores indvirkning på planeten; at menneskelig aktivitet udplyndrer Jordens resurser, og vores udvikling ødelægger miljøet; eller, at vi befinder os i en

konkurrencetilstand med andre folkeslag om en fastlagt mængde resurser. Den fælles virkning af disse variationer over et tema er at gøre os små; vi tænker småt, vi handler småt og vi afviser den form for metoder, der ændrer historien, som »umulige«.

(Titelbillede: Krafft Ehrlicke opfandt Måne-glidelanderen som et alternativ til motordrevet nedstigning til måneoverfladen, og som ville bruge 90 % mindre drivmiddel ved at benytte sig af Månens sandede og glasagtige jord til at sagtne fartøjets fart. Maleri af Chris Sloan.)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Verden er under forandring; USA vil måske vende tilbage til sin glemte oprindelse fra sine grundlæggende fædre

25. marts, 2017 – Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov holdt den 23. marts et foredrag for højtplacerede officerer fra den russiske generalstabs militærakademi, hvor han diskuterede Ruslands rolle i sikring af strategisk stabilitet, og også refererede til potentielle, store forandringer, som kunne ændre USA tilbage til en fremgangsmåde, der blev udstukket af dets grundlæggende fædre.

Lavrov påpegede, at historiske traditioner var blandt de faktorer, der er bestemmende for en nations rolle i verdenspolitik, og citerede Henry Kissinger, der engang sagde: »Historien er staters hukommelse«. Lavrov fortsatte: »For øvrigt, så aspirerede USA, hvis interesser hr. Kissinger altid har forsvaret, ikke til at blive centrum for den liberale verden i størstedelen af sin egen, temmelig korte historie, og så ikke en sådan rolle som sin fremmeste mission. USA's grundlæggende fædre ønskede, at dets lederskab og eksistens' exceptionelle natur skulle afledes af dets eget, positive eksempel. Det er ironisk, at den amerikanske elite, der voksede frem som frihedskæmpere og separatister, der var ivrige efter at kaste den britiske kronens åg af sig, da det nåede frem til det 20. århundrede havde transformeret sig selv og sin stat til at være en magt, der tørstede efter global, imperialistisk dominans. Verden er imidlertid ved at forandre sig, og – hvem ved – Amerika kunne endnu rense sig selv og vende tilbage til sin egen, glemte oprindelse.«

Lavrov understregede den rolle, som Rusland spiller i sikring af strategisk stabilitet i verden. »Takket være sin fremskredne atomafskrækkelseskapacitet spiller Rusland en vigtig, stabiliserende rolle i global politik. Samtidig er strategisk stabilitet for os ikke begrænset til at opretholde atomvåbenbalancen mellem os og USA«, sagde han. »I politik er strategisk politik en tilstand af internationale relationer, der sikrer streng overholdelse af international lov fra alle landes og deres sammenslutningers side, respekt for alle landes og folkeslags legitime interesser og ikke-indblanding i deres politiske anliggender. I militær sammenhæng betyder det konstant at bygge bro over svælget mellem militære kapaciteter og at sikre et højt tillidsniveau, gennemsækelighed og forudsigelighed og at afholde sig fra skridt, der kunne opfattes som en trussel mod andre landes nationale sikkerhed og således tvinge dem til at ty til forholdsregler for gengældelse. Vi fastholder styrkelse af alle aspekter af strategisk stabilitet, som er fundamentet for en holdbar fred

og pålidelig, ligeværdig og uadskillelig sikkerhed for alle.«

Specifikt på atomvåbenfronten sagde Lavrov, at Rusland er villig til at diskutere yderligere atomvåbenreduktion, men kun, hvis alle faktorer, der har indflydelse på strategisk stabilitet, tages i betragtning, og ikke kun antallet af sprænghoveder i hvert atomarsenal. Dette må, tilføjede Lavrov, omfatte, at man har en multilateral fremgangsmåde, og ikke kun anliggender mellem USA og Rusland.

Politik er også en faktor i strategisk stabilitet. »Det er særlig vigtigt at bemærke, at det i dag er Ruslands standpunkt, at magt kun kan bruges i streng overholdelse af international lov og dets egne love og forpligtelser om ikke at erobre, og ikke at eksportere politiske ideer, som det gentagne gang er sket i historien og i vores fortid for den sags skyld, men, når alle andre midler er blevet opbrugt, da at forsvare vore mest vitale interesser, eller at hjælpe vore allierede og venner på deres anmodning, som det i dag sker i Syrien på invitation fra landets legitime regering«, sagde Lavrov. »Desværre er ikke alle lande i verden så omhyggelige med at sikre lovligt grundlag for anvendelsen af militærmagt. Vi har bemærket tilfælde af lemfældig fortolkning af FN's charter og af at fjerne alle grænser for at udpege noget som en trussel mod ens egen sikkerhed.«

En video med hele Lavrovs tale kan høres her:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cMsWzn5F7mU>

Der er to systemer i verden:

Det Amerikanske System vs. Det Britiske System. Leder; LPAC Internationale Webcast, 24. marts, 2017

Jeg tror, vi meget klart kan sige, med en omskrivning af den store statsmand fra det 19. århundrede, Henry C. Carey, at to systemer er stedt for verden. Det ene er det Amerikanske System, og det andet er det Britiske System. Vi befinder os i et fuldt optrappet opgør; et opgør, som Lyndon LaRouche har været engageret i, i mere end 40 år, men som nu har nået et afgørende punkt. Som vi diskuterede i mandags, så har præsident Trump eksplicit torpederet den britisk-amerikanske, 'særlige relation', med sin afvisning af at tilbagevise den påstand, at GCHQ var involveret i aflytning af medlemmer af Trump-administrationen efter valgene i november. Udenrigsminister Tillerson har netop været på besøg i Kina, hvor han eksplicit sagde, at USA og Kina vil udforske en »win-win«-relation; så vi vil få en win-win-relation med Kina, til erstatning for den særlige relation med Det britiske Imperium. Og, hvad der er meget vigtigt, så har præsident Trump, i løbet af denne uge, gjort sig selv til den første, amerikanske præsident siden præsident McKinley[1], der eksplicit har nævnt det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som den økonomiske model, som han søger at anvende i det nuværende USA. Det sagde han, ikke kun ved én lejlighed, men ved to forskellige lejligheder.

Matthew Ogden: God aften. Det er i dag den 24. marts, 2017. Jeg er Matthew Ogden, og dette er vores udsendelse fredag aften på larouchepac.com. Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Paul

Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for *Executive Intelligence Review*; og via video har vi Michael Steger, et ledende medlem af LaRouchePAC Policy Committee, fra San Francisco, Californien.

Jeg tror, vi meget klart kan sige, med en omskrivning af den store statsmand fra det 19. århundrede, Henry C. Carey, at to systemer er stedt for verden. Det ene er det Amerikanske System, og det andet er det Britiske System. Vi befinder os i et fuldt optrappet opgør; et opgør, som Lyndon LaRouche har været engageret i, i mere end 40 år, men som nu har nået et afgørende punkt. Som vi diskuterede i mandags, så har præsident Trump eksplicit torpederet den britisk-amerikanske, 'særlige relation', med sin afvisning af at tilbagevise den påstand, at GCHQ var involveret i aflytning af medlemmer af Trump-administrationen efter valgene i november. Udenrigsminister Tillerson har netop været på besøg i Kina, hvor han eksplicit sagde, at USA og Kina vil udforske en »win-win«-relation; så vi vil få en win-win-relation med Kina, til erstatning for den særlige relation med Det britiske Imperium. Og, hvad der er meget vigtigt, så har præsident Trump, i løbet af denne uge, gjort sig selv til den første, amerikanske præsident siden præsident McKinley[1], der eksplicit har nævnt det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som den økonomiske model, som han søger at anvende i det nuværende USA. Det sagde han, ikke kun ved én lejlighed, men ved to forskellige lejligheder.

