

Glass-Steagall skal ligge klar til underskrift på Trumps skrivebord, når han overtager embedet!

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 30. december, 2016

Vi befinder os i nedtællingen til afslutningen af Obama-administrationen og begyndelsen af den tiltrædende Trump-administration. Om præcis tre uger finder indsættelsesceremonien for den tiltrædende administration sted. Der er stadig meget, der er uafklaret og usikkert; men verdenssituationen ændrer sig meget hurtigt. Som hr. LaRouche advarede om for mindre end 48 timer siden, så må vi stadig holde øje med Obama; så længe, han beklæder embedet, kan han lave en forfærdelig masse ulykker. Blot i dag forsøgte han, fra sin ferie på Hawaii, at optrappe og fremprovokere en konflikt med Rusland. Han meddelte, at 35 russere vil blive erklæret persona non grata og ville blive udvist af USA under anklage om angivelig spionage; og at der ikke alene ville blive pålagt Rusland flere sanktioner som gengældelse for den såkaldte »russiske hacking«, men at to russiske ejendomsområder, der angiveligt bliver brugt til spionage – et område på Marylands østkyst og et på Long Island, steder, hvor russiske diplomater til USA og Washington D.C. kan bringe deres familier til en hårdt tiltrængt ferie og afslapning – han meddelte, at føderale styrker ville rykke ind og lukke disse områder ned. Jeg er sikker på, at Obama regnede med, at dette ville provokere hans ærke-Nemesis Vladimir Putin til at gøre gengældelse, men Obama blev sørgeligt skuffet. Til trods

for, at Sergei Lavrov, Ruslands udenrigsminister, sagde, at de var i deres gode ret til at gøre gengæld, øje for øje, og udvise 35 såkaldte amerikanske diplomater af Rusland som persona non grata og lukke amerikanske feriesteder i Moskva og omegn ned; men i stedet foretog Putin, på klassisk Putin-vis, et judo-træk og gjorde ingenting. Et træk fra Putin side, som generelt erkendes som at udmanøvrere Obama – f.eks. i overskriften i Daily Beast, »Putin udmanøvrerer Obama i spionkrig; Moskva griner ad Obama-administrationens sanktioner og udvisninger som de sidste handlinger af svaghed«. Putin afslørede Obama for det, han er, en 'lam and'; og han nægtede at respondere. I en erklæring offentliggjort på Kremls webside i dag sagde Putin følgende: »Alt imens vi forbeholder os ret til at tage forholdsregler til gengældelse, så vil vi ikke degradere os selv til et niveau af 'køkkendiplomati'. I vore fremtidige skridt på vej imod en genoprettelse af de russisk-amerikanske relationer, vil vi gå frem fra den politik, som Donald Trumps administration forfølger.«

Så dette er en perfekt afslutning og diplomatisk sejr for Putin; og det er på linje med et tweet, der blev udsendt af det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, og som var et billede af en gul and med ordet »lam« skrevet over billedet. Obama og hans hold, selv om de kan skabe en masse ulykker i de resterende tre uger, anses ikke for at være særlig magtfulde mere, af Putin og andre i verden.

Samtidig kan russerne hævde en sand diplomatisk sejr i Syrien. Oven i befrielsen af Aleppo og genoprettelsen af regeringskontrol over en stor del af landet imod ISIS og andre oprørsstyrker, så forhandlede russerne en våbenhvile igennem sammen med Tyrkiet; men uden USA. Foreløbig holder denne våbenhvile. Dette er en meget håbefuldst situation og demonstrerer endnu engang, at Obama definitivt har mistet lederskabsrollen i verden, og Rusland er en formidabel strategisk leder på verdensscenen, mens denne administration træder tilbage og den nye administration går om bord.

Samtidig har vi en nedsmeltning af det finansielle system; Monte dei Paschi banksituationen kører fortsat videre. Vi har en eksponering til derivater fra hver eneste bank på hele planeten. Enhver af disse – Deutsche Bank, Monte dei Paschi – hvad som helst kunne udløse en nedsmeltning af hele finanssystemet. Hr. LaRouches Fire Love er fortsat de afgørende og særdeles presserende forholdsregler, der må tages i USA. Som jeg sagde, så er intet afgjort, men der er meget, der er muligt. Som I har set i vore diverse udsendelser de seneste dage – Fireside Chat i går, en LPAC e-mail, der blev udsendt i dag, hovedoverskrifter på larouchepac.com hjemmesiden – så er vi engageret i en absolut presserende og afgørende mobilisering for at tvinge Glass-Steagall på dagsordenen, endnu før den tiltrædende administration indsættes. Dette må være det absolutte top-lovforslag, der lægges på den nye præsidents skrivebord til underskrift. Kongressen kan handle på det, når de træder sammen i næste uge; i modsætning til [senator] McCains meddelelse om, at han vil have høringer om russisk hacking, eller sådan noget. Dette er den afgørende forholdsregel; og vi vil have aktivister, der kommer til Washington, D.C. Vi har allerede afleveret marchordrerne; og vi vil diskutere dette yderligere i aftenens udsendelse.

Men dette er fortsat blot det første skridt i Lyndon LaRouches Fire Hastelove til at redde USA, nu. Det bedste eksempel, vi stadig har, den bedste præcedens, er Franklin Roosevelts første 100 dage; hvad FDR var i stand til at opnå i sine første 100 dage i embedet. Kongressen trådte sammen; han vedtog omgående Bankloven af 1933, erklærede banklukkedag, reorganiserede hele det bankerotte finanssystem og satte Amerika i arbejde igen. Kongressen holdt ikke pause før nøjagtig 100 dage senere; og 100 milepæle i lovgivning blev debatteret, vedtaget og sendt over til Det Hvide Hus til Franklin Roosevelts underskrift, hvilket ændrede historien. Dette er fortsat præcedensen; det er fortsat modellen, og indholdet af disse første 100 dage bør være Lyndon LaRouches

Fire Love til USA's redning.

Jeg giver nu ordet til Jason [Ross], for der er nogle specifikke måder, hvorpå vi kan gå i gang med disse presserende forholdsregler.

**WE NEED GLASS STEAGALL SITTING ON TRUMPS DESK
AWAITING HIS SIGNATURE WHEN HE TAKES OFFICE!**

LaRouche PAC International Webcast, Dec. 30, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon! It's December 30, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're watching our final Friday evening broadcast for 2016 for this year on larouchepac.com.

I'm

joined in the studio today by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and via video by two members of our Policy Committee – Bill Roberts from Detroit, Michigan (Hi, Bill); and

Michael Steger from San Francisco, California.

Now, obviously we are in a countdown to the end of the Obama administration and the beginning of the incoming Trump administration. Exactly three weeks from today is the inauguration of the incoming administration. There are still many things that are undetermined and up in the air; but the world situation is moving very fast. As Mr. LaRouche warned less

than 48 hours ago, you still have to keep your eye on Obama; as

long as he remains in office, he can cause an awful of mischief.

And we saw that just yesterday, in an announcement that came from

Obama while he was vacationing in Hawaii; he attempted to escalate and provoke a conflict with Russia. He announced that

35 Russian nationals would be declared {persona non grata} and would be expelled from the United States under supposed spying charges; and he announced that not only would there be more sanctions imposed against Russia in retaliation for the so-called

"Russian hacking", but also two Russian estates that are supposedly being used for espionage purposes – one on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and one on Long Island, places where Russian diplomats to the United Nations and to Washington DC can

bring their families for much-needed vacation and rest and relaxation – he announced that Federal forces would be moving in

to close down those estates. Now, I'm sure that Obama expected

that this was going to provoke his arch-nemesis Vladimir Putin into retaliatory measures, but Obama was severely disappointed.

Despite the fact that Sergey Lavrov, the Foreign Minister of Russia, said that they would be fully justified in retaliating tit-for-tat and expelling 35 so-called US diplomats from Russia

as {persona non grata} and closing down US vacation homes in Moscow and the Moscow suburbs; Putin instead, in classic Putin fashion, judoed Barack Obama and did nothing. Vladimir Putin, in

a move which is being universally recognized as outfoxing Obama

– for example, in a headline in the {Daily Beast} "Putin Outfoxes Obama in Spy War â! Moscow Laughs Off the Obama Administration's Sanctions and Expulsions as Feeble Last Gestures". Putin called out Obama for what he is, a lame duck;

and he refused to respond. In a statement that was put out on the Kremlin website today, Putin said the following:

"While we reserve the right to take reciprocal measures, we are not going to downgrade ourselves to the level of

irresponsible 'kitchen' diplomacy. In our future steps on our way towards the restoration of Russian-United States relations,

we will proceed from the policy pursued by the administration of

Donald Trump."

So, this is a perfect ending and diplomatic victory for Putin; and I think this goes along with a tweet that was sent out

by the Russian Foreign Ministry, which is a big picture of a yellow duck with the word "lame" written over top of it.

Obama

and his crew, although they are in the position to cause an awful

amount of mischief in the remaining three weeks, are not being recognized as all that powerful anymore by Putin and others around the world.

Now, at the same time, there is a true diplomatic victory that the Russians can claim in Syria. On top of the liberation

of Aleppo and really restoring government control over a vast part of the country against the ISIS and other rebel forces, yesterday the Russians brokered a ceasefire with Turkey; but without the United States. This ceasefire has, up to this point,

been holding. This is a very hopeful situation, and yet again,

demonstrates that Obama has definitely lost the leadership role

in the world; and Russia is a very formidable strategic leader on

the world stage as this administration exits and as the new administration comes on board.

At the same time, you've got a meltdown of the financial system; the Monte dei Paschi banking situation continues to unravel. We have the exposure of derivatives from every single

bank in the entire planet. Any one of these – Deutsche Bank, Monte dei Paschi Bank – anything could be the trigger to blow out the entire financial system. Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws remain the essential and most urgent measures that need to be taken in the United States. As I said, nothing is determined, but there is a lot that is possible. As you've seen on various channels of our communications over the last few days – the Fireside Chat yesterday, an LPAC email that went out today, headlines on the larouchepac.com website – we are engaged in an absolutely urgent and critical mobilization to force Glass-Steagall onto the agenda even before the inauguration of the incoming administration. This should be the number one bill that is delivered to the new President's desk for his signature. It could be acted on by Congress as they come into session next week; as opposed to McCain's announcement that he's going to have hearings on Russian hacking, or something like that. This is the critical measure; and we will have activists that will be coming into Washington, DC. We've already delivered the marching orders; and we can discuss that more on the broadcast today. But of course, that remains just the first step in Lyndon LaRouche's Four Urgent Laws to Save the United States Now. The best example that we still have, the best precedent, is the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt; what FDR was able to accomplish in his first 100 days in office. The Congress came into

session;

he immediately passed the Emergency Banking Act, declared a bank

holiday, reorganized the entire bankrupt financial system, put Americans back to work. Congress did not leave session until exactly 100 days later; and 10 landmark pieces of legislation were debated, passed, and sent over to the White House for Franklin Roosevelt's signature, which changed the course of history. So of course, that remains the precedent; that remains

the model, and the contents of that first 100 days should be Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws to Save the United States.

So, with that said, I'd like to hand it over to Jason, because there are some very specific examples of means by which

we can undertake those urgent measures.

JASON ROSS: Let's also put it in the context of the world.

The

US desperately needs an economic recovery, a change in direction.

Think about the world as a whole; there's so much to be done.

Two and a half billion people on the planet don't have access to

continuous electricity; 800 million don't have access to fresh water; 1.5 billion people don't have access to basic sanitation;

and over 1 billion people don't have access to telephone capabilities. There's much work to be done, and the United States is definitely for a large shift.

President-elect Donald Trump has said that he's got big plans to make America great again; that he wants to spend \$1 trillion on infrastructure in the United States over the coming

period. There's a lot that we could learn from China on this.

China, over just the past decade, has built the largest

high-speed rail network in the world. In one decade, it went

from basically nothing, to now being the world's leader. That network is slated to double its size in the next 1.5 decades to a level of 40-50,000 kms; about 30,000 miles of high-speed rail. They're working, through their Belt and Road initiative, with 65 other nations in the region and beyond on cooperative projects; on rail, energy, transportation, logistics, water, information, training, expertise, education, a whole slew of projects for economic cooperation and development that itself will entail beyond China's borders tens of thousands more kilometers of high-speed rail. So, how are they financing this? How are they doing it? China's been spending \$1 trillion a year for the past decade; so the idea of spending \$1 trillion in the US to get everything up to some great standard is far too low. The other aspect is, how is this going to be financed and how is it going to be built? How is a \$1 trillion going to be brought to bear for the US economy? Let me read the concluding paragraph of an op-ed that was published in the {People's Daily} online of China; an op-ed by Curtis Stone. He wrote: "Trump wants to spend \$1 trillion on infrastructure upgrades in America to rebuild the nation and put people back to work. The problem is how to pay for it and how to do it. China knows how to fund and carry out serious infrastructure building, and deep-pocketed Chinese investors want to invest billions more in America. One way for Trump to realize his plan would be to use Chinese funds and technology. This would help return some of America's investment in China back to America for the benefit

of
America, and strengthen the bilateral relationship. Trump's
plan
to rebuild America is bold, but it remains to be seen if he
will
be bold enough to do what is best for America."
So, on that, let's think about how China can be involved
here. The need for financing in the US is very great; there
is
not a lot of credit available in the way that people think.
The
very low interest rates that currently exist, as Paul
Gallagher
has explained well in the "Economics Frequently Asked
Questions"
section on our website, we can't just sell a bunch of bonds at
low interest rates; the rates will go up. Where is that money
going to come from? Private investors? What's the return?
What
this really requires is a totally different way of thinking
about
economics. So, let's look at the LaRouche approach – very
briefly – to economics. In his policy document for the US,
called "Four New Laws to Save the USA Now", LaRouche gave four
very primary steps. First, Glass-Steagall, to end the
connection
to the outrageously decrepit and collapsing financial system
that
we have; it's almost totally divorced from the physical aspect
of
economy.
Second, that we need a national banking approach. Now, what
does that mean? Let's think of some examples in US history as
to
how a national approach to economy has occurred. If you look
at
what Alexander Hamilton did in the early days of the new

United

States, he turned the huge liabilities, the huge debts of that new US and the state governments into something very valuable by

turning that debt into what became the basis for the First National Bank of the United States; using that debt to become the

basis for a huge amount in loans that were necessary to build the

roads and then later the canals in the United States. To take a

more recent example, Matt had mentioned Franklin Roosevelt as the

best precedent that we have in the United States of late.

Look

at what Roosevelt did with the Tennessee Valley Authority, for example. This is a project that dramatically improved the economy in the southeast part of the US; in the Tennessee Valley

area that it serviced. The increased productivity in that region

itself more than paid for the cost of the investment of the project. This was the type of project where it doesn't really matter whether the money that's spent on building it is paid back

directly; and that's something that private investors would demand. "Can we build a toll road that we'll be able to get money back from? Can we upgrade an airport terminal which charges passenger fees for passing through it, and then we'll pay

back the investment in that terminal at the airport?"

Well, what about the large projects that shape the economy as a whole; that provide a platform for economic activity?

That's the sort of thing where you look at the nation as a unique

economic actor that's able to finance investments whose payback

isn't direct in the way that a private investment would be; but comes back in the sense of "Did we improve the productivity of the nation as a whole in a way that makes the project worthwhile?" That's what we saw with the creation of the railroads in the United States, for example. This was something that wouldn't have happened without the government support that it got to build the Transcontinental Railroad. The payback was that we had a connected economy; we had a whole country. We had definitely the improvements that made it worthwhile have done that.

So, if you think about that today, to get away from project-by-project – does it pay for itself? Is it worth it? – and to think about how do we institute in the U.S. a higher platform of technology in our infrastructure: are we building a high-speed rail network? Are we building power generation of the highest energy-flux density? Or are we building solar panels? Are we investing in fusion technology, to make that breakthrough in our knowledge of the atom and nuclear processes that will transform our relationship to materials, to energy, in a way that will be far more profound than the development of the steam engine? These are the kinds of things: the space program – what are the {drivers} of our human identity as a species that goes beyond and that develops? And I think maybe to start a discussion on it, here on the program – I don't have everything to say about it – but this also raises the issue of the culture in

the population. In other words, what expressions, culturally, do we have of what it is to be a person; of what it is to live in a society; of our relations among each other? What is the kind of culture that's commensurate with going to space, with developing fusion, with developing our economy, with becoming better human beings, and how do we bring that culture into being? I think that that's a very major question. It's not one that addressed quite as directly as, say, national banking or financing of a national high-speed rail network, but is just as important. I think that's something to take up here.

