

Helga Zepp-LaRouche interviewes af Sputnik forud for mødet mellem Xi og Trump

... jeg mener, at, siden Kina i 2013 lagde politikken med den Nye Silkevej, eller Bælt & Vej-initiativet, som det nu kaldes, på bordet, og har været i gang med at bygge denne Nye Silkevej, med en idé om, at også USA skulle tilslutte sig den, skulle det slet ikke forbavse mig, hvis noget i denne retning blev diskuteret, til manges store overraskelse.

5. april, 2017 – Dette er et udskrift af et interview, Sputnik førte med Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, mht. det forestående topmøde mellem præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Donald Trump:

Spørgsmål: Hvad vil tonen i mødet være?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg tror, det vil være venskabeligt. De vestlige medier, der som regel ikke har ret, forsøger at reducere hele dette spørgsmål til en eller anden geopolitisk konflikt, men jeg mener, at begge parter har forberedt dette møde meget grundigt. Jeg mener, at, da udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson i sidste måned var i Beijing for at forberede mødet, sagde han, at de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer under Trump-administrationen ville blive en meget positiv relation, der bygger på nul konfrontation, nul konflikt, gensidig respekt og altid i søgen efter en »win-win«-løsning. Dette var nøjagtig den formulering, som Xi Jinping brugte i 2012, da han opfordrede til opbygningen af en ny type af relationer mellem store nationer, mellem Kina og USA.

Det blev dengang afvist af præsident Obama. Men det faktum, at

Tillerson nu bruger nøjagtig den samme formulering, er et meget positivt signal. Og jeg mener, at, siden Kina i 2013 lagde politikken med den Nye Silkevej, eller Bælt & Vej-initiativet, som det nu kaldes, på bordet, og har været i gang med at bygge denne Nye Silkevej, med en idé om, at også USA skulle tilslutte sig den, skulle det slet ikke forbavse mig, hvis noget i denne retning blev diskuteret, til manges store overraskelse.

SP: Javel. Tidligere har Trump beskyldt Kina for at voldtage den amerikanske økonomi. Han kaldte landet for en valuta-manipulator og truede endda med at gennemføre høj told på kinesisk import; men, når dette er sagt, hvilken reaktion bør vi forvente fra den kinesiske leder? Hvilke standpunkter vil de indtage?

Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg tror ikke, Xi Jinping vil reagere på den tone, som kandidaten Trump havde under sin kampagne. Og jeg tror, hvis de frem på bordet lægger den idé, at Kina ville investere i USA's infrastruktur – Trump har jo selv bebudet behovet for et \$1 billion stort program til genopbygning af den amerikanske infrastruktur. Der var for nylig en konference i Hongkong, hvor kinesiske økonomer skønnede, at det virkelige behov var på \$8 billion. Se, den måde, hvorpå man kan nedbringe underskuddet på handelsbalancen, er, hvis der kommer direkte kinesisk investering i infrastruktur, måske ikke lige med det samme, med indirekte; man kunne måske få en infrastrukturbank, hvor Kina kunne indsætte sine investeringer, eller en lignende løsning.

Men jeg er overbevist om, at de absolut vil komme ud af dette topmøde med resultater, der er til fordel for begge lande.

SP: Det er interessant, at De taler om en positiv løsning på handelsunderskuddet, som De netop nævnte, med Kina, der muligvis kunne skabe en særlig investeringsbank; men er der noget andet, som Trump kunne gøre for på en eller anden måde at nedbringe dette handelsunderskud? Eller findes der en måde,

hvorpå præsident Trump kunne forbedre relationerne mellem landene og forbedre handlen mellem landene?

Zepp-LaRouche: Trump har på det seneste flere gange nævnt, at han ønsker at vende tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, som er Alexander Hamiltons, Lincolns og Henry Clays system, og det er i realiteten det system, der gjorde USA stort i kølvandet på Uafhængighedskrigen. Det var et yderst protektionistisk system. Alexander Hamilton skabte USA ved at skabe en Nationalbank, et statsligt kreditsystem, og f.eks. påpegede den tyske økonom Friedrich List forskellen mellem det Amerikanske Økonomiske System og det Britiske Økonomiske System, hvilket vil sige, at det Amerikanske System, som blev skabt af Hamilton, grundlæggende set siger, at den eneste kilde til rigdom er arbejdskraftens kreativitet og produktivitet; i sammenligning med det Britiske System, der siger, at man må opkøbe billigt og sælge dyrt, have kontrol over handelen og holde udgifterne til arbejdskraften så lave som muligt.

Hvis man rent faktisk ser på det, Kina har gjort med det kinesiske økonomiske mirakel i de seneste 30 år, så er det meget tættere på Alexander Hamiltons filosofi, end det ville være på systemet med globalisering og såkaldt »frihandel«. For jeg mener ikke, at det kinesiske frihandelssystem er helt det samme frihandelssystem, som briterne og amerikanerne under Obama- og Bush-administrationerne tænkte på.

Hvis Trump derfor siger, OK, globalisering førte til en outsourcing af produktive jobs, og jeg ønsker at genskabe den amerikanske økonomi, ja, så er det måden, hvorpå handelsunderskuddet nedbringes, for grunden til, at der er et handelsunderskud, er, at mange produkter i løbet af de seneste 16 år under Bush- og Obama-administrationerne i stigende grad blev mindre konkurrencedygtige, som i bilindustrien, f.eks. Grunden til, at der importeres flere biler fra Japan, Korea og Tyskland, end den anden vej rundt, er, at disse biler er bedre end de amerikanske biler.

Det, som Amerika må gøre, hvad præsident Trump må gøre – og jeg tror, det er, hvad han har til hensigt at gøre – er at genopbygge den amerikanske økonomi på det højeste, produktive niveau. Infrastrukturen er blot forstadiet, men så er der andre områder, som kernefission, men i særdeleshed kernefusionsteknologi, samarbejde om rummet med andre lande, så der er mange områder, hvor man kan foretage 'frøspring' ind i de mest produktive områder af økonomien, og jeg mener, det er, hvad Trump har til hensigt at gøre.

SP: Det er interessant, at De nævner dette, og jeg synes virkelig om, at De nævner dette spørgsmål. Det må vi desværre tage på et andet tidspunkt. Bortset fra disse spørgsmål, vi har diskuteret, er der så andre spørgsmål, som vil komme på bordet mellem den kinesiske leder og USA's præsident?

Zepp-LaRouche: Spørgsmålet om Nordkorea vil selvfølgelig stå højt på dagsordenen i betragtning af Nordkoreas nylige prøveaffyringer af missiler. Men her må man forstå, at Nordkorea ikke gør dette, fordi de planlægger en aggression mod Sydkorea eller Japan, eller USA. De gør dette som en reaktion mod deployeringen af THAAD-missiler, som både Kina og Rusland har sagt, udgør sikkerhedstrusler imod deres egen nationale sikkerhed; og, Nordkorea reagerer på de meget store [militære] øvelser, som omfatter USA, Japan og Sydkorea, og som finder sted i øjeblikket.

Måden at reducere dette på – det ville være mit gæt, at de vil indgå en aftale om at genforeslå sekspartsforhandlingerne, for at forsøge at finde en løsning, eller måske endda fempartsforhandlinger, for at forsøge at gennemarbejde en reel løsning, som kunne tilbydes Nordkorea. Men det er min overbevisning, at den eneste måde, hvorpå denne konflikt kan løses for altid, er at forlænge den Nye Silkevej ind i Korea, få en forening af Syd- og Nordkorea, og dernæst sammen udvikle, Nordkorea, selvfølgelig med at tage Nordkoreas suverænitæt i betragtning; men jeg mener ideen om at overvinde de forfærdelige, økonomiske vanskeligheder og bruge den

højtuddannede arbejdskraft, man har i Nordkorea! Folk er ikke klar over, at der faktisk er en højt udviklet arbejdskraft i Nordkorea.

Jeg mener, at den Nye Silkevej / Bælt & Vej-initiativet, selv på kort eller mellemlang sigt, er den ramme, inden for hvilken det nordkoreanske problem kan løses for altid.

SP: OK. Med dette spørgsmål vil jeg gerne takke Dem for at være med os i dag, Helga. Det var en fornøjelse at have Dem her, og jeg ser frem til at have Dem her i fremtiden.

Zepp-LaRouche: OK, mange tak.

Det Nye Paradigme er inden for rækkevidde – men 'perfide Albion delenda est'

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 5. april, 2017 – Præsident Donald Trump vil torsdag og fredag holde møde med præsident Xi Jinping i Florida, og det er nu blevet meddelt, at udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson vil besøge Moskva i næste uge, 11.-12. april. Aldrig har potentialet for et historisk skifte i civilisationens orden – med en afslutning af imperiegeopolitik og begyndelsen til et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling og hele menneskehedens forædling – været så stort, som det er i dette historiske øjeblik.

Det bør derfor ikke komme som en overraskelse, at Det britiske Imperium har lanceret desperate forholdsregler, med det formål

at trække USA ind i en ny kolonikrig, ligesom de gjorde i tilfældene med Vietnam, Irak, Libyen – og nu Syrien. Hensigten er ikke kun den, at ødelægge endnu en sydvestasiatisk nation, men derimod at forhindre deres tidligere koloni, og nu opkomling, USA i at indgå i et partnerskab med Rusland og Kina og gøre en ende på den fundamentale imperieopdeling af verden i Øst og Vest, og således gøre en ende på den fundamentale forudsætning for Imperium.

Til dette formål skabtes en grusomhed i Syrien i denne uge, med kemiske våben, der blev udløst over byen Khan Sheikhoun, en Idlibprovins, enten af terrorister, eller, som russiske beviser indikerer, af et legitimt, syrisk luftangreb på et al-Qaeda våbenlager, som ved et uheld afslørede og ødelagde en kemisk våbenfabrik, som bruges af al-Qaedas syriske grene, og herved udløste et dødbringende, kemisk stof, der rapporteres at have dræbt dusinvis af mennesker, inklusive børn. Denne analyse af begivenhederne blev over for *EIR* bekræftet af et vidende, amerikansk militært efterretningsnetværk på jorden i Syrien.

Briterne, franskmændene og amerikanerne, desværre, udstedte omgående en resolution i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, som erklærede, at den syriske regering havde det fulde ansvar og krævede en ny række nye krav og sanktioner. Som sædvanlig blev der ikke fremlagt nogen beviser. Man bør erindre sig, at, i 2013, blev skylden for et angreb med kemiske våben på Ghouta, en forstad til Damaskus, der var besat af oprørsstyrker, omgående lagt på præsident Assad og blev af Obama brugt til at forberede et fuldt optrappet angreb for »regimeskifte« mod Syrien, som ville have efterladt Syrien i den samme, ødelagte tilstand som Irak og Libyen, under krigsførende terroristfraktioners kontrol. Udelukkende kun, fordi daværende formand for de amerikanske generalstabschefer, general Martin Dempsey, intervenserede for at stoppe det, undgik verden endnu en krig, der meget vel kunne have ført til en global krig med Rusland. På samme tid trådte Putin til for at arrangere ødelæggelsen af

Syriens kemiske våbenlagre, hvilket blev opnået. Det blev sluttelig demonstreret, af FN's Organisation for Forhindring af Kemiske Våben, at al-Qaeda- og ISIS-styrkerne virkelig har kemiske våben og midlerne til at producere dem, og at de virkelig har brugt dem.