Vi begynder dagens udsendelse med to korte klip af disse to taler, hvor præsident Trump diskuterer det Amerikanske System, ved navns nævnelse. Det første klip er fra begyndelsen af hans tale i Louisville, Kentucky; hvor han citerer Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Boone og Henry Clay, grundlæggeren af det Amerikanske, økonomiske System. Her kommer klippet:

Trump: »Vores første Republikanske præsident, Abraham Lincoln,

blev født her i Kentucky. Det er ikke så dårligt. Den legendariske pioner Daniel Boone var med til at kolonisere Kentucky. Og den store, 1800-tals amerikanske statsmand, Henry Clay, repræsenterede Kentucky i USA's Kongres. Henry Clay var tilhænger af det, han kaldte det Amerikanske System; og han foreslog told for at beskytte amerikansk industri og finansiere amerikansk infrastruktur.«

Ogden: Dernæst deltog præsident Trump i en fundraiser for den Nationale Republikanske Kongres-komite, og brugte størstedelen af sin tale til at diskutere det Amerikanske System endnu en gang, såvel som også den historiske anvendelse af det Amerikanske System; inklusive Abraham Lincoln og andre præsidenter. Vi afspiller to korte klip fra denne tale:

Trump: »Jeg har kaldt denne model, den model, som I har iagttaget, den model, der har skabt så meget værdi, modellen for at bringe jobs tilbage og for at bringe industri tilbage; jeg har kaldt det for den Amerikanske Model. Det er det system, som vore grundlæggere ønskede. Vore største, amerikanske ledere – inkl. George Washington, Hamilton, Jackson, Lincoln – de var alle enige i, at, for at Amerika kunne blive en stærk nation, må det også være en stor, vareproducerende nation; må tjene penge. Den Republikanske partiplatform for 1896 – for mere end hundrede år siden – erklærede, at beskyttelse (protektion) og gensidighed er tvillingemetoder i amerikansk politik, og går hånd i hånd. Vi har situationer, hvor andre lande har nul respekt for vores land – har I for resten lagt mærke til, at de er begyndt at respektere os meget? Rigtig meget. De pålægger os 100 % skat på nogle ting – 100 %; og vi pålægger ikke dem noget som helst. De vil gøre det umuligt gennem regler for vores produkter at blive solgt i deres land; og alligevel sælger de rutinemæssigt deres produkter i vores land. Det vil ikke fortsætte. Ordet gensidighed; de gør det, vi gør det. Hvem kan klage over det? Stor forskel. Vi taler store, store dollars, for resten. Denne platform fortsatte med, 'Vi fornyer og

understreger vores troskab over for politikken for protektion som bolværket for amerikanske, industriel uafhængighed og som fundamentet for amerikansk udvikling og velstand.'«

»Vores første Republikanske præsident, Abraham Lincoln, kørte sin første kampagne for offentligt embede i 1832, da han var blot 23 år gammel. Han begyndte med at forestille sig, hvilke fordele en jernbane ville bringe hans del af Illinois, uden nogensinde at have set et damplokomotiv. Han havde ingen idé om det; og dog vidste han, hvad det kunne være. Tredive år senere underskrev han som præsident den lov, der byggede den Transkontinentale Jernbane; som forenede vores land fra hav til hav. Stor præsident; de fleste mennesker ved ikke engang, at han var Republikaner. Er der nogen, der ved det? Mange mennesker ved det ikke; det må vi opbygge lidt mere. Lad os bruge en af disse PACs (Political Action Committee). Disse PACs, man ved aldrig, hvad pokker der kommer fra disse PACs. Man tror, de er venligtsindede. Selvom den bedste annonce, jeg nogensinde har haft, var én imod mig fra Hillary; den var så god, at jeg sagde, 'Jeg håber, hun bliver ved med at køre den annonce'.

»En anden stor, Republikansk præsident, Dwight Eisenhower, havde en vision for en national infrastrukturplan. Som officer i hæren efter Første Verdenskrig gik han med i et militært land, der trekkede tværs over landet til Stillehavskysten. De rejste langs Lincoln Highway, det hed dengang Lincoln Highway. Rejsen begyndte ved Det Hvide Hus' sydlige plæne, ved et monument, som i dag kendes som 'Zero-Milepælen'. Ved I, hvor det er? Turen gjorde et stort indtryk på den dengang unge Eisenhower. Mere end tre årtier senere, som præsident, underskrev han en lov, der skabte vores store, inter-delstats-jernbanesystem; som atter forenede os som nation. Tiden er nu kommet til, at en ny Republikansk administration, i samarbejde med en Republikansk Kongres, vedtager den næste store infrastrukturlov.«

Matthew Ogden: Han fortsætter med at sige, at vi må drømme

lige så stort og dristigt som Lincoln og Eisenhower. Det var et kort uddrag af en meget længere tale for den Nationale Republikanske Kongres-komite; men vi er her for at indgå i en diskussion med jer, det amerikanske folk, og med administrationen, om de afgørende principper, der er fundamentet for det Amerikanske Økonomiske System. LaRouchePAC har en meget enestående autoritet på dette felt, for det har været Lyndon LaRouche, der, hen over de seneste 35-40 år, har været den førende person, der har været fortaler for en tilbagevenden til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System.

Før vi går videre, vil Paul [Gallagher] forklare lidt nærmere om baggrunden, så folk ved, hvad det Amerikanske System rent faktisk er.

Paul Gallagher: Jeg vil først komme med en iagttagelse, som først blev gjort af Lyndon LaRouche i sin første rapport – han så begge disse fremlæggelser af Trump – og det er, at Trump ikke siger disse ting for en politik fordel. Han taler om specifikke ting i det Amerikanske System, der grundlæggende set er ukendte for hans Republikanske tilhørere i det ene tilfælde, og til hans store publikum i Kentucky i det andet tilfælde. Han siger ikke, »Ophæv Obamacare« eller andre samtaleemner, der skaffer politisk fordel. Men i stedet instruerer, underviser han lytterne; i det ene tilfælde, en stor gruppe af den amerikanske befolkning, og i det andet tilfælde, Republikanske aktivister og fundraisers. Han underviser dem i noget, som de bogstavelig talt intet ved om; så der er ingen politisk fordel her. Han siger disse ting, fordi han virkelig mener det; fordi han mener, at dette er den politik, som USA bør [have]. Dette anti-britiske Amerikanske System, og sådan blev det beskrevet af den store økonom, som var Lincolns økonomiske chefrådgiver, Henry C. Carey. Sådan blev det beskrevet af Carey, som det Amerikanske System; i hele verden – ikke kun i det unge USA, men i hele verden – i opposition til det Britiske System, som indtil da havde domineret og styret verden finansielt og økonomisk. Dette var

en ny måde at organisere en nations økonomi for først og fremmest at frembringe hurtigt, teknologisk fremskridt; især inden for vareproduktion og inden for erobring af fremskudte grænser inden for infrastruktur, som jernbaner og kanaler, der strakte sig dybt ind i landets indre; havne, der kunne rumme en flåde og en handelsflåde, der kunne konkurrere, og sluttelig endda overgå, de tilsvarende britiske flåder. Og, hvad der er meget vigtigt, noget, han kaldte for »En interesseharmonik«; noget, der er så fuldstændig fremmed for de politikker, som Trump nu blander sig i. At interesserne hos, på den ene side, de ansatte arbejdere, med hensyn til fundamentalt fremskridt, er identiske med interessen hos deres arbejdsgivere; at der er en »interesse-harmoni« imellem dem. Og for det andet, at der er en interesse-harmoni i det, vi er begyndt at kalde »win-win« mellem nationer, der i fællesskab investerer i nye infrastrukturplatforme, i nye rejser til Månen, i nye rejser til Månens bagside, og i videnskabelige eventyr, der ikke tidligere er foretaget; at disse virkelig udgør et interessefællesskab. En fundamental interesse i disse to nationers befolkningers fremskridt, og at der ikke er nogen geopolitisk modsætning mellem disse nationer i det tilfælde, hvor de følger denne form for udviklingspolitikker.