BILL ROBERTS: Yeah, I would say this, what you've just touched on, Jason, is the real question of sovereignty of nations to participate in the development of mankind, to free themselves from the diktats of this dying trans-Atlantic financial system.

That really is sort of the crux of the entire shift that we're experiencing right now.

Just to mention a few things on this: Yesterday, in an interview that Bashar al-Assad did with the Italian newspaper, {Il Giornale}, he identified that the issue in the Syrian war, was that Syria wanted to make a sovereign decision on the development of both oil pipelines, but also railroad lines running east-to-west through Syria; rather than Syria simply being sort of a passing-through point of oil pipelines from Qatar, north-to-south. Of course the east-to-west route – for those of you who are familiar with our plan, the Phoenix Project

for Aleppo and the Integration of Syria, the proposals that the Schiller Institute has made for the integration of Syria into the New Silk Road; this is designed to make Syria an energy hub, an industrial hub, and sort of restore Syria's ancient tradition as an important step along the New Silk Road. This is the implication of Vladimir Putin's intervention into Syria to crush the terrorists in that area. This was the same question with respect to Japan's recent decision to resume its historical role as a country that is not going to be part of an offshore, trans-Atlantic financial system, but it going to be a "machine" for the development of the interior of Asia. Japan had made this decision against the interests of what's historically been the attempt by the United States to try to prevent Japan from negotiating a peace treaty with Russia over the remaining islands in dispute from World War II. So, Japan made this decision as a sovereign nation, and was really prompted to do so by Vladimir Putin, who made the issue directly that Japan had to make a sovereign, independent decision. I would say in the United States, the question of the Trump Presidency and the United States Government being able to address the horrid conditions of the American population, and uplift, both culturally and in terms of the physical standards of life, depends upon the immediate reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. Number one, because if Glass-Steagall is not reinstated before the crash that is looking very likely to happen soon in the European banking system, hits, there will be more bail-outs; and

this will further increase the death-rates of Americans. But also
number two, as both Matt and Jason were just discussing, the United States has to make a serious commitment to providing massive financing, and mobilizing our workforce, to build entirely new platforms of infrastructure. That's not going to be possible without a credit system; and that will not be possible without the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. That may require, as this recent {People's Daily} article points out, in certain cases that may mean that China will come in and build certain aspects. They may be better suited to build high-speed rail systems, for example. We've seen the problems [inaud; 22:09]. We've seen the problems with [California Governor] Jerry Brown's program on the West Coast with high-speed rail. Perhaps we should just set up a Chinese initiative for doing this. Our sovereignty today, ironically, does not mean isolationism. I don't know that Donald Trump thinks that it does; I don't think he does. But in many cases, what the New Paradigm has meant is that certain countries have made breakthroughs in certain areas. Certainly we have in the United States. We should look at {all} the potentials that exist for cooperation: the space program, medicine, certain aspects within the machine-tool sector that we still have – in the same way that this was considered by Kennedy when he placed the science centers, the

space program centers, in the more-backwards, southern part of the United States. Or when FDR placed the Oak Ridge facilities, the "secret city" that developed the Manhattan Project outside of Knoxville, Tennessee. Or like the Russians are doing, currently, in their plans to have Rosatom invest in building a new science city for the development of nuclear science, in one of the poorest cities in South America, La Paz, [Bolivia] which has basically been the center of a drug-production economy. These are some of the things that we're going to continue to be filling out; but these are the issues behind the immediate necessity of Glass-Steagall, that every American has to know the ABCs of.

MICHAEL STEGER: Yeah, that's great! There are just a couple of things I'd like to touch on. One is the Putin situation, because as Bill just indicated, the whole situation internationally seems to have been greatly shaped by Vladimir Putin. If anyone were to watch some of the news alerts, the {New York Times} and the entire political establishment of the United States was taken off guard, significantly. As Matt indicated, Obama had clearly expected his nemesis, Putin, to have the strong-man response. The {New York Times}, at 6:00 Eastern Time, sent out a message indicating they [the Russians] are going to go for a "massive retaliation. Thirty-five people evicted." This was blasted out on the internet airwaves. Within just two hours, the {New York Times} had to report a "head-spinning turn of

events,"

in terms of the fact that not only did Putin not retaliate, as Matt indicated, but I believe he invited all of the U.S. diplomatic corps to the Kremlin to celebrate the New Year and Christmas!

The way Putin has shaped this process – and we were reflecting on this here this morning – that it was just a little

over a year ago, the end of September 2015, that Russia formally

entered into the Syrian conflict on the side of Assad against the

terrorists. It was just November of last year, just a little over

a year ago, when a Turkish fighter jet shot down a Russian fighter jet. It was then last Christmas – in that entire holiday

period – when we were on the verge of what could have been a break-out of nuclear war. The tensions were incredibly high.

The rhetoric was incredibly high. And what we had in the White House,

Obama, is now on full display in its psychotic kind of pettiness.

So the way that Putin has shaped this process – and it's worth situating the recent events – that not only did we have this display of psychosis by Obama. There was also the assassination of Russia's Ambassador to Turkey, Andrei Karlov. This came just a few days after Obama had made an illicit threat

against Russia, which Mr. LaRouche had captured very specifically. This meant that Obama was looking to kill, and kill

people of significance. And then you had the assassination of Ambassador Karlov by someone tied to what looks to be some kind

of Western intelligence-coordinated network. And then, it's

not

yet clear what happened, there's much speculation, but regardless, there's the unfortunate loss of the Alexandrov Ensemble (the Red Army Chorus).

As we speak, we're in Manhattan at the Russian Consulate, singing Russian patriotic songs, as well as American songs. I'd

like to read a section of a leaflet that Helga Zepp LaRouche wrote on this occasion for our chorus outside the Russian Consulate. This is just a small taste of it, which will be released in its entirety today, following that event. She says:

"Let me therefore share with you the idea that in addition to rebuilding the Alexandrov Ensemble, which they intend to do,

thousands of Alexandrov choruses be established, in schools all

over Russia, to honor the heroic contribution of Russia in the liberation of Syria, and at the same time, broaden the uplifting

effect of choral singing to the young generation."

I think that proposal stands out as the quality of idea and initiatives that can now be taken; that there is unfolding a new

paradigm. There's a paradigm of win-win, or almost as Putin displayed today, of turn the other cheek. We're not going to go

tit-for-tat. We're not going to descend into kitchen-level politics. We're going to rise to a higher level, of a discussion

of mankind and the collaboration towards world peace and global

development. Nothing better expresses that than what's developed

in Syria, and the collaboration of Russia, Turkey, and Iran to consolidate that. This really has been the work of Putin, and this last year has really been shaped by Vladimir Putin more

so

than anyone else.

Now, the question is: how do we respond to this in the United States? That's the onus upon us today. As Matt indicated,

the financial crisis around Monte dei Paschi and the other major

trans-Atlantic banks, are clearly at a point of breakdown. I would ask people just to reflect upon, look at the electoral maps. Some of this has been done by various studies after the election, where they saw the kind of vote turnout for Trump happened the greatest in areas that had been hit the hardest by

the drug epidemic, the suicides, the unemployment levels.

If you look at the demographic condition of the country today, it is defined by the insanity of our financial and economic system. The financial bubble that has been run, perpetually, really going back even since the early '90s, and we

saw it then regained after the dot.com blow-out with the housing

bubble. Then the blow-out of the housing bubble only accelerated

even further towards what is an entirely just fictitious financial derivative scheme, with almost {no} benefits, even monetarily or financially, to the population of the United States.

What you see is limited pockets, small specific areas. The New York City area; the Washington, DC area, major Dulles airport

area; San Francisco and the Bay area; certain key pockets where

the financial bubble that Obama has pumped up and has called his

"Obama recovery". This was the dominant area where you saw the

votes come in against Trump and for this Obama program. But

more

importantly, you saw the reaction, the rebellion against Obama and this Bush-Obama legacy, came from a majority – 80% to 90% of

the land area of the country, and a good majority of the population; whether they voted for Bernie Sanders or they voted

for Donald Trump, they voted against this Obama-Bush tyranny.

A majority of the American people have been left out and forgotten;

they have become the forgotten men and women of the country, as

Franklin Roosevelt characterized them in the Great Depression.

It is the question of, how do you bring together the entire country? Because we're looking for an economic development that

is based on physical reality, not on some fictitious financial numbers; you can't forecast an economy based on the financial numbers that are presented today – they're all lies. Let alone

Obama's recovery, but even notions of financial success; it's all

lies. The physical reality is, the United States is crumbling;

it's in horrible disrepair. It's not just our infrastructure, or

our manufacturing capabilities; it's our cultural level of our society, it's the educational orientation. It's the sense of optimism; it's the productive skill set and sense of integrity and confidence in the ability to produce something of significance that has been crushed and taken away from our population.

So, Mr. LaRouche – as Jason indicated – presented Four Laws; and those four laws really start with the fourth law, which

is an immediate commitment towards the restoration of a space

program which has been laid out in detail by Kesha Rogers, and the fusion program. The initial first step on these four laws to initiate this kind of science-driver program is Glass-Steagall; because Glass-Steagall ends this financial cult, this financial bubble. And it integrates that part of the country which has been forgotten into the conception of our economy and of our society. And we're going to take the entire nation and take it upwards. There's no longer going to be fly-over areas of the country; there's no longer going to be these provinces on the outskirts of our economy. We're going to look at the entire productivity of our nation; and most importantly, the productivity of our people. The greatest sham of Obama's recovery is the fact that you have 100 million people not in the workforce; not involved or engaged in any kind of economic activity. Many of them are on painkillers, and out of work or on disabled lists. We've got to bring this entire part of the country into the economy immediately; in the areas which increase the productivity per capita of the nation as a whole. So, we've got to move on Glass-Steagall. As Matt said, it should be on Trump's desk the day he comes into office on January 20th. Congress comes back into session next Tuesday; they're sworn in. That's mostly a reception day. There will be some activities Wednesday and Thursday, and then they'll be in session again the following week. We have reports from this morning that Obama has the gall to go to Capitol Hill next Wednesday to meet with Senate and House Democrats. This, of course, is the

party

he's crushed and destroyed. I'm sure he will browbeat or worse,

the Democratic members of Congress. So, we will definitely have

a presence in Washington, DC; we will have {Hamiltonian} issues

distributed throughout New York City and throughout Washington.

We are definitely asking people to participate in a full-scale mobilization. That doesn't mean just Congress; Congress will be

available for meetings not this coming week, but likely the next

week. The bigger question is to get to Democratic clubs, state

legislators, union leaders, other activists, other writers, other

people who have advocated and promoted Glass-Steagall. We should

set the country on fire around this notion that Glass-Steagall is

not something to support; it's not something showing that you are

on the right side of things. Glass-Steagall must be passed; it

must be passed quickly, because we have a lot more work to do in

2017 than to simply deal with the insanity of this financial crisis.

We're asking people to mobilize as much as possible; and have in mind how much work we have to do to rebuild the country's

infrastructure, its manufacturing, and most importantly, rebuild

the minds of the coming generations – which is really the most important work any of us can participate in doing. So, that's

the mobilization LaRouche PAC has set forth. The email went out today, and we're asking everyone to participate.

OGDEN: Well Michael, what you're describing is the kind of policy revolution that Franklin Roosevelt ushered in, in his first few days as President in 1933. Of course, he was inaugurated in March; the inaugurations back then used to happen in March, not January. But it's that first 100 days, as we've said, that remains the kind of model; and unfortunately, there are very few people in the United States for whom that historical accomplishment of Franklin Roosevelt remains something from their living memory. It's our job to educate and remind people of what Franklin Roosevelt was able to accomplish. Now, I don't think any of us are assuming that this is something that's going to happen by itself; this is why we are mobilizing. This is why we are saying, in the countdown to this inauguration, it's our job to set the agenda. And at the same time that we're doing that domestically, you really do have the winds of history are blowing in from around the world. There's a shifting global dynamic which is forcing a change in the United States, as Jason referenced with that article in {People's Daily}; the role that China can play with the One Belt, One Road policy in transforming the economic potential of the entire planet and the strategic changes that are coming out of Russia. But with that said, it is always very useful to go back and review what Franklin Roosevelt

did in his entire administration; it's almost something you could not discuss in abbreviated form – from the beginning of his first term into his fourth term, with the victory in World War II. But if you just take those first 100 days and quickly review what he was able to accomplish, that's the kind of urgent revolution in policy that is needed right now in the United States around these four LaRouche economic laws. So, let me just very quickly list what Roosevelt was able to accomplish. Of course, this was not unilateral actions from the White House by any means. This was done by a willing and cooperative Congress, who recognized the urgency and the emergency of reversing the economic despair and disintegration that the entire nation was experiencing. But, as I said, from the very first day of his administration, he passed the Emergency Banking Act; which reorganized all of the banks across the entire country, declared a banking holiday, audited these banks, and allowed them to open under completely new standards. He passed the Government Economy Act – slightly less important – but it eliminated certain waste that was in government; he also passed the Volstead Act, which temporarily suspended the rules of Prohibition – that was popular. He passed the Farm Credit Act, which was very important; this refinanced farm mortgages across the country. Farmers who were unable to keep their farms open because they couldn't pay their mortgages and their farms were being foreclosed; this was a very big story in Iowa and the heartland states. In fact, there were vigilantes who were standing up to sheriffs, saying "We will not let you foreclose on

our farms." This resolved that situation, and also provided operating funds for farms across the country at very low interest

rates; to keep the food on the plates of the American people.

He

established the Homeowners' Loan Corporation; this provided relief for struggling homeowners across the country, and in fact,

actually directly assumed one-sixth of all the mortgages in the

country from homeowners who were struggling to pay their mortgages.

He provided within the first 100 days a half-billion dollars in 1933 dollars in unemployment relief; which was administered by

Harry Hopkins. That was greatly expanded in the following months

after the first 100 days. Here's a very important one which we've been discussing a lot lately: He established the CCC, the

Civilian Conservation Corps, which provided training and employment for unskilled youth from across the entire country to

build public works projects and conservation projects. Over six

years, this ultimately employed {3 million} young people in the

United States. As Jason mentioned earlier, within the first 100

days, he established the Tennessee Valley Authority – the TVA; this was passed through law and shovels were hitting the dirt within five weeks. This transformed one of the most backward parts of the entire United States in Tennessee and Kentucky and

the neighboring states.

To address what had caused the Great Depression in the first place, FDR passed the Truth in Securities Act – an important

element; and then, of course, as we've been discussing, passed the Glass-Steagall Act. This required banks to immediately divest within a certain amount of time, all of their securities operations; and established the FDIC, which created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation protections for the average American depositing their savings in commercial banks. Then he created the National Industrial Recovery Act, which – among many other things – guaranteed collective bargaining for unions, greatly increased the union membership across the United States, and made available \$3.3 billion in 1933 dollars; that's \$50 billion dollars in today's dollars in public works financing. That's the first 100 days; and Congress did not leave session. Congress did not go home from the day that Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated until the day they left, exactly 100 days later. That's the kind of policy revolution that has to happen in the United States; and it will only function if it's carried out according to the principles underlying LaRouche's Four Economic Laws.

STEGER: That's great, Matt. I think it's important to indicate and let people know that LaRouche PAC also has two other initiatives. One is a new pamphlet coming out, which will highlight this kind of economic program based on Lyn's Four Laws.

It looks at how is it possible in the most effective way to increase the productivity of the American people and that we as a nation build our own recovery. We build ourselves out of this economic rot that we have been plunged into.