Skulle det lykkes briterne at trække præsident Trump ind i en krig i dag, på trods af Trumps gentagne løfter om, at der ikke kommer flere krige for regimeskifte, og at USA vil arbejde sammen med Rusland om at adressere den faktiske fare – nemlig terrorisme – så hersker der ingen tvivl om, at det hurtigt ville føre til Tredje Verdenskrig, og en term nuklear krig tilligemed.

Under mødet i dag i FN's Sikkerhedsråd nedlagde både Rusland og Kina, denne gang støttet af Bolivia, ikke alene veto mod den sindssyge resolution fra USA/UK/Frankrig, men adresserede direkte den britiske ambassadør til FN som en løgner og en krigsmager. På typisk britisk vis havde ambassadøren, fordi Rusland og Kina havde vetoet tidligere bestræbelser på at lancere en krig mod Assads Syrien, givet dem skylden for at være årsag til, at disse nye, kemiske angreb havde fundet sted, idet han løj og sagde, at det var indlysende, at denne nye grusomhed blev udført af Assad.

»Deres udtalelser kan ikke tolereres«, sagde den kinesiske ambassadør. »De må holde op med at misbruge FN's Sikkerhedsråd og afholde Dem fra sådanne handlinger.« Den russiske repræsentant anklagede briterne for at »introducere provokationer, hinsides diplomatiske normer. I ønsker, at FN's Sikkerhedsråd skal låne legitimitet til jeres illegitime planer«.

Vil Tony Blairs/George Bush' løgne, der i 2003 lancerede det evige Helvede i Mellemøsten med deres illegale krig mod Irak, blive gentaget i dag? Vil det enorme potentiale for fred og udvikling gennem globalt samarbejde med den Nye Silkevej blive dræbt af endnu en britisk grusomhed, med amerikansk

dobbeltspil i »perfide Albions« ondskab?[1]

Vi står ved et afgørende vendepunkt i historien. Det er præcist alle bevidste menneskers vilje til at handle i dette beslutningens øjeblik, som vil afgøre, om vi får krig eller fred, ødelæggelse eller udvikling, civilisation eller en ny Mørk Tidsalder.

Foto: Syriens præsident Assad møder Ruslands præsident Putin i Moskva, oktober, 2015. (Photo: Kremlin.ru)

[1] 'perfide (troløs; ondskabsfuld) Albion (England) bør ødelægges'. (overskriften)

Vil præsident Trump gå med i den Nye Silkevej?

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 4. april, 2017 – Civilisationens skæbne kunne meget vel blive afgjort i denne uge, med præsident Trump, der står fast imod den »farvede revolution«, der føres imod USA fra Det britiske Imperiums og deres håndlangere i den mislykkede Obama-administrations side, og som samtidig er i færd med at forberede et historisk topmøde med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, hvor han officielt kunne, og må, tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej.

Den britiske imperieopdeling af verden i krigsførende blokke – af hvilke ingen er vigtigere for deres modbydelige Imperiums overlevelse end »Øst vs. Vest« – ville kollapse under et Trump-partnerskab med Kina for at samarbejde om udviklingen af verdens nationer gennem Kinas Ét Bælt, én Vej, og gennem et

partnerskab med Rusland for at overvinde terroristsvøben, en skabelse af London og deres saudiske monarkiske allierede.

I kølvandet på terrorbombningen af en Metrostation i Skt. Petersborg i mandags, ringede Trump til præsident Vladimir Putin og tilbød »den amerikanske regerings fulde støtte til responsen på angrebet, og med at bringe de ansvarlige til retsligt ansvar«, iflg. Det Hvide Hus. »Både præsident Trump og præsident Putin var enige i, at terrorisme må endegyldigt og hurtigt besejres«, lød udskriftet.

Torsdag og fredag vil præsidenten mødes med Xi Jinping på sin ejendom i Florida. Det rapporteres, at begge parter har planlagt topmødet omhyggeligt – begge parter ønsker et succesrigt møde, og begge parter har til hensigt at gøre en ende på den geopolitiske nulsums-fremgangsmåde over for globalt diplomati og erstatte det med win-win-samarbejde for at adressere menneskehedens fælles mål. Som udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson under sit besøg i sidste måned for at arrangere denne uges topmøde sagde til kineserne, så ville de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer under Trump-administrationen blive »en meget positiv relation, der bygger på nul konfrontation, nul konflikt, gensidig respekt og altid i søgen efter win-win-løsninger«. Dette reflekterede direkte Xi Jinpings opfordring fra 2012 til at opbygge »en ny slags relationer mellem store lande« mellem Kina og USA, baseret på »nul konflikt, nul konfrontation, gensidig respekt og win-win-samarbejde«, et forslag, der blev blankt afvist af præsident Obama, som i stedet gik frem med forberedelser til en militær konfrontation med Kina.

Bestræbelserne fra briternes/Obamas/mediernes side på at give Rusland skylden for Hillary Clintons fejlslagne valgkampagne, og på at anklage Trump for at være et godtroende fjols for russerne, bliver i stigende grad latterliggjort, alt imens Obamas og hans korrupte efterretningsteams forbrydelser ikke længere kan skjules. Den tidligere vicedirektør for USA's Centralkommandos Efterretningstjeneste, oberst James

Waurishuk, sagde, i sin respons til afsløringen af Obamas nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Susan Rices rolle i at bruge efterretningssamfundet til at udspionere Trump-kampagnen: »Vi står og ser på en potentiel, forfatningsmæssig krise ud fra standpunktet om, at vi brugte en ekstremt stærk kapacitet, der er tiltænkt at bruges til at sikre og beskytte landet, og vi brugte det til politiske formål, på vegne af den siddende præsident. Det skaber en ny præcedens.«

Trump adresserede også Byggesektorens Fagforenings kongresmedlemmers konference i Washington, D.C., i dag, og inspirerede dem til at tage ansvar for de »engang så fremgangsrige byer, der nu skæmmes af tomme parceller, og engang så fremgangsrige industribyer, der nu ligger hen som rustbyer og er i totalt forfald«. Han fortsatte: »Jeg har her for mig i dag, her i denne sal, de mænd og kvinder, der, hvis de får muligheden, kan transformere disse lokalsamfund. I er borgere, der kan genopbygge vore byer, genoplive vore industrier og forny vort elskede land, og jeg ved, I ikke vil helme, før jobbet er gjort.«

Det britiske Imperium er i færd med at brase sammen, men, med en følelse af total desperation, udsender de deres styrker for at bekæmpe Amerikas Forenede Stater, for at bevare deres »del og hersk«-magt over verden på vegne af deres bankerotte finansimperium. Hvis USA, Kina og Rusland sluttede sig sammen, på vegne af hele menneskeheden, ville det betyde enden på Imperiet, måske for altid.

De ideer, der i løbet af de seneste halvtreds år er blevet introduceret og udbredt af den bevægelse, som Lyndon LaRouche har grundlagt – for fred gennem udvikling, for en genoprettelse af det Amerikanske System for en kreditinvesteringsøkonomi, for en ende på den kulturelle sump med »sex, narko, rock and roll« til fordel for en ny renæssance for klassisk kultur og videnskab – er nu meget tæt på at realiseres. Vi kan ikke svinge historien på dette storslåede tidspunkt.

Foto: Præsident Trump taler for den Nationale Byggesektors Fagforeningskonference i Washington, 4. april, 2017.

Hvis Trump og Xi genlancerer det Amerikanske System, bliver Londons finansimperium knust

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 3. april, 2017 – Hvorfor har Londonavisen *Financial Times* lanceret så fjendtlig en provokation i sit 'interview' af præsident Trump – hvor de insisterer, at det centrale spørgsmål under hans topmøde med Kinas præsident bliver krigstrusler mod Nordkorea?

Hvilke muligheder i dette topmøde er det, City of London så rasende ønsker at afspore?

Dette topmøde 6.-7. april i Mar-a-Lago har potentialet til at genantænde gnisten til netop det 'Amerikanske System', som motor for økonomisk fremskridt i USA, som Trump så lidenskabeligt har påkaldt i sine seneste taler. Med fokus på handel har præsident Trump brug for den substans og form for investering i genoplivelsen af varefremstilling, landbrug og produktiv beskæftigelse i Amerika – og de milliarder i infrastrukturinvesteringer, han har sagt, må foretages. Dette kan præsident Xi tilbyde, og mange eksperter i Kina mener, han vil tilbyde det, hvis topmødet ikke bliver saboteret.

Kina og de andre BRIKS-nationer har brug for, at de store magter USA og Tyskland samarbejder med Bælt & Vej-initiativet («Nye Silkevej») med store infrastrukturprojekter og landbroer. Og de har frem for alt brug for at bringe denne »win-win« økonomiske genopbygning ind i de sydvestasiatiske og afrikanske områder, der er ødelagt af de endeløse krige, påført dem af Tony Blair, George W. Bush og Barack Obama. Sammen med Ruslands præsident Putin har de brug for hjælp til at udrydde terrorisme og stabilisere Sydvestasien.

Dette er den førende, økonomiske dynamik i dag. Præsident Xi vil sandsynligvis give præsident Trump en personlig invitation til at deltage i det internationale Forum for Bælt & Vej-initiativet i Beijing, den 14.-15. maj. Hvis topmødet på Mar-a-Lago bliver en succes, vil et nyt paradigme for økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt, og for fred blandt nationer, tage et spring fremad.

Som den kinesisk-amerikanske leder George Koo i dag påpeger i *Asia Times*, så bygger Kinas førende jernbaneproducent allerede i dag nye broer i Amerika, under budgettet og foran tidsplanen, og de køber amerikansk. De har vundet priser for deres byggeri af en bro i New York City ved navn Alexander Hamilton – grundlæggeren af det »Amerikanske System«, som Trump ønsker at genoplive.

London forfølger naturligvis sine egne handelsfordele med Kinas hastigt voksende økonomi; men *Financial Times* gjorde det klart, at London ønsker at se det amerikansk-kinesiske topmøde gå ned i flammerne af krig over Nordkorea, handelskrig, eller begge dele. Det var ligeledes britisk efterretning, der var ophavsmand til den eskalerende kampagne à la McCarthy-isme, for at skandalisere og ødelægge Trump-administrationen over en hvilken som helst kontakt med Putins Rusland.

Lyndon LaRouches bevægelse i USA, og Schiller Instituttet, har i årtier ført en kampagne for en tilbagevenden til det »Amerikanske Økonomiske System«, og er blevet angrebet og

retsforfulgt af den samme »deep state«, bestående af briterne, NATO og USA, der nu jager Trump – i visse tilfælde af denne magts selv samme agenter. Det Amerikanske System er LaRouches Fire Love for at redde nationen: Glass-Steagall, statslig kredit, moderne infrastruktur i stor skala, genoplivelse af rumforskning og fusionsteknologi.

En appel, der promoverer disse Fire Love over for præsident Trump, samler nu tusinder af underskrifter på larouchepac.com sitet.

Xi-Trump-topmødet vil, hvis det bliver en succes, være et skridt på denne vej.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump vil være vært for Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i Florida, 6. april, 2017.

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.

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 Ehricke 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)

**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.

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.

En 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.

**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

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 Ehrickes 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«

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, med 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, med 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 økonom 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 than 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.

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 lurer 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 billioner i ny infrastruktur af den højeste, teknologiske standard; at udvikle fusionskraft, vende tilbage til Månen og det dybe rum med menneskelig kolonisering og udvikling.

Dette 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.