Det Amerikanske System have altså tre grundpiller i det 19. århundrede, eller ansås at have tre grundpiller; og disse tre grundpiller var, anvendelsen af protektion af nationale industrier, som præsidenten talte om. Protektion og gensidighed inden for handel, for at sikre, at vareproducerende industrier kunne udvikles. For det andet, anvendelsen af national (statslig) kredit i form af en statslig bankpraksis (nationalbank) – som den blev opfundet af Alexander Hamilton – for at drive nationens økonomi frem mod nye fremskudte grænser for varefremstilling, for teknologi, for videnskab, ved at yde det, som lokal og privat kredit ikke kunne yde, gennem statslig bankpraksis. Og for det tredje, anvendelse af denne regeringsmyndighed til rent faktisk at frembringe de mest avancerede forbedringer internt i landet –

som vi i dag kalder infrastruktur – og ligeledes frembringe en reel harmoni – en overensstemmelse – mellem interesser, eller en ramme, inden for hvilken der kan være harmoni mellem interesserne hos både de ansattes og deres arbejdsgiveres bestræbelser. Og ligeledes [en harmoni] mellem USA og andre republikker; så Monroe-doktrinen var også en del af det Amerikanske System på det tidspunkt, hvilket betød, at USA ville gøre, hvad der stod i dets magt som en ung nation, for at blokere for de Britiske og Franske Imperiers forsøg på at overtage kontrollen over unge republikker i Sydamerika i særdeleshed; og ved at blokere for dette, ville det muliggøre en gensidig fordel og udvikling mellem de sydamerikanske republikker og Amerikas Forenede Stater.

Disse elementer var *fantastisk* succesrige. Selvom præsident Trump sagde, ophavsmanden var Henry Clay – meget vigtig med hensyn til lovgivning, og mht. at kæmpe for dette i Kongressen – men ophavsmanden er faktisk Alexander Hamilton. Man kan f.eks. læse denne vidunderlige og store bog af James G. Blaine, der var udenrigsminister. Han var tæt på at blive Republikansk præsidentkandidat i 1880, og han var mangeårigt medlem af Senatet. Hans bog, der handler om det 19. århundredes økonomiske historie i USA, og som han kaldte *Twenty Years of Congress*, handlede i virkeligheden om 80 år af hele Amerikas økonomiske historie. Når man læser denne bog, ser man, at han i detaljer forklarer, at, når disse principper for det Amerikanske System var lig med den amerikanske regerings og den amerikanske nationaløkonomis principper, så blomstrede økonomien. Og når de ikke var, især i perioden fra midten af 1830'erne og frem til Borgerkrigen, f.eks., hvor Nationalbanken blev frataget sit charter og blev ødelagt af Jackson; når principperne ikke var, så var resultatet finanskaos, panikker, økonomiske sammenbrud, ubegrænset import og mangel på amerikansk eksport. Og sluttelig, som det kunne forudses, opbrydningen af nationen i en borgerkrig; hvor præsident Lincoln måtte genetablere det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, som præsidenten (Trump) nævnte, at han gjorde, i

processen med at vinde krigen for Unionen og samle nationen igen.

Anton Chaitkin, der har skrevet historiske artikler for *Executive Intelligence Review* og LaRouche-bevægelsen, har ligeledes i *endnu* større detaljer dokumenteret og forklaret, at det Amerikanske System var *enormt* succesrigt mht. dette lands fremskridt. Og når dets principper blev opgivet, kom vi ind i alvorlige vanskeligheder, både politisk, militært, økonomisk, finansielt – meget alvorlige vanskeligheder. Det er absurd at antage, at disse principper skulle være ophørt at være sande – disse principper for økonomi skulle være ophørt at være sande, på et eller andet tidspunkt i løbet af det 20. århundrede, og dernæst forsvandt. Det er ekstraordinært, at præsident Trump nu siger, at det er principperne – selv om I, de amerikanske borgere, i det store og hele ikke engang ved, hvad de er eller hvad de betyder – dette er de principper, på hvilke vi igen kan gøre dette land stort, som han hele tiden siger.

Det er en ekstraordinært vigtig indgriben, og det bringer omgående frem i forreste linje de seneste 50 års økonomi i det Amerikanske Systems tradition; den herskende, og næsten eneste, og ganske bestemt den mest berømte økonom i det Amerikanske Systems tradition i de seneste 50 år, Lyndon LaRouche, der har bearbejdet disse principper til en moderne form (LaRouches Fire Love).

Så kan vi gå i gang.

(Her følger resten af webcastet i engelsk udskrift):

MICHAEL STEGER: Okay, I can follow that up, I guess. I think what Paul just laid out is very critical to grasping the potential this Trump administration represents. One of the biggest problems we have right now in the American population is

the outright treason of this Obama faction, this British faction in American politics. Much of what we just presented from Trump's speeches I would recommend people going back to them. There's also the speech he made over a week ago at Willow Run Airport near Detroit, where not only does he call for a second industrial revolution – the first being the one that Abraham Lincoln launched in the middle of the Civil War, which was consolidated by the 1876 Centennial Exposition – he also referenced this in his February 28 Address to a Joint Session Congress. But he also calls for having faith in the American worker, American companies, and to have faith in foreign nations who built factories in our land – really, clearly, opening up the door for the questions of China, Japan, and other nations to rebuild the U.S. manufacturing base that's so desperately needed.

And that's what I think is so important about this political situation, one the media is not presenting at all. So we have to make a breakthrough. People have to get a sense of what President Trump is presenting in this perspective, and to recognize other moments when the American System was applied both by Hamilton, by Lincoln, by those following in Lincoln's tradition like Grant and McKinley, also Franklin Roosevelt. It was interesting in that speech, Matt, that he presented in Washington, D.C. to the Republican Committee dinner on March 21, he does make a very clear reference to FDR. He references a child born in poverty

with dreams in its heart, waiting. He says the waiting is over, the time for action is now, which is a clear reference to the kind of urgency that Franklin Roosevelt came into the Presidency in 1933, to address the economic depression.

OGDEN: The other explicit reference that he makes right after that Franklin Roosevelt reference is John F. Kennedy. He says "Now is the time for New Frontiers," which was the Kennedy phrase, and looking forward into space, the exploration of space, and these are the kinds of dreams that a child born today can realize in the future – a new era of optimism.

STEGER: The American people are absolutely ignorant of any of this at this point. Largely the media, regardless, left, right Fox News, CNN – it's all right now either outright treason or just intellectually stupid, incapable of understanding what's actually taking place; that there is a revival of this political tradition. It's the one that the modern Democratic Party was based on from Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, and that Obama destroyed. It's now being revived by Donald Trump against outright ideological opposition throughout most of the Republican Party, as we see with this disastrous health care bill put forward by Paul Ryan, Wall Street, and the health insurance companies.