The other initiative, which maybe Jason can say more on, is going to be an educational initiative to the American people a

sense – especially members within the Trump administration – of how real economics is. Because Lyndon LaRouche has been the leading economic thinker for the last 50 years on the planet, let alone the United States. He has forecast some of the most significant events in the course of that 50 years; and he is the leading figure from the standpoint of real physical economics and scientific advancement. I know Jason is part of that, so maybe he can say more on that as well.

ROSS: Sure. Economics is a pretty funny subject because it's one that so many people get so wrong. One that specifically so many experts get so wrong. If you look at the Society of Professional Economic Forecasters and you look at how good their forecasts have been over the last 50 years, they're not getting any better. You'd say that's a science that really isn't improving, is it – economic forecasting. It's because it's not treated as a science. There is so much ideology and there's so much just plain old stupidity about looking at measures that are based on money, rather than a physical understanding of what makes economy possible. So, we're going to be preparing and presenting a series, a number of pedagogical discussions; some tools to help think about how an economy really functions, drawing on Lyndon LaRouche's decades of experience as an economic writer and forecaster – as a remarkably accurate one. We will have these things available, like some of the concepts that he

brings up frequently; like what is energy flux density in an economy. I know that I made a video on that recently, and there's much more to say than could fit in a short summary video that touched on it only briefly. Or, other concepts, like capital intensity, and the concept of an economic platform, which is not something to get into detail right now on. But a reconceptualization of what many people think of as just infrastructure and public works, and how to think about that as a mediating a relationship of a society and the physical world around them and within that society itself; in the way that Vladimir Vernadsky, for example, looks at the human species in terms of what is the power of cognition? How does that transform the relationship of the human species to the planet and to the biosphere in a way that is unlike any purely biological species? What is the physical power of cognition? How can we measure that as geologists, as biologists, as economists? So, definitely more coming on that.

OGDEN: The central theme in Mr. LaRouche's Four Economic Laws document is the necessity to increase productivity – per capita and in terms of the productivity of the labor force. As we've discussed, going back to Alexander Hamilton, this is really the root of economic science. In the "Report on Manufactures", Hamilton's theme is how do manufactures and technology and industry increase what would otherwise just be the raw labor force of the population. It has a multiplier effect. One thing going back to Mr. LaRouche's Four New Economic

Laws document, one point that he makes is that this is not just an option – as we've said before; but this is an absolute necessity. Not just because of the urgency of the collapse, but also because of the nature of our nation. Alexander Hamilton was the founding economic genius of the country, founding father of our system of economics; but he was also one of the central authors of the United States Constitution. He made a very explicit point of putting the clause in there which is the General Welfare Clause; which not only gives permission to the United States Federal Government to act in the general welfare of the United States – this was used as the reason behind the constitutionality of the National Bank – but it also mandates that this is part of the responsibility of the Federal government. This is what gives it legitimacy; that it {must} act in the interest of the general welfare of the American people. And {all} of the American people, not just sections; not just the coasts or the big cities, but all of the American people. This is a point that Mr. LaRouche makes in one very short sentence in that Four Economic Laws. He says: "The ceaseless increase of the physical productivity of employment, accompanied by its benefits for the General Welfare, are a principle of Federal law which must be a paramount standard of achievement of the nation and of the individual." So, the word "law" is in the title of this document; and Mr. LaRouche is asserting that this increase in productivity is included under the idea of the General

Welfare,

and is a central principle of what we should understand as Federal law under our Constitutional republic.

It was recently stated in a similar way in the white paper that was put out by the Chinese government; where they declared

that development is an inalienable human right. The same way that we talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as

being inalienable rights, the Chinese, who have lifted 750 million people out of poverty in their country, were declaring that development itself is an inalienable human right. I think

this is an important understanding of what the responsibility of

government itself needs to be; and this central principle of economic science – understanding what it means to, and how one proceeds to increase the physical productivity of one's labor force for the benefit of the General Welfare as a whole.

STEGER: I think that captures the New Paradigm.

OGDEN: OK, wonderful. I do want to say that I really appreciate Bill being on, and I think increasingly we need to return to some of the questions that Mr. LaRouche was directly involved in, in Detroit and Michigan and Ohio and some of these

Midwest areas. What you brought up, Michael, about there are no

fly-over states; we should no longer have the word "Rust Belt" in

our vocabulary. The question is, how are we going to take the skills that are inherent in these machinists and former machinists and skilled workers in that region – who are now in a

state of real despair and increasing mortality – and put them to

work again for the development of the country. So, you can say something about that now, but Bill, I think we should also revisit that maybe in some of our future shows; and have that be part of our countdown to the new Presidency.

ROBERTS: Yeah, sure. It's a real challenge. This is the subject of what Marcy Kaptur took up in a recent op-ed, when she said the Democratic Party has to do some "soul-searching" is the way that she put it. But really, it's not soul-searching; we've got to define what the commitment is going to be to the American population and all of the American population. It's a real challenge; I think much more so than what Franklin Roosevelt had to face. Part of it is what we didn't get into so much today — the deep cultural degeneration process that has left young people without very much of a sense of character or identity. You mentioned the CCC program of the past; [that] had to be tailored to address — and Franklin Roosevelt himself was very personally involved in crafting that program, which he saw as being absolutely critical if the nation was going to have a future. So, I agree; this is going to have to be something we put a lot of thought and effort into how to make that shift upward in productivity that is so required today immediately, but also for the future, for the long-term.

OGDEN: Great. Well, thank you very much. Thanks, Bill; thank you, Michael; thank you, Jason. I would recommend reading the op-ed that Jason referenced at the beginning of the program; this was in {People's Daily}. I know when we spoke with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier today, Helga put a major premium on that op-ed. We, of course, encourage you to participate as fully as you can in this mobilization to immediately not build support for Glass-Steagall, but immediately make Glass-Steagall law. So, as Michael said, the marching orders are available; we sent out an email to the entire LaRouche PAC email list today. If you're not yet a subscriber to that email list, you need to sign up immediately. We're going to have marching orders such as that as we count down the next 21 days, the three weeks until the new administration; and we're not going to stop there. So, please subscribe to the email list and please subscribe to our YouTube channel as well. Thank you all for watching today, and Happy New Year to you! I think we all can look forward to a 2017 full of a lot of potential; and it's our job to realize that potential. Thank you and good night.

Afrika har presserende behov for, at Amerika atter bliver stort

Et nytårsbudskab til nyvalgte præsident Trump og det amerikanske folk.

Af R.P. Tsokolibane, LaRouche-bevægelsen, Sydafrika.

23. dec., 2016 – Mit navn er Phillip Tsokolibane, talsmand for LaRouche-bevægelsen her i Sydafrika. Med min hilsen til Dem, nyvalgte præsident Donald J. Trump, og til det amerikanske folk, mener jeg at give udtryk for mine sydafrikanske medborgeres, og alle afrikaneres, håb for Deres succes.

Hr. Trump: De indtager embedet på en international bølge af folkelig modstand mod, og afvisning af, den magtfulde elite, der har kontrolleret det kollapsende, transatlantiske finansimperium og dets mislykkede politik, som har efterladt det meste af verden, inklusive store dele af Deres egen nation, i økonomisk ruin. Præsident Barack Obamas to embedsperioders vildledelse har bragt Amerika ud på randen af militær konfrontation og mulig atomkrig med Rusland og Kina, hvilket ingen mentalt rask person ønsker. Obama har lanceret krige for regimeskift og støttet og bevæbnet terrorister og således myrdet befolkninger i en grad, der svarer til folkemord, over hele planeten. Jeg kan fortælle Dem ligeud, at USA under Barack Obama, hans klon (og Deres besejrede modstander) Hillary Clinton, samt Bush-klanen, hvis politik Obama kopierer, spottes i hele verden og her i Afrika for denne politik, og han støttes kun af det døende, angloamerikanske imperiums lakajer.

Men, med udgangspunkt i Øst, og under direktion af præsidenterne Putin i Rusland og Xi i Kina, kommer der betydningsfulde initiativer, der, hvis de bliver forstået

korrekt, og De selv og det amerikanske folk tilslutter sig dem, kan omstøde forbandelsen med en Obama, som i realiteten ikke er andet end en marionet for det onde britiske monarki og dets oligarkiske følge. Vi har nu, i bogstavelig forstand, mulighed for at opbygge en ny fremtid for menneskeheden – en fremtid, der hurtigt kan føre til en ny æra med samarbejde mellem nationer – og som således gør en ende på geopolitik og en konkurrence, der sætter folk og nationer op imod hinanden, til fordel for de degenererede monetarister og deres pengeimperium. Vi må gøre hele menneskeheden rig i en fremtid med kreative opdagelser, med gennembrud inden for videnskab, der vil være drivkraft for civilisationen som helhed hen imod kæmpe spring for fremskridt.

En sådan verden kunne indtil for nylig kun store mænd drømme om, såsom jeres egen Martin Luther King, Jr., og vores fader, Nelson Mandela, men som Wall Street og City of London konspirerede om at knuse.

Skabelsen af BRIKS-alliancen, af hvilken mit land er det stolte medlem, med dets forpligtende engagement til at udstede massive mængder kredit til det, der kaldes storstilet 'infrastruktur-udvikling', som i Kinas 'Bæltet-og-Vejen', er pødekrytallen til et nyt, globalt system, et system, der gør en ende på den påtvungne underudvikling i Afrika og andetsteds. Denne politik er helt igennem amerikansk i sin oprindelse og er baseret på Det Amerikanske System for Fysisk Økonomi, som blev udarbejdet af jeres første finansminister, den store Alexander Hamilton (se hans Fire Rapporter til Kongressen)[1]; han forstod, at al værdi skabes gennem den uophørlige forbedring af den produktive, menneskelige arbejdskraft. Det er den førende, moderne fortæller for Hamiltons system, verdens førende fortæller for fysisk økonomi, statsmanden Lyndon LaRouches udtrykkelige politik.

Lyndon LaRouches moderne 'opdatering' af Hamilton, som fremlægges i hans 'Fire Love', afviser det monetaristiske systems behandling af mennesker som dyr, som en hjord, der

skal udtyndes af en selvudnævnt elite, og gør i stedet den uophørlige realisering af menneskets skabende potentiale til universets fremmeste kraft for forandring til det gode. Regering – alle regeringer – må handle ud fra det princip, som er omdrejningspunktet i jeres egen Forfatning: at al politik må tjene det almene vel, nu, ved at handle nu for at forbedre de fremtidige vilkår for alle mennesker, og ikke blot for en dekadent, oligarkisk elite.

Det, som kineserne og russerne i realiteten foreslår, er en politik for gensidig fordel og forbedring, der tjener princippet om det almene vel, hvis moderne forsvar kan spores direkte til det arbejde, som hr. LaRouche og hans hustru, 'Silkevejsladyen', Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har udrettet i løbet af de sidste 50 år. Som jeg sagde, så er dette i realiteten en 'amerikansk' politik i traditionen efter Hamilton, Henry Carey, Abraham Lincoln og, i sidste århundrede, Franklin Roosevelt og John Kennedy.

Det er i sandhed ikke blot i Amerikas virkelige interesse, men også dets historiske mission, som er testamenteret os af Hamilton og jeres grundlæggende fædre, for at lede den globale revolution imod britisk monetarisme og dets kvægrøgterpolitik, hvilken sidstnævnte politik uvægerligt fører til befolkningsmæssig kollaps, fordi en sådan anti-human økonomi aldrig vil kunne støtte og opretholde selv det nuværende befolkningsniveau, især under et finanskollaps' betingelser. I dag konfronteres Afrika, med mindre en sådan politik omstødes, med et overlagt og forudsigeligt folkemord på en skala, der ville gøre den britisk-skabte, unaturlige skabning, Adolf Hitler, grøn af misundelse. Vi i Afrika anser de nye initiativer, der kommer fra BRIKS-medlemmerne Rusland og Afrika, for anvendelse af kernekraft og anden infrastruktur, som værende ikke blot ønskværdige, men afgørende for vores overlevelse.

Men hvis vi skal finde vej til en fremtid med fred og fremgang, må vi henvende os til Dem, hr. Trump, og til Deres

store, amerikanske republik, og kræve, at I også er med til at løfte os bort fra afgrunden, der vinker forude. Vi afrikanere trygler ikke. Vi beder ganske enkelt om, at I atter påtager jer den storhedens kappe, som jeres nation skabtes til at bære, i en revolution mod trældom for britisk imperialisme. Lad Amerika, sammen med verdens andre store, kontinentale magter, Rusland og Kina, slutte sig til at sætte menneskets kreative udvikling i centrum for en ny æra med fred og udvikling, og vi vil få begge dele.

I 1980'erne, da Lyndon LaRouche stillede op til præsident for jeres nation, fremlagde han et budskab over tv, der beskrev en fremtidig koloni for jordboere på Mars, anført af en kvindelig, amerikansk forsker. Dette udtryk for en mission for menneskeheden blev knust af de successive Bush-regeringer og deres klon, Obama-regeringen, som har ødelagt jeres bemandede rumprogram. Men tiden er inde til atter at drømme store drømme og til at anbringe mennesket uden for og væk fra denne lille planet og ind i universet, i søgen efter nye opdagelser og ny viden. Det er mit håb, at, med hjælp fra det amerikanske folk, kan denne 'kvinde på Mars' blive afrikaner!

Idet vi rækker hånden frem til venskab, forstår vi afrikanere – især på denne tid af året, hvor vi reflekterer over vores menneskelighed og menneskets grundlæggende godhed – at jeres hjælp til os, og til andre i verden, der har hjælp behov, også vil hjælpe jeres egen nation, ikke alene i et partnerskab for økonomisk udvikling, men på et spirituelt plan, idet vi alle bliver bedre mennesker. Det er således i ånden af denne universelle tid, at vi søger 'fred på Jord, og i menneskene velbehag', i hele verden.

Jeg sender således mine hilsner til det amerikanske folk og minder dem om, at verden har brug for, at I bliver det store folk, som Hamilton, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt og Kennedy opfordrede jer til at være. Og jeg rækker hånden frem til Dem, nyvalgte præsident Trump, i venskab fra Afrika, og ønsker Dem succes med deres ofte erklærede mål, atter at gøre Amerika til

den store nation, som var meningen med den, og som den må blive igen.

Ramasimong Phillip Tsokolibane, 23. december, 2016.

Foto: Fra BRIKS-topmødet i Brasilien, 2014: Statslederne Vladimir Putin, Rusland; Narendra Modi, Indien; Dilma Rousseff, Brasilien; Xi Jinping, Kina; Jacob Zuma, Sydafrika. Dilma Rousseff blev afsat ved et politisk kup i 2016; alle de øvrige er fortsat deres nationers ledere.

[1] Se hovedartiklen: 'Nyt kreditsystem', <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=15409>

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 20. december 2016:

Briterne og Obama forsøger

at sætte verden i brand

inden Trump tager over

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

NYHEDSORIENTERING DECEMBER 2016: Helga Zepp-LaRouche i København: Donald Trump og Det Nye Internationale Paradigme

Den 12. december 2016 var Helga Zepp-LaRouche – Lyndon LaRouches hustru, Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og en international nøgleperson i kampen for et nyt globalt udviklingsparadigme – særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar på Frederiksberg med titlen: »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Blandt deltagerne var diplomater, aktivister og repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet blev indledt med fremførelsen af en kendt traditionel kinesisk sang, Kāngdìng Qínggē (Kangding Kærlighedssang), af Feride Istogu Gillesberg (sopran) og Michelle Rasmussen (klaver). Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som på smukkeste og mest optimistiske vis førte publikken igennem en tour-de-force af den nuværende politiske situation med såvel befolkningens afvisning af det nuværende paradigme gennem Brexit, Hillary Clintons valgnederlag til Donald Trump og det italienske "Nej", som et forsøg på at skabe kaos (og krig) inden Donald Trumps indsættelse den 20. januar. Dertil kom en fremstilling af det nye globale paradigme, som allerede er ved at overtage verden, illustreret ved Kinas politik for Den Nye Silkevej – som den kommende amerikanske administration skal finde sin plads i – og den videre udvikling, der er nødvendig, hvis menneskeheden skal

finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**»Donald Trump og det Nye,
Internationale Paradigme«
(DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches
hovedtale
ved Schiller
Instituttet/EIR's seminar
i København, 12. dec., 2016.**

Jeg mener, at vi bør være meget glade, for hvis dette alt sammen går den rigtige vej; og det er for en stor del vores personlige forpligtelse at hjælpe, og jeg beder jer alle sammen om ikke at være passive tilskuere, men gå med i Schiller Instituttet for at være med til at implementere disse visioner og disse ideer, for så vil vi blive meget heldige med, at vi i vores levetid kan leve det nye paradigme. Og det nye paradigme vil blive første gang, menneskets værdighed vil blive virkeliggjort, og jeg mener, at det er en meget, meget vigtig mission, som vi alle bør vedtage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

(Efterfølgende spørgsmål og svar, engelsk udskrift: [Klik her.](#))

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var

repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Instituttets og EIR's seminar i København: Donald Trump og det nye internationale paradigme. ENGELSK udskrift af tale samt Spørgsmål og Svar

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter

for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale, der varer omkring 1 time og 20 minutter, kan høres ovenover eller her:

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on 'Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of various Danish and international institutions.