Imperiet kollapse: Lad os kæmpe for menneskehedens

modne alder

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 20. marts, 2017 – Præsident Trump er i færd med at drive Det britiske Imperium og dets satrupper i USA og hele verden ind i en tilstand af ren panik. Han afviser den »særlige relation« mellem USA og briterne og identificerer åbent de britiske og amerikanske efterretningstjenesters forbrydelser – forbrydelser, der har været velkendt meget længe (især siden Snowden), men som misdæderne mente, verden kunne formås til at glemme.

Myten om »den frie verden versus gudløs kommunisme« er smuldret i takt med, at Trump åbnet fremmer venskab med Rusland og Kina. Løgner om, at »verden er ved at brænde op under den industrialiserede verdens kulstofudledninger« er blevet smidt over i kategorien for eventyr for børn, i stil med Walt Disney-filmen »Chicken Little«. Libertarianismens myte om, at »frihed« betyder legaliserede, narkotiske stoffer og uhindret spekulation, er stadig i live, men konfronteres med de sidste krampetrækninger i takt med, at lovgivning for Glass-Steagall og krig mod narko nu er på bordet.

FBI-chef James Comey og NSA-chef Michael Rogers blev stillet for Repræsentanternes Hus' Efterretningskomite, med den hensigt fra nogle kongresmedlemmers side at komme ind til sandheden bag løgnene og hysteriet imod både Rusland og præsidenten. I stedet sagde Comey, at han ikke kunne besvare sådanne spørgsmål, eftersom der i øjeblikket var undersøgelser i gang af både den angivelige russiske, undergravende virksomhed i præsidentvalgkampen og angivelig russisk, undergravende indflydelse over Trump og hans kampagne. Høringen udviklede sig til et freak-show, hvor flere Demokrater lød endnu mere sindssyge end Joe McCarthy-fanatikerne under Harry Trumans antikommunistiske heksejagter i 1950'erne.

Trump demonstrerede, at han ikke ville kues, ved at udsende to

budskaber før åbningen af høringen:

* »James Clapper og andre erklærede, at der ikke findes beviser for, at Potus [President of the United States, – red.] intrigerede sammen med Rusland. Denne historie er FALSKE NYHEDER, og alle ved det!«

* »Demokraterne opfandt og promoverede den russiske historie som en undskyldning for at køre en frygtelig kampagne.«

Det, der mangler, og som er afgørende, er det, som Krafft Ehrlicke, geniet, hvis raketter bragte mennesket til Månen, kaldte den menneskelige races nødvendige modning. Hans koncept med den 'udenjordiske forpligtelse' (Extraterrestrial Imperative), der siger, at mennesket ikke er en jordbo, og at der ikke er nogen grænser for vækst, satte en mission for menneskeheden for, at den skulle komme ud over stadiet med det barnagtige tidsfordrives mudderkastning med krigsvåben, og til at opløfte den menneskelige ånd til stjernerne. Dette fordrer den nødvendige udvikling af alle verdens borgeres skabende evner.

I dag markerer LaRouche-organisationens lancering af »100-års jubilæumsugen for Krafft Ehrlickes fødsel«. Arrangementer og videopræsentationer vil finde sted i hele USA og Europa i ugens løb, inklusive LaRouchePAC Policy Committee webcastet mandag (se https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wV9fR_LeeEE). Denne særlige uge er ikke alene for at hædre Ehrlickes liv og værk, men for at »udbrede hans skønne ideer om menneskehedens fremtid i universet«.

Ehrlicke er berømt for denne sætning: »Det er blevet sagt, 'Hvis Gud ønskede, at mennesket skulle flyve, ville Han have givet det vinger'. I dag kan vi sige, 'Hvis Gud ønskede, at mennesket skulle blive en rumrejsende art, ville Han have givet mennesket en Måne'.«

Men, tilføjede han, »teknologi er ikke løsningen på alle vore mangler. Dertil behøver vi at vokse, at modnes – men teknologi

gør det nemmere«. Det var denne erkendelse af nødvendigheden af en kulturel transformation af det menneskelige samfund på Jorden, der tiltrak Ehrlicke til det nære venskab og samarbejde med Lyndon LaRouche og dennes bevægelse. Heri så Ehrlicke den nødvendige bestræbelse for at forbinde de forskellige civilisationer på vores planet, hver med deres forskellige filosofiske og kulturelle traditioner, for at gå sammen om den fælles bestræbelse på at opdage universets naturlige love og anvende dem til at opløfte arten som helhed.

Det nye paradigme, som Den Nye Silkevej repræsenterer, gør præcis dette og skaber et fællesskab af nationer med en fælles skæbne for fred gennem udvikling. Denne proces er nu hastigt ved at spredes i hele verden. Med Det britiske Imperiums magt stærkt svækket, men endnu ikke død, er det menneskehedens presserende opgave at bringe USA og Europa ud af dette rådende ligs magt, for at skabe menneskehedens modne alder.

Foto: Solen går ned over Buckingham Palace.

Schiller Instituttet planlægger at bringe Amerika ind i 'Det Nye Silkevejsparadigme' i dette forår

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 19. marts, 2017 – Donald Trumps præsidentskab, bagvasket (og aflyttet) af hele det transatlantiske establishment, fra neoliberalt til neokonservativt, er i færd med at ryste det gamle paradigme

med geopolitik, globalisering og »grøn« afindustrialisering. Det britiske establishments efterretningsvæsen og statsråd (Privy Council) reagerer med ekstrem giftighed på dette og centrerer fremstødet i både EU-eliten og Obama/Soros-netværkerne omkring hurtigt at bringe Trump til fald ved hvilke midler som helst; rigsretssag, tilbagetræden eller endda mord.

Men det nye paradigme – og den »nye industrielle revolution«, som præsidenten påberåbte sig i Detroit i sidste uge – er allerede på vej fra Den Nye Silkevej. Den tilbydes Trumps USA af Kina og de eurasiske magters store initiativ med byggeri af de store, nye infrastrukturprojekter for Jordan, og med rejser til Månen og gennem Solsystemet.

Som USA's udenrigsminister Tillerson sagde under sit møde med Kinas præsident Xi i søndags, så støtter USA relationer, der er

»baseret på princippet om nul konflikt, nul konfrontation, gensidig respekt og win-win-samarbejde«.

Og som Xi svarede ham, relationer, der er *»ansvarlige over for historien og fremtidige generationer«*. Og Den Nye Silkevej tilbyder dette samme, nye paradigme til Tyskland og »Europa« – der nu er så chokeret og fjendtlig over, at Trumps administration afviser de britiske diktater om »frihandel«, miljøbeskyttelse og globalisering.

Det er af afgørende betydning, at der kommer en impuls for dette fra USA. Men for at det kan ske, er det nødvendigt med en politisk revolution i USA, mere, end præsident Trump kan yde, mens han bekæmper angreb fra briterne og Obama. Inden for de næste 30 dage vil Schiller Instituttet, med LaRouche-bevægelsens »Manhattan Projekt« som drivkraft, mobilisere for at bringe USA ind i det nye paradigme.

Der afholdes afgørende konferencer, som fokuserer på Schiller Instituttets konference i New York City 13.-14. april.

Konferencen vil præsentere både en Dialog mellem Filosofier – den reelle ensartethed mellem konfucianisme og kristendom i særdeleshed – og de historiske, strategiske muligheder i perioden, der leder frem til »Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde« 14.-15. maj. New York-konferencen vil blive et vigtigt vendepunkt i denne proces.

Blandt deltagerne vil der være tre, fremtrædende, kinesiske autoriteter inden for Bælt & Vej-initiativet, eksperter inden for USA's infrastruktur og politiske personer, ledere fra LaRouche-bevægelsen og repræsentanter for diplomatiet. Den kulturelle dialog vil blive understreget af en musikalsk aften.

Manhattan-projektet vil være spydhoved for et forenet, nationalt organiseringsfremstød for at katalysere den nødvendige dynamik gennem denne konference og tilknyttede aktiviteter, for at styrke potentialet for en konsolidering af det Nye Paradigme, der udgår fra Beijing.

Samtidig må Glass/Steagall-loven genindføres i Kongressen for at bryde Wall Streets spekulationskasinos greb om den stagnerende, amerikanske, industrielle økonomi. Lovforslaget har samlet 40 sponsorer siden 1. februar; nu må et gennembrud tvinge det til afstemning i salen. De aktuelle ændringer af NASA's mission må bringes fra blot en »omprioritering« og til et nyt, forceret program for at vende tilbage til og udvikle Månen, som menneskets trædesten til Solsystemet og det fjernere rum. Præsidentens egne, \$1 billion store infrastrukturinvesteringsplaner vil forlise uden skabelse af en statslig kreditinstitution til infrastruktur og varefremstilling, en nationalbank efter Hamiltons principper.

At støtte det nationale fremstød for LaRouches »Fire Love« er vejen til en politisk revolution for at bringe USA ind i det nye paradigme. Målet er at bære præsident Trump hele vejen til en central rolle i Beijing 'Bælt & Vej'-forummet, to måneder fra i dag.

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson giver hånd til Kinas præsident Xi Jinping før deres bilaterale møde i Beijing, 19. marts, 2017.

Kinesisk initiativ ønsker at hjælpe Trumps 2026-vision for USA; Britisk efterretningstjeneste ønsker at afsætte eller dræbe ham

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 14. marts, 2017 – Hvis det voksende antal meldinger om, at Donald Trump og Xi Jinping vil mødes i Florida i næste måned, er korrekte, så ligger vejen åben for, at præsident Trump kan samarbejde med Kinas globale drivkraft for vækst og fremskridt – den såkaldte Nye Silkevej eller Bælt & Vej-initiativet – og som Barack Obama nægtede at gøre.

De mål ude i horisonten, som Trump har fastsat for Amerikas »250-års jubilæum« i 2026 – fred med nationer, inklusive vore nuværende »modstandere«; en fornyet, moderne, økonomisk infrastruktur, »vore fodspor i fjerne verdener« – ville i så fald have langt bedre udsigter til at blive nået. Disse mål er ikke på dagsordenen hos nogen af USA's to krigsførende, politiske partier.

Det britiske efterretnings- og sikkerhedsapparat har forvandlet det Demokratiske Partis chok over Trumps valgsejr til en fuldt optrappet mobilisering, der stadig kører i

højeste omdrejninger, for at fjerne ham gennem afsættelse ved en rigsretssag eller ved tilbagetræden. Nogle, på den europæiske elites højeste niveau, ville også overveje mord. Den ene britiske efterretningsagent efter den anden (hvoraf dagens briefing rapporterer om den seneste) har indført »efterretninger, der kan ødelægge Trump« i den amerikanske, politiske proces, gennem Obama og hans George Soros-fraktion af Demokrater. Mandag, den 20. marts, er endnu en nøgledato i deres mål, deres indsats for at bringe Trump til fald gennem falske skandaler, såfremt Obama-demokrater fortsat spiller rollen som klovn for denne indsats.

Det britiske oligarki kan ikke udholde tanken om en amerikansk præsident, der afviser geopolitik og finansimperium, til fordel for national udvikling og »win-win«-samarbejde mellem de store magter – USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien, Japan og andre. Dette er, hvad der står på spil i de forestående møder med Xi Jinping og, måske, med den russiske præsident Putin.

Målene med at genopbygge Amerikas infrastruktur, med at vende tilbage til Månen på permanent basis, og hinsides Månen, kan ikke opfyldes på nogen anden vis. De \$5-8 billion, der behøves til et nyt, højteknologisk, amerikansk infrastruktursystem, eksisterer ikke uden, at verdensmestrene i dette felt, Kina og Japan i særdeleshed, deltager. Bælt & Vej-initiativet, som Kina nu kalder sit globale opbygningsinitiativ, er altafgørende for dette nye paradigme; og ligeledes for udsigten til fred i Mellemøsten i samarbejde med Rusland.