One, they're just not aware of it. The second part, which is where this actually comes from. What did Lyndon LaRouche

actually

revive? Lyn made a unique discovery. It wasn't just simply a historical redevelopment or re-finding of this American tradition, referenced by Lincoln, McKinley, and others. Lyn made

a fundamental advancement to the entire sense of what this American System was. He was able to situate it in a higher conception of scientific thought. That's not surprising, because,

as Lincoln and others made these advancements in the United States, the profound scientific revolutions especially in Germany, by people like Carl Gauss, Bernard Riemann, the Weber brothers. There were major advancements, then, later, by Einstein, that opened up a scientific era of advancement and development that mankind had never seen before. This was partly

unleashed by Franklin Roosevelt with the Manhattan Project, to unleash the power of the atom, as Eisenhower captured, and the Atoms for Peace project.

In the wake of that, Lyndon LaRouche recognized that these basic conceptions of scientific advancement had not yet been applied to economic thought, in the way that they needed to be.

In having recognized a unique discovery of economic science, in

that process, he revived this American System. That unfolded.

There was a process of rediscovery of these principles that Paul

just laid out. What Lyn has done in presenting, just a few years

ago now, the Four Laws, the four new laws, if you look at this document, it's stunning. The Four Laws, as they're stated in a positive statement, are clearly rooted in Hamilton, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, and John Kennedy. They're clearly rooted in

the American System. In an article you wrote recently, Paul,

the first step, obviously, is the Glass-Steagall. Tax reform, health care? These things are total diversions from addressing the real economic crisis the country faces: to stop this collapse of lifespan, to shut down this drug epidemic, to get the American people working. The Glass-Steagall, and a launch of this kind of infrastructure development and a national bank, are absolutely key.

But then, in the broader sense of the Four Laws, is that higher question of principle. That's really what's key, because history does not work by parts. Economy does not work by parts. It's a question of a domain of principle that is unified uniquely within the powers of the human mind. That is that great scientific tradition of Cusa and Kepler, Gauss and Riemann. It's this conception of actually acting upon history effectively. Because as the questions of the Glass-Steagall are raised – and Paul, perhaps you can say more because there is an ongoing discussion of this – the questions of the National Bank have yet been raised, and that's absolutely key. We've got to get a way of increasing the credit towards this development project, because we are unable to turn to the current banking system. Wall Street is {incapable}, both philosophically and I think financially, of really making the investments necessary to get this nation

moving
again.

This higher characteristic of the principle of the discovery is essential to the change in the historical process. As Mr. LaRouche has said, President Trump does seem to capture this. The people around him certainly don't. But it's {obviously} clear that there is practically {no one} in Congress who understands this. Otherwise why would they have paid heed for so long to President Obama's absolute treason to the country and its people? You see it in Paul Ryan's failed leadership in the House today.

If we're going to have a revival of this American System foundations, unlike during the 19th Century, when these characteristics of a sense of the unique nature of mankind were still somewhat understood; Lincoln captured them in his love of Shakespeare, and the recognition of Shakespeare's strategic importance. But today there's been a loss of the actual principle nature of mankind acting in the universe. That's what we have to ultimately address. The process of the Laws, or the policies, are not simply things that you will adopt and expect to function. You must recognize you're establishing these institutions of Glass-Steagall and the National Bank with a commitment towards infrastructure and scientific advancement; but they ultimately have to be governed by a re-awakening of this higher creative principle.

I would say, very clearly, this American System is one of

the highest expressions of that renaissance tradition coming out of Europe to found a new world, to develop a new culture and society, and to now develop it. It's clearly on that basis – and Matt, I think you might have more to say on this – that with the revival of this tradition, both the Lincoln tradition of the Republican Party, the Franklin Roosevelt and Kennedy tradition in the Democratic Party, the United States is more that capable of creating a relationship among Russia, China, and the United States that not only eliminates the British Empire once and for all, but does really establish a new human species on this planet. I think that discussion that Trump has now introduced, with LaRouche's Four Laws, really makes that more possible and more feasible than I think any of us had imagined just a few months ago.

GALLAGHER: This is a bombshell for members of Congress of both parties, if they're listening; because if you take Glass-Steagall, for example, the restoration of which Lyndon LaRouche has made a {sine qua non} of restoring the American System of economy now. In earlier times, when the American System was understood, both as an anti-British, anti-City of London economic system, or means of organizing the government and the economy, when it was understood in that way, the direct connection between restoring Glass-Steagall, establishing a national credit institution, a Hamiltonian National Bank, investing in the most advanced infrastructures, such as national high-speed rail systems, reviving the deep-space human exploration; the connections among these things would be

relatively self-evident to an American System spokesman, not necessarily even a great thinker of that system like Henry Carey, but a spokesman like James G. Blaine in the government and in the Congress. It would be immediately evident to them now that these are all part of one policy; that when you talk about Glass-Steagall, you're talking about returning the part of the banking system on which the nation is driven in economic progress, you're returning that part of the banking system to the definition of banking of Alexander Hamilton, who didn't confront Glass-Steagall, but he did confront all manner of what today we would call wild investment banks, hedge funds posing as government banks, posing as banks speculating in government debt, and so forth. And Hamilton established the dominance of the model of what today we call a commercial bank, whose purpose it is to connect the savings of the nation, by lending, to the hands of those, as he said, who can make the most productive use of it. That was the function of a bank; that was the need for proliferation of banks; and clearly that was the need to have a national bank whose purpose was to provide the credit which these individual local banks were incapable of providing; and also the direction for investment of that credit so that a transcontinental railroad would emerge where it had previously seemed impossible on any continent to make such a world-spanning transportation corridor. Those things would be directly

connected in their mind; so those who were fighting for Glass-Steagall in the Congress would simultaneously, naturally be fighting for the creation of a national Hamiltonian bank to do what Trump is groping towards – these trillions of dollars of investment in new infrastructure. And they would naturally be fighting for the expansion and revival of the space program as a deep space human exploration program; and these other things would come together for them. Whereas now you find many people who simply regard Glass-Steagall as something to prevent another 2008 collapse; something which is merely a kind of a prophylactic that keeps banks from committing crimes of speculation and from bringing down the economy. Well fine, it is that; but it is the doorway to making the American economy work according to the principle of the American System before. As President Trump does have absolutely right, it has been functioning on absolutely opposite principles to the American System; especially for the last 40 years, especially in the period known as complete globalization after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Especially in the period in which real harmony of interests manufacturing employment in the United States has gone away and left behind it despair, drug addiction, constricting life expectancies, and general impoverishment of what was the American System that worked for us through the period of Roosevelt and Kennedy.

So, that's where LaRouche has uniquely been able to express this over the last nearly half a century; that you're really talking about one impulse for human progress and an impulse

that
is international. It brings together nations, because
fundamentally over whole continents, over the Solar System
even,
nations have the same expansion and progress objectives; and
therefore, if they work together on them, they have a harmony
of
interests. This is what now is coming from the Chinese Belt
and
Road Initiative, which in turn ultimately came from Lyndon and
Helga LaRouche and their work.

OGDEN: I would like to say something on that
directly.

This is President Trump at the Kentucky speech; he said "For
too

long, our government has abandoned the American System." I
think

that's clearly stated. We've been engaged in an educational
campaign, a fight in the United States to educate the American
people and to educate the American leadership on what the
American System is. I pulled this out, we can go to the Four
Laws, which is obviously what we're talking about: Lyndon
LaRouche's Hamiltonian economic program for the present
moment.