The event was opened by the presentation of a Chinese love song performed by Feride Istogu Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Afterwards, Tom Gillesberg, the chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark, introduced Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, describing her historical role in bringing about the New Silk Road policy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehrlicke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa.

She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

Her speech, about 80 minutes long, may be heard above, or at: https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

Zepp-LaRouche's speech and discussion had a profound effect on all present.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Discussion:

(There is no video or audio of the discussion period, only this transcript.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)

Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the 'dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.' What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail

of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gaddafi, “We came, we saw, and he died.” This is barbarism.

Her behavior in the Ben Ghazi case. There were so many things where she became worse than Obama, almost. So the immediate thing was that that big danger, that she would have continued the policies of Bush and Obama, in the confrontation with Russia and China, that that was stopped is, already, for the survival of civilization, the most important step.

Now, on these other points. Naturally, there is climate change. There is no question about it. But the question is, what is the cause of it? And the Schiller Institute had several conferences where we invited extremely important scientists who presented, beyond a doubt, that if you look at the last 500 million years in the history of the Earth, you have a continuous cycle of ice ages, of warming periods, of small ice ages, and the man-made component of climate change is absolutely negligible. It’s a big fraud, for example, it’s a big business. To sell CO2 omission quotas, is like selling indulgences in the Middle Ages.

Obviously, there are climate changes, and some countries which have low coasts are very much affected, but then you have to adapt to these climate changes with modern technology, and you cannot solve the problem by going to electric cars, or going to decarbonization of the world economy. This is a big fraud, and I am not saying that Trump is saying this for all the

right reasons, but the idea to impose measures implied with the “great transformation” Schellnhuber is talking about – I mean these people do not want development.

We have been on this case for the last – as a matter of fact, we, the LaRouche movement, had a conception about the development of the world really starting at the end of the sixties.

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said, ‘I have to become political, because I want to change this.’ I could give you a long, long story of the many observations, because I went with a cargo ship, and when you go to these countries with a cargo ship, you get a quite different idea than if you go on a 5-star cruise, and hotels. You see how the poverty affects people in their real lives. And I came back, and I looked at all the political movements, and I saw that LaRouche was the only one who said, ‘We have to have Third World development. We have to have technology transfer. We have to alleviate this poverty.’

And we had a positive conception already in the seventies, and therefore, when the Club of Rome appeared, we immediately said, ‘This is a fraud.’ Because the Club of Rome said, ‘There are limits to growth. We have reached equilibrium. Until the year 1972, you could develop, but now, we have reached equilibrium, and we have to have sustainable development. We have to have appropriate technology.’ These notions did not exist before, because before, you had the idea of a UN Development Decade, where each decade, you would overcome the underdevelopment by qualitative jumps. And when we recognized this propaganda by the Club of Rome, we immediately said, ‘This is a complete fraud,’ and the people who wrote the book “Limits to Growth,” Meadows and Forrester ...

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

A: I would like to give you written documentation afterwards of the studies that were made by these geologists, which are, without question, the explanation of climate change is not

man-made. The anthropogenic aspect of it is so miniscule. Climate change has to do with the position of the solar system in the galaxy, which goes in cycles around a certain axis, and you can see that over 500 million years, the data confirms that you have these wide changes. Greenland is called Greenland, because it was green. There used to be vineyards. You had ice ages which completely covered the Earth, and the reason why I went into this longer history, is to show how the environmentalist movement was created with the attempt to keep development down, and climate change is just another expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO2 emission trade, you have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing, because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, 'What is the source of wealth?' Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No. The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That's double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

There is no danger of cutting [countries off from one another], because all of these infrastructure projects are connectivity. The world will be more connected than ever before. But this whole myth of free trade is really a very bad thing. It has been coined by the people who profit from it. That's why the world is in the condition it is right now, where the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. The middle class is being destroyed all over the world. And I would really like to communicate with you so that we can deepen this dialogue.

On the Iran thing, I don't think he will break it, but that is my hope. I don't know.

So, I'm not saying he's a – as I said, Baron von Knigge would get a heart attack when he hears Trump's speeches, but the world was in such a grip of evil, satanic evil, that it is a good thing that there is a break, and the unfortunate thing, is that Europe is still in this grip.

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

And it is the British, because you will see tomorrow, because tomorrow, there will be a federal press conference in Berlin, where a number of people will present their contribution to the German chairmanship of the G-20, which will take place in July in Hamburg. This will be Joachim Schellnhuber, the head of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change), this is the scientific advisory organization advising the German government. He put out this paper about 'the great transformation,' which we wrote about. You can look in the

archive. He is the head of the idea of a decarbonization of the world economy.

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

And they will announce a sinister plan, to try to use the fact that many countries have environmental problems, to sneak in their anti-development programs. People should not be naïve, because not everybody thinks that population growth is a good thing. There are many people who think that each human being is a parasite, destroying nature. That is the image of man which many people have. The greenies, for example.

We look at it in a different way. We think that the more people you have, the greater longevity you can have, division of labor, and a modern scientific society needs many people with a long life span. Because if you are in the Third World, and you die, and you have an average life expectancy of 40 years, or less, you cannot have scientists, because the production of a scientist takes 30-35 years, and if people then die right away, then you can't have a modern society.

So the more creative people you have, the better. Each human being is an incredible addition, because we are creative.

Tom Gillesberg: Schellnhuber, for his services, was appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), and for him, he personally has said, that the highpoint of his existence was that the British Queen, personally, gave him the Order of the British Empire, for his efforts to reduce the possibility for mankind's survival, you could say, so it is connected with what you said.

Q: This is the best speech I have ever heard in my life.

Is this a second American Revolution, and will the Federal Reserve, which is privately owned, be closed down, and will money be created for the benefit of all people, and not just the private Fed?

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in Wilhelm Tell. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, 'When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

If you compare these two texts, the Declaration of Independence, and the Rütli Oath from Schiller's play, they are almost identical, and it's very clear that Schiller was inspired by the American Revolution when he wrote that play, because in his plays, there are many ideas which resonate with the American Revolution, and he actually wanted to immigrate, at one point, to America.

So I think that if Trump turns out to be another fraudster, which we don't know yet, I think that this process of revolt will continue, because I only mentioned some elements.

I could mention that there are many countries now in

realignment. for example, the Philippines, Duterte. This was supposed to be the playground for the conflict with China in the South China Sea. Now Duterte sent his Defense Secretary, Lorenzana, to Russia and China, to buy weapon systems from Russia and China, and to establish a friendship with China, and he said, 'The Philippines is no longer the colony of the U.S.'

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

Q: About Russia hacking the U.S. election. Why doesn't the U.S. have anti-hacking measures? Can you explain that?

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

Q: Will the result of the Brexit be positive for Europe, to enable continental Europe to become stronger, and to improve cooperation with the eastern parts of Europe?

A: I think that the EU is not functioning, and I think it is not just the Brexit. The "No" in Italy is a reflection of the same dynamic. Now you have Gentiloni, the new prime minister, and they will probably go for new elections. Right now, in the polls, you have the 5 Star Party leading. If they win, and form the new government, they have already said that they would leave the EU, and leave the Euro, and, in a certain sense, it is not functioning.

The reason I was against the introduction of the Euro from the beginning, was because we said that it cannot function. You

cannot have a European currency union in something which is not an optimal economic space. You cannot put advanced industry together with an agrarian country, with completely different tax laws, pension laws, and you don't want a political union, because Europe is not a people. You don't have a European people. I don't know what the Danes are saying. I don't know what is in the Danish newspapers. The people of Slovenia have no inkling of what is happening in Alsace-Lorraine, and so forth, and so on. You don't have a European people. Esperanto doesn't function. You have 28 nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

I just think that this European Union is not going to stay forever.

Q: (followup) Will it be easier for Germany and France to promote this development, as the leading countries?

A: Everybody says that Germany is the biggest beneficiary of globalization, the EU, and the Euro, but that's not really true, because, if you look at it more closely, then you can say that since the introduction of the Euro, the domestic market of Germany has completely stagnated. And the number of people who became poorer has increased.

Q: (followup) What about regarding the dialogue with Russia.

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU

Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea. And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

Q: You said that the One Belt, One Road was stripped of commercial interests from the Chinese side, as opposed to the IMF, World Bank. On what basis do you say that it is less interest-driven than the Bretton Woods institutions?

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

The Cultural Revolution was horrible for the people. The Red Guards would take people out of their homes, put them in jail, send them to the countryside, and people were distraught.

And now, people in China are happy. If you talk to students, or to young people, they are optimistic. They say, 'Oh. I will do this in the future. I have these plans.' I talked to a group of students in Lanzhou two years ago, and they said, 'We will go to Africa. We will develop Africa.' I have never heard a German student say this. Yeah, when I was a student, but that's a long time ago.

I think that it is very worthwhile to read the speeches of Xi Jinping. There is a book, "The Governance of China," but that only has about 60 speeches, and there are many, many more. For example, you should read the speeches he gave when he went to France, to Germany, and to India.

For example, when he went to India, he made a speech which was really incredible, because he said that he loved Indian culture from his early youth, and then he gave so many examples of the high points of Indian culture, the Gupta period, the Upanishads, the Vedic writings, Rabindranath

Tagore, many predicates which prove that he really knows what he is talking about. He is not just one of these politicians who have a PR advisor about how to make nice bubbles in your speeches, but you could really see that he means it. And the same for Germany. He came to Germany and he emphasized Schubert and Heine, things which I also appreciate about Germany, and he did the same thing in France.

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government. Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

China is the only country that has not made wars of aggression, colonial wars, in its 5,000 years of history. It was invaded many times, the Opium War, and things like that, but China is not an aggressive nation, at all.

And if you look at what they are doing in practice, the IMF and the World Bank have prevented Third World development, and China is going from one country to the next, building science cities, helping with space cooperation, bringing in developing countries in the most advanced areas of science, in order to not prevent their development. I think this is a completely different approach.

I think that the Chinese have come up with a new model of government, which I have not seen in any place in Europe, the U.S. ever, and it's a model which is overcoming geopolitics,

which is, if you say, 'I have a win-win for cooperation. Everybody can join.' Then, if everyone joins, then you have overcome geopolitics.

And geopolitics is the one thing that caused two world wars, and in the age of thermonuclear weapons, we cannot have geopolitics anymore. So I think that these are very important differences.

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey democracy,' and do nothing.

Q: Statement about Chinese infrastructure projects in Morocco. Both are winners, as opposed to projects 20 years ago run by other countries. The Chinese there have learned Arabic. The projects have greatly reduced the travel time. They have a different perspective than the French, and Europeans had.

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

A: I would just say that people should not just believe, or not believe, what I am saying, but take an active attitude to try to find out what the truth is, for themselves. Because the world is not helped by replacing one ideology by another. The only way you can be certain, is that you become a truth-seeking person yourself. Because the whole question about what went wrong, is that people forgot what it is to be an honest truth-seeking person, taking the truth not as something you reach finally, but something you always improve.

Schiller had this beautiful writing about universal history, where he said that the philosophical mind is the first one to take his own system apart, to put it together more perfectly again.

I think that that quality – and, also, we had two days ago in Berlin, a very important event, which was also about the dialogue of cultures, and every – we had a very important presentation, which you can soon see on our webpage, where we

had a double bass player who spoke about the importance of Wilhelm Furtwängler as a conductor, and he gave some musical examples, and he compared the performances of Furtwängler with some modern conductors, and the difference is so unbelievable. The music of Furtwängler is transparent. It is beautiful. It is absolutely overwhelmingly uplifting, and many of the other conductors are just playing along, with no respect for what the composition is.

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness. That you don't fake it, because if you're not truthful – for example, you cannot recite poetry, if you're not truthful. You cannot sing beautifully, if you're not truthful. Sure, you can sing brilliantly, you can do all kinds of tricks, and it impresses people, but to really produce art, you have to be truthful. You have to try to understand the poetical idea, the musical idea. You have to step back with your ego behind what the composer or the poet wrote. And that's what is wrong with modern theater. In Regietheater, they just say, 'I don't care what Schiller wrote, or what Shakespeare wrote. I just make my modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art.

And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

Or, are you just eating three tons of caviar, and have 3,000 Porsches. And then, when you die, they write on your gravestone, 'He/she ate three tons of caviar, and had 3,000 Porsches,' and that was it.

No, you should try to be an honest person, trying to make human society better with what you do. And, once you do that, you become happy. Then you are free. This inner freedom, is what you should try to find. And that is the only way that we will win that battle. It's not Trump. It is, can we get enough people to be innerly free.

And then we win.
End of discussion

POLITISK ORIENTERING
den 8. december 2016:
Slaget om Aleppo;
Trump udnævner Xi Jinpings
ven
som ambassadør til Kina

Lyd:

Syrien står umiddelbart foran
befrielse
– Vil Det britiske Imperiums
terrorist-
instrument blive ødelagt for

altid?

✘ Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt holder Pearl Harbor-talen den 8. december, 1941, til en særlig indkaldt Kongressamling.

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. december, 2016 – På 75-års dagen den 7. dec., 1941 – »en dag, som vil blive husket som en skændselsdag«, som FDR erklærede – breder et lignende chok sig i De forenede Stater, og i verden, med Det britiske Imperium, der står over for sin mulige, endelige død. Politisk, økonomisk og strategisk vakler Imperiet, med Olympens bjerg, der smuldrer under dets fødder.

På den politiske side har den italienske befolknings overvældende afvisning af den EU-dikterede folkeafstemning, der skulle overgive magten til Bruxelles-bureaukraterne, som handler på vegne af bankerne i City of London, føjet yderligere et slag til Brexit, Trumps valgsejr, Fillons valgsejr i Frankrig, Dutertes valgsejr i Filippinerne og den allesteds nærværende fornemmelse af, at den britiske »globalisering« af hele verden under bankierernes kontrol er ved at være forbi.

På den økonomiske side bliver det i stigende grad erkendt, at den hektiske bestræbelse for at holde de europæiske banker oven vande gennem mere kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), mere bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindsud) og mere bail-out (statslig bankredning) – de samme, mislykkede bestræbelser, som Bush og Obama har brugt i USA – skal dække over ødelæggelsen af folks levebrød, hvor produktiv beskæftigelse og selve produktiviteten bliver lukket ned for at redde spekulanterne. Og så virker det ikke engang, for at redde bankerne!