Det er nyttigt, at chefen for Bælt & Vej-initiativets topmøde, Yang Jiechi, også er den mand, der tilbragte to dage med møder med Trumps team i Washington og New York i sidste måned.

Men, de afgørende handlinger, der vil få dette til at fungere, afhænger af os.

Det betyder at bryde Wall Streets magt ved at gennemtvinge en Glass/Steagall-bankreorganisering; at presse igennem en

national kreditinstitution efter Hamiltons principper, og som USA fuldstændigt mangler; og at fastholde »Amerikas genopbygning« på det absolut højeste niveau med udvikling af fusionskraft og udforskning af Solsystemet.

Lyndon LaRouche fremlagde disse »fire love til USA's redning« for flere år siden, for præcist at opnå dette mål med samarbejde, og som repræsenterer hele hans livsværk. Og han har advaret om, at den britiske kronens kræfter ikke vil tolerere at »miste« USA til dette nye paradigme; de må besejres, for at dette paradigme kan bære frugt.

Foto: Præsident Trump under et møde med sin regering, 13. marts, 2017. [facebook@DonaldTrump]

Kina træder frem som leder af global udvikling

13. mrs., 2017 – Kina er i færd med at træde frem som nuværende verdensleder inden for politiske og økonomiske initiativer, for nutidig økonomisk udvikling, og de annoncerer dette direkte til det amerikanske folk, med en helsidesannonce på side A5 i dagens *New York Times*, med titlen, »Xi Jinping: Leder af Kinas Store Genoplivelse«.

Et andet kinesisk-amerikansk initiativ, der rapporteres samtidigt, er et møde den 6.-7. april mellem præsidenterne Xi og Trump i præsident Trumps Mar-a-Lago landsted i Florida. De mange rapporter om et møde 6.-7. april mellem de to præsidenter fremkom først i *Axios News Service*, så *Sputnik International*, *Examiner* i Washington, D.C., og *South China Morning Post*.

Den 8. marts spurgte *NewsMax*-reporter Robert Gizzi, med henvisning til en rapport fra et japansk nyhedsagentur, præsident Trumps pressesekretær, Sean Spicer, under hans pressekonference, om de to præsidenter skulle mødes »i næste måned« [april], og, »Vil de have et topmøde forud for G20?« Dengang svarede Spicer, at han »ikke have nogen kommentarer om præsidentens kalender«.

Xinhua News fulgte op på dette ved at indsætte en helsides »annonce«, der forklarede om Kina, på side A5 i *New York Times* de 13. marts, med titlen, »Xi Jinping: Leder af Kinas store genoplivelse«, og som har til formål at give amerikanske læsere i USA's intellektuelle centrum, New York, den fulde historie om Xi, »der anførte mere end 1,3 mia. mennesker i marchen mod den kinesiske drøm: en afslutning af de værste former for fattigdom og en foryngelse af en nation, der allerede har skabt forbløffende fremskridt med skabelse af velstand«. Artiklen siger, at den 63-årige reformator [Xi] »har ladet sine egne tanker få indflydelse på de problemer, som vil blive konfronteret hen ad vejen, især efter et år med uventede verdensbegivenheder«. Den bemærker, at, »med folkets bekymringer som sine egne primære bekymringer, er Xis erfaring, engagement, beslutsomhed og evne til at regere og lede blevet noget af en sjældenhed på den politiske verdensscene«.

»I år vil Kinas Kommunistiske Partis 19. Nationalkongres vælge et nyt lederskab for en femårsperiode, den afgørende periode for Xis vision om en rig nation ved Kinas Kommunistiske Partis 100-års jubilæum ...

»Frem til 2020 forventes Kinas BNP at overstige 9 billion yuan (US\$ 13 billion), hvilket eksperter mener, vil nærme sig USA's BNP. Der skulle til den tid være omkring 440 mio. middelklassehusstande i Kina, et enormt marked for verden.«

Artiklen påpeger, »Kina skabte 2,65 mio. jobs for amerikanere i 2015 gennem bilateral handel og investeringer, iflg. det

Amerikansk-kinesiske Erhvervsråd, der har base i Washington, D.C. ... Den fælles drøm er ikke kun til fordel for Kina, men for hele verden«.

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping i FN's hovedkvarter i Schweiz, 18. jan., 2017.

De transatlantiske nationer konfronteres med finanssammenbrud og borgerkrig – Trump må gå ind for Glass- Steagall og tilslutning til den Nye Silkevej

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. marts, 2017 – Alt imens hysteriet med den »farvede revolutions« angreb på Donald Trump fortsætter i hele Europa og i USA, så er sandheden bag denne »nye McCarthyisme« også ved at komme frem.

Udtalelser om et muligt mord på Trump er fremkommet i flere europæiske pressemedier og i blogosfæren. Obamas justitsminister Loretta Lynch, der nægtede at fængsle bankiererne for deres forbrydelser med hvidvask af narkopenge og med at ødelægge den amerikanske økonomi, har nu offentligt opfordret til voldelige demonstrationer og bemærker, at, i

tidligere tider, »blødte folk og ja, nogle af dem døde. Dette er hårdt. Alt, hvad der er godt, er hårdt. Vi har gjort dette før. Vi kan gøre det igen.« At sammenligne det Obama/Soros-anførte kupforsøg med borgerrettighedsbevægelsen er både en løgn og en afskyelighed. Den eneste, legitime sammenligning er med det voldelige kup i Ukraine i 2014, anført af nynazister, som *EIR* har dokumenteret, blev kørt af netop de selvsamme agenter (Se *EIR*'s rapport, »Obama-Soros 'farvede revolutioner'; Nazi-kup i Ukraine, 2014; USA, 2017?«)

Det er ikke det indbildte angreb på »vore vestlige værdier«, der er drivkraften bag dette kupforsøg, men snarere det desperate Britiske Imperium og dets aktiver i USA, der er rædselsslagne over, at imperieopdelingen af verden, der er afgørende for at opretholde deres bankerotte, vestlige finanssystem gennem krige og nedskæringspolitik, trues af Trumps bestræbelser på at bringe USA ind i et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina. Et sådant samarbejde, der vil forene verden gennem et nyt paradigme, baseret på fred og udvikling, vil ikke have plads til de spekulative finansinstitutioner, hvis fremgang beror på hasardspil, narkopenge og krige. Trump gør forberedelser til at mødes med både Putin og Xi Jinping i de kommende måneder. Samarbejde omkring bekæmpelse af terrorisme og USA's tilslutning til den Nye Silkevejsproces ville betyde enden på Imperiet – måske for altid.

Men Trump har endnu ikke opfyldt sit kampagneløfte om at genindføre Glass-Steagall for at afslutte det tyranni, der begås af Wall Streets »for store til at lade gå ned«-banker, der har suget kreditten ud af hele det transatlantiske finanssystem for at nære deres derivatboble. Denne boble er nu en halv gang større end den, der eksploderede i 2008 som følge af den sindssyge genforsikring af subprime-ejendoms lån og andre værdiløse, spekulative værdipapirer. Hvis præsidenten skal lykkes med at genopbygge den amerikanske økonomi og gøre en ende på den værste narkokrise i nationens historie, må han omgående genindføre de finansielle principper, i Hamiltons

tradition, som har været drivkraften bag alle amerikanske perioder med fremskridt.

✘ Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-angreb på Wall Street er modellen – den eneste model – der kan forhindre den langt værre, finansielle nedsmeltning, der nu truer det europæiske og amerikanske banksystem. Kun ved hjælp af dette indledende, første skridt vil en genindførelse af solide og fornuftige principper for bankpraksis – som dirigerer statslig kredit til industri, landbrug, infrastruktur og en genindførelse af videnskabeligt fremskridt – atter være i stand til at gøre Amerika stort igen. Det er den effekt, som **LaRouches Fire Love** har.

Muligheden for en sådan revolutionær transformation af nationen og verden har aldrig været større end den er i dag. Kampagnen, der har til hensigt at bringe Trumps præsidentskab til fald, har ikke held til at overbevise det amerikanske folk. Efter at Trump anklagede Obama, og Obamas »oversiddere« i efterretningssamfundet, for at køre løgnekampagnen, der anklager Trump for ulovlige bånd til Rusland, måtte *New York Times* indrømme præcis dette. I en artikel fra 2. marts forklarede *NYT* Obama-administrationens anbringelse af hemmelige (og falske), udokumenterede efterretninger i officielle dokumenter, hvor de sænkede hemmelighedsgraden med det formål at maksimere disses cirkulering og forberedte efterforskninger for kriminelle handlinger, baseret på disse løgne.

Nu har Trump anklaget Obama for at aflytte hans kontorer i Trump Tower under kampagnen og tilføjet, at »dette er Nixon/Watergate« og »dette er McCarthyisme«. Han har krævet, at Kongressen udfører en tilbundsående efterforskning. Obamas chef for den nationale efterretningstjeneste, James Clapper – bedst kendt for sin løgn over for Kongressen i 2013, hvor han benægtede, at efterretningssamfundet overvågede millioner af amerikanere (afsløret som løgn af Snowden-afsløringerne) – optrådte i dag på NBC's »Mød Pressen« for at benægte, at der

fandt en sådan aflytning af Trump Tower sted (selv om han denne gang var lidt mere forsigtig og sagde, »så vidt jeg ved«). Vi får se.

Aktivistteams fra LaRouchePAC deltog i pro-Trump møder i hele landet søndag, hvor de både oplevede en høj grad af anerkendelse af LaRouches år med at afsløre Obamas forbrydelser og også en åbenhed over for bestræbelserne på at få Demokrater og Republikanere til at kræve, at Trump går frem med sit løfte om at genindføre Glass-Steagall. Men aktivisterne bemærkede, at befolkningen, ligesom Kongressen, er selvisk optaget af partiske angreb uden meget hensyn til, eller blot begreb om, afgørende politiske spørgsmål. Indgriben med LaRouches Fire Love har aldrig været mere presserende. Med det transatlantiske banksystem, der er rede til at sprænges, og de hektiske bestræbelser på at fremprovokere en borgerkrig eller et kup i USA, har vi ikke tid til mangel på klarhed.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag sagde til medarbejdere: »Dette er vores livs største kamp. Folk bør ikke opføre sig dumt.«

Foto: New Yorks Børs.

**Vi må gå frem med vores
kampagne for de Fire Love!
LaRouchePAC Internationale
Webcast,**

3. marts, 2017; Leder

Dette er en aktiv, igangværende kamp; og efter en række diskussioner med hr. og fr. LaRouche i løbet af de seneste par dage, har vi nu gen-optrappet og gen-understreget en ny kampagne for dette initiativ. Dette vil omfatte en ny appel; den forrige havde fokus på denne tale til Kongressen. Denne nye appel er lidt mere åben og skal være et nyt samlingspunkt for en national, og international, kampagne for at få USA til at vedtage dette program.

Benjamin Deniston: Vi skriver i dag den 3. marts, 2017, og dette er vores ugentlige fredags-webcast på larouchepac.com. Med mig her i studiet har jeg Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for *Executive Intelligence Review*; og via video, Bill Roberts, medlem af LaRouchePAC Policy Committee.