But I pulled this out; this is a pamphlet from 2012. We named
it

"Platform for a New Presidency; the Full Recovery Program for
the

United States"; and I can tell you, because I was involved in
writing this, that we intentionally made this a nonpartisan
document, because this wasn't for the Republican Party or for
the

Democratic Party. This was for the United States; to
establish a

completely new economic policy for the running of the United
States. In this pamphlet, we had an entire case study of the

history of the application of the American System; which went through Alexander Hamilton's creation of the national bank and his "Report on Manufactures", which is a very important part of this. It went through John Quincy Adams; and then let me read you one quote here, and tell me if this sounds familiar. "It was in the election of 1832, right in the middle of the fight over the national bank, that Abraham Lincoln got his start in politics. Lincoln was 22 years old; and his platform was Henry Clay's American System, a revival of the Hamiltonian program." We quoted this perhaps apocryphal quote, but I think it's very apropos from Abraham Lincoln's campaign speech in 1832: "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank, the internal improvement system, and a high protective tariff."

Anyway, we went on to elaborate how this was applied over the coming 50 years; McKinley, Franklin Roosevelt, even John F Kennedy's program. But this is something that has been the substance of the LaRouche movement's campaign to educate the American leadership, and to create a new cadre of American leadership in the United States. What you said, Paul, about how just because it's called the American System does not mean it's somehow exclusively American; this was called the American system because it was explicitly in counter to the British system, as it was originally conceived. We fought the American Revolution against the British Empire. The British Empire applied a

system

of colonialism and enforced poverty and slavery on the world.

We

fought a revolution against that; Alexander Hamilton created a new system – this was the American System. The mission was to give this system to the world; so over the course of the 19th Century, countries around the world began to emulate the American

System in order to use those economic principles to gain their independence from imperialism. Some of the well-known cases: the

case of Friedrich List, a German economist; the case of Irish economist Arthur Griffith, who used Friedrich List's ideas in their fight for independence. Very important in this case is

Sun

Yat Sen; the founding father of modern China emulated Abraham Lincoln's model of government and of economics. So now when we're talking about creating a new win-win cooperation with China; building the New Silk Road; turning this into a World Land-Bridge economic platform. This is the return to the fight

of the last 200 years to spread this American system; the Hamiltonian system around the world, to free mankind from the British Empire once and for all. That's how it has to be understood. So, we're not talking about some kind of nationalistic American-exclusive system; we're talking about something which nations around the world can apply and share and

use as the basis for a new paradigm of win-win relations among countries.

GALLAGHER: When Hamilton was developing the American System

and was known by Washington to be fighting for a government with

capabilities, a government with strength; not with eternally broad responsibilities, but with strength to carry out the

responsibilities that it had. At that time, he was attacked on the idea that if you were for a strong government, you were for the employers, you were for the wealthy. Now, we have the inverse in contemporary party warfare, where it's assumed that if you're for a strong government, you're for the poor; and you think the only thing government really does other than national defense is to give things to the poor in order to equalize them with the wealthy. In other words, oppose the employers. These ideas indicate just how striking it is, for President Trump at this point, to reintroduce this idea with everything involved in it, including the harmony of interests. And when he speaks to unions, who tend to support him, and did during the campaign, as Mike indicated in Detroit to industrial workers; that harmony of interest is definitely part of what he is conveying to them. The same thing is true in terms of trade; but without getting into that in detail, that seems to be the aspect of the American System on which President Trump has the most developed ideas, has the greatest emphasis. Trade, reciprocity, get American exports. This is considered complete heresy and not even worth discussing by London-educated economists and all of their imitators today; but in fact, it is true that reciprocity – if you start with the potential idea of tariffs and you negotiate reciprocal

elimination of the tariffs in the context of countries jointly investing in their mutual development – that you wind up not with a system necessarily of high tariffs at all. But rather, with a system in which there is mutual investment in the most important projects of economic progress and infrastructure development in both of those countries; as well as manufacturing development in both of those countries. It is not absurd; the alternatives that are thrown out about how you can run as large a trade deficit as you want, it doesn't matter because the bigger your trade deficit, the more direct investment you will get into your country; as if that was some sort of automatic built-in stabilizer. These arguments, in fact, have no basis; and the purpose of a government with strength at this point, as Hamilton outlined it, is to be able to make those kinds of critical investments and win-win agreements among countries. And also investments domestically, which bring the progress back; bring the manufacturing capabilities back at a higher level. Bring the scientific and technological capabilities back into industry and make it work.

Even though we're not seeing President Trump equally develop all aspects of the American System in the way he's presenting and fighting for it, Lyndon LaRouche has; and has put it in the form of these Four Laws that have to be taken not only by the United States, so that there is a real opportunity there to shape this

policy. That's what we've got to fight for. We're doing it with major international conferences – there's another one taking place in Europe today; in a couple of weeks in New York City, a very important one with a lot of international speakers on the subject of making international the New Silk Road global infrastructure investments that were initiated through China, and making this into a platform of progress in which the United States is going to join. That's how we're pursuing this, but we have an opening to shape, as you said in the pamphlet, the policy of the Presidency; and that's the most important thing. It's not the policy of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party; but the policy of the Presidency as Hamilton already identified that as key to the American System when others wanted America to not even have a President. They wanted it to just have a legislature like poor old Ireland and other republics.

OGDEN: I think you can see that people are beginning to get inspired – even members of Congress. There was the signing of the NASA authorization budget at the White House on Monday, I believe; and it's the first NASA authorization in seven years, which is unbelievable. Obviously, there's much more that needs to be done; but people are inspired. One of the members of Congress said, just as Americans remember that President Eisenhower was the father of the interstate highway system, with

your bill signing today and your vision and leadership, future generations will remember that President Donald Trump was the father of the interplanetary highway system. So, I think that's

an appropriate comment for the 100th anniversary of space visionary and pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke's birthday, which we're celebrating today and we've been celebrating this whole week.

But this is not a view toward the past. Right now, it's a time of action; it's a time of – as President Trump said in that speech – this is the time when great deeds must be accomplished.

It's a vision; it's a question of where does mankind go next? What are the frontiers of discovery? What are the frontiers of

exploration? Absolutely, not only the development of a modern economic platform for the planet, a transportation and energy platform like we're talking about with the expansion of the New

Silk Road into the World Land-Bridge; that must be done. But the

expansion of mankind into becoming an interplanetary species and

the abiding principles which Alexander Hamilton developed with the founding of this country, were not simply principles merely

for the 18th Century; they were not principles merely for the 19th Century.

The nature of principles is that they exist and they are

eternal. And principles of economics – as Lyndon LaRouche has developed them in his modern application of this American System,

as you were saying, Michael – require that mankind continue to progress and to push the envelopes of knowledge and to push the

envelopes of progress. Where does that take us today? It takes us into space. There's a very good reason why Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws economic document begins and ends with the idea of mankind as an interplanetary species beginning to explore and colonize the Solar System and beyond. This is the identity of mankind; and economics begins and ends with what makes mankind unique as a species. So, Michael, maybe you want to say a little bit more about that, but I do think as we look at what Lyndon LaRouche's role has been on the record over the last 40 years as the leading modern spokesman of the American System of economics. I have a few books here – these are props: {The Political Economy of the American Revolution}, published by the LaRouche movement; {The Civil War and the American System; America's Battle with Britain 1860 to 1876}, Allen Salisbury, published by the LaRouche movement; {Friedrich List: Outlines of the American System of Political Economy}. These are just a few selections of the books that have been published over the last 30 years as part of the LaRouche movement's educational campaign on the principle of the American System.