På den strategiske side, så er krigene for »regimeskifte«, som Bush, Blair, Cameron og Obama har ført i hele Mellemøsten, og som har overgivet land efter land til bestialske terroristbander, ved at blive nedkæmpet på Syriens slagmarker. Aleppo er næsten blevet befriet fra al-Qaeda og ISIS, disse, de britiske og saudiske monarkiers skabelser. Som oberst Pat Lang (pens.) bemærkede på sin blog, *Sic Semper Tyrannis:[1]* »Det, der er sket i borgerkrigens heksekedel, er, at en ny magt er opstået i Levanten. En ny, syrisk, arabisk hær eksisterer nu, takket være russisk uddannelse, udstyr og rådgivning.«

Som en yderligere konsolidering af denne afvisning af britisk imperiepolitik, erklærede Donald Trump i går aftes i North Carolina med sin hidtil stærkeste formulering:

»Vi vil ophøre med at fare rundt for at vælte udenlandske regimer, som vi intet ved om; som vi ikke bør være indblandet i. Denne destruktive cyklus med intervention og kaos må omsider være slut ... Vi søger harmoni og god vilje mellem verdens nationer.«

✘ EIR's rapport 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen' på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk

Grundlaget for denne harmoni er blevet fremlagt i detaljer i EIR's Specialrapport, **»Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«**, som nu cirkulerer i hele verden på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk. I løbet af den forgangne uge fortalte to politiske ledere fra Kina, Patrick Ho, tidligere Hong Kong-indenrigssekretær, og viceudenrigsminister Fu Ying fra Beijing, et amerikansk publikum i Washington og New York, at den nyvalgte præsident Trump har mulighed for at bringe Kina og USA sammen omkring global opbygning af nationer, ved at tilslutte sig Xi Jinpings Silkevejsprojekter, Bælt-og-Vej-

programmet, og ved at tage imod det stående tilbud fra præsident Xi om samarbejde, som Obama havde afvist til fordel for militær konfrontation med både Kina og Rusland.

Trump har gjort det ekstremt klart, at han vil arbejde sammen med præsident Putin omkring bekæmpelse af terrorisme, samt inden for andre, endnu ikke afgjorte områder. I dag foretog han endnu en positiv gestus over for Beijing ved at udnævne guvernøren for Iowa, Terry Branstad, som den næste ambassadør til Kina. Branstad er en nær, personlig ven til præsident Xi Jinping, et venskab, der stammer fra Xis mange besøg til Iowa i årenes løb.

☒ LaRouches Fire Love

For virkelig at bringe Amerika ind i en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og Kina, må det transatlantiske banksystems bankerot løses, helst før der indtræffer en ukontrollabel sammenbrudskrise. Dette kræver den omgående genindførelse af Franklin Roosevelts **Glass/Steagall-lov** og afskrivning af boblen med værdiløse derivater, der er i færd med at drive realøkonomien ad Helvede til. I dag er aktivist-teams fra hele USA's østkyst i Washington, hvor de giver de sædvanligvis totalt idéforladte kongresmedlemmer deres marchordrer om at tilslutte sig den nu på globalt plan gærende revolution, der er i færd med at bringe en afslutning på Det britiske Imperiums finansdiktatur gennem Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit, der, efter Hamiltons principper, dirigeres til opbygning af industri, landbrug, infrastruktur og satsning på fusionskraft og udforskning af rummet. Magten til og muligheden for at gøre dette ligger i dette øjeblik i vore hænder, et øjeblik, der ligeledes vil »huskes som en skændsel«, hvis vi mislykkes. Som i 1941, har alle patrioter i deres respektive nationer, og alle borgere i verden, muligheden for at ændre historiens gang til det bedre, ved at tilslutte sig denne historiske, internationale kamp for at skabe en civilisation, der er i overensstemmelse med alle menneskers værdighed.

Foto: SAA Tigerstyrker og civile i Aleppo, Syrien, 7. december, 2016.

[1] Sic semper tyrannis er latin og betyder 'således altid for tyranner'. Det blev foreslået af George Manson ved Virginia Konventionen i 1776 og henviste til Marcus Junius Brutus' udtalelse ved mordet på Julius Cæsar. Det bliver undertiden fejltolket som »Død over tyranner«. (*wiki*)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 5.
december 2016:**

**Nu har Italien sagt "Nej":
Den globale transformation
fortsætter**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast,

25. november, 2016

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

Dette Nye Paradigme, der i øjeblikket ledes politisk og økonomisk af Rusland og Kina, kommer som et resultat af LaRouche-bevægelsens og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange organisering; der er således nu et Nyt Paradigme, der fører en

stadigt større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorisme (JASTA). Og som vi nu står klar til at gøre, med at få Kongressen – under denne overgangsperiode, 'lamme and'-perioden – til at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, det nødvendige første skridt for en økonomisk genrejsning. Glass-Steagall er den lov, som Franklin Roosevelt fik vedtaget, og som skabte 60+ år med stabil, kedelig, stabil, produktiv bankvirksomhed i USA; snarere end den form for spillevirksomhed, vi nu ser.

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

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

et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

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

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

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

Jeffrey Steinberg (efterretningsredaktør, EIR): Det er indledningsvist meget vigtigt at indse, at vi befinder os i en periode med forandring. Vi ved visse ting om konsekvenserne af det amerikanske præsidentvalg og andre nationale valg den 8. nov. Jeg mener, at Lozansky og Jatrus gjorde en fundamental pointe meget klart: Der forelå en meget alvorlig fare, baseret

på Hillary Clintons kampagneretorik, baseret på politikker, der blev stadigt mere aggressivt forfulgt af præsident Barack Obama mod slutningen af hans otte år i embedet; at vi havde kurs mod den værste krise mellem USA og Rusland, som vi nogen sinde har oplevet – måske endda værre end Cubakrisen i 1962. Så Hillary Clintons nederlag er virkelig afslutningen af præsidentskaberne Bush' og Obamas 16 år lange tyranni. Hvor hurtigt, vi kan vende politikken omkring under det nye Trump-præsidentskab, og i hvilken retning, udnævnelserne til hans administration vil gå, er alt sammen ukendte faktorer; vi har ingen vished om dem.

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

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

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

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

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

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske

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

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

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

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

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

JASON ROSS: Hi there! Today is November 25, 2016; and you're joining us for our regular webcast here from larouhepac.com. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today.

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

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

and Atlantic sides of South America; about setting up science cities. He was greeted by President Correa in Ecuador, who considered Xi Jinping's trip the most significant event to occur in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; such that there is now a New Paradigm taking an increasingly larger portion of the world in a very positive direction. Our job at present isn't to get the hottest news on what Trump's appointments will be, etc. It is to shape US policy; as we successfully did in forcing an override against Obama's veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. And as we stand poised to do now with getting the Congress – during this lame duck session – to implement Glass-Steagall, the necessary first step for an economic recovery. Glass-Steagall is the law that Franklin Roosevelt had put in place that created 60+ years of stable, boring, stable productive banking in the United States; rather than the kind of gambling that we see now.

Let me pull up this chart [Fig. 1] just to show a bit of this success that we've seen along the Chinese economic program.

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

economic belt, which you see the nations in blue, and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in orange. Together, China refers to this in Chinese as the "One Belt, One Road" initiative; in English, often just the Belt and Road initiative. As far as the potential that this holds, these are just some of the figures: 20,000 km of high-speed rail in China, all built within the last decade – more than the rest of the world combined; tens of billions of dollars of direct investment into nations of the region; an increase in services contracts of over 33% in just one year along the One Belt, One Road; the Export/Import Bank of China has outstanding involvement in over 1000 projects, and just recently has signed up about 500 new projects along the Belt and Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering training for 500,000 for professionals for training in China; has set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has initiated over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade agreements, and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects – including about 20 that were just set up this year among One Belt, One Road nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of the American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called,

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

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

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. For starters, it's very important to realize that we're in a period of significant flux. There are certain things that we know about the consequences of the US Presidential elections and other Federal elections on November 8th. And I think Lozansky and Jatruss made one very fundamental point quite clearly: That there was a very grave danger based on the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton, based on the policies that were pursued even ever more aggressively towards the end of his eight years in office by President

Barack

Obama; that we were headed for the worst crisis between the United States and Russia that we ever experienced – worse perhaps even than the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. So, the defeat of Hillary Clinton really is the end of the 16-year tyranny of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. How rapidly we can

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

they're not certain to us.

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

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

which was then followed by state visits by Chinese President Xi

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

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

Because

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

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

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

of a trilateral meeting would be extraordinarily valuable. I think it's important to remember that in 1944, the orientation of President Franklin Roosevelt in the move to establish the United Nations – which happened in 1945 – was to include both the Soviet Union and China among the permanent five nations of the UN Security Council. Remember, Roosevelt understood that there were imperial policies that were still at the core of the British Empire with Churchill, and similarly with France. So, the idea of having Russia – the Soviet Union at the time – and China in this permanent Security Council core grouping, reflected the fact that Roosevelt at that time saw the prospect of that kind of an alliance system across Eurasia. So, I think that's there's an historical basis to look to here for exactly this kind of Russia-China cooperation. For the last 15 years, a cornerstone of Lyndon LaRouche's of global policy has been a US-Russia-China-India cooperation, particularly on scientific programs; especially space exploration, as the basis for global peace and development. So, those ideas are out there.

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

used that term explicitly. He said, if you look at what Europe was able to accomplish in the aftermath of the devastation of World War II, and the role that the Marshall Plan played; it was not the whole thing, but it was an important element of the postwar recovery. That kind of perspective is really the winning strategy for dealing with the population growth and this spread of Saudi-sponsored jihadism throughout the Middle East-North Africa region. It extends into Southeast Asia as well.

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

Congressional

leadership gives the green lights, then Glass-Steagall can be brought to the floor of both houses and can be debated and voted

within a matter of hours. The override of JASTA took two hours

in the morning for the US Senate, and two and a half or so hours

in the afternoon for the House. It was accomplished in one legislative day. So, there's no reason whatsoever that we can't

move immediately – literally next week when Congress is back in

session after Thanksgiving; and they're there for three weeks.

There's no reason that we should not have Glass-Steagall back as

the law of the land before the Christmas recess. So that we hit

the ground running with the new administration; and frankly, time

is of the essence. We don't know, given the situation with

Deutsche Bank, with Royal Bank of Scotland, the largest US

too-big-to-fail banks are sitting on \$252 trillion in

derivatives. That's 30% more than it was at the time of the 2008

crash. That's on top of a very questionable capital base of \$14

trillion; the reality is that it's probably much less than that,

because some of the assets that are allowed to be counted as the

capital reserves, are basically illiquid and can't be – even on

an emergency basis – made liquid.

So, we could wake up tomorrow morning, or Monday morning, or

the middle of next week, and find that the entire trans-

Atlantic

banking system has blown out. So, Glass-Steagall is an urgent,

immediate issue; and it then begs the other three key elements of

LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws. Which is a credit system; investment in major infrastructure projects; and a revival of the

most advanced scientific programs, including a major return to space and the work internationally to finally achieve the full breakthrough on fusion. All of these things are on the table, but again, there are no guarantees, there's nothing that's even

remotely certain about what's going to come next. We can breathe

a little easier because danger of war with Russia, with China is

greatly reduced; and there's a lot of potentiality. There's a lot of the kind of transition from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan

in the air as a potential; but none of it is fully realized yet.

So, people are going to have to realize this is a moment of great

opportunity. It's going to be an outpouring of the population under the right kind of leadership, directed at the right policies, that can really seize the opportunity. If we wait until January or February of next year, who knows what kind of sabotage operations are going to be run?

You can go on Craig's List and find George Soros front groups, like MoveOn.org and blacklivesmatter.org, offering \$1500

a week for people to run around like idiots, protesting against

the outcome of the election. There's a great deal of uncertainty,

in terms of what's going on, at the same time that there's

great

opportunity. We've got to make sure that we take the lead in seizing the moment.

ROSS: Great! Thanks! In terms of the long-term outlook of where

we're going to go, what our policy should be, a major aspect of

this goes beyond legislation that affects us only here on Earth.

A major component, in fact the fourth component of the Four Laws

of Mr. LaRouche, the last one being the fusion driver crash program, is connected with our existence beyond the planet, also

out in space. Ben wrote an article that's going to be in the upcoming issue of the *Hamiltonian* about what a U.S. space policy ought to be, and about the really long-term goals that we

have to have, and why this is important and essential. So, could

you tell us about that, Ben?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Gladly! As viewers are aware, this has

been an ongoing subject of discussion. Mr. LaRouche, as Jason is

saying, has put a major, major focus on, as a critical part of the needed recovery program and the future of mankind. In this article we tried to elevate people's thinking about space, especially in the context of so many years and administrations and decades of just zero-growth policies.

One thing that's being discussed now, which is interesting

and useful, is how much NASA has been hijacked for this global warming crap. A lot of NASA's budget has been redirected to "Earth sciences." Not all Earth sciences are bad. There's a

lot

of interesting science to learn about the Earth. But Earth sciences is often a front to push this fraud of some man-made global warming crisis. So, there's some discussion about NASA being redirected away from wasting their time on this phony, phony, fake crisis, which is not something we need to be concerned about, and redirecting back to exploration. Surprise, surprise. The Moon has come back now as a central subject of the discussion. Anybody who had any sense would realize that once Obama was out, this crazy asteroid mission [The Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission] would likely be tossed aside. Anybody who is serious would recognize that the Moon is the next place to get back to.

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

activity for mankind?

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

This goes directly to the vision of Krafft Ehrlicke, the early space pioneer who worked very closely with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the '80s, who was one of the leading space visionaries, who had outlined in great detail the initial basis

of mankind expanding to really becoming a Solar System species.

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

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

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

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

The real understanding of what qualitative revolutions in

infrastructure systems mean for mankind's continual creative progress is not connected to the way most people use that term.

Mr. LaRouche defined the very profound and critical assessment of

looking at the development of human civilization in these stages

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

What

you began to see, with the development of inland waterways, inland river systems – he had put a big point on what Charlemagne was doing during his reign in central Europe in

developing these canal systems and river systems – was a qualitative revolution above what had existed prior, with these trans-oceanic civilizations: the development of these inland waterways. That defined a new platform of activity that supported a qualitative leap in what civilization was able to accomplish.

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

I think back to the early phases of these frontier explorations of the American Continent. You go back to the Lewis and Clark Expeditions, where to travel from the east coast across the entire mainland of the continent to the west coast required someone like the leading skilled frontiersmen, and a very dangerous, very challenging mission, which was a very brave

undertaking for a handful of people to actually be able to accomplish that. Some decades later, with the rail system, with the infrastructure of this railroad platform, any family could do this. With your young children, you could hop on the rail line and get across the country. Any entrepreneur could come out and take advantage of the development of new territories that were completely inaccessible before. It was a complete transformation in our most fundamental ability to exist on the planet in these different territories.

Now what does this have to do with space? This is how we should be thinking about space exploration, space development—things that we view today as incredibly expensive, difficult, dangerous missions. We should be thinking now what kind of investments can we make to ensure that those then become regular, day-to-day even, activities that we can support very easily. What will it take to create a Solar System physical-economic platform that will enable mankind to do much more, much easier, than we can today? That's the metric we want to set. That's the measuring rod we want to utilize, to determine what kind of space program, what kind of policy we need today.

In breaking this down, this might not include everything, but in some of our work in the Basement with our discussions on this subject, I think we can really, very usefully look at three categories of activity – three categories of infrastructure and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Developing resources. Developing the capabilities to utilize

the resources available to us throughout the Solar System, not having to take everything with us everywhere we go, but be able

to develop the wealth that's available out there; to utilize it

on site and transport it around, even bringing stuff back to Earth that we can't necessarily get from Earth.

If you look at these three pillars, these three categories

together, and if you make qualitative breakthroughs in each of these together, this really comes together to define a new platform of activity, a new standard that will enable the kind of

leap that will transition us from viewing space as a Lewis and Clark style expedition, to a trans-continental railroad style relationship to the Solar System.

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

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

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

The graphic here displays this, in terms of travel from Earth's surface to different planetary bodies, measured in the standard terms used for Solar System travel, which is your change in speed. To get into Earth orbit requires not just going up 100 miles, but actually changing your speed, from your current velocity sitting here on the Earth, to something that will

allow

you to stay in orbit. If you want to change orbits, or travel around, you can measure that, in terms of changes in velocity. So that happens to be the metric here; but you can see the lowest

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

you can see a relatively recent article covering studies in China on interest in China to develop what some people call single-stage-to-orbit space planes. So, you can get on a plane on a runway – it's probably going to be a little bit longer than your standard runway for airplane travel – and you can ride a single space plane from the runway all the way up into Earth orbit. A lot of this depends upon much more advanced engine designs that can utilize the oxygen in the atmosphere at higher speeds and at higher altitudes to continue to provide thrust. But these things could dramatically lower the cost, the energy requirements of getting people and payloads up into Earth orbit; far more than a lot of the discussion about these reusable rockets and some of the developments going on in improving rocket systems to get from Earth's surface into Earth orbit.