I dag annoncerer vi lanceringen af nogle nye initiativer, der er direkte affødt af den meget succesrige kampagne, vi har ført i januar og februar for vores appel for Glass-Steagall. Over 3.000 underskrifter, inklusive både online appeller og skrevne underskrifter, er blevet overgivet til præsident Trump og mange kongresmedlemmer. Andre organisationer, der støtter et lignende initiativ, har også indsamlet tusinder af underskrifter. Antallet af underskrevne appeller lyder måske ikke af så meget, sammenlignet med andre appeller, men dette reflekterede en meget effektiv og vigtig kampagne. Blot i år har 14 delstatskongresser introduceret resolutioner, der enten kræver, at USA's Kongres støtter Glass-Steagall alene, eller også Glass-Steagall og en eller anden variant af Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love. Vi så spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall komme i front og centrum under senatshøringen for godkendelse af den person, der blev finansminister, Mnuchin; hvor han blev konfronteret direkte med spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall. Vi har set en række mediedækninger, der har indikeret, at Wall Street har holdt vejret for at se, om dette bliver *spørgsmålet* eller ej. Så enhver med forstand indser, at dette er blevet til en

central kamp. Wall Street er rædselsslagen over dette spørgsmål; de ved, at der stadig er seriøs støtte til det. Alt imens Trump ikke støttede det i sin tale om unionens tilstand (28. feb.), så er tiden ikke til, at vi klapper hinanden på ryggen over den effekt, vi har haft, eller læner os tilbage og opgiver; tiden er for en optrapning.

Dette er en aktiv, igangværende kamp; og efter en række diskussioner med hr. og fr. LaRouche i løbet af de seneste par dage, har vi nu gen-optrappet og gen-understreget en ny kampagne for dette initiativ. Dette vil omfatte en ny appel; den forrige havde fokus på denne tale til Kongressen. Denne nye appel er lidt mere åben og skal være et nyt samlingspunkt for en national og *international* kampagne for at få USA til at vedtage dette program. Jeg vil gerne oplæse denne appel. Den vil snarest blive udlagt på hjemmesiden; og alle, der underskrev den aktuelle appel (som var stilet til Donald Trump, -red.), vil omgående modtage den. Så hvis man endnu ikke har underskrevet appellen, så sørg for at gøre det nu. Så vil man være med i vores kampagne og vil modtage opdaterede rapporter – dagligt, ugentligt eller når som helst, der er nye udviklinger i dette spørgsmål, vil man modtage opdateringer. Man vil vide, hvad der foregår, og man vil blive en del af vores orientering for handling.

Vi beder ikke om, at folk bare efterlader et navn og et nummer, og det er så det; vi beder folk om at gå med i kampen. Som man kan se her på skærmen, kan man tilmelde sig; man kan få informationerne via sms på sin telefon, ved simpelt hen at skrive bogstaverne »GSACT« til nummeret 52886. Alene denne handling vil indlede den proces, hvor man kan læse og underskrive appellen og gå med i kampagnen. Hvis man har underskrevet (den tidligere appel, -red.), vil man omgående modtage udgivelsen af vores nye appel, som jeg nu vil oplæse en kopi af, og som meget snart vil blive udgivet. Det nye udkast lyder:

»Præsident Trump og den 115. Kongres: USA har brug for win-

win-udvikling; vedtag LaRouches Fire Love og gå med i Kinas Nye Silkevej.

»Underskriverne af dette erkender, at det transatlantiske finanssystem er på randen af en ny nedsmeltning, der er værre end den fra 2007-08. Livsbetingelserne for det store flertal af amerikanere er støt og roligt brudt sammen i løbet af de seneste to årtier. USA's økonomiske politik har fokuseret på at beskytte Wall Streets spekulative boble i stedet for at beskytte det almene vel og det amerikanske folks fremtidige velfærd. Vi erkender, at der nu må træffes nødforanstaltninger for at komme en ny finanskriser i forkøbet, og for atter at sætte amerikanere i arbejde for at genopbygge vores nation og vores fremtid.

For at opnå dette, anmoder vi præsident Donald Trump og den 115. Kongres om at vedtage og implementere programmet for LaRouches Fire Love for Økonomisk Genrejsning, som en hasteforanstaltning; og at tilslutte sig Kinas program for en Ny Silkevej for globalt samarbejde og storstilede infrastrukturprojekter og økonomisk udvikling.

De Fire Love definerer et sammenhængende program for økonomisk genrejsning, der har sine rødder i det Amerikanske System for økonomi:

1. Genindfør Franklin Roosevelts oprindelige Glass/Steagall-lov; som adskiller kommercielle udlånsaktiviteter fra Wall Street spekulation.
2. Vend tilbage til et nationalt banksystem i Hamiltons tradition.
3. Direkte statslig kredit til projekter og initiativer, der skaber stigende niveauer af produktivitet og indkomster.
4. Lancér et forceret program for udvikling af fusionskraft og en hurtig udvidelse af vores rumprogram.

USA's økonomiske genrejsning vil blive meget optrappet, hvis

USA tilslutter sig den globale udvikling af infrastruktur og den økonomiske renæssance, der strømmer fra Kinas Nye Silkevejsprogram.«

Dette vil altså blive offentliggjort snarest; dette vil være det nye samlingspunkt omkring en appel, men er i virkeligheden en national mobiliseringskampagne om dette spørgsmål. Vi vil gå mere i detaljer med dette, men jeg vil også annoncere, at vi er i gang med at opdatere LaRouchePACs brochure/rapport om præcis dette spørgsmål – LaRouches Fire Love og USA's tilslutning til den Nye Silkevej. Så i løbet af de næste par dage kan I se frem til udgivelsen af denne nye rapport; den er faktisk et supplement og en støtte til indholdet af denne appel. Og som sagt, hvis man allerede er indtegnet som en del af vores kampagne for appellen, vil man også modtage en annoncering, så snart dette ligger klart.

Vi vil diskutere lidt mere i dybden det nye indhold af denne rapport; men før vi kommer til det, mener jeg, at vi må diskutere modreaktionerne og kampen imod denne politik. Som det er blevet nævnt i noget af dækningen af kampen om Glass-Steagall i de seneste måneder, så indser Wall Street, London og det internationale finansapparat, der faktisk har kørt USA og Obama-administrationen, at Trump er tilbøjelig til at gå i denne retning; og de er rædselsslagne over, at USA skal vælte de seneste 16 års politiske skakbræt og rent faktisk arbejde sammen med Rusland, Kina og andre nationer på basis af gensidig udvikling og gensidigt samarbejde. Dette ville betyde enden på Det britiske Imperium; noget, vi alle ser frem til at fejre. Men de opgiver ikke; der køres en massiv operation imod USA's præsidentskab, imod Donald Trumps administration; og dette må være et spørgsmål, som vi må yde modstand overfor, hvis vi skal have noget af dette gennemført.

(Fortsat engelsk udskrift):

PAUL GALLAGHER: Well, we're right now in the middle of a fight in which it's become very well exposed that the past President of the United States, Barack Obama, is trying to overthrow the President who has just gotten elected. This is the situation. He is not alone in this, quite obviously. We've put out a dossier recently on the collaboration between George Soros, his money, his foundations, his forces around Europe in particular, and the Ukraine revolution – which they pulled off – and the attempt to do the same thing to Trump here in the United States. This is now becoming more exposed. On the one hand, the {New York Times} has just run an article today making clear that the Obama administration took extraordinary actions in its last days in order to disseminate what had been classified information and make sure that it was widely spread throughout the government; that its classification was lowered, and that the National Security Agency's limitations on distributing its intercepts against communications of all kinds, that the barriers against its distributing this throughout other parts of the government, other parts of the intelligence community were pulled down so that – as some people called it – the "breadcrumbs" which supposed represented Trump campaign team collaboration with Russia would be everywhere.

The {Daily Mail} in London today runs a story with an unnamed source who they say is an Obama family friend, which says that they have been told that Obama personally intends to lead the drive until it's successful to get Trump removed from

office,
either by impeachment or by resignation. And that this is something to which he was persuaded by a number of people, including Valerie Jarrett; who stayed in Washington and set up with Obama in that Kalorama mansion in Washington DC for that purpose. Obviously, the one other country in the United States

and Europe where this kind of furor to attempt to undo the election has been in Britain; a furor both to try and undo the Brexit vote and to try to undo the Trump election, although in the rest of Europe as well, a lot of the elites are hysterical against the Trump Presidency and are even calling for his assassination. This has gone even to the chief editor of {Die Zeit}, one of the leading "liberal" newspapers in Europe, who

—
on national television in Germany — suggested that Trump might be assassinated. What he said has been quite typical of exactly that liberal elite.

Now, what we're dealing with here is that voters around the world, the public in nations around Europe, including Eastern Europe and the United States, to a certain extent in southern Asia, have been voting to reject the entire era of globalization

and deindustrialization of the last 30 years. They've been doing

that for good reason, because it has lowered their living standards, lowered their productivity, and has emasculated government which otherwise would have been investing in their manufacturing sectors and investing in their infrastructure; it's

prevented them from doing that. It's produced a truly dismal era

of economy in which there was a crash unlike any since 1929-1931.

Why? Because this era of industrialization produced

tremendous levels of debt, tremendous build-ups of debt relative to economic product; and the securitization of that debt in order to try to wave hands and say that that total debt build-up was not a problem, securitizing it all. When it reached the point of securitizing unpayable debt in the US real estate household mortgage sector, it blew up the entire global banking system as I said, in a way not seen since 1929-31.

DENISTON: It's something we've never actually recovered from.

GALLAGHER: Since that time, we have not recovered; we have been characterized by rates of economic growth to 1% to 1.5% throughout the Obama administration in the United States; 0% to 0.5% and in some cases negative growth for the entire period throughout Europe. The only way in which this globalization elite in the United States, Britain, and Europe has kept itself together, has been by trying to assert military dominance and the right to overthrow governments anywhere in the world, and by declaring virtual war against Russia in order to maintain a situation of extreme hostility both to Russia and to China. Why? Because in China, in Asia more generally but in China in particular, the alternative to this terrible stagnation which voters have been rejecting in all these countries; that alternative has been clearly emerging in the rates of investment, overcoming of poverty, real progress, technological and

scientific leadership coming from China, and other Asian nations to a significant extent as well. So that if we see now, all of a sudden, the Democratic Party in the United States has become, apparently, a McCarthyite policy, where...

DENISTON: The Red Scare's back.

GALLAGHER: ... Yeah, where Schumer sits up there and says, "Let me ask you, sir, have you ever, in any time in your past life, known a Russian? Have you ever been in a room where a Russian was present?" Where the Minority Leader of the Senate and Leader of the Democrats in the Congress has turned into Joe McCarthy, this is the reason. It's not his background as a McCarthyite. It's this absolute refusal to accept the rejection of this 30-year period of globalization, de-industrialization, impoverishment of populations in the United States and Europe, and throughout Eastern Europe.

Just so that people understand what's going on here. In every Eastern European government which has recently rejected, or, the voters have elected it, to reject the bankers' socialism of the European Union – in every one of those countries, the same kinds of efforts with demonstrations, protests, funded by George Soros, the same kind of effort to overthrow those governments which have just been elected, is going on in Macedonia, in Romania. Obviously it happened in Ukraine. In Bulgaria, in all of these countries. In the attempts to fix the French election, to knock out anybody in the French election who isn't in this bankers' socialism league, by prosecuting them

in
the middle of the election campaign – everywhere this is
happening at the same time.