GALLAGHER: Make that 50! At the time that these were being published in the 1970s, they were, in fact, since the turn of the 20th Century, the first significant publications on the American System that had appeared anywhere.

STEGER: That comes to my final point, which is that Lyn's put a lot of emphasis on the very clear revival of Alexander Hamilton; that he really was the founder of this as a conception. I think it's also very clear that if this is going to be successful today, given the very complex world we're living in Before I get to that point, let me just say we haven't touched on it and I think it's important. This is why there is a coup attempted against Donald Trump; this is why there is an outright attempt to overthrow him and prevent him from even taking the Presidency. And at this point, to try to impeach him or force him out by assassination or other means; because there is this threat of this revival. But if we're going to make this New Paradigm work, you can't ignore the discoverer. The damage done by continuing to ascribe Isaac Newton with the discovery of gravitation has done great harm. Even with Einstein's attempt to end that insanity, there's still a great harm done to the scientific thought of mankind to think that Isaac Newton's statistical version of gravitation was the nature of its discovery. There has to be a revival of Lyndon LaRouche. The members of Congress, the policy centers in this country and the world must look to Lyn's ideas over these 50 years to understand the means by which we implement this higher conception of economics known as the American System. It really was Lyn's discovery which made the basis for its revival in the first place. So, I think a full exoneration is more than due; but I think a full implementation of Lyn's writings and ideas is absolutely critical, and are really the outright objective of any patriot of this country. It is to acknowledge Lyn's role and

his
discovery in setting the foundation of not only the building
of
our country, but what we see internationally with this New
Paradigm.

GALLAGHER: You mentioned at the beginning, 34 years
ago
this week, that President Ronald Reagan adopted an outline of
policy – namely the Strategic Defense Initiative – which had
been developed and circulated internationally by Lyndon
LaRouche.
At that time, virtually no one knew what he was talking about;
I
remember I got to make my one and only appearance on a
national
television morning news show on the basis that I had some idea
–
which came from LaRouche – of what Reagan was talking about.
But it was admitted in many places later on that that
initiative
by Reagan led to the collapse of the Soviet Union; it led to
the
development of fundamentally new technologies which are still
revolutionizing areas now. Now you have a situation 35 years
later; another American President is taking up what over the
past
half-century only LaRouche has developed. President Trump has
all sorts of errors and faults and warts and so forth; yes he
does. But don't imagine for a minute that the British
spear-headed attempt to get rid of him as President is not for
this exact reason, and has nothing to do with policies of
health
care, or even for that matter, connections with discussions
with
the Russian ambassador. It has to do with the fact that this
was

such a tremendous break, even with all of Trump's shortcomings in many regards, this thrust of his which was already implicitly visible when he was running for office and immediately as he was being inaugurated; this was such a tremendous break with the deleterious policies of finance and economics of the last half century, the so-called "globalization" era, that there was an immediate vitriolic response from the standpoint of British finance and spreading from there to the European elites and so forth, into what has now made the Democratic Party leadership of the United States, into virtually a McCarthy-ite mob for reasons that they don't even understand. They're looking for Russians everywhere; is there a Russian listening to me in this room today? It has become like McCarthy; it is the height of irony that it's the Democratic Party leadership which is doing this, and they don't even understand – most of them; Obama being one exception – why it is that they are trying to railroad Trump in this McCarthy-ite fashion. It's because of the potential of exactly this type of American System of economics changing the whole world.

OGDEN: Sure; if you want to talk about Watergate, the Watergate here is the Obama administration listening in and spying on an incoming Presidential administration as part of its enemies list to try to bring down a President. We can get into a lot more details on that, but everything that has come out during the course of the hearings in Congress this week and what Chairman Nunes had to say and so forth; this is a political fight

beyond what we've seen in our lifetimes.

I want to say in conclusion, we have the responsibility to continue to educate and to continue to lead. Obviously, Lyndon LaRouche's economic authority here is unparalleled; and it's the required authority on the table right now, internationally as well as nationally. We have opportunities, but nothing is determined; nothing is final, nothing is concrete. So, we're putting the link on the screen right now; this is the newest pamphlet, which is now being published by LaRouche PAC, which is titled "America's Role in the New Silk Road." The next step for the Trump administration will be to officially enter into this Belt and Road Initiative, which China has invited the United States to be a part of. There is a summit coming up in China in the beginning of May, which President Trump should personally attend; and should make very clear that he is accepting the Chinese invitation to become a part of this New Paradigm. We had the beginning of this with Secretary Tillerson's trip and his affirmation of the win-win principle in his meetings with Xi Jinping. We are looking forward to the bilateral summit between Xi Jinping and President Trump which is scheduled hopefully for some time in April. This is first and foremost; and then we have a petition which we're continuing to circulate on that question. This is available for you to sign at lpac.co/sign4laws. This is a petition on win-win cooperation and the implementation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws here in the United

States.

We ask you to sign that and to circulate it; and become an active part of changing history.

So, thank you very much Michael for joining us over video today; and thank you to Paul for joining me here in the studio.

We have all the material that you need on the LaRouche PAC website to educate yourself on what the American System is and the application of the American System today on the international scale. So, we encourage you to explore all that material; visit the LaRouche PAC website; and sign up and become a member of the LaRouche Political Action Committee. So, thanks for tuning in; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

[1] Se EIR-Tema-artikel: »[Londons mord på McKinley lancerede et århundrede med politiske mord](#)«, af Jeffrey Steinberg og Anton Chaitkin.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 23.

marts 2017:

Trump vil genoplive Hamiltons, Henry Clays og Lincolns “Amerikanske System”

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Menneskets ånd er ukuelig

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 23. marts, 2017 – Det er nøjagtig 34 år siden, at en tidligere, amerikanske præsident handlede ud fra sin egen dybe, personlige overbevisning og gjorde Lyndon LaRouches **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ** (Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI) til USA's politik.*

LaRouche respondere den næste dag ved at sige:

»Kun højtplacerede regeringsfolk, eller en privat borger, der har så intimt et kendskab til detaljerne i den internationale politiske og strategiske situation, og som jeg har det privilegium at være, kan begynde blot at forestille sig, hvilken omvæltende virkning, præsidentens fjernsynstransmitterede tale i går aftes vil få i hele verden. De ord, præsidenten talte i går aftes, har sluppet ånden ud af flasken, og den kan ikke igen kontrolleres. Det meste af verden vil snart kende, og aldrig glemme, denne politiske bebudelse. Med disse ord har præsidenten ændret den moderne

histories gang.

I dag er jeg mere stolt over at være amerikanere, end jeg har været, siden den første bemandede Månelanding. For første gang i 20 år har en amerikansk præsident udført en offentlig handling, der vidner om storslået lederskab, for at skabe grundlaget for at give fornyet håb for menneskehedens fremtid til en plaget og demoraliseret verden. Præsident Ronald Reagan blev i går rørt af sand storhed i en amerikansk præsident; dette er et storhedens øjeblik, der aldrig må glemmes.»

Hvis I har studeret det, som I må gøre, ved I, at SDI ikke var nogen fidus, og heller ikke en militær taktik. Det var snarere omdrejningspunktet for et vendepunkt i hele verden for en renæssance for en ny verden – ligesom LaRouches »Fire Nye Love« af juni, 2014, med USA's samtidige tilslutning til Den Nye Silkevej, er i dag. LaRouche og Reagan havde samlet den fane op, som Franklin Roosevelt havde båret så langt, han kunne – den samme fane, som John Kennedy senere var begyndt at hejse i den meget korte tid, han fik.