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

DENISTON: Yeah, absolutely. These rocket systems have to carry the oxygen as part of the rocket to combust to provide the thrust. These are more innovative engine designs – air-breathing engines that can use the oxygen in the atmosphere. As you said, this has been researched in the United States

with
different scramjet designs. Yeah, Mr. LaRouche featured some
of
this, which he had developed I think in some close discussion
with some Italian colleagues at the time in his collaboration
with the Fusion Energy Foundation; and had made it a major
part
of his "Woman on Mars" mission.

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

The next pillar, the next category is travel in
space. And
again, this is an issue that Mr. LaRouche has been campaigning
on
for decades. Space travel requires nuclear reactions;
chemical
fuel just doesn't have the energy density to provide quick and

efficient access to the Solar System. We can get to the Moon; that's OK. It probably would be nice to get there a little bit

quicker, but that's our next door neighbor in terms of the Solar

System. If you want to get to Mars, you want to get around to other places in the Solar System, you've got to get to nuclear reactions. The heart of this is the fact that the energy density, the energy per mass of nuclear reactions is, on average,

on the order of a million times greater than the energy per mass

in chemical reactions; even as broad categories, setting aside the particular fuel you use in either case.

A million times is just a big number, but for one quick

comparison, you take the fuel used for the Space Shuttle launch

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

is the defining characteristic that makes nuclear reactions key to getting around the Solar System; enabling things like travelling at constant acceleration. Instead of just initially firing your thruster and basically floating on an orbit to get to different planetary bodies – which is what's often proposed for getting people to Mars; which would take on the order of six, seven, eight months to do. If you had nuclear reactions – especially fusion reactions – you can be accelerating for half the trip, and decelerating the second half of the trip; you can cut that time down to weeks or even days.

We were all excited that New Horizons got to Pluto. Unfortunately, it didn't have the fuel in it and the engines to slow down when it got there; which is too bad, because it spent ten years getting there, and even just passing by in the course of a couple of weeks, found amazing things. Imagine if it actually got to stop and stay? If you had nuclear reactions, that the type of stuff you could be doing. If you had one-gravity acceleration, so you're constantly accelerating, providing the thrust that creates the equivalent of one Earth gravity for the crew on the space ship, it would literally take 16 days to get to Pluto. Compared to New Horizons taking ten years to get there; that's when the orbits are closest, but maybe a few more days in sub-optimal conditions.

You're talking about a complete revolution in our ability to efficiently get around the Solar System; travel to different planetary bodies; visit multiple locations. If you want to

send

people to Mars, this is the way to do it. If you want to send people out to other places, this is the way to do it. Even robotic missions; you want to get around and do way more exploration. There's so much we don't know about all these planets, about their moons; there's just so much to figure out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

eventually look to serious industrialization and development of

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

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

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

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

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

designs

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

to process the regala[ph], extract the helium-3; and initiate real industrial-style processes; developments on the lunar surface. That's just one example. You want to get oxygen, hydrogen, metals; asteroids are also potentially very useful places to develop the resources. So, as a third category, the general idea of developing advanced capabilities to utilize and

create what we need in different regions of the Solar System.

If you put this together and look at these things synergistically as integrated technologies, infrastructure systems, levels of energy flux density; as a whole they define for mankind a completely different relationship to the Solar System. The question is, are we making investments that are bringing us to that level? Can we say that the investments we're

going to make in this next administration are going to be taking

mankind in that direction, to be able to support these qualitatively higher levels of activity to the point where we can

honestly look back in a couple of generations and see the space

activity going on now as equivalent to Lewis and Clark style explorations of the West; and have mankind have the capabilities

to regularly visit many planetary bodies and do all we want around the Solar System? That's the vision that we need.

We were talking about this with Mr. LaRouche earlier today,

and he again said, "Your starting point is Krafft Ehrlicke."

And

Krafft Ehrlicke's industrialization of the Moon really I think is

the critical driver program that can get a lot of this going.

As

I said, we have helium-3 on the Moon; that puts fusion directly

right there on the table. You're talking about developing industrial capabilities and mining capabilities on the Moon.

If

you're serious about doing this, you want to increase our access

to space from the Earth's surface. So, it is excellent that we're seeing a lot of discussion about the Moon coming on the table again; but I think the issue is, are we going to pursue this Krafft Ehrlicke vision for a real industrial development?

Although he might have used different terms in discussing it, he

had exactly the same conception that Mr. LaRouche has: That this

is the basis for mankind's much broader expanse. Really the essential nature of the type of qualitative changes that mankind

goes through in his natural growth and development as a very unique species on this Earth and hopefully tomorrow in the Solar

System.

As Jason mentioned, some of this is discussed in an article

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

ROSS: Mhmm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good.

I

think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the

Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying the

develop

that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast

that with what China is able to do now with building rail networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to

that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it

made it possible to open up the interior of the continents.

And

with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or more

regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip.

The other aspect, which you talked about is, if you look at

what's going on with the New Paradigm in the world; what China's

doing, with the way things are being reshaped politically also around Russia. And then you look at the scientific advancements

that are being made, where China's got a very top-line in the world super-conducting tokamak for fusion research. The major breakthroughs in terms of lunar exploration – that's China right

now; China's going to be landing on the far side of the Moon; China had the first soft landing on the Moon in decades. This is

really a potential. With their far side of the Moon landing, China will be able to take the first photographs of our universe

in the very low radio range; it's never been done before.

We'll

have access to a whole new sense of sight about the universe around us.

So, I think it's very exciting. It's definitely much more thrilling than most of the discussion that takes place about this policy or that policy, when you think big like that.

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

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

The ability to understand this concept of the platforms, of the history of economic development of the United States, a real major aspect of economic science, comes through studying Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with —

if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to join us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself. The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the USA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 24. november 2016:

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

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

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

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

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

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

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

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

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast November 18, 2016

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

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

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

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

Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We had the opportunity just now to have a discussion with

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

point

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

What

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

this point. The leadership that the LaRouche PAC has delivered

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

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

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

international order; and that is what is determining world events

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

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

we respond to that?

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

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

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

leading activists of the LaRouche Political Action Committee.

We

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

and we definitely met a completely shaken up and much more

open

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with

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

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

stops and terminates the casino economy which is really the cause

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

Obviously,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

cents back from each cent of investment. Everything from

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

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

into South America. That would also obviously have to include North America. This is the vision that Helga LaRouche has been emphasizing, and what she laid out in a very inspiring way in this speech in Peru; the idea of the New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge. The organizers of that conference – this national congress of economists, the economists' association in Peru – drafted their own copy of a 60-page pamphlet that they distributed to all the participants of this conference, that was based on excerpts from this report by {EIR} – "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge". It also included a printing of Lyndon LaRouche's Four New Laws concept. So, this is obviously a very significant event; and the fact that it's happening in conjunction with the APEC summit at this moment in history, is very important. We hope to make the proceedings of that conference available to viewers of this website.

But what I can say is, we have now set the agenda. What's happening now is that the world is being forced to respond to the agenda that has been set over decades – but really in the last few months – by the LaRouche Movement internationally. You can see this by the flurry of coverage of Glass-Steagall inside the United States, and the fact that there's open discussion including from the new leadership of the Democratic Party: Warren, Sanders, Keith Ellison, and others. Now is the time to put Glass-Steagall on the table and get out in front of this. But the other element of this is the discussion of so-called "infrastructure". Now infrastructure can mean a lot of

different

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

The latest development in that discussion is an article that

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

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

that will repay its investment many times over for generations to

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

borrow most of the money from investors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, there are some much deeper scientific points that have

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

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

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

and I think we should maybe expand from there.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

country; increase the productivity of existing territories, and

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

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

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

physical goods needed to support society more efficiently and at

higher qualities with less physical input per capita, you could

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

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

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

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

what are the essential principles of human economic growth?

And

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

leader

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9/11 and so on.

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

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

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

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

In

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

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

of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jay

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

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

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

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

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

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

your economy per capita, and per land area.

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

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

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

program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the integration of the classical culture as the expression of a

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

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

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

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

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

good

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

conscious to the Kennedy administration; not only did they bring

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

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

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

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

which will encourage great culture, classical culture around the

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

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

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

happened politically, where New York City has definitely become

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

It

was a strategic decision to center a very active organization in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

potential of each individual which will be necessary to

transform

the nation and the world in the immediate future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

isotope economy, the intimate connection with energy flux density

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

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

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

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

ways.

Helga mentioned this very exciting prospect that's been

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the breakthroughs which are necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the
present tense for a reason.

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

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

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

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

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

is

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

Vi må sætte dagsordenen! USA må gå med i den Nye Silkevej. LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 11. nov., 2016; Leder

Det andet punkt, som står meget klart, er, at LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) har sat dagsordenen; ... Glass-Steagall; den omgående nødvendighed af at nedlukke Wall Street; og det faktum, at det amerikanske folk ikke var villigt til at acceptere Obama-Clinton-dagsordenen om at bringe USA ind i Tredje Verdenskrig med en konfrontation med Rusland. Men vi må fortsætte med at sætte dagsordenen. Der er intet alternativ, ingen erstatning for en fortsat mobilisering og en fortsat klarhed i lederskab, som kommer fra LaRouche Politiske Aktions-komite og vore allierede.

*Studievært, Matthew Ogden: Jeg håber, alle har haft mulighed for at se **specialudsendelsen efter valget**, som vi udlagde på denne webside onsdag; med direkte udtalelser fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Vi har haft mulighed for at tale med hr. LaRouche flere gange siden, inkl. for blot en time siden; og hr. LaRouche fastslår fortsat den pointe, at dette er en højst*

uafgjort situation; meget udefineret. Vi har endnu ikke fået de fulde fakta om, hvad implikationerne af den tiltrædende administration vil blive, men to punkter står klart. Og jeg tror, at folk meget klart har set, at dette har været en total afvisning af hele Obama-Clinton-Wall Street-apparatet, der havde overtaget det Demokratiske Parti; men også, på samme tid, det Republikanske Partis Bush-Cheney-apparat. Begge partier er nu ophørt med at eksistere i deres tidligere form, og vi befinder os i en situation internt i USA, der ikke har fortilfælde.

Det andet punkt, som står meget klart, er, at LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) har sat dagsordenen; og dette punkt burde stå klart med de foregående år, der har ført frem til i dag, inklusive med Kesha Rogers' succesfulde kampagner med stor indvirkning, hvor hun har stillet op til valg til offentligt embede. Men vi har på dagsordenen sat: Glass-Steagall; den omgående nødvendighed af at nedlukke Wall Street; og det faktum, at det amerikanske folk ikke var villigt til at acceptere Obama-Clinton-dagsordenen om at bringe USA ind i Tredje Verdenskrig med en konfrontation med Rusland. Men vi må fortsætte med at sætte dagsordenen. Der er intet alternativ, ingen erstatning for en fortsat mobilisering og en fortsat klarhed i lederskab, som kommer fra LaRouche Politiske Aktions-komite og vore allierede.

Jeg vil gerne oplæse et kort uddrag af lederartiklen, der blev udlagt på LPAC's webside i dag, for jeg mener, at det meget klart definerer, hvad hr. LaRouches aktuelle analyse af denne situation er. Derfra går vi over til diskussionen. Overskriften lyder: **»Trumps sejr betyder kun en udsættelse af krigsfaren – med mindre der vedtages en langt mere fundamental forandring«**. Den indledes med følgende erklæring:

»Donald Trumps valgsejr, og både Hillary Clintons og Barack Obamas valgnederlag, betyder en kortvarig udsættelse af fremstødet for Tredje Verdenskrig imod Rusland, under forudsætning af, at Obama forhindres i at foretage en eller anden vanvittig handling i sine tilbageværende 'lame duck'-uger – overgangsperioden – i embedet. Det faktum, at en umiddelbar fare for atomkrig midlertidigt er taget af bordet,

er vigtigt, men det løser ikke den anden, alvorlige krise, som verden konfronteres med.

Det transatlantiske finanssystem er stadig på randen af total disintegration, og med mindre man omgående håndterer dette problem, vil betingelserne for global krig snart vise sig igen. For at løse denne umiddelbare krise, må den amerikanske Kongres omgående vedtage de love, der er fremstillet i begge Huse, for en genindførelse af den oprindelige Glass/Steagall-lov fra 1933, og som bryder for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-bankerne op, i totalt adskilte kommercielle banker og investeringsbanker. Dette må være det første punkt på Kongressens dagsorden, når den vender tilbage til Washington i begyndelsen af næste uge.»

Det fortsætter således:

»Når denne presserende handling er vel overstået, må der træffes yderligere forholdsregler til en ny form for relationer mellem de ledende nationer på planeten.»

Dette vil vi gå meget mere i dybden med i udsendelsens løb, men denne udtalelse fortsætter med at citere nogle udtalelser af Sergej Glazjev, præsident Putins førende rådgiver; og af Chas Freeman, fremragende topdiplomat i USA's diplomati; og på anden vis, og som nu fastslår den meget klare og korrekte pointe, at tiden nu er inde til at indse, at verden er på vej ind i et totalt nyt paradigme. Og ud over blot en detente mellem USA og Rusland, hvilket er en potentiel meget positiv udvikling, så må USA også gengælde tilbuddene fra Kina om at gå med i dette program med den Nye Silkevej, det Nye Paradigme; med at gå med i AIIB og på en meget konkret og afgørende måde gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

Vi kan meget klart definere, at hr. LaRouche er den førende statsmand på scenen i USA lige nu. De Fire nye Love, som vi gentagende har understreget i løbet af de seneste mange måneder før dette valg, er fortsat øverste punkt på dagsordenen. Denne

dagsorden begynder selvfølgelig med Glass-Steagall, men programmet er i sin helhed en renæssance for USA, i traditionen efter Hamilton.

✘ Under en tidligere diskussion i dag, understregede Helga Zepp-Larouche dette brochuretillæg, der blev udgivet af LPAC for næsten et år siden – »**The United States joins the New Silk Road**« (Se også **dansk introduktion** ved samme navn). Heri fremlægges det meget klart, hvordan USA kan tilslutte sig dette nye paradigme.

Jeg vil gerne indlede med et par uddrag af disse udtalelser, som Sergej Glazjev og Chas Freeman er kommet med, og som tydeligt taler om netop denne pointe; men der kan siges meget mere. Dette er fra et interview med Glazjev til Itar-Tass umiddelbart efter præsidentvalget: Artiklen siger:

»Ifølge Glazjev viser de amerikanske valg, at 'det amerikanske folk ikke ønsker krig. For første gang i verdenshistorien har vi chancen for at få en ny økonomisk verdensorden, uden at føre en verdenskrig.'«

En tale, som Chas Freeman holdt i Hawaii nogle få dage før valget, med titlen, »Ét bælte, én vej«, slutter med den pointe, at

»USA må nu indse, at det nye paradigme, defineret af AIIB og den Nye Silkevej og alle de andre initiativer, som Kina har taget, er det nye spil i byen«.

Og Chas Freemans pointe er, at amerikanerne ikke er med i spillet. Tiden er nu inde til, at amerikanerne går med i dette og indser, at det er i vores egen interesse at gå med i initiativet for Ét bælte, én vej (OBOR). Chas Freeman siger:

»Kinas voksende indflydelse er en meget god grund til at søge at få en plads ved siden af det, både i de nye og gamle råd i den fremvoksende, multipolære verden, snarere end forgæves at søge at ekskludere det. USA må være konstruktivt og hjælpsomt,

ikke negativt og kritisk – stadig mindre obstruktivt – i takt med, at alt dette udfolder sig. Amerikanere har meget på spil mht., hvordan Eurasien bliver integreret, og mht., hvordan dets relationer med andre kontinenter og regioner bliver. Tiden er inde til at komme med i spillet«, konkluderer han; »tiden er inde til at deltage i udarbejdelsen af ordenen efter Pax Americana. Tiden er inde til at bruge Kinas initiativ til amerikansk fordel.«

Jeg kunne sige mere endnu, men jeg vil blot fastslå den pointe, at tiden nu er inde til at anerkende det fulde ansvar af det intellektuelle lederskab, som LaRouchePAC har defineret og fortsat leverer. Og, med de **Fire Nye Økonomiske Love**, med implikationerne af **Alexander Hamiltons økonomiske rapporter**, der oprindeligt definerede og skabte USA, og med anerkendelse af, hvad klokken er slået; og med skiftet til en totalt ny, international, økonomisk og strategisk orden, er det vores ansvar at mobilisere USA og bringe det ind i denne nye orden.