That's what we're seeing in the United States, but I
think,
as the President said in the tweet, which I don't remember if
you
mentioned at the outset, but what he said today about this
latest
crazy Sessions business. Sessions, a senior member of the
Senate
Foreign Relations Committee, talked to the Russian Ambassador.
That's his job! And that's the Russian Ambassador's job, is to
go
talk to him! And it was his job, as senior member of the
Senate
Foreign Relations Committee, to talk to him! These are
absurdities, and, as President Trump said in responding to
this
today, "The Democrats are overplaying their hand." They are so
desperate to find a way to reverse this entire movement
throughout the United States and Europe and Eastern Europe and
places like the Philippines; and, again, put Russia under the
pressure of confrontation again, develop a complete hostility
and
encirclement of China. They're so desperate to get this back
that
they've now, as he said, overplayed their hand, descended into
absurdity.

What clearly was represented in the most recent speech
that
he made, is that, as you said, he is open to this kind of
thing.

It's ironic: the President, Trump, even before he was even
inaugurated, met with the Prime Minister of Japan. This is not
exactly an unusual thing – that an incoming President's team
would be meeting with foreign leaders. He met in New York with

the President of Japan in early January for the first time.

In these countries, there is the obvious offer of what you pointed to, there, that the United States can join a New Silk Road which for three years has been the announced foreign policy of China – the "win-win" policy of China. This economic belt across Eurasia with rail lines of all kinds being built; and the maritime belt going through the Indian Ocean, the Suez Canal, up from Southern Europe into Central Europe, again, with ports, with railroads, with power development. This all is effectively an offer to the United States and it's an offer in the area where President Trump and his team are clearly weakest. That is, how to do what they're aiming for, which is to really get economic growth and progress going in the United States for the first time in decades. They are very weak on how to do that. This New Silk Road policy, coming from Asia, in particular from the powers of Asia, offers them a simple way to break through and do that. And that's why we're seeing this hysterical apparent McCarthyism on the part of the Democrats who made themselves into effectively a party of war with Russia, and containment and potential war with China. Not exactly what their voters wanted them to be at this point either.

I think we're in a situation now where it's become against their wishes. It's become an extremely open political

situation

for us to move with this idea of the United States joining the New Silk Road, and using the actions that we call the Four Laws of LaRouche, using those actions in order to do it.

DENISTON: Bill might have more on this, but I think this discussion is critical, because part of this whole "color revolution" process in the U.S. is just this insane party-line bickering. It really is surface level. If you're out there talking to the American people, and you're out there talking to people that voted for Trump or voted for Sanders or didn't vote at all, there's a {clear}commonality in line for this program, that permeates America as a whole.

The idea of trying to get people caught up in this red vs. blue, party-line debate on these issues, is really paper-thin on the surface when you get to the actual substance. I know Bill's been doing some work in the Midwest, the area where he's centered, where you see a lot of this patriotic American tradition coming back to ferment, in line for this kind of program. Part of what we really have in this report that's going to be coming out, is a further elaboration of what the United States can do in this program. We can have all the kind of high speed rail we need, we can have the water we need, we can the power we need, we can have quality jobs for the American people. Anybody who wants a quality job can get it. We have the program, and it really is critical to organize on this level to get

support for this, to get this thing through.

So, Bill, I don't know if you want to comment on the content of the report, or some of the work you have been doing out there.

ROBERTS: I would tend to agree with Trump that the Democrats are really overplaying their hand on this question of demonizing Russia, because the Democratic Party, a lot of Democrats don't really like this idea that we're going to revive the Cold War right now. I think this demonization of Trump on this Russia question has tended to create, in Republican's minds, much more of an openness to collaboration with Russia. Some of the Republicans – they would tend to be the Heritage Foundation types, the {Wall Street Journal} reading types – are probably tending much and much more so to see that this is just a crazy McCarthyite revival going on right now.

A lot of Americans are simply going to reject {everything}. This is what we saw in the election. People are going to tend to reject everything that's been associated with the last 16 years of the Obama and Bush administrations. We're seeing this develop more clearly in terms of what Trump talked about in his address to Congress. It was a very clear repudiation of this post-9/11 Bush "clash of civilizations" policy; that we {don't} represent the world. We're not going to go abroad "searching for monsters to destroy."

I would say, one of the more interesting aspects of

Trump's address to the Congress, was this reference to Lincoln; not just the reference to the protectionist policy – which, in its own way, is part of the Hamilton credit system – but actually the reference to the 1876 Centennial Celebration. He said we have the 250-Year Anniversary of the country coming up, and as they did when the 100-Year Anniversary of the United States was being planned, we should be thinking about the future; we should be thinking about what kind of breakthroughs that {we} can create that will represent real accomplishments, and work to get above party divisions on small things. In this sense, he very much set a kind of Lincolnesque and FDR tone in this discussion.

But it's interesting that he referred to the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, because this was a real inflection point of the spread of the American System to countries that the British Empire had to later work very hard to turn against one another. Japan, Germany, Russia – under the influence of Henry Carey. China. The first half of the 20th Century was typified by wars that the British, in manipulating these great nations that had been influenced by the policies of the Lincoln American System. And then, of course, in the second half of the 20th Century, you had the Cold War. You had the British moving in after the death of Roosevelt, to divide the war on the basis of East vs. West.

I think this reference to going beyond parties, looking at the principle of this country, identifying a certain kind of Promethean quality, is good; and you're going to have

Americans

tend to become optimistic about returning to a space program. You're going to have Americans obviously agree with the necessity of building infrastructure; Glass-Steagall.

But, there's definitely a limit there at the same time.

These potentials are obviously frightening to the Establishment

and represent something that they are clearly in a last-ditch effort to try to destroy through this Obama/Soros/McCarthyist revival. However, in terms of how you actually unleash a Promethean economic environment, both culturally and in terms of

real increases of productivity, that is the principle that ties

Glass-Steagall to the issuance of credit and the way in which the

breakthroughs, the products of the human mind as a result of those policies, bring about the upward transformations in productivity. That's really uniquely something that no one besides the LaRouche movement has worked through and developed a

very clear policy program for.

I would just say that there are a number of rallies coming

up this weekend – pro-Trump rallies across the country. Keep an

eye out for notifications that we will be getting out to people

who have signed the Glass-Steagall petition. We will be organizing a whole series of activities across the country in support of activities to bring the Four Laws to this American constituency, to this highly-energized American constituency that

is looking for solutions. I would urge people to find these rallies and get on the megaphone, get on the microphone at

these events. Call up your city council, call up your state representatives. This is a sort of unique situation in which there is a kind of proper repudiation of the failed policies of Obama and Bush – the geopolitics and so forth – but without a real conception of how to replace a monetarist thinking in economics with the kind of Promethean concept which Mr. LaRouche has spent his life developing, this will certainly not come into fruition. You will not see, it will not be possible for the United States to find its place in terms of the unique role that we have to play now in joining the New Silk Road in the future of mankind. So, I would just urge people to be extremely active in the next couple of days in finding ways to inject this unique conception of LaRouche's Four Laws into the discussion process; and I guarantee people will be in the state of mind of wanting to work through and master these ideas, because it's really a life-and-death question.

GALLAGHER: Bill, I know that you did some organizing directly with meetings that were taking place in the course of this contest for who would be the new chairman of the Democratic Party. Some of them took place out there in your area. That's another matter in which it has become exposed just in recent days that the person who initially seemed to be supported by most of the party – Rep. Ellison of Minnesota – had put up against him

by the direct solicitation of Obama and Biden, Obama's former labor secretary; and Obama, Biden, and others then did a lot of telephone calling in order to make sure that this former labor secretary, Perez, would beat Ellison and take over the chair of the Democratic National Committee. This was another instance of what's been going on. But I know that you saw that this was something which was definitely non-partisan and definitely wide open when petitioning at those meetings to decide the leadership of the Democratic Party. We found at the same time that at all sorts of meetings, from the collaboration we had with people who had supported Bernie Sanders in Ohio, all the way to the CPAC convention – the conservative side of the Republican Party – that people were signing these petitions specifically to get the Glass-Steagall introduced again. I think the total that we had gathered, together with that parallel effort by people in Ohio, it was certainly in the range of no more than 6-7000 signatures overall; and yet, they were used by the key Congressmen and -women who introduced Glass-Steagall back on February 1st, just about a month ago. Marcy Kaptur, Tim Ryan, Tulsi Gabbard, and Walter Jones; they had those petitions when they had their press conference introducing HR709, which is the current House Glass-Steagall bill. It has now gotten 30-some co-sponsors.

Also, while that petition campaign was going on – again it

may seem modest – but while it was going on, we were also contacting state legislators and state senators, particularly in the so-called Rust Belt, the formerly industrial part of the country. The result of that, just in the month of January, is that I think Ben, it's actually 15 if you count states in which both houses introduced this; that resolutions in support of what we're calling an American Recovery Program, which was essentially the outline of the Four Laws. Glass-Steagall; Hamiltonian national bank; credit for high-technology infrastructure; and space and fusion development. Those resolutions went into nine states – and I'll just mention, in three states, they went into both houses during January; that was Rhode Island, Minnesota, and Washington state. In six other states, they went into either the House or the Senate. I'm sorry, Illinois is the fourth state in which they were in both houses; it has already been passed in the Illinois House, and introduced into the Illinois Senate. Then there were other states in which it went into just one house: the Alabama House, the Iowa Senate, the South Carolina House, the Mississippi House, the New Mexico Senate. In addition to that, there were three other states where resolutions simply naming Glass-Steagall and calling on Congress to pass the Glass-Steagall Act were introduced: Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland – where there was a hearing this afternoon actually for which I prepared

testimony on that resolution, HJ4 in Maryland, calling on its Congressional delegation to pass Glass-Steagall.

So, this development which has occurred during January and February while we've been on this petition and organizing drive on a bipartisan basis, is also wide open or open-ended; because anyone who has been a part of that, even just to sign the petition, even online, anyone who has been a part of that from any of those states or any other states which have come close – particularly Ohio, New York state – these states are still in session. Anyone can make it their project with their state legislator, to make sure that he or she co-sponsors this resolution and contacts whatever Congressmen he usually deals with. And these state legislators do, so that we can really make these legislatures in these Rust Belt states in particular, make them boil with this campaign for the Four Laws, for the actions that have to taken to be able to join the New Silk Road development. If we're doing that at that level, at the same time, it's going to have a big impact on the Congress. So, I just wanted to point that out.

DENISTON: I think that's exactly the kind of initiative that's going to continue and grow with this new petition, this new campaign escalation. And I think people should have no other priorities at this point; we have this issue which is the economic life or death of the United States, and we have – as Paul, you mentioned – more material coming out on this whole colored revolution policy. I was glad you went through some of

the details; this is, I think, at least for generations, an unprecedented level of attack on a US Presidential administration from within. It reminded me of some of the treasonous actions that were done right before Lincoln came in, to try and set up the South and their split for the Civil War before he came in as President; just this outright treasonous sabotage of an incoming administration; but the way we're going to cut through it is this kind of mobilization. Again, I would point people to also the upcoming release of our new report, which will have a more in-depth presentation of the principle of this recovery program. And going also back to what Bill was saying, this is really the way we're going to capture the spirit, the soul of the American people again, by this returned commitment to the future development, the future growth of our nation. And getting people rallied around the fact and out of this pessimism and cynicism that just settled in over so long with Bush and Obama emphatically; but going back even further, we've had this terrible zero-growth economic policy that's affected people much more deeply than they realized. So getting a real, true realization that we can again return to this level of growth; just the basic idea that every generation is going to be a revolutionary advance in the living standards, in the opportunities, in the growth of the science, the capabilities of mankind. If people really get a sense that that's possible, that that's what's represented by China's leadership in this New Silk

Road program, this returned orientation to space; I think that will give people the level of fight they need to get this thing through. The kind of things Paul was just presenting in terms of the top-down, Federal level, local level, also municipalities, labor organizations; all of these groups should be organized and we should just throw this party crap out the window. It's an issue of what is your commitment to the principles and the policies the nation needs at this point. If we can continue to rally people around that, then we'll have a basis to actually get this thing through and give Trump the support he needs to go with these initiatives that he's talked about.