Ronald Reagan havde allerede været udsat for et forkrøblende, forebyggende mordforsøg, før han kom med sin SDI-bebudelse, og han blev dernæst, senere, udsat for mange pres imod SDI – men han opgav det aldrig, så længe han levede. For eksempel gentog han den 6. august, 1986:

»I SDI og andetsteds har vi sat teknologi, der næsten overgår vores forstand, til at arbejde og således øge vores produktivitet og udvide grænserne for, hvad der er menneskeligt muligt ... Fremtiden ligger i bogstavelig forstand i vore hænder, og det er SDI, der hjælper os med at genvinde kontrollen over vores skæbne.»

Som en del af den operation, der forsøgte at slå præsident Reagan ihjel, blev også Lyndon LaRouche på falske anklager fængslet, og hans sammenslutning brudt i stykker, men LaRouche – såvel som hans ideer – overlevede ikke desto mindre – eller

bedre endnu, hans kreative evne til at skabe nye, gyldige ideer, overlevede. De kunne ikke, ville ikke lade sig dræbe. Fireogtredive år senere næsten på dagen, har en anden præsident taget LaRouches ideer op, selv om LaRouche, til forskel fra tilfældet med Ronald Reagan, aldrig har mødt selve manden.

Det, vi mener hermed, er det følgende. Præsident Donald Trump har offentligt forpligtet sig over for det Amerikanske System, ud fra sine egne, dybe overbevisninger. Det har han gjort med fuld, indre forpligtelse – som Lyndon LaRouche har set bevis for i sine undersøgelser af præsidentens offentlige udtalelser. Der kan ikke herske tvivl om, at præsidenten har anselig, dybtgående kendskab til det, han taler om. På den anden side mangler hans medarbejdere, især i deres bredere kredse, næsten med sikkerhed denne dybtgående viden.

Men, som medlem af LaRouchePAC Policy Committee Michael Steger bemærkede i en e-mail i går til medarbejdere og andre – den sidste, amerikanske præsident, der offentligt erklærede det Amerikanske System, var William McKinley, lige i begyndelsen af den 20. århundrede. Dette var før de to, ødelæggende verdenskrige og den efterfølgende kolde krig (og hvis afslutning skulle blive fremskyndet af sovjetrussernes sluttelige afvisning af LaRouches SDI). Det var før Einstein, før atomkraft og før den praktiske erobring af rummet, med begyndelse i 1957.

Det, som det Amerikanske System vil sige i dag, er ikke længere det samme, som McKinley mente – endskønt i princippet det samme. I dag vil det sige Lyndon LaRouche. Han er manden, der har båret Alexander Hamiltons udødelige ideer frem til slutningen af det 20., og nu, til det 21. århundrede – og ikke blot som en akademisk disciplin, men i direkte handling, inklusive succesfulde kamphandlinger, som Hamilton selv gentagne gange gjorde.

At tale om det Amerikanske System i 2017 er at tale om Lyndon

LaRouches arbejde. Alle, der har forhåbninger om at omsætte denne præsidents forpligtende engagement til succesfuld handling, er nødt til at studere Lyndon LaRouches arbejde og selv mestre hans ideer. Og dét nu.

Foto: LaRouche taler med Ronald Reagan under et kandidatmøde i New Hampshire under præsidentvalgkampen i 1980.

Præsident Trump vil genoplive det 'Amerikanske Økonomiske System': Ved I, hvad det vil sige?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. marts, 2017 – I sine taler mandag ved et møde i Kentucky og tirsdag for møder for det Republikanske Parti, understregede præsident Donald Trump, at han har til hensigt at lede landet til en tilbagevenden til det »Amerikanske Økonomiske System«. Efter meget kvalificerede iagttageres skøn »mente præsidenten det virkelig« begge gange – han ønsker at vende tilbage til den faktiske, økonomiske politik, der blev ført af Alexander Hamilton og George Hamilton, Henry Clay og Abraham Lincoln: det »Amerikanske System«.

Er Trump den præsident, der kan føre USA tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System? Det er stadig ikke afgjort og afhænger også af landet – af os, af jer. Bør vi vende tilbage til det? Absolut.

Med enkelte undtagelser ved de fleste amerikanere, og andre landes borgere, ikke længere, hvad det Amerikanske Økonomiske System var. Det blev defineret af Abraham Lincolns økonom Henry C. Carey, for eksempel, som det »Amerikanske System«, i direkte modsætning til det »Britiske System« med frihandel.

De samme briter, der, i løbet af det seneste år, har stået bag McCarthy-kampagnen for at miskreditere Donald Trump og drive ham ud af Det Hvide Hus.

»Få ram på Trump«-McCarthyismen er britisk, fordi Trump – efter årtiers katastrofal »globalisering« og afindustrialisering – ønsker at vende tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System. Og han erkender fordelene ved fred, ved at standse Bush' og Obamas endeløse krige, og ved at samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at stoppe det.

Et »dossier« fra britisk efterretning om Donald Trump, produceret for Hillary Clinton, var således begyndelsen på at forvandle det Demokratiske Partis lederskab til en McCarthy-hob, på jagt efter »russere«, der lurder bag hver søjle i Det Hvide Hus.

Det Amerikanske Økonomiske Systems grundpiller var:

- 1) beskyttelse og støtte af amerikansk produktion således, at USA kunne blive den storslåede, producerende nation, det blev;
- 2) en konstant promovring og opbygning af den mest moderne, nationale infrastruktur, af de samme grunde – de transkontinentale jernbaner, det nationale hovedvejssystem, Apollo-Måneprojektet; og
- 3) et kreditsystem, baseret på national (statslig) bankpraksis, som den store finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, havde opfundet.

I dag vil dette sige at lukke Wall Streets kæmpekasinoer ved at genindføre Glass/Steagall-loven; at etablere en

nationalbank i traditionen efter Hamilton, til infrastruktur og varefremstilling; at investere milliarder i ny infrastruktur af den højeste, teknologiske standard; at udvikle fusionskraft, vende tilbage til Månen og det dybe rum med menneskelig kolonisering og udvikling.

Det er, hvad *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, økonom i det Amerikanske Systems tradition, Lyndon LaRouche, for nylig har udviklet som »Fire Love« for at redde den amerikanske økonomi.

Det Amerikanske System betød også Monroe-doktrinen – at det unge USA ville gøre alt, der stod i dets magt, for at holde de britiske og franske finansimperier ude af de amerikanske kontinenter, så alle disse kontinenters nationer kunne udvikle deres økonomier og indgå gensidige handelsaftaler, til fælles fordel.

I dag vil det Amerikanske System sige at koble sig til Kinas Nye Silkevejsinitiativ, hvor 60 nationer er i færd med at indgå sådanne aftaler inden for et »win-win«-paradigme.

Schiller Instituttet og *EIR* er i færd med at opbygge en stor, international konference i næste måned i New York City for at bringe Trumps USA ind i dette nye paradigme, hvor det »Amerikanske System« kan blomstre.

Præsident Trumps forståelse af det Amerikanske System i dag er elementær, men alvorligt ment. Jo flere amerikanere, der ved, hvad det *skulle betyde*, og handler på det, desto bedre chancer er der for, at det Britiske Systems »globaliseringsæra« vil slutte under hans præsidentskab.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump modtager en NASA-flyverjakke tirsdag, den 21. marts, 2017, efter at have underskrevet 'NASA Transition Authorization Act of 2017' i det ovale værelse i Det Hvide Hus i Washington, D.C.