(Herefter følger aftenens diskussion; se video/engelsk udskrift.)

WE MUST SET THE AGENDA!

THE UNITED STATES MUST JOIN THE NEW SILK ROAD.

International Webcast, Nov. 11, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's November 11, 2016.

Happy

Veterans' Day! My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to welcome you to our regular weekly Friday evening broadcast here

from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio today by Ben Deniston, my colleague, as well as Kesha Rogers, member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee and former candidate for Federal

office – United States Congress and US Senate – joining us from Houston, Texas; and Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California, also a leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

I hope everybody had a chance to see the post-election broadcast special that we posted on this website on Wednesday; which included some direct video statements from both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. We've had a chance to speak with Mr. LaRouche several times since then, including just about an hour ago; and Mr. LaRouche continues to make the point that this is a highly inconclusive situation; very undefined. We have yet to get the full facts on what the implications of the incoming administration will be, but two points are very clear. And I think as people have observed very clearly, this has been a total repudiation of the entire Obama-Clinton-Wall Street apparatus that had taken over the Democratic Party; but also, at the same time, the Bush-Cheney Republican Party apparatus. Both parties have now ceased to exist in their previous form, and we are in an unprecedented situation inside the United States. The other point which is very clear is that the LaRouche Political Action Committee has set the agenda; and this point should have been clear for years leading into this, including from Kesha Rogers' successful, highly impactful campaigns for Federal office. But we've put on the agenda: Glass-Steagall; the immediate necessity

to shut down Wall Street; and the fact that the American people were not willing to accept the Obama-Clinton agenda to bring the United States into World War III with a confrontation with Russia. But we must continue to do so, and we must continue to set this agenda. There can be no alternative, no replacement for a continued mobilization and a continued clarity of leadership coming from the LaRouche Political Action Committee and our allies.

Now, I would like to read a short portion of the lead item which was posted on the LaRouche PAC website today, because I think it very clearly defines what Mr. LaRouche's current analysis of this situation is. And then we can open up the discussion from there. But the title is, "Trump Victory Is Only a Reprieve from War Danger Unless a Much More Fundamental Change Can Be Enacted". It begins by stating the following:

"The election of Donald Trump and the defeat of both Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama has provided a short reprieve in a drive for World War III against Russia, so long as Obama is prevented from taking some kind of insane action in his remaining lame duck weeks in office. The fact that an immediate danger of nuclear war is off the table for the time being is important; but it does not address the other grave crises that the world is facing.

"The trans-Atlantic financial system is still on the edge of

total disintegration, and unless that problem is immediately addressed, the conditions will soon re-emerge for global war. To solve that imminent crisis, the US Congress must immediately pass the pending legislation in both Houses, to reinstate the original Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, breaking up the too-big-to-fail banks into totally separated commercial and investment banks. This must be the first order of business when Congress returns to Washington early next week."

This continues by saying: "Well beyond that urgently required action, other measures must be taken to forge a new kind of relations among the leading nations of the planet." This is something we will elaborate much more during the course of this broadcast, but this statement goes on to cite some statements that were made by Sergei Glazyev, a leading advisor of President Putin; Chas Freeman, a top and very distinguished diplomat in the United States diplomatic community; and otherwise, that make the very clear and correct point that now is the time to realize that the world is moving into an entirely new paradigm. And beyond just a détente between the United States and Russia, which is a potentially very positive development, the United States must also reciprocate the offers from China to enter into this New Silk Road, New Paradigm program; entering into the AIIB, joining the New Silk Road in a very concrete and definitive way.

Now, what can be very clearly defined, is that Mr. LaRouche is the leading statesman on the scene right now in the United States. The Four New Laws that we have been repeatedly emphasizing over the course of the recent several months leading into this election, continue to be the number one agenda item. Of course, that begins with Glass-Steagall, but the entirety of the program is a Hamiltonian renaissance for the United States.

Now, during a discussion we had earlier today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized this supplementary pamphlet which was issued by the LaRouche Political Action Committee almost a year ago – "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance". And this very concretely lays out how the United States can join this New Paradigm.

Now, I'd like to just begin with a few excerpts from these statements that were made by Sergei Glazyev and Chas Freeman, which I think clearly get to this point; but I think a lot more can be said. This is an interview with Sergei Glazyev from {Itar Tass} in the aftermath of the Presidential elections: "According to Glazyev," this article says, "the result of the US elections show that 'The American people don't want war. For the first time in the world's history, there is a chance to a new global economic order without waging a world war.'"

And then Chas Freeman, in a speech called "One Belt, One

Road" which was delivered in Hawaii a few days before the election, end with the point that "The United States must now realize that the new paradigm defined by the AIIB and the New Silk Road, and all of the other initiatives that have been taken by China, is the new game in town." And Chas Freeman's point is that Americans are not in the game. Now's the time for us to enter into this and to realize that it's in our interest to join the One Belt, One Road initiative. Chas Freeman says, "China's growing influence is very good reason to seek a seat alongside it, both in the new and old councils of the emerging multipolar world, rather than continuing to futilely try to exclude it. The United States needs to be constructive and helpful, not negative and critical – still less obstructive – as all this unfolds. Americans have a big stake in how Eurasia integrates, and in what its relationships with other continents and regions become. Time to get in the game," he concludes; "time to participate in crafting the post-Pax Americana order. Time to leverage China's initiative to American advantage."

And I could go on, but I want to just make the point that now is the time to recognize the full responsibility of the intellectual leadership that LaRouche PAC has defined and continues to deliver. And taking the Four New Economic Laws, taking the implications of Alexander Hamilton's economic reports, which defined and created the United States in the first place,

and recognizing what time it is; with the shift to an entirely new international economic and strategic order, it's our responsibility to mobilize and bring the United States into that new order.

So, I'll just leave it at that; and I think we can explore some of the implications of this in discussion with Kesha and Michael.

KESHA ROGERS: OK, I will start in response by saying that what has to be recognized is that the fight has never been a matter of party politics, one party over the other; because as President George Washington said, "Party politics is the bane of our nation's existence." What we saw during my campaigns for US Congress, was very instrumental in that; because the people I was able to pull together were people from all different types of backgrounds. It was a question not of just what party you belonged to, or what your race was, or any of that; but this question of what do we want to see for our nation and for the future of our nation? Reviving the vision and the ideas of President John F Kennedy, President Franklin Roosevelt; people of all different types of backgrounds – as has been stated – came together around Glass-Steagall to defy Wall Street, and they continue to do so. The Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and so forth. So, I think it's important to note that what we have identified is a question of the direction that mankind has to take; that the people of this nation have come together on a few accounts that have been completely against what the establishment had thought would happen. During my campaigns,

the

victories around the two nominations despite the fact that the party establishment did everything in their power to create a divide against the truth that myself, Mr. LaRouche, and our slate

were saying; that Obama represented a threat to this nation.

The

cancelling of the NASA Constellation program, the continued policies for backing Wall Street against the interests of the population. The second time that we saw the population come together in a real way – as has been said on a number of occasions here – is the JASTA vote. The JASTA vote was not a

–

Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act – was not a Republican

or a Democratic issue; so I think we are now eliminating the party system. This has been a big part of what I have been advocating, what Mr. LaRouche has been advocating is that we have

to have a new conception of mankind brought forward. I think it's been very clearly stated in the discussions that we've had

with him, that are really continuing and hopefully we can get that developed in this discussion today. The idea that this is

not just a US issue; now we're talking about how do we improve and develop new conceptions of international relations. New conceptions of relations among human beings.

Just a couple of things I want to start off with to develop

that. First of all, just in the discussion we had with Mr. LaRouche yesterday, in response to the election and where we must

go from here, he said we will get a unity among human beings as

human beings. The US and Russia can work together as human beings; and we are looking at mankind in a universal way. We

are

going to learn how to apply our minds. People have to see the meaning of their existence in a way that most people have not. If we're really going to conceptualize that idea, I think what we're going to discuss here today is: 1. The concrete policies

that are needed to bring together the type of collaboration as we're seeing develop from the development of the BRICS nations

—

Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa — and their cooperation. The development of the AIIB, and the offer of cooperation through the Silk Road, by President Xi Jinping to the

United States. People probably remember that Obama rejected it.

Now, the mission is, we have to reverse the rejection. We have

to work with Russia; we have to take up China's offer. But we have to take it up in a bigger way than just around treaty agreements or working together on international cooperation of projects. Those things will be essential, but the essential is

going to be the development of a new, unified, international mission of a new direction for mankind in space collaboration. I

want to develop that a little bit more, but I will stop right there, because I think we need to pull a few more things together

to come back to that point.

MICHAEL STEGER: The underlying ability for the LaRouche

organization and LaRouche PAC to operate as a leading force on the planet has been something that eludes most people. It's not

something that's in the predicates of the policies we've been fighting for directly; there's something philosophically more

profound. It does stand out, the fact that this election, where
vote came from, what people voted for – whether it be in the
Democratic primary, where we saw Glass-Steagall both by Martin
O'Malley and Bernie Sanders, and again even by Trump at the
end
of the general election campaign; where Glass-Steagall came up
again. {We} were the leading factor and force of a political
fight, won in the opposition of Bush and Cheney and the clear
tyranny that they represented, but even more distinctly,
because
of the nature of Obama in this last years—which is important
just to take a few seconds, not long, but just to recognize:
the
Republican Party for the last eight years worked with Obama.
There was no real opposition to it. That's why the Republican
Party is really in as much of a shambles as the Democratic
Party
is.

The Party system, as Kesha said, is gone, because
there was
no legitimate opposition to Obama, except for what we did. And
it
started on the Obamacare question. We led the fight entirely.
We
defined it as a Nazi program, while the Republican Party was
likely going to adopt it and support it, the same way Mitt
Romney
had pushed in Massachusetts. It was generally a kind of
Heritage
Foundation, right-wing, healthcare reform. We recognized it to
be, underlying, a fascist program of population reduction, and
we've been relentless with Obama, unrelenting, on the question
that this Presidency was a failure and a very danger to
mankind.

But then you had Lyn's intervention following the
invasion

of Libya, and the killing of Muammar Gaddafi, and Lyn's precise insight that this represented a very accelerated drive for nuclear war. There was immediate resonance, immediate response from the leadership in Russia. Like Dmitry Medvedev, [then President, now Prime Minister]. And we saw an increasing level of recognition, somewhat slowly, but from key figures, who began to identify the fact that Lyn was absolutely right. And that again became a center of the discussion of the U.S. Presidential election over the last few months.

So, you have the immediate collapse of the financial system – which is there, we're on the precipice, this has been in the financial media now practically for a year, going back to last December, when the financial markets collapsed then. There's a very, very imminent breakdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It's an underlying bankruptcy, a deep bankruptcy. Then you also have the immediate drive for war. Both of those issues have now been on the table. That's what the American people voted for. It was a mandate for the LaRouche policy. And for the very reason that the political establishment in this country compromised on Lyn, going back to the 1980s, shut down his efforts for space exploration, for collaboration among nations, and instead put an FBI attack on him and our organization, they got this kind of revolt. Had they adopted Lyn's policies then, you wouldn't see neither the breakdown of our economy and our society, the threat of nuclear war, or the collapse of a revolutionary type situation in the United States.

The only way to really address this problem is to

address it

quickly. We are talking about a timeframe where if the new Administration coming in does not fulfill what the LaRouche PAC

has defined as the "New Presidency," then it will fail, and fail

quickly. There is a quality of crisis in the country, and so there is a level of urgency that Mr. LaRouche expressed today in

our discussions. We need to get a handle on this. The policy orientation needs to be very clear. And it needs to be a comprehensive program. You can't just implement Glass-Steagall,

though that's exactly where you have to start. You've got to go

with the full Hamilton perspective. You've got to look at a full

development of the country. And you can't go with this Wall Street garbage. It's not going to function.

A point that Kesha really made an emphasis of, and that Lyn

emphasized on Wednesday following this election, stands out, because there is clearly – as Matt, you read from the Chas Freeman quote – at the highest institutional level of recognition, that this New Silk Road orientation is in depth; it

is not weak; it is not superficial. As someone from the Chinese

Consulate in San Francisco recently said, "This is not on paper.

This is on the ground. This is a real project. This is not the TPP." The question though, is how is this approached? The approach of the political establishment may be best indicated by

Henry Kissinger and these types: is to approach it from the Hobbesian view – an animalistic view of man, where you're looking for advantages. How do we take advantage of this? How

do
we work with this? China is looking to their advantage. How do
we
look to our advantage?

It doesn't mean that one disregards one's own benefit.
But
the emphasis that Lyn made, and I think what Kesha was
developing, is that you have to look at the universal nature
of
mankind. You have to look at what policies, what approach
towards
the relationship among nations is of benefit to mankind as a
whole, or as Helga said on Wednesday in a discussion, what
used
to be referenced as the "common aims of mankind." That has to
be
then the basis, the philosophical basis for a scientific
foundation, for a new relationship among nations. And that
really
then defines how this can be very much a new paradigm or a new
era for mankind. Not only is an immediate action required, but
the potential of action is perhaps greater than it's ever
been.

OGDEN: Just to continue to emphasize the point that you,
Kesha,
brought up, the first indications, I think very clearly, of
what
hit with full force with this election, was what you were able
to
generate around your campaigns for federal office.

BEN DENISTON: Over and over again.

OGDEN: Three times in a row. Twice the Democratic
nominee
for Congress, and then you forced the Senate campaign into a
run-off, in Texas, on precisely this LaRouche PAC program.

Every

time that people say, "Oh, we are so surprised, we are so shocked, none of the polls saw this coming," whether it was in this general election campaign for President, whether it was in

the Brexit vote – every time somebody tells you that, you say, "No, that's actually not true."

DENISTON: Most people probably know, but it's worth emphasizing: Kesha led with "Impeach Obama." You had a Democrat

leading the Democratic ticket on impeaching Obama, and that was

what shocked. It was national news. It's kind of amazing that the

Democrats are so far behind, so much in this crazy bubble, that

they can't see where the ferment is in the population. Just to add that in there.

OGDEN: Absolutely!

DENISTON: It shocked the country, it shocked the world.

There was international recognition when Kesha won [the Democratic Party primaries for U.S. House in 2010 and again in 2012; and came in second in a field of five candidates for U.S.

Senate in 2013, but lost in the run-off]. These guys are now years and years behind the ball on this thing.

OGDEN: The other element of your campaigns, Kesha, was a clear vision for the country. This is an element of inspiration

that a population which was, yes, legitimately angry and enraged

against the policies of the last not 8 years, but the last 15,

16

years of both the Obama and Bush administrations, and had been ground into the dust and left behind, and were literally suffering from an increase in mortality, and so forth, as we've spoken about.

It was not only a rage factor, in terms of that, but it was also, and it continues to be – and this must be recognized – a deep desire for purpose, for meaning, for inspiration, and for a vision of what the future actually can be. And, Michael, as you were saying, it's a philosophical question: What is the meaning of mankind? What is this really all about? Why am I struggling, day in and day out? What's the meaning behind "what it means to be human?"

And so, the Number One point of emphasis in your campaigns, Kesha, and the Number One point of emphasis continues to be, what is the role that mankind is going to play over the next 100 years in this solar system and in the universe? It was clear when John F. Kennedy committed the United States to having a man on the Moon before the end of the 1960s, that this was the defining moment in the entire generation at that point. The United States rose to the challenge because it was a truthful challenge.

We applied the Hamiltonian principles to make that happen.

You stood up and you said "We're going back to space. China is doing it." In the years since your campaigns, Kesha, China has

achieved unbelievable feats. There will be a robotic lander on the far side of the Moon. If we put this on the agenda, and we say, "We are no longer going to succumb to the backwards agenda.

We're going to join hands, not only on the New Silk Road here on

Earth, but we're going to join hands with China to go back to the

Moon. We're going to go to Mars. We are going in a way which affirms the true, creative nature of the human species. We're going into space." That's the other element of this.

ROGERS: Yeah, that was already defined by Krafft Ehricke. It

was defined by Lyndon LaRouche. It was exemplified, as has already been stated, in a conception of mankind and the relationships among human beings, that most people, through the

degenerate culture that we have been immersed in, has yet to actually, truly experience. It's not just a question of "Well, I

like this policy of going to the Moon," or "Yes, we should do that," or "Kennedy's idea of going to the Moon was for economic

profits or to put feet on the Moon and then it was going to be over." We were talking about policy for a 50-year-plus plan, or

should we say, a generational.

Right now, the problem is that we have lost the conception

of acting for the next generations. Most people say, especially

with space policy, "Well, we'll see what this next President's going to do, but then after that we have to follow whatever the

next President wants to do, and it's just going to be an up-and-down cycle. Maybe we'll have a good one who wants a

good

policy, and maybe we'll have a bad one." But that's not how the

process works. As I said, this is a question of international relations, but also, as Krafft Ehrlicke said, the question of development of space, and what that represents for understanding

our relationships right here on Earth is a Universal, an Extraterritorial Imperative.

I think these conceptions are not just things that are to be

thrown around, but they really have to be conceptualized, understood, and mastered, just as Lyn's emphasis and very

important call, that the only thing that can save the United States right now, and for that matter save the entire world against this economic collapse, is the return to those

Hamiltonian principles – the recognition that we have to restore

an understanding of what Hamilton was developing in his four reports: "Report on Public Credit;" "Report on a National Bank;"

"Report on the Subject of Manufactures;" and "On the Constitutionality of the Bank of the United States."

We've done a number of very thorough presentations on those

points, because that's not just something of the past, or just "policy issues," but it is the necessary direction that has to be

re-established right now: how are we going to build up our capabilities on this planet to provide for the needs of every single human being? We're talking about development around food,

most importantly around fusion resources—LaRouche's Fourth Law.

We have to have a science-driver fusion program. This is the key

aspect of China's policy for their Moon mission, and their

space

program – the mining of Helium-3, the development of the far side of the Moon.

This is the policy that the United States has gone far away from. We just have to just put the United States back on course again, and that the course of action has been clearly stated by the direction that China's taking with their space program. It's interesting to note: that was the direction we were going in, or slated to go in, with the development of the Moon, under not just President John F. Kennedy, but this was the policy that was being put forth prior to President Obama cancelling it.

OGDEN: I want to pick up on what you said, Michael. What the LaRouche Movement – both in the United States, but also internationally – has clearly been at the forefront of for decades, is the agenda. The intelligentsia of the planet has concentrated itself, at key moments of history, around what the conceptions for the future must be that have been laid forward by the LaRouche Movement. I just want to bring up one point which was contained in this report. This is the transcript of an international conference that took place in June of this year. Coincidentally, it was literally the day after the Brexit vote occurred; which had the entire trans-Atlantic expert establishment on their heels. Nobody supposedly saw this coming. But the keynote speaker at this event was Helga Zepp-LaRouche; one of the other keynote speakers was Ambassador Chas Freeman. At that point, the point of the One Belt, One Road policy, the

New Silk Road policy was put clearly on the agenda. The other major agenda item of this conference was the necessity to work with Russia to resolve and rebuild the situation inside Syria. This conference was called in order to discuss the contents of this massive special report, which was published by {Executive Intelligence Review}. This is "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge"; and with the publication of this, the entire nitty-gritty aspect of what this New Paradigm really means on the ground – not on paper, as you said, Michael – was put into writing.

At that point, Helga Zepp-LaRouche called for the publication of a supplementary pamphlet which would concretely elaborate exactly how the United States would join that New Silk Road. And with all of the discussion now in the last few days of infrastructure and big projects and how to create millions of new jobs inside the United States, this is clearly the number one item of relevance. Now, we're going to play a short excerpt from a video which was put out by LaRouche PAC about two months ago. The full video is called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge", but this short excerpt from the concluding portion of that video elaborates exactly how the United States could work with China and work with these Eurasian countries to build itself into this New Silk Road. So, I'd like to play that excerpt for you right now.

"As part of the trans-Atlantic, the United States is

also

associated with a high standard of living. However, the Wall Street-dominated, post-World War II paradigm has taken its toll

on the US economy and its people. Scrapping its agro-industrial

sector for financial and services industries, with the promise that it would make for a more competitive economy, high-earning

skilled work was out-sourced to cheaper markets abroad which provide a living wage for their workers. This flawed version of

globalization lowered the productivity of the Americas as a whole, increased the rate of poverty throughout the hemisphere,

and invited billions of dollars of illicit money flows from the

global drug trade, which to this day represent a significant portion of the cash on hand in the Western banking sector.

"However, even after the 2007-2008 crisis, when the bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic financial system could no longer

be covered up and needed an emergency bail-out –

"|'This is not just about Lehman Brothers; these problems

are not limited to Wall Street or even Main Street. This is a crisis for the global economy.'

"– no serious structural reforms have been made to the Western financial establishment; putting the West and the rest of

the world at risk of an even greater crisis.

"No wonder that in recent years, China, Russia, and other

emerging economies have begun to create new international financial institutions, based on a concept of 'win-win' relations

among nations and created to facilitate economic development

and trade for all participants instead of preserving the hegemony of some. Instead of the exclusivity of US trade agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, China has extended an invitation to the US and the rest of the Americas to join them in establishing a new era of global economic development.

"I state this very clearly to President Obama that China will be firmly committed to the path of peaceful development; and China will be firm in deepening reform and opening up the country ...!"

"But can the US envision a world where it is no longer the sole superpower; and instead shares that responsibility with other nations?"

"...and will work hard to push forward the noble cause of peace and development for all mankind." [Chinese President Xi Jinping]

"The potential for US participation in the New Silk Road program is immense. One key project in EIR's New Silk Road report is finally connecting the Eurasian continent with North America at the Bering Strait. A Bering Strait provides the needed symmetry to make the One Belt, One Road strategy a global one; and would transform the two continents the same way the ancient Silk Road opened up Europe to Asia.

"Imagine boarding a magnetically-levitated train in downtown Paris or Berlin, travelling 250 miles per hour across the steppes

of Siberia, through a tunnel below the Bering Strait, emerging on the other side in Alaska on your way to Manhattan. Layered with a freight and passenger rail line running north-south from Alaska to the lower 48 states from Eurasia, is the construction of the long-awaited North American Water and Power Alliance [NAWAPA]; an Apollo-era continental water management system that takes freshwater run-off from Alaska and Canada, and diverts it southward for use in the arid southwest United States.

"And while the average American will tell you these projects are impossible, the average Chinese today is building them. In the last decade, China – comparable in size to the United States – constructed over 11,000 miles of high-speed rail; and seeks to triple that number by 2020. Similarly, China's Three Gorges Dam and South Water North projects are some of the greatest water infrastructure projects ever undertaken. In the new 'win-win' paradigm, big infrastructure investment is the new normal everywhere."

That video is available on the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel and the LaRouche PAC website. But I'd like to ask Ben to just follow that up.

BEN DENISTON: Off of the discussions that Matt referenced with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the last couple of days, we wanted

to redirect people's attention to this supplementary pamphlet. Obviously the full report is a little bit hefty for your average

American, we did want to produce this shorter, condensed kind of

organizing report to really grip people and give people a sense

of what it means for the United States to join this New Silk Road

program, this New Paradigm. We want to make sure people know

— we can bring up on the screen share here — that this full report

is also available on our website. If you go under "our policies", "US Joins the New Silk Road" it's available right there; and the entirety of the report is available here. As

Matthew said, this was published almost one year ago, so maybe some of the introduction might be a little bit dated to the context of the time when we put this out; but the substance, the

content, is still very relevant, very crucial, and integrates together with the more recent focus Mr. LaRouche has put on his

Four Laws program.

But just to give people a very quick overview of the report,

we can see here in the table of contents, it's broken into a series of chapters following the introduction. The first chapter

really provides somewhat of a sketch, but a real presentation of

what can be done in the United States in the context of joining

this New Paradigm. So, passing Glass-Steagall; engaging in an international credit/finance system to facilitate growth, development. What does that mean? Well, as was referenced in the video, one of the mega-projects that's been on the table

for
a century now quite frankly, if not longer, is this Bering
Strait
connection; literally connecting, via high-speed rail, North
America into this entire World Land-Bridge perspective. So,
that's been long recognized as a keystone project. That can
come
together with – as was also discussed in the video – high-
speed
rail across the United States. As Mr. LaRouche, in his work
on
the Eurasian Land-Bridge and World Land-Bridge, had developed,
these are more than just rail corridors; this mankind
developing
the interior regions of continents. Moving from a coastal
dominated civilization to one that actually master the
interior
landmass of regions. A lot can be said, but this really goes
to
the heart of his science of economics, his insight, his metric
of
potential relative population density; how mankind can
transform
the so-called "carrying capacity" of a piece of land of
society
with this kind of development. So, bringing in high-speed
rail
and all the associated infrastructure to make vastly larger
regions of the territory of the United States inhabitable and
developable. We have huge amounts of unused land waiting to
be
developed.

In the development of this report, Helga LaRouche also
placed a large emphasis on the development of new cities; new
renaissance cities as she called for as part of the whole
development program. Bringing rail, water, power to these new
regions of the country to develop new, highly-organized

cities;

not just urban sprawl, not just endless unorganized development.

But actual cultural city centers organized around a central region, focussed on an educational, artistic focus of society; and you center your activity around that. That's also discussed in some detail in this report.

This is obviously going to create major spin-off effects in terms of job requirements; rebuilding US industry. All kinds of connected jobs required to support that kind of activity. So, this talk about creating millions of jobs, this can be done very easily in the context of this New Paradigm system. One thing we fought with in producing this report was actually gripping people with what this means. It's easy to go through the figures – this many miles of rail, this many cities, etc. – but the American people have suffered so long under a lack of this kind of development, that it's important to really grip people and give them a sense that these are not just projects; this is your future. This is a return to the idea that every generation is going to be fundamentally better off than the generation before them. That you live your life with the recognition that your children are going to have a fundamentally better life than you were able to live; and it was because you and your generation contributed to creating that.

It's been recognized – LaRouche PAC may have been the first to point this out – but it's now generally recognized, the

current youth generation does not have that. You have the first situation potentially in American history where the younger generation is worse off than their parents' generation. If you want to talk about the death rates, the drug epidemic, all these things, that's the substance of what's driving that process. Not just poverty per se, but poverty in the context of no future; complete degeneracy of society.

So, returning to this idea that there is to your job, to your employment, to your activity, to your family's activity, to your neighborhood, your city, your town. There's a purpose in investing and creating a new, higher state of living for the nation as a whole; and that's what this really means. That's driving inspiration in China, in nations working with China; in this whole One Belt, One Road program. That's what we can revive and return to in the United States; that's what these infrastructure projects really mean. It's about mankind participating in the truly immortal nature of mankind's creative development.

And what we also address in this report, just to point this out to people directly, is an added integral element of that is a real science driver program. So, we have on the one hand – it's not separated, but together with the idea of joining the New Silk Road, rebuilding the United States on a higher level with new infrastructure, a new standard of living; also engaging in the science driver programs and technology driver programs that

push

to new frontiers. Fusion power. With fusion power, you can completely transform mankind's capabilities; you can blast mankind up to a higher level of potential existence. Both in making power available, but also completely revolutionizing all kinds of production, industry, technologies; it's a totally new stage for mankind.

This goes directly together with space; the development of the Moon, the development of helium-3 resources on the Moon as a key fusion fuel. So, bringing mankind really into a level of a Solar System species, a Solar System existence; and learning – we had some discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today – learning what the Solar System is really all about. There are some of the most basic things we still don't understand about how the Solar System works; even how the Moon works. Our knowledge is still extremely limited in terms of what mankind is existing in here in this Solar System; let alone what the Solar System is doing in the galaxy, and how to understand these kinds of things.

Recognizing that that is kind of the first of the substance of these kinds of revolutions of mankind's ability to exist. If we discover these higher levels of the principles organizing the fundamental nature of the universe, we can uniquely utilize that understanding to transform how we act.

So, it's this intimate connection that Mr. LaRouche, I believe, is the first to really define scientifically between

fundamental scientific discovery and the crucial role of real scientific method in that context, and what people call economic

progress and economic growth. That's the integrated central picture that we have to present and break through on; and we have

presented it in a somewhat short but moving and condensed and illustrated way in this report. So, Helga had specifically requested that we draw people's attention again to this important

piece of organizing ammunition that we have; to move people in this time of ferment, in this time of potential, to not sit back

and wait for something to happen, but to take action. Realize this is the future we can create. We've just had an opening created that gives us the potential to act; it's not here yet, but now we have a potential that we have not had for four terms

of the Presidency. So, I think this is critical that we get all

this on the table and move immediately with the recognition that

this is the true mission of mankind.

STEGER: I would just like to say, on the Four Laws, which captured this policy direction, the subtitle is that this is not

an option, but an immediate necessity. And I think it's worth making it clear that these are not policy options from the standpoint of government. These Four Laws and this orientation

that Ben just laid out, is actually a necessary and integral functioning of any competent form of government. Hamilton uniquely understood that at his time; there was resistance from

the slave-based oligarchy at that time which opposed the recognition that the economic power to unleash mankind's

advancement, to orient mankind towards this level through manufacturing, through industry, and especially through the scientific process. But that was an integral part of what government required to fulfill its obligation to the well-being of its population and its posterity. So, these Four Laws are a necessity not simply because of the economic crisis; they must be adopted by government as laws. Our government today, to secure for the first time as Glazyev said, for the first time, world war is no longer a danger; and for the first time the United States will set the leading example of a form of self-government based on the highest scientific conception of mankind based on these Four Laws; and have the economic power and potential to unleash that unique characteristic of mankind. These Four Laws are of that quality of significance.

OGDEN: This is the immediate action agenda. And as Lyndon and Helga LaRouche said earlier, there's a lot that's undefined; there's very inconclusive facts available right now. But the one thing that is clear, is that we need a full-scale mobilization from the people who are involved in the activities of LaRouche PAC, to immediately force the Glass-Steagall agenda. Congress is coming back into session at the very beginning of next week – Monday and Tuesday. They need to be confronted with an absolute torrent, a flood of calls and activity from around the country

to

say "There is nothing else; this is agenda point one." And to pull out all the stops on this entire program. We've emphasized

we have the ability to pull together the entire country on the Four Laws action page; this is action.larouchepac.com/fourlaws.

If you haven't signed up there yet, that's available. There's also a place where you can submit your reports. All of the material that you need is on that website, including the Alexander Hamilton four reports and Mr. LaRouche's original document, "LaRouche's Four Laws". Then as Ben just showed you,

we also have this supplementary page, a digital pamphlet that we

produced; "The United States Joins the New Silk Road". This is

also available on the LaRouche PAC website.

So, we are in undefined and uncharted territory right now; I

think people are recognizing that at the point that the United States, for example in the 1930s, faced similar situations, it was only because of the immediate leadership that Franklin Roosevelt provided with the entire program – this was the initial Glass-Steagall, this was a reorganization of the entire

bankrupt financial system, this was immediately getting people back to work – that is the agenda. At that point, it was undefined what was going to happen; it was because Franklin Roosevelt provided the kind of leadership that he did, that prevented what could have been a very dangerous situation from degenerating into that. It's our responsibility to place that onto the agenda now. Nobody else is going to do that. We have a

short reprieve, a short window of reprieve from the danger of World War III. You have qualified leadership from around the world tentatively reaching out and saying we are ready for an

entirely new paradigm of relations with the United States. Russia, China, other countries around the world. But the United States that they want, is LaRouche's United States.

So, thank you very much for joining us. I'd like to especially thank Michael and Kesha. Kesha, thank you; and I'm sure we will be looking to you for some more in the near future.

And I'd like to thank Ben for joining me here in the studio. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. If you haven't subscribed to our YouTube channel yet, do so immediately. And subscribe to our weekly and daily emails as well. Thank you and good night.