So Bill, I don't know if you have anything you want to add from some of your work there.

ROBERTS: I would just point out that state representatives and these local and state elected officials, these are the people that the Congress goes to. Because the Congress is inside the Beltway; they're the most affected by the insanity of these last two Presidents. But the local elected officials, the state representatives, these are the guys living through the drug epidemic, the violence, the mass unemployment, the 94 million Americans who are outside the workforce that Trump referred to in his speech this past week. Those are the constituents; those are the people that these local representatives live with. So, I think these are the types of people to get to. Radio

stations;

this is the way we can effectively now very quickly make LaRouche's Four Laws as much of a household word as Glass-Steagall is.

GALLAGHER: Well, we also have other fronts that are going to be dealt with specifically in the pamphlet. One is the issue of – which again, Trump brought up in the address to Congress – of large-scale infrastructure development. If you look at the ground level of it, it appears that there's no direction there; there was a meeting of the various members of the Cabinet yesterday – and other staff. But it was run by a Goldman-Sachs guy, Gary Cohen. But there was effectively an administration meeting on infrastructure legislation; starting to move to introduce legislation for this idea of a trillion-dollar infrastructure bank. At the same time, you have on the Democratic side, already legislation which has been submitted. But there is a complete barricade there in terms of knowing how to finance it, knowing what the really transformative infrastructure developments like a national – not East and West Coast – but a national, 25-30,000-mile network of high-speed rail and maglev rail. This is nothing futuristic; this is simply China. This is exactly what they're building. They're building local subway lines now, local metro lines with maglev technology in China, and putting them into operation. So, if you're going from the Bronx to lower Manhattan, on your 25 or 30 stops, you'd be going in between those stops in a completely smooth and frictionless drive at up to 60mph in between each stop. Having already done this on the level of intercity, and

having already gone far to linking every city in the country – and China has a very large number of significant cities – linking every single one of them with true high-speed rail; now

they're down to the level of the subways and maglev metro systems. But this is the kind of thing that produces tremendous

increases not only in productive employment, but productivity.

This idea has to be put into the discussions of infrastructure in the United States, and so do Japanese and Chinese methods and investments have to be put into this idea of

rebuilding the infrastructure of the United States. They don't

have that idea now. What's getting underway seems hopelessly limited by the lack of any real idea of how to do it. On the other hand, you have the President talking about the 2026 250th

anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence as

a horizon point to which people should look; and think about how

the economy, the infrastructure, as he said, are "footsteps on distant worlds is not too much to hope" in that 9-year period of

time. Giving people a horizon to look at what actually {could}

be transformed during the period of the next decade. That's the

kind of thing that puts Americans into the right state of mind in

thinking about being more open politically, being more open in terms of what they think is possible. In that sense, he definitely did contribute to defining the right solutions which

he and his team clearly don't have at this point, in order to make this kind of trillion or multi-trillion dollar

infrastructure bank investment work. The same is true with space; where there is clearly discussion in the administration – and in NASA as a result – of trying more quickly to put astronauts in orbit around the Moon, preparatory to beginning the re-colonization and industrialization and development of the Moon. Something which had been completely wiped aside during the Obama administration, which clearly wrote this off and said, we don't need this. We don't need fancy energy sources like fusion energy, he said to one backyard group of Democrats in Virginia.

DENISTON: He said you just need to insulate your windows.

GALLAGHER: Yeah, better insulated windows is our future by the 250th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

So, this is a different view, but one in which we have to drive to a certain extent from the bottom up, as we've been doing; as well as discussions with people in Congress and in the administration in order to crystallize the right idea. Also, so that they see that Glass-Steagall, if it isn't passed now, the next major bank failure – and there are plenty of them waiting to happen in Europe in particular at any moment – the next major bank failure is going to take the system down again like Lehman did and AIG did, ten years ago. If it isn't implemented right now, the banks are going to continue not to lend to small- and

medium-sized enterprises which tend to have the new technologies coming on line; and only to lend to the big bond issuers and the largest corporations.

One thing that I pointed out in the testimony today in Maryland, is that JP Morgan/Chase and Citigroup each only lends out loans and leases equal to about 65% to 66% of their deposits.

Whereas in the banking system as a whole, it's 80%. That means

that if you take all the community banks and regional banks around the country – 6000 of them – their lending is equivalent

to 90-plus% of their deposits. And yet, this little group of six

or ten banks who control two-thirds of all the deposits, their lending is very low; and that's going to continue to be the case.

If a real infrastructure development bank gets going, then this

lack of lending to the contractors for all those projects by the

private banks is going to be a real problem. So, you're going to

have that problem if you don't implement Glass-Steagall now, and

separate out the commercial banks. And in addition, of course,

we've had now these big banks have – according a report a couple

of days ago – now accrued \$321 billion worth of fines since the

crash, for illegal, immoral, and otherwise non-banking despicable

activity; which is the way they've used these deposits.

DENISTON: And that's without an actual Pecora Commission or any serious investigation.

GALLAGHER: Without ever a prosecution of a senior banker; \$321 billion worth of fines for violating banking practice and violating the law.

DENISTON: They give them the fines, but they let them keep doing it; so it makes you wonder if it's a fine or just a cut the government's taking on the scam or something. That's good; I think that really ties to the necessity of the Four Laws as a whole. To have a functioning banking system doesn't mean anything without what you were raising about the issue of productivity and investment. It really is a question of what are you doing to facilitate the investment of creating a higher level of net productivity for the economy as a whole? A higher level of scientific, technological state for mankind as a whole? Which is something that mankind can uniquely do; that's our character, to create those kinds of revolutionary advances. That's the secret of economics, as Mr. LaRouche has kind of uniquely developed and discovered in a higher way than I think anyone before him.

Anyway, just take that as another teaser for the content of this upcoming report; because that will be material presented in there.

Just to conclude, I would just re-emphasize that

anybody who
has not signed on to the petition yet – even the old petition
–
please do so; because you'll then be ready to be updated as
soon
as the new petition is released, as soon as this report is
released, and any other relevant breaking developments on our
campaign which I think we've discussed rather thoroughly as a
good launch point. We are in the footing for a rapid
escalation;
and that's what's needed right now. So, I think this served
as a
good launch point for some more material we'll have in the
coming
days and weeks.

We thank you for joining us today, and we'll be back
on
larouchepac.com with more.

GALLAGHER: Can I just remind people, before you sign
off,
everybody watching this, that this online petition is still to
be
signed. What we're going to do, we will try then to involve
everybody who's signing it, in what we're going to do
immediately
in the next week to ten days. There are going to be – as Bill
mentioned – pro-Trump rallies tomorrow in quite a number of
places; we're going to be at all the ones we can reach. In
fact,
we're speaking at one of them up in the New York City area.
Then
our own rallies and lobbying both in Washington and in New
York
on Thursday, and in other parts of the country next Thursday.
We're going to have rallies before that in New York, and what
we

call a Day of Action, when we'll be going after all kinds of elected officials at the local, state, and national levels next

Thursday. Everybody who's been involved in this petition campaign up to now – even if it's only been just to sign – the targets are there; that's what we indicated. We can move, and {must} move, elected officials up to and including those in the

Trump administration in order to break this logjam. I just wanted to throw that in.

DENISTON: Thank you. We have a clear path of action ahead of us. I encourage everyone to get directly on board with that.

If you want to take more action, email us on the website, get directly in contact, and volunteer yourself for further action.

We have an action center on the LaRouche PAC website. If you go to the front page, you'll see it at the very top there on the top menu banner. So get active; get in contact with us there and let's make this happen. Let's not sit on our laurels and wait here.

Thank you for joining us here today. Stay tuned for more from larouchepac.com.

LaRouchePAC's APPEL: USA har brug for »win-win«- udvikling; gennemfør LaRouches Fire Love og gå med i Kinas Nye Silkevej

»Til præsident Trump og medlemmerne af Kongressen:

Underskriverne af denne Appel erkender, at det transatlantiske finanssystem er på randen af en ny nedsmeltning, der er værre end den fra 2007-08. Livsbetingelserne for det store flertal af amerikanere er støt og roligt brudt sammen i løbet af de seneste to årtier. USA's økonomiske politik har fokuseret på at beskytte Wall Streets spekulative boble i stedet for at beskytte **det almene vel og det amerikanske folks fremtidige eftertid**. Vi erkender, at der nu må træffes nødforanstaltninger for at komme en ny finanskrise i forkøbet, og for atter at sætte amerikanere i arbejde for at genopbygge vores nation og vores fremtid.

For at opnå dette, anmoder vi præsident Donald Trump og den 115. Kongres om at vedtage og implementere programmet for LaRouches Fire Love for Økonomisk Genrejsning, som en hasteforanstaltning; og at tilslutte sig Kinas program for en Ny Silkevej for globalt samarbejde og storstilede infrastrukturprojekter og økonomisk udvikling.

De Fire Love definerer et sammenhængende program for økonomisk genrejsning, der har sine rødder i det Amerikanske System for økonomi:

1. Genindfør Franklin Roosevelts oprindelige

Glass/Steagall-lov, som adskiller kommercielle udlånsaktiviteter fra Wall Street spekulation.

2. Vend tilbage til et nationalt banksystem i Hamiltons tradition.
3. Direkte statslig kredit til projekter og initiativer, der skaber stigende niveauer af produktivitet og indkomster.
4. Lancér et forceret program for udvikling af fusionskraft og en hurtig udvidelse af vores rumprogram.

USA's økonomiske genrejsning vil blive meget fremskyndet, hvis USA tilslutter sig den globale udvikling af infrastruktur og den økonomiske renæssance, der strømmer fra Kinas Nye Silkevejsprogram.«

Narcissistiske »Demokraters« virkelighedstab antager kliniske former. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Og hvor var disse medier og deres ensrettede politikere, da regeringerne Bush og Obama, bakket op af hele det »vestlige værdifællesskab«, i årevis bombarderede staterne i Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien og bevæbnede terroristgrupper, og som har kostet over én million mennesker livet og bragt usigelige lidelser over mange millioner familier, og uden hvilken fremfærd den nuværende form for flygtningekrise overhovedet ikke ville have eksisteret?

25. februar, 2017 – Det kollektive hysteri, som har grebet det neoliberale, transatlantiske establishment med hensyn til de

dybtgående, strategiske forandringer, som bl.a. manifesterer sig i Trumps præsidentskab og den Nye Silkevejsdynamik, fremviser en ny form for et massepsykologisk fænomen. I en symbiotisk sammensmeltning af gruppetankegang og gruppenarcissisme, fortæber fortællerne for det åh, så demokratiske »vestlige værdifællesskab« sig i verbale udfald af laveste karakter mod anderledetænkende, uden at det i mindste måde falder dem ind, hvor diktatorisk, de opfører sig.