Det modsatte af falske nyheder? Sandheden: Vi kan vinde!

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 21. marts, 2017 – Et internationalt medievanvid gik i gang i anledning af Repræsentanternes Hus' høring i Efterretningskomiteen den 20. marts, over spørgsmålet, »Undersøgelse af russiske aktiviteter«, med en proklamation af – som det tyske *Bildzeitung* hovedoverskrifter i dag sagde – at »Trumpgate« er godt i gang, og at USA snart vil miste sit hoved. Tidligere tyske regeringspersoner citeredes for at komme med den iagttagelse, hvor 'historisk' og 'unik' og 'alvorlig', situationen i USA er, med statshovedets troværdighed gået fløjten.

I virkeligheden var dette blot endnu et moment i den igangværende, beskidte operation i forsøget på at dumpe Trump og dæmonisere Rusland. Processen består i skræmmekampagner og løgne, som i går blev øget af en opvisning, der skulle imponere, fra et galleri af Demokrater, med en opførsel i traditionen efter Truman og McCarthyismen. Det, som den nuværende medie-hype rent faktisk viser, er ønsketænkningen på vegne af de kontrollerende interesser bag de falske nyheder, som er knyttet til det udåndende britiske system, der trues af den kendsgerning, at valget af Trump er en del af et betydningsfuldt skift til en helt ny verdensorden.

Den fortsatte mulighed for et sådant skift ses af flere af dagens begivenheder. Mandag nat talte præsident Trump i Kentucky for et møde i Louisville, hvor han stærkt fremhævede behovet for at vende tilbage til det »Amerikanske System«. Han nævnte berømte ledere, der er født i, eller knyttet til,

Kentucky – Abraham Lincoln og Daniel Boone – og dvælede ved Henry Clay som en »stærk fortaler for amerikansk varefremstilling« og en tilhænger af udenrigshandel, som »må være fair, ligeværdig og gensidig«, sagde Trump. »Vores regering har alt for længe opgivet det Amerikanske System ...« Han talte om genindustrialisering, genoprettelse af kulminearbejderjobs, og mere.

Og igen her til aften talte Trump, ved en Kongresmiddag, om historiske ledere og projekter for USA's udvikling. Han sagde, at det Amerikanske System altid havde været de grundlæggende fædres hensigt. Senere, se på den transkontinentale jernbane. Han påpegede Republikanernes politiske program i 1896 (under McKinley) for protektionisme og gensidighed inden for handel.

Det Amerikanske System er præcis, hvad Lyndon LaRouche i fyrré år har været fortaler for og har argumenteret med, at det Amerikanske Systems praksis med dirigeret kredit til industri, videnskab og infrastruktur er blevet kasseret i USA, især siden Franklin Roosevelts død, og omgående må genindføres for at forhindre en økonomisk katastrofe.

I mellemtiden fortsætter fremstødet for den fremgangsmåde, der kan få dette til at ske – nemlig genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall. Mandag blev en resolution fremsat i North Carolinas generalforsamling (delstatskongres), som krævede, at USA's Kongres vedtager Glass-Steagall og et »amerikansk, økonomisk genrejsningsprogram«, som det skitseres i Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Love«. I går havde Fortune.com en artikel til støtte for Glass-Steagall, med overskriften, »Vil Donald Trump holde sit kampagneløfte om at genindføre Glass-Steagall?«

Parallelt med indenrigspolitikken er der udenrigspolitiske initiativer i en ny retning. Trumps udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson skal nu, efter diskussioner i Kina med præsident Xi Jinping i sidste weekend – hvor et møde mellem Xi og Trump blev forberedt – til Rusland i april, iflg. rapporter fra Udenrigsministeriet til TASS i dag. Den indikerede tidsplan

er, at Tillerson vil forblive i USA under det sandsynlige møde den 6.-7. april i Florida mellem præsidenterne Xi og Trump. (Tillerson springer over NATO-udenrigsministermødet, der finder sted samtidigt, den 5.-6. april, hvor underudenrigsminister Tom Shannon vil deltage.) Så tager Tillerson til Italien, til mødet den 10.-11. april i Gruppe af Syv-udenrigsministermødet, og derfra videre til Moskva.

Disse initiativer, i sammenhæng med Bælt & Vej-initiativets fortsatte præstationer og forpligtelser på internationalt plan – der karakteriseres af 'Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde' i Kina om mindre end to måneder – er i færd med at fjerne eksistensen af falsknerier af enhver art, der har pågået i årtier, og som blev promoveret af Romklubben, Verdensnaturfonden og det Kongelige Dit & Dat.

Den virkelige sandhed er, at menneskeheden kan vinde.

Et Silkevejsinstitut i Kina opfordrer Trump til at deltage i konference til maj

21. marts, 2017 – Liang Haiming, cheføkonom ved Kinas Silkevejsdalens Forskningsinstitut, en tænketank med hjemsted i Guangzhou, skrev en artikel i *Global Times* i dag om 'Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde' i maj måned i Beijing og opfordrede specifikt præsident Trump til at deltage, idet han fremlagde win-win-fordelene.

»Trump bør seriøst overveje at tilslutte sig B&V-initiativet«, skriver Liang, idet det kunne »øge antal jobs og fremme hans storstilede infrastrukturplan ... Hvis Trump ikke ønsker, at

genoplivelse af varefremstilling skal ende som blot et kampagneløfte, bør han overveje at søge samarbejde med Kina om B&V-initiativet.«

Liang påpeger potentiel finansiering fra Kina, så vel som kinesiske fabrikker, der producerer i USA, og tilføjer, at »samarbejde mellem Trump-administrationen og Kina om B&V-initiativet ville styrke konnektivitet med hensyn til politik, handel og kapital, som ville være favorabelt for USA's forøgelse af vareeksport til Kina«.

Om Trumps \$1 billion store infrastrukturplan siger Liang, at »Kina kan tilbyde det, USA har brug for. Kinas samarbejde med lande langs med Bælt & Vej-ruten begynder sædvanligvis med byggeri af infrastruktur. Med Kinas rige erfaring inden for infrastrukturprojekter i udlandet, ville samarbejde inden for dette område være et win-win for de to lande«.

Han bemærker ligeledes, at de enorme kinesiske porteføljer af amerikanske statsobligationer kunne blive et problem for USA, hvis Kina begynder at sælge ud af dem, men at disse resurser fra Kina »kunne være med til at løse problemet med finansiering af infrastrukturen« i USA. Lyndon LaRouche har foreslået en statslig udviklingsbank, der ville være det perfekte redskab til at flytte disse kinesiske porteføljer over til produktiv investering i USA.

Og, tilføjer Liang, at gå med i B&V-initiativet vil gøre det muligt for den amerikanske varefremstillingssektor at udforske nye markeder og drive sin økonomi frem og tilføje nye jobs«, samtidig med, at USA arbejder sammen med Kina om at »være fælles om risiciene, reducere konfrontation og opdyrke et momentum for ny, økonomisk vækst«.

Dette stemmer meget overens med Schiller Instituttets indsats for at få Trump-administrationen til at bringe USA ind på Silkevejen, og for at få præsidenten til at deltage i forummet til maj.

Foto: USA's infrastruktur smuldrer. Her et billede, der viser arbejde på at erstatte Seattles Alaskavejs-viadukt, som er gået i stå, fordi boremaskinen Bertha har sat sig fast under jorden. (Photo courtesy of Washington DOT)