Den utvivlsomt mest dramatiske demonstration af dette kliniske virkelighedstab er den patologiske ophidselse, med hvilken enhver udtalelse fra præsident Trump bliver kommenteret. Et af de seneste eksempler er Trumps tale for Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) i National Harbor i delstaten Maryland. Han påpegede det åbenlyse, nemlig, at USA i løbet af de seneste 15 år har givet seks billioner dollar eller mere ud til krige i Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien, hvilket har resulteret i, at dette område i dag befinder sig i en dramatisk værre tilstand. Hvis de hidtidige præsidenter i stedet for havde tilbragt denne periode ved stranden, ville alle i dag have været væsentligt bedre stedt, og med pengene kunne man have genopbygget sit eget land tre gange. Men medierne fandt altså ikke, at disse betragtninger var værdige til kommentarer og hyperventilerede i stedet for over, at nogle af dem, der tidligere var gået frem med særligt ondskabsfulde nyhedsrapporteringer imod Trump, ikke var blevet inviteret til at deltage i Det Hvide Hus' medie-pool.

Og hvor var disse medier og deres ensrettede politikere, da regeringerne Bush og Obama, bakket op af hele det »vestlige værdifællesskab«, i årevis bombarderede staterne i Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien og bevæbnede terroristgrupper, og som har kostet over én million mennesker livet og bragt usigelige lidelser over mange millioner familier, og uden hvilken fremfærd den nuværende form for flygtningekrise overhovedet ikke ville have eksisteret?

I stedet for blot at modsætte sig Trumps krav om, at Europa må

bruge flere penge til den militære oprustning, af den simple grund, at der ikke eksisterer noget trusselsscenario, fordi Warszawapagten ikke længere findes, og fordi, Rusland ikke har nogen erobningsplaner – hverken over for de baltiske stater eller over for Polen eller nogen som helst andre – alt imens NATO og EU derimod har udvidet sig til Ruslands grænser, så reagerer disse medier ikke mindre hysterisk med krav om Tysklands og EU's atomoprustning. »Har EU brug for bomben?«, skrev for nylig medarbejdere på den åh, så liberale avis *Die Zeit*, Peter Dausend og Michael Thumann, og afslørede således, hvor de egentlige krigsmagere sidder – nemlig i dettes blads redaktionslokaler.

Det neoliberale, neokonservative establishment er ganske enkelt ude af stand til at analysere og på afgørende vis rette sit mislykkede paradigme.

Endnu et eksempel på denne holdnings absurditet er EU's seneste fremfærd over for højhastighedsjernbanen, finansieret af Kina, mellem Beograd og Budapest. Denne 350 km lange strækning, som første gang blev foreslået i 2013 af præsident Xi Jinping, og som vil forkorte rejsetiden mellem disse to hovedstæder fra otte til tre timer, er selvsagt en stor fordel for de berørte lande, Serbien og Ungarn, men også for hele Balkan. Men nu har EU indledt en undersøgelse af, om projektet er finansielt bæredygtigt (!), og om det overholder EU's retningslinjer. Og så er Serbien ikke engang medlem af EU!

Befolkningerne i alle Balkanstaterne er sig smerteligt bevidst, at EU ikke har virkeliggjort én eneste af de transportkorridorer, som oprindeligt blev besluttet på EU's transportministerkonference i 1994 på Kreta, men som derefter alle faldt som ofre for EU-kommissionens og ECB's 'nøjsomhedspolitik', nedskæringer. Det bør således ikke undre nogen, at de central- og østeuropæiske stater, såvel som Balkanlandene, ser deres fremtid i forlængelsen af den Nye Silkevej, Kinas »Bælt & Vej-initiativ«, som tilbyder dem et perspektiv for at deltage i det mest dynamiske og største

infrastrukturprojekt, verden nogen sinde har set. Men, i stedet for at acceptere Kinas mange tilbud om samarbejde og virkeliggøre de enorme, økonomiske muligheder, der ligger i alle de eurasiske staters samarbejde, i et win-win-samarbejde, så forsøger det neoliberale EU-bureaukrati ud fra en svaghedsposition at udøve en magt, som det for længst, i betragtning af EU's sørgelige tilstand, har mistet.

Herom skriver *Global Times*: »EU gennemgår tydeligvis svære tider og forsøger tydeligvis at bevise sin autoritet, idet den forordner undersøgelser og omvurderinger, men EU befinder sig i en blindgyde. Det er uklart, hvilke interesser, EU-undersøgelsen skal tjene.«

Kina må forsøge at overbevise EU om fordelene ved samarbejde.

Knap så forestillingsforladt er det Londonbaserede, næststørste rådgivningsfirma i verden, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), som operer i 152 stater med 756 kontorer og 223.000 ansatte. De har netop udgivet en omfattende undersøgelse med titlen, *PwC B&R Watch: China and Belt and Road Infrastructure; 2016 Review and Outlook*, hvor det ved hjælp af mange grafiske fremstillinger og illustrationer fremstilles, hvilket enormt potentiale Kinas Silkevejsinitiativ har. Dette initiativ vedrører allerede tre kontinenter og 66 stater og strækker sig fra Litauen til Indonesien, som alle nyder godt af en eksplosiv vækst, og bringer enorme fordele for transport, udvinding af energi, kommunikation, sundhedssektor og endnu flere områder.

EU's besynderlige holdning er for længst blevet genstand for diskussion i Asien. Allerede for et år siden spurgte S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies i en artikel, om EU allerede var kommet for sent til det Nye Silkevejstog? De europæiske medier fokuserede udelukkende på kinesiske opkøb og forsømte fuldstændigt at belyse det enorme potentiale, der for alle parter resulterer af et samarbejde med Kina. Følgelig er Europas borgere ekstremt dårligt informeret.

Selv om karnevalsrådet »Mainz når byen synger og ler« på ingen måde er så vigtigt, som det måske kan synes for dette eller hint opblæste hoved, så er dette års version imidlertid på eksemplarisk vis velegnet til iagttagelse af den ondsindede karakter af etablissementets gruppenarcissisme, der i det mindste selektivt var samlet i publikum. Nogle af indlæggene, som f.eks. indlæggende fra Hanz-Peter Betz og Lars Reichow, havde så godt som intet mere med humor at gøre og var kun giftige fornærmelser på allerlaveste plan af Trump, som publikum – hvis man skal tro kameraføringen – reagerede samstemmende på.

Disse indlæg afslører ikke blot en dårlig smag, men reflekterer også en aggression, der gør det tydeligt, hvor skrøbelig den politiske situation er, og hvor tynd det »vestlige værdifællesskabs« facade allerede er blevet. Bag denne facade findes netop dette krav om at være enegældende, som er forbundet med den unipolære verdensorden, og som ikke var krigene i Mellemøsten og Sydvestasien, bygget på løgne, én eneste demonstration værdigt. Netop af denne grund råber de neoliberale, neokonservative efter den »pæne« Obama. Og det er ikke så meget Trump, der har vanskeligt ved at finde Tyskland på verdenskortet, som en af disse såkaldte komikere mente, som det er dem selv, når det drejer sig om at vide, hvor Yemen findes på kortet.

I de kommende måneder vil verden fortsat forandre sig lige så dramatisk, som vi har set det i det forgangne år. Hvis vi er heldige, vil det komme sådan, som det allerede var sidste gang, da et system gik til ende: Der vil være mange vendekåber, og nogle vil forblive betonhoveder. Forskellen er den, at der denne gang er et stort antal stater, der allerede er i færd med at etablere en helt ny form for samarbejde mellem staterne. De europæiske nationer har valget mellem enten at samarbejde om menneskehedens fremtidige skæbnefællesskab, eller også snart at komme til at høre til »de ynkværdige«.

Foto: Oprustning af den Europæiske Union og NATO? »Har EU brug for bomben?«, skrev for nylig den åh, så liberale, tyske avis Die Zeit. I modsætning hertil rapporterer PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), hvilket enormt potentiale, Kinas Silkevejsinitiativ har.

Trumps tale til Kongressen: Vil Obamas kupforsøg imod ham blive overvundet?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. februar, 2017 – De intense angreb mod præsident Donald Trump fra liberale, »globalistiske« medier og partiledere i Europa og USA bliver nu afsløret som et kupforsøg imod ethvert samarbejde, eller blot relationer, mellem USA og Rusland. Som formand for Efterretningskomiteen i Repræsentanternes Hus, Devin Nunes, vurderede det i går: »Dette er en ny McCarthyisme«. Forhåbentlig er det afslørede kup ved at miste terræn.

Men der er nu afgørende spørgsmål om præsidentens tale til en samlet Kongres i aften.

Hvordan vil præsidenten tackle disse krav, i McCarthy-traditionen, om en politik for konfrontation, og endda krig, med Rusland og Kina?

Vil præsident Trump, som han har indikeret, fremlægge planer for storstilede investeringer i den amerikanske økonomi, i moderne infrastruktur? Dette er ikke alene det mest udbredt støttede løfte i Trumps præsidentskab. Det er også de midler, ved hvilke reel produktivitet og produktiv beskæftigelse atter kan indføres i en økonomi, som uden dette står over for endnu

et umiddelbart finanssammenbrud. Store europæiske banker rapporterer om enorme tab. Alene spredningen af antydningen i finansmedierne om, at Trumps meget omdiskuterede infrastrukturplaner er sat »i venteposition«, har ført til advarsler fra sådanne personer som tidligere embedsmand i Reaganregeringen, David Stockmann, samt fra andre »markedsanalytikere«, om, at en generel 'udblæsning' af gæld vil finde sted i dette forår.

Det afgørende spørgsmål er en *kreditinstitution i Hamiltons tradition*, for at disse investeringer kan virkeliggøres på det mest produktive, teknologiske niveau. Planer om skattelettelser »for infrastruktur« vil intet frembringe.

Vil præsidenten tale om rumprogrammet og sit antydede ønske om en snarlig tilbagevenden til bemanded udforskning og udvikling af Månen? Den 24. februar kom NASA med visse indikationer på basis af et krav fra regeringen om en indledende undersøgelse. De peger på et stadig højere niveau af fremskridt inden for produktivitet. Månen er ikke blot det næste prøveområde for nye teknologier og nye energiresurser; den udgør også menneskehedens afgørende første skridt til Solsystemet, og hinsides dette.

Dette var det førende diskussionsemne ved mandagens møde i LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee.

Vil præsident Trump foreslå Glass/Steagall-loven for Kongressen, som han gjorde i oktober under sin kampagne; og som begge de politiske partiers platforme ved præsidentvalget krævede? Den tværpolitiske støtte til loven er vokset betragteligt i den amerikanske befolkning, under truslen om et endnu mere ødelæggende finanssammenbrud.

Uden at opdele Wall Streets og Londons storbanker og nedlukke deres spekulationskasinoer – før de endnu engang nedsmelter – vil hverken investeringer i produktivitet og videnskabeligt fremskridt, eller udlån til produktiv beskæftigelse, finde

sted.

Og igen, de »Fire Nye Love til at redde nationen«, som Lyndon LaRouche for to et halvt år siden skiteserede som afgørende- og for hvilke tusindvis af appeller er blevet overbragt til Det Hvide Hus i ugen op til præsidentens tale i aften. Som LaRouche allerede dengang, i juni 2014, sagde, så er de handlinger, der gives udtryk i disse »Fire Love«, ikke »en mulighed«, men en uopsættelig nødvendighed.

POLITISK ORIENTERING 23. februar 2017: Kuppet i Ukraine i 2014: Stop George Soros' kupforsøg i USA i 2017

Lyd:

Video 2. del

**RADIO SCHILLER den 20.
februar 2017:**

**Forsøg på farvet revolution
og regimeskifte imod USA og
Donald Trump**

**fra det gamle imperium og de
vestlige**

efterretningstjenester//

**Fantastisk koncert for
musikalsk dialog mellem
kulturerne afholdt i
København.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg