

# »Da vores sag er ny, må vi tænke nyt og handle nyt«. – Lincoln

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. januar, 2017* – For at få et indtryk af LaRouche Manhattan Project's stormende fremskridt, se [pressemeddelelsen](#) på New York Schiller Institutets forestående begivenhed denne lørdag, 7. januar. Manhattan Projektets voksende, nationale magt, tilsammen med de nye, globale betingelser, som Putin og Kina, og valget af Donald Trump, har skabt, vil gøre det muligt for os at intensivere og udvide en mobilisering for vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall som vejen frem mod LaRouches Fire Love i deres helhed, og for at bringe USA ind i samarbejde med andre nationer som Rusland og Kina.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche er i gang med at lancere initiativer for en intensiv mobilisering for Glass-Steagall og de Fire Love, med langt mere vidtrækkende overskrifter, som vil begynde at give genlyd i de forestående timer og dage.

New Yorks senator Chuck Schumer, der er leder af et Senatsmindretal, angreb den 3. jan. den nyvalgte præsident for at være »virkelig dum« for at modsige chefer for USA's efterretningstjenester. »Jeg siger jer, hvis man går op imod efterretningssamfundet, så har de utallige måder, hvorpå de kan angribe jer«, sagde senatoren på Rachel Maddox showet. »Så, selv for en praktisk, angiveligt behård forretningsmand, er det virkelig dumt af ham at gøre dette.« Schumer, sagde, at han forstår, at efterretningsfolk er »oprørte over den måde, Trump har behandlet dem på og omtalt dem«.

Lyndon LaRouche sagde, at efterretningssamfundet er blevet korrumperet; at vi må dumpe al denne korrupsion, og at Schumers kritik af Trump ikke var værd at støtte.

De bemærkninger fra Trumps side, der i den grad har oprørt efterretningscheferne, var et tweet i tirsdags, der lød: »Briefingen om 'efterretningerne' om den såkaldte 'russiske hacking' blev udsat til fredag, måske fordi der var brug for mere tid til at opbygge en sag. Meget mærkeligt!« Men han havde ikke alene ret, for direktør for den Nationale Efterretningstjeneste, James Clapper, samt de andre, har stadig brug for mere tid; det blev klart i dag, at de ikke vil blive i stand til at få deres sag op at stå før i næste uge – og de ved stadig ikke, hvilken dag i næste uge.

I mellemtiden rapporterede *Wall Street Journal* den 4. jan. fra kilder, der er bekendte med Trumps planer, at han ville omstrukturere og nedskære direktøren for den Nationale Efterretningstjenestes kontor, som nu ledes af Clapper, og som han (Trump) mener, er oppustet og politiseret. (Bare se på Clapper ...) Han vil omstrukturere CIA og nedskære personalet på Virginia-hovedkvarteret og få folk ud i poster i marken. »Trump-teamets synspunkt er, at efterretningsverdenen er blevet fuldstændig politiseret. De skal på slankekur.« Trumps tiltrædende nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, general Michael Flynn, som blev fyret af Obama som chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, er i centrum for den planlagte reorganisering.

Clapper blev tilsagt til at aflægge forklaring om »den russiske hacking af valget« for Lindsay Grahams og John McCains Senatskomite for de Bevæbnede Styrker i dag, men han sagde, at, før hans memo var klart, var han ikke indstillet på at sige mere, end han allerede havde sagt. Når dette memo er til rådighed på en ikke nærmere angivet dag i næste uge, sagde Clapper, at han vil aflægge forklaring om det for fire komiteer i Huset og Senatet, dernæst for hele Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet, og sluttelig offentliggøre en ikke-klassificeret version for hele landet.

De memoer, som Obama hidtil har fået fremstillet om den angivelige russiske hacking, har været temmelig latterlige –

professionelle IT-sikkerhedsfolk fra alle politiske tendenser har kaldt dem et sjusket job. Den seneste version, der blev offentliggjort den 29. dec. af Homeland Security og FBI, har denne advarsel skrevet øverst. ANSVARSRASKRIVELSE: Denne rapport udgives 'som den er' udelukkende til informationsspørgsmål. Afdelingen for Homeland Security giver ingen garantier af nogen som helst art mht. de informationer, der er indeholdt i rapporten.« Efterretningsveteranerne William Binney og Ray McGovern afslører Clapper som en serieløgner i en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* i dag. Den 12. marts, 2013, aflagde han falsk vidnesbyrd til Kongressen mht. rækkevidden af NSA's indsamling af data om amerikanere, som han indrømmede fire måneder senere efter Edward Snowdens afsløringer. Clapper havde tidligere hjulpet Donald Rumsfeld med at opretholde løgnen om de angivelige masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak.

Ingen af disse anklager mod Rusland vil holde vand – og således rejser den afsluttende del af et radioshow den 3. jan. med prof. emeritus fra New Yorks Universitet, Stephen F. Cohen, spørgsmålet, om »Obama kunne gribe til endnu mere radikale skridt i løbet af sine sidste dage i embedet ... « Dette anså Lyndon LaRouche for en relevant og signifikant advarsel.

LaRouche tilrådede også, at den nyvalgte præsident spiller en ledende rolle mht. Glass-Steagall. Giv Trump større juridisk spillerum. Hav en velvillig indstilling til den tiltrædende præsident. Erkend, at han har et vanskeligt job som udgangspunkt, og at vi derfor må give ham en vis opmuntring. Åbn sagen i sin helhed på denne måde, og gå ikke ind i enkelte punkter.

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 5. januar 2017: Farvel til 2016, Obama og det gamle paradigme. Se også 2. del.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Lyd:

---

## **Obama går ned i flammer – Vedtag Glass Steagall nu!**

*4. januar, 2017* – Både i USA og hele verden bliver Obama latterliggjort og fordømt for sit massemyrderi, sine krigsforbrydelser, sine løgne og sine hektiske (men mislykkede) bestræbelser på at fremkalde »fabrikeret hysteri« vendt mod Rusland. Stort set ingen, udover de løgnagtige massemedier og de mest hæmningsløse neokonservative omkring Obama og Hillary Clinton, tror et ord af det.

Tirsdag aften blev et interview med WikiLeaks' Julian Assange sendt på Fox News, hvor Assange igen fremhævede, at de omtalte e-mails fra den Demokratiske Nationalkomite og Hillary Clintons kampagneleder John Podesta ikke kom fra Rusland, som Obama og hans »efterretningsteam« har hævdet, og heller ikke fra nogen statslig aktør. Assange tilføjede, at WikiLeaks, i de ti år, det har eksisteret, aldrig har afsløret sine kilder,

og heller ikke vil gøre det nu, men også, at det aldrig har taget fejl, eller blot er blevet beskyldt for at tage fejl. Som mange efterretningseksperter har vist, så findes der intet bevis, eller blot troværdigt bevismateriale, for, at Rusland havde noget som helst at gøre med at skaffe og lække disse e-mails.

Men, sandheden bekymrer ikke den døende race af aktiver for Det britiske Imperium. CIA-chef John Brennan, der er mest kendt for sine ugentlige møder med Obama for at kortlægge ugens liste over dronedrab, optrådte tirsdag på PBS for at himle op om, at de informationer, der viser, at Rusland havde grebet ind i valget, var absolut sande, men at han endnu ikke kunne afsløre denne information. Forespurgt om CIA's »stensikre« bevis (som daværende CIA-direktør George Tenet dengang sagde) for, at Saddam Hussein havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, svarede Brennan, at det var noget, der fandt sted »for flere lysår siden«, og at CIA nu kun fortæller sandheden.

I Tyrkiet udstedte den tyrkiske premierminister Yilderim en erklæring, der sagde, at, selv om Obama hævder, at han bekæmper terrorisme, så har han i realiteten »sendt våben til terroristorganisationer ... Det er kun Tyrkiet, der bekæmper Daesh (ISIS).

USA og andre gør ingenting ... Det, vi forventer af den nye administration, er, at den sætter en stopper for denne skændsel.« Tyrkiske ledere stiller alvorlige spørgsmålstegn ved, at USA's luftvåben fortsat skal have lov at bruge Incirlik Flyvebasen, eftersom de nægter at hjælpe tyrkiske og russiske styrker med at bekæmpe Daesch (ISIS) i Syrien.

Men, at sprænge Obamas krigsplaner vil i det lange løb ikke betyde stort, hvis disintegrationen af hele det vestlige finanssystem ikke standses og vendes omkring, hvilket kun er muligt gennem den omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Den nye Kongres åbnede i denne uge, med flere ledende

Demokrater, der udtrykte, at de har i sinde at arbejde sammen med Trump omkring spørgsmål af gensidig interesse, og de nævnte især store investeringer i infrastruktur og en revision af den katastrofale frihandelsaftale NAFTA. Dette er nyttige og vigtige forholdsregler, men uden Glass-Steagall, der lukker de ulovlige spillebuler, centreret omkring Wall Street, vil intet andet kunne lade sig gøre i takt med, at den fremstormende implosion af det transatlantiske finansimperium vil feje alle andre bestræbelser på at genrejse økonomien væk. Kun gennem Glass-Steagall kan vi sætte scenen for et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, og som kan dirigere kredit til genopbygning og til fremskridt i forskning på videnskabens fremskudte grænser.

Aktivister fra LaRouchePAC var tirsdag til stede på Capitol Hill, hvor de mødtes med mange nye og tilbagevendende senatorer og medlemmer af Repræsentanternes Hus. De fik at vide, at Glass/Steagall-lovforslagene fra sidste Kongresforsamling vil blive genintroduceret i den nye Kongres inden for få dage.

Men Demokraterne har hidtil forsømt at gribe til handlinger, der ville få Trump til at gøre det, han sagde, han ville gøre, under valgkampagnen – nemlig at støtte Glass-Steagall. Ved omgående at gennemtvinge spørgsmålet – før vi rammes af et nyt finanssammenbrud – kan, og må, et tværpolitisk flertal genoprette fornuft i nationen og genoplive regering af folket, ved folket og for folket – og ikke af Wall Street, ved Wall Street og for Wall Street. Det var netop en sådan erkendelse af denne degradering af nationens borgere på vegne af Wall Street, der forårsagede det solide nederlag for Obama/Hillary-kampagnen i 2016.

En koalition af Demokrater fra det nordøstlige Ohio, der har afholdt møder med repræsentanter for LaRouchePAC, har udstedt en stærk erklæring til nyvalgte præsident Trump om at inkludere et krav om Glass-Steagall i sin Tale til Nationen.

Onsdag, den 11. januar, bliver en LaRouchePAC »Aktionsdag« på Capitol Hill for at levere det nødvendige »opløftende« spark bagi til de tøvende og/eller feje kongresmedlemmer om at handle nu.

---

## **USA's nye Kongres åbner i dag, med et land, der forfølges af sandheden**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 3. januar, 2017* – USA's 115. Kongres tages i dag i ed i en tid, hvor den sandhed bliver mere og mere åbenlys for ethvert blot nogenlunde menneskeligt væsen, at der må komme et skifte i USA's politik, bort fra økonomisk kollaps, krig og løgne. Hold af LaRouchePAC-aktivister var på stedet for at modtage kongresmedlemmerne med detaljerne for denne bydende nødvendige proces i form af en handleplan – genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven og sæt USA på en kurs for produktivitet gennem et nyt kreditsystem, og forny det forpligtende engagement over for videnskab og økonomisk udvikling.

Ydermere er sandhedens lys i færd med at brænde huller i Obama-administrationens aktuelle, store favoritløgn, nemlig, at det dæmoniske Rusland er i færd med at 'hacke' Amerika i stumper og stykker. For det første måtte *Washington Post* i dag bide i det sure æble og trække sin påstand tilbage, som avisen fremkom med i sidste uge, om, at Rusland havde hacket et elektricitetsselskab i New England, med mulige blackouts til følge. *WP's* forsideartikel i dag lyder, »El-selskab i Vermont har tilsyneladende ikke været udsat for russisk hacking«. *WP* havde urigtigt rapporteret, at selve værket var blevet hacket;

at den skadelige software (malware) kunne forbindes til Rusland; og at der var fare for et blackout på værket – Burlington Electric. Intet af dette var sandt.

Man bør huske på, at dette er den samme *Washington Post*, der, sammen med *New York Times*, oprindeligt fremkom med den påstand, at Rusland hackede den Demokratiske Nationalkomites computere og opsnappede e-mails fra John Podesta, Hillary Clintons kampagneleder, og med disse e-mails, der senere blev offentliggjort af WikiLeaks og således på ulovlig vis greb ind i valgresultatet (til Trumps fordel).

I denne sammenhæng udtalte WikiLeaks' grundlægger og redaktør, Julian Assange, sig offentligt imod denne påstand og sagde, at han er 1000 % sikker på, at Rusland ikke leverede hackede e-mails til WikiLeaks. »Vi kan sige, og har sagt, gentagne gange i løbet af de seneste to måneder, at vores kilde ikke er den russiske regering, og ikke er et nationalt parti.« Dette, og mere, sagde Assange i et eksklusivt interview i sidste uge med Sean Hannity fra Fox News, der vil blive udsendt i sin fulde udstrækning (første del) kl. 22 den 3. januar. Dette er første gang nogensinde, at Assange giver et interview til en Tv-kanal, og hans foreløbige kommentarer får allerede stor opmærksomhed internationalt og skaber ravage for Obama-flokken, inklusive for det Republikanske Partis russofober.

Disse afsløringer understreger den pointe, Lyndon LaRouche for nylig kom med, om Obama-præsidentskabets sidste dage: »Husk, hvem, der står bag Obama.« Han refererer til det døende, britiske City of London/Wall Street slæng. Men, tilføjer han, i takt med, at deres system udånder – og så længe der ikke gennemtvinges et skift i politikken for at udslukke det – så er de farlige og i stand til at udføre grusomheder.

I Sydvestasien skal man se hen til dette netværk i forbindelse med de ansvarlige for massenedskydningen i Istanbul nytårsaften. De tyrkiske myndigheders og samarbejdende, asiatiske regeringers efterforskning er stadig i gang og



holdes hemmelig, men LaRouche bemærkede: Led efter de britisk-tjetjenske netværks hånd i denne grusomme handling. Ud over visse empiriske 'signatur-fakta', der er knyttet til hændelsen, er der den grelle realitet med en sådan handlings onde formål – at forsøge at sabotere det igangværende tyrkisk-russisk-iranske samarbejde om en syrisk våbenhvile, forhandlinger i Kasakhstan i næste uge og en politisk løsning. Den tyrkiske vicepremierminister, Numann Kurtulmus, bekræftede imidlertid i dag, at Tyrkiets forpligtelse forbliver resolut.

Samme dag som massenedskydningsforbrydelsen fandt sted i Sydvestasien – hjemstedet for Det gamle, britiske Imperiums »Store Spil«, med alle dets årtier med blodsudgydelser – holdt den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping i Østasien sin årlige nytårstale, hvor han specifikt udtalte den sandhed, at menneskeheden kan handle på en måde, hvor der er fred i verden. Efter en gennemgang af Kinas præstationer i 2016, især inden for rumforskning, Bælt-og-Vej og præstationen med at løfte 10 millioner borgere ud af fattigdom, sluttede Xi:

»Det kinesiske folk har altid troet på, at verden er et fællesskab. Vi kinesere aspirerer ikke kun til et godt liv for os selv, men vi håber også, at mennesker i andre dele af verden har et anstændigt liv. I øjeblikket plages mennesker i visse lande og områder stadig af krige og uroligheder; mange lider under sygdomme og katastrofer. Vi håber inderligt, at det internationale samfund vil gøre en fælles indsats, arbejde i den overbevisning, at menneskeheden har en fælles skæbne som et fællesskab og bygge vores planet op til at være et mere fredeligt og fremgangsrigt sted at leve.«

*Foto: LaRouchePAC-aktivister foran Capitol uddeler materiale under banner for 'Genindfør Glass-Steagall'. Foto fra 2014.*

---

# Obama skal gå nu; han er lige så bitter en fiasko som Herbert Hoover

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 2. januar, 2017* – Da præsident Herbert Hoover havde tabt valget til Franklin D. Roosevelt i 1932, brugte han hele overgangsperioden til at forsøge at tvinge FDR til offentligt at støtte hans, Hoovers, mislykkede politik; og da FDR ikke ville det, tog en rasende Hoover til indsættelsesceremonien, hvor han nægtede at tale, eller bare se på den nyvalgte præsident. Hoover bar på et bittert nag imod FDR's nye paradigme – New Deal – frem til 1950'erne, hvor han spillede en rolle i fremvæksten af »McCarthy-giften«.

Alle Barack Obamas handlinger udgør nu et forsøg på at tvinge nyvalgte præsident Trump til at følge hans, Obamas, mislykkede politik; og til at angribe og bagvaske Rusland og dets præsident Putin.

Obama har i enhver forstand svigtet nationen – dens arbejdsstyrke, beskæftigelse, produktivitet, husstandsindkomst, narkoafhængighed, hjemløshed, stigende dødsrate og faldende gennemsnitslevealder, katastrofale krige. Han tyer nu til angivelige »uigenkaldelige eksekutive ordrer« og til deciderede misinformationskampagner fra regeringen, for at forsøge at tvinge Trump ind i – mindst – en ny kold krig. Dette kommer fra en præsident, der ikke kunne klare præsident Putin, og heller ikke Kinas præsident Xi Jinping.

Trump vil stadig ikke gå med, som hans bemærkninger i Florida nytårsaften indikerer. Men, hvilken politik, han vil føre, er stadig ikke klart.

Det, som er klart, er det nye paradigme med økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt, og med potentialet for fred, der er blevet skabt i løbet af 2016 af Xis Kina, Putins Rusland og

deres allierede blandt eurasiske og afrikanske nationer, og med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, der fortsat spiller en katalyserende rolle. Og lige så klar er »sangens kraft« i dette nye paradigme, der må have det bedste af alle nationers kulturhistorie, deres »klassik«, som kan gives til de andre. Dette demonstreredes af den over Internettet, især af russiske speakere, med lynets hast spredte kondolencehilsen fra Helga LaRouche i anledning af tabet af Alexandrov Ensemble i et flystyrt. (Det er overflødigt at nævne, at Barack Obama ikke kommenterede den tragiske død af hvert eneste medlem af Ruslands nationale kor.)

Det nye paradigme dikterer også ganske klart, hvad Trump og den tiltrædende Kongres omgående må gøre: Genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven og skab en statslig kreditinstitution til at hælde investeringer ind i rumforskning, gennembrud i kernefusion og ny infrastruktur med høj produktivitet.

Vi hører, at Obama har til hensigt at »sige farvel og takke nationen« den 10. januar i en tale i Chicago. Han bør holde den tale en uge før, og gå.

---

**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 håbefuldt 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](http://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 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.

---

**Putin har transformeret både  
Sydvestasien  
og Østasien hen imod**

# udvikling; Vil Amerika følge trop?

28. december, 2016 – Mens Obama fortsat demonstrerer, at han er »politisk afdød«, som Lyndon LaRouche udtrykker det, og kaster tordenkiler fra sin politiske kiste, som om han stadig var »dræberkongen« fra før, udstedte nyvalgte Trump i dag et tweet, hvor han fordømte de »mange inflammatoriske udtalelser og vejspærringer«, som kommer fra Obama. Obama har meddelt, at han snart vil annoncere »forholdsregler til gengældelse« imod Rusland for fantasifostret med Putins angivelige tyveri af valget, i håb om, at han kan underminere Trump-teamets plan om at gøre en ende på galskaben.

Men, Putin har ikke spildt tiden med at fumle rundt med det amerikanske valg. Hele Mellemøsten er blevet transformeret af hans succesfulde intervention i Syrien, der har vendt stormløbet fra de saudisk-britisk sponsorerede terroristnetværk. Ødelæggelsesprocessen imod Irak, Libyen og Syrien – de tre stærkeste, sekulære, antiterrorist-nationer i området, er nu slut. Undervejs er der dukket beviser op allevegne for, at Obama har bevæbnet terroristerne – russiske sappører, der rydder miner fra det befriede Aleppo, annoncerede i dag fundet af et terrorist-våbenlager, proppet med amerikanske, tyske og bulgarske våben, mens den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan annoncerede, at han havde sikre beviser for USA's bevæbning af selve ISIS.

Men, hvad der er vigtigere, så har kombinationen af den russiske rolle i Syrien og Putins nylige besøg i Japan transformeret begge områder og forenet dem bag kendsgerningen om et nyt paradigme, baseret på udvikling. Den østrigske mellemsteksperit Karin Kneissl kom i dag med den indsigtfulde pointe, at Ruslands evne til at hjælpe den syriske regering med at knuse terroristtruslen på dramatisk vis blev fremhjulpet af Kinas »den bløde magts strategi« og bringer den

Nye Silkevej ind i regionen og således skaber jobs for de millioner af unge mennesker, hvis fremtid var blevet tyvstjålet af Bush' og Obamas krige, og som skaber potentialet for, at de millioner af flygtninge kan vende tilbage til produktive beskæftigelser i deres hjemlande.

I dag pegede Lyndon LaRouche på Putins højst succesrige besøg til den japanske premierminister Shinzo Abe i denne måned, hvor han igangsatte enorme, fælles udviklingsprojekter i det russiske Fjernøsten, og endda på de omstridte Kurilliske Øer, og som således forbereder vejen for en fredstraktat mellem Rusland og Japan.

»Dette er ikke blot en lokal aftale«, sagde LaRouche. »Det vil stimulere væksten ikke alene i hele Asien, men det vil stimulere hele verden.« Abe besøgte Pearl Harbor tirsdag sammen med præsident Obama, hvor førstnævntes udtalelser kun kunne forstås som en advarsel til USA om ikke at følge Obamas vanvittige konfrontation med Rusland, men derimod gå sammen med Japan og med Kinas Nye Silkevejsproces for at skabe et nyt paradigme for fredelig udvikling for menneskeheden.

LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) er i færd med at forberede en opdateret rapport om »USA tilslutter sig Den Nye Silkevej – en Hamilton-vision for en økonomisk renæssance«. Rapporten vil gennemgå det utrolige tempo, i hvilket udviklingsprojekter er blevet igangsat i hele verden i 2016, under Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ og dermed relaterede bestræbelser fra Ruslands og Indiens side, og fremlægge for det amerikanske folk, og Trump-teamet, at USA kan og må deltage i denne revolutionære proces. Ikke alene kan en genoplivet amerikansk industri i stor stil bidrage til disse globale projekter, men den smuldrende, amerikanske infrastruktur kan også selv blive genopbygget, med nye, storstilede projekter inden for vand, transport, et genoplivet rumprogram og videnskabelig udforskning på den menneskelige videns fremskudte grænser.

Magten hos det finansielle oligarki, der har påtvunget verden sin vilje, har nu mistet kontrollen over det meste af verden uden for de transatlantiske nationer, og dets magt dér står nu på højkant. Deres finansielle kartellers bankerot kan ikke længere udskydes, og deres befolkninger er i en tilstand af oprør, som de miskrediterede oligarker afviser som »populisme«. Raseriet imod deres onde nedskæringspolitikker, og imod deres fremstød for krig imod Rusland og Kina, er åbenbart overalt i Vesten. Dette raseri må finde sit fokus i positiv hævde af sund fornuft, baseret på fremgangsmåden med LaRouches Fire Love: underkast kartellerne konkursbehandling iflg. Glass-Steagall; skab nye kreditinstitutioner efter Hamiltons model; målret kreditudstedelse til genopbygning af industri, landbrug og infrastruktur; og stimuler vore borgeres kreative evner, for at virkeliggøre fusionskraft og rumforskning, og for skabelse af en fremtid i overensstemmelse med menneskeværdet.

*Foto: Kesha Rogers fra LaRouche Komite for Politisk Strategi (LPAC) ved NASA's Johnson Space Center, (Houston), i januar 2016. Se hendes artikel: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=11543>*

---

## **Den presserende opgave for det nye år: Sæt dagsordenen for USA**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 27. december, 2016* – I denne uge udgav Kina sin rapport, »Kinas aktiviteter i rummet i 2016«, med en gennemgang af rumprogrammets præstationer igennem de seneste år, og med en fremlæggelse af planer for den kommende periode,

med det formål, lyder rapporten, at tjene »menneskehedens utrættelige forfølgelse af en fredelig udforskning og anvendelse af det ydre rum. Kina står ved en ny, historisk startlinje og er fast besluttet på at fremskynde udviklingen af sin industri og aktivt udøve international udveksling og internationalt samarbejde omkring rummet således, at resultater fra aktiviteter i rummet vil tjene og forbedre menneskehedens trivsel i bredere omfang ... «

I skarp modsætning hertil befinder USA og det transatlantiske område sig i et økonomisk sammenbrud, der udgør en stor fare for hele menneskeheden, og de fortsætter desuden med at forfølge den selv samme politik, der var årsag til dette sammenbrud.

Nærmere bestemt, så finder der i øjeblikket et opgør sted mellem Den europæiske Centralbank (ECB) og Italien over Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS), som truer med at bryde ud i kaos. I denne uge kom det frem, at ECB har beordret MPS til at fremskaffe – genkapitalisere – 8,8 mia. euro, og ikke de tidligere 5 mia., som den italienske regering har arbejdet på at fremskaffe. Befolkningen er rasende.

Den eneste fornuftige respons til alt dette er at dumpe det døde system ved at indlede en Glass-Steagall reorganisering og etablere et ordentligt banksystem. Udsted kreditter til prioriterede, produktive aktiviteter og promover den økonomiske virkning, med videnskab som drivkraft, af at fremme arbejde omkring rummet og omkring gennembrud inden for fusion. Dette fremlægges i Lyndon LaRouches forslag fra 2014 med de »Fire Love«, som vi vil præsentere i den kommende, nye brochure fra LaRouchePAC til masseomdeling – en opdateret version af brochuren »USA går med i den Nye Silkevej; en Hamilton-vision for en økonomisk renæssance« (2015).

Dette program må sættes øverst på dagsordenen i USA, og ligeledes i Europa og andre steder, og det må ske omgående. Det er desuden ligeledes presserende nødvendigt at formidle

videnskaben bag de 'Fire Love'. Se tilbage og studer LaRouches gennembrud inden for metodologi i årtiernes løb. For eksempel, hans koncept med potentiel relativ befolkningstæthed; hans koncept med energigennemstrømningstæthed; hans koncept med den 'produktive platform' – og ikke blot infrastruktur.

I dag bemærkede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at det, man ser i den netop publicerede kinesiske rapport om rum-infrastruktur, faktisk er, at man har taget halvdelen af Lyndon LaRouches forslag for en økonomisk platform og projiceret det ud i rummet. Det er meget rigt og håbefuldt.

Den 3. januar vil den nye, 115. Kongres træde sammen i Washington, D.C. De skal mærke presset for at handle. Den 6. januar vil alle kongresmedlemmer være til stede for at gennemføre protokollen med at optælle valgmandskollegiets stemmer og officielt erklære valget af Donald Trump, hvis kampagne red ind på en bølge af befolkningens afsky for den nuværende politik med økonomisk destruktion og krig. Vi må nu sætte dagsordenen for, hvad der må gøres for at gøre en ende på denne befolknings trængsler, fortvivlelse og vrede.

Lyndon LaRouche talte om denne bydende og presserende nødvendighed: »Læg pres på kongresmedlemmerne for at få tingene til at ske.« Han sagde, »Vi må opbygge mennesker, der blev ødelagt af det, som Bush-familien og Obama gjorde. Det er spørgsmålet.« Han talte om Franklin D. Roosevelt og sagde, »Se på, hvordan FDR var foregangsmand for nye fordele for USA's befolkning« og bemærkede, at FDR og hans politik dernæst blev knust. Men, »vi har en latent mulighed. Vi kan få det tilbage«. Ideen er, at »vi må genopdrage. Brug redskaber til at gøre folk kreative ... Se, hvad FDR opnåede. Det må gøres klart.«

---



# 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](http://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](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](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

---

## Har Obama efterladt 'en ny, stor recession' til Trump?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 8. december, 2016 – Alt imens det aktuelle, afgørende spørgsmål er, om den tiltrædende Trump-administration virkelig vil begrave »krigsdoktrinen for regimeskifte« og forfølge produktivt, økonomisk samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, så blev vi i dag mindet om den anden, triste arv fra Barack Obama: økonomien. Det amerikanske Konkurrenceråd har udgivet en rapport om USA's produktivitet med titlen, »Ingen økonomisk genrejsning«, og i *USA Today* lød overskriften meget passende, »Obamas økonomiske genrejsning var alligevel ingen genrejsning«. Og det Nationale Center for Sundhedsstatistik udgav en grummere undersøgelse, der fandt, at den forventede levealder for alle amerikanere faktisk er faldende, og at dødsfald som følge af alle de mest almindelige sygdomme er stigende, og det samme er spædbarnsdødeligheden. En af undersøgelsens forskere sagde: »Der er simpelt hen dette fænomen med, at tingene ikke står så godt til i USA, over hele linjen.«

På trods af »markedets« kortvarige eufori over valget af Trump, så forudsiger mange økonomer, at Obama har efterladt ham »en ny, stor recession«; og faktisk, et snarligt finanssammenbrud på grund af Dodd/Frank-lovens åbenbare manglende evne til at kontrollere og undertvinge Wall Street. Mange af de mest aktive og interesserede amerikanere er også meget bekymrede over dette.

Det ovenfor nævnte «største spørgsmål» vil fundamentalt afgøre det; amerikansk velstand vil vende tilbage gennem at samarbejde omkring »Den Nye Silkevej« om store infrastrukturprojekter, gennem fælles gennembrud inden for teknologier for fusionskraft; og inden for kernekraft og afsaltning af havvand ved hjælp af kernekraft.

Som Rachel Brinkley, fra LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee, udtrykte det i en udtalelse om den mislykkede Dodd/Frank-lov: »For det første, så er der ... forøgelsen af reel velstand som resultat af forøgede rater af fysisk produktivitet. Kinas politik for den Nye Silkevej har en positiv effekt på 70 lande og 4,4 mia. mennesker, ved at fokusere på byggeriet af nye transportruter og udvikling af energi, inklusive byggeriet af højhastighedsjernbaner og mere effektive havne, at bringe elektricitet til landdistrikterne, og ved at indgå partnerskaber for avanceret, videnskabeligt samarbejde med andre lande. Dette er en aktuel, levende demonstration af, hvordan man påvirker nettorater af fysisk vækst i positiv retning. Monetære processer må altid være underordnet dette ... «

#### ☒ LaRouches Fire Love

Men, vi må omgående have en reorganisering af bankerne gennem indførelse af Glass-Steagall – i modsat fald, med stigende rentesatser, der nu rammer kolossale gældsbobler, vil Wall Street og City of London atter kollapse og ødelægge udsigterne til fremskridt. Trump har sagt, at han vil have Glass-Steagall genindført; mange kendte økonomer siger, at Kongressen og hans Wall Street-rådgivere ikke vil tillade det.

De undervurderer det tilbageholdte krav fra millioner af informerede amerikanere, om at få retfærdighed gennem **Glass-Steagall** og få »lukket Wall Street-kasinoet ned«. Dernæst kan en politik for statslig kredit og produktivitet, i Franklin Roosevelts tradition, løfte nationen ud af det langvarige, økonomiske kollaps, i hvilket Bush og Obama har efterladt den.

*Foto: Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump har forpligtet sig til, at USA skal ophøre med at føre en politik for regimeskifte ...*

---

# **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*)

---

**Ved et uafgjort øjeblik i historien er**

# den personlige faktor endnu vigtigere: Gør det Nye Paradigme til virkelighed!

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 6. december, 2016* – Den formelle overgang til USA's næste præsidentskab – der er 45 dage til Indvielsesdagen for Donald Trump – får uophørlig opmærksomhed i USA og i andre medier, men, den historisk vigtige overgang i verden som helhed er det følgende: hvor hurtigt og vist vil USA og Europa opgive det geopolitiske, kasino-økonomiske system og gå med i det nye, globale win-win-paradigme? Udfordringen består i at mobilisere folk til at være med til at få dette til at ske. Dette omfatter, at de foretager en personlig ændring og bliver aktive, og ikke længere blot ser passivt og afventende til. Der gives øjeblikke i historien, hvor den subjektive faktor er altafgørende. Vi befinder os ved et sådant øjeblik.


Omstændighederne er dramatiske. Yderligere initiativer for fred og udvikling kommer i denne uge fra Rusland og Kina.

I dag var premierminister Dmitri Medvedev vært for mange møder i Moskva med den tyrkiske premierminister Binali Yildirim, inkl. møder med præsident Vladimir Putin. Sammen med afgørende, økonomiske engagementer, såsom byggeri af kernekraftværker og gasledningen Turkish Stream, bekræftede lederne det, som Yildirim kaldte behovet for en ny, international sikkerhedsarkitektur for at besejre terrorisme, og en ny dialog med vestlige magter på dette grundlag.

I Tokyo fremlagde en kinesisk embedsmand fra den magtfulde Nationale Udviklings- og Reformkommission (NDRC) i går et tilbud om at opkoble Bælt-og-Vej-programmet til Japans og

Sydkoreas økonomiske »arbejdsplaner«. Hr. Cao Wenlian, generaldirektør for NDRC's Internationale Samarbejdscenter, talte om at styrke komplementariteten i de tre nationers økonomiske aktiviteter, der tilsammen allerede udgør 36 procent af verdens BNP. Cao talte i anledning af det Første Forum for Samarbejde om Industrikapacitet mellem de tre lande. Dette fremstød med det kinesiske tilbud tilsidesætter Japans mangeårige underdanighed under transatlantisk, økonomisk og militær, tvivlsom og aggressiv manipulation.

Selv Henry Kissinger – hvis personlige historie kan siges at indbefatte særdeles uønskede paradigmer – taler offentligt til fordel for samarbejde mellem USA og Kina. Kissinger mødtes den 2. dec. med præsident Xi Jinping i Beijing. I dag mødtes han med Donald Trump i New York City. I går aftes under et Manhattan-arrangement svarede Kissinger på et spørgsmål, der var stillet af LaRouchePAC's Daniel Burke, som spurgte: »Hr. LaRouche deler stærkt Deres mening om, at USA og Kina må samarbejde. Og han understreger, at USA og Kina kan samarbejde omkring politikken med Ét bælte, én vej; at dette ville være en indlysende vej til at genopbygge USA's kollapsende økonomi ... « Kissinger svarede: »Jeg mener, at konceptet med Én vej, ét bælte [sic] er et vigtigt spørgsmål. Jeg mener, at Kina kan og bør finde en måde at tale om det. Det er et af de spørgsmål, hvor samarbejde sandsynligvis er muligt ... «

I denne uge vil LaRouchePAC-aktivister fra flere  østkyststater anføre angrebet på Capitol Hill i Washington, D.C., for at lægge pres på virkeligheden og politikken med det formål at få USA til at gå med i det nye paradigmes æra, med start i en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der følges op af gennemførelse af de handlinger, der fremlægges i LaRouches *Fire Love*.

Ved et arrangement i går i Washington, D.C., talte både vicepræsident Joe Biden og Thomas Hoenig, vicepræsident for den amerikanske Statslige Indskudsgarantifond, FDIC, offentligt til fordel for Glass/Steagall-loven. Biden fordømte

sin egen stemme til fordel for en ophævelse af Glass-Steagall i 1999 (Gramm-Leach-Bliley-loven) som »den værste stemme, jeg nogensinde har afgivet i hele min tid i USA's Senat«. Men så vendte han rundt og sagde, det er derfor, vi nu »ikke kan tillade en ophævelse af Dodd-Frank«, fordi vi har brug for »en opmand i marken«.

Hoenig udtalte imidlertid støtte til genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og forklarede, at ophævelsen af denne lov førte til de risikable omstændigheder, der skabte krisen i 2008.

»Man gav de kommercielle banker, der har et statsgaranteret sikkerhedsnet, lov til« at engagere sig i alle former for aktiviteter, og man »forsynede dem endda med udvidet statsstøtte til at handle ... « Hoenig er en potentiel Trump-udnævnelse til viceformand for banktilsynet i Federal Reserve (USA's centralbank).

Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og betragter historien, ser man, at visse øjeblikke træder frem som tidspunkter, hvor en afgørende, personlig ændring finder sted. I denne uge tænker vi med alvor tilbage på den 7. december, 1941, Pearl Harbor Day, hvor amerikanske borgere, som nation, gennemgik en ændring over en nat.

Vi skal i dag forstå, at vi alle er kaldede til aktivt at intervenere for at være med til at afgøre det historiske udfald.

---

## **EU-oligarkiet går ned med et**

# brag i italiensk folkeafstemning

5. dec., 2016 – Denne rapport blev publiceret i *EIR European Alert Service*:

Det overvældende nederlag for pro-EU-oligarkier i den italienske folkeafstemning om en forfatningsændring den 4. dec., åbner for en ny fase i europæisk politik og har globale implikationer. Dette er det tredje chok, leveret af den glemte borgers verdensomspændende oprør mod et politisk etablisement, der er ansvarlig for en økonomisk krise og for krige, der driver millioner af mennesker ud i fattigdom, fortvivlelse og død. Ikke tilfældigt kom den største andel af Nej-stemmerne fra de sydlige regioner, såsom Sicilien og Sardinien, som har de højeste tal for ungdomsarbejdsløshed og fattigdom, og ligeledes fra den nordøstlige region Veneto, som blev hårdest ramt af den industrielle ørkendannelse efter krisen i 2008, og med en høj rate af selvmord blandt mindre virksomhedsejere.

Med en valgdeltagelse, der lå på næsten 70 % hjemme (66 % inkl. vælgere i udlandet), gav italienerne en lektion i visdom ved, med 60 % mod 40 %, at afvise en forfatningsreform, der var dikteret af den Europæiske Union og investeringsbankierer. Hvis reformen var blevet vedtaget, ville den have forvandlet parlamentet til en institution, der blot skulle eksekvere en diktatorisk magt, der ikke havde base i Rom, men i Bruxelles og Frankurt (dvs., EU-kommissionen og ECB). Faktisk erklærer introduktionen til lovforslaget til forfatningsreformen, at dens hensigt er »i en udtømmende grad at rationalisere det komplekse styrelsessystem med flere niveauer, som udtrykkes mellem den Europæiske Union, staten og lokale autonomier«. Ikke færre end fire nye artikler i forfatningen fastslog, at EU-lov var på samme niveau som italiensk forfatningsbestemt lov.

En ny, turbulent fase vil nu begynde for Italien og EU. Premierminister Matteo Renzi trådte tilbage, og statspræsident Sergio Mattarella må nu pålægge en ny, politisk person eller teknokrat at danne ny regering. Oppositionspartierne Lega Nord og Femstjernebevægelsen (M5S) har krævet snarligt valg, men der er fortsat et stort flertal i parlamentet til støtte for en premierminister fra det Demokratiske Parti (som Renzi er leder af). Hertil kommer, at, før der kan afholdes nyvalg, må en ny valglov først vedtages, eftersom Forfatningsdomstolen har afgjort, at den nuværende lov er forfatningsstridig.

Desuden er det vanskeligt for Mattarella at opløse parlamentet, når budgetloven stadig mangler at blive vedtaget og den aktuelle bankkrise kunne komme ud af kontrol.

Den finansstorm, som var blevet annonceret, ifald valget blev et nederlag for Renzi (Raffaele Jerusalmi, adm. dir. for Borsa Italiana, den italienske børs, advarede om »kolossale short positions«[1] på Italien, i forventning om en sejr for 'Nej'), kom ikke dagen derpå. Tiden rinder imidlertid ud for Monte dei Paschi di Siena og andre banker, der forventer en løsning på akkumulerede tab under ti år med depression, og en EU-dikteret »markedsløsning«, der involverer en bail-in (ekspropriering) af (visse typer) indskydere, er nu mere vanskelig end før. Hvis krisen udløses, vil den sprede smitte i hele finanssystemet.

Italien vil om kort tid blive konfronteret med et valg: enten at gennemføre finansfascisme, eller også forlade euroen og implementere nationale nødretslove, som vil omfatte en Glass/Steagall-finansreform og en storstilet plan for investeringer i infrastruktur og for en økonomisk genrejsning; dette i samarbejde med Kinas strategi for den Nye Silkevej.

[1] *Hvad er en 'short (eller short position)'*? Det er en retningsbestemt handels- eller investeringsstrategi, hvor investor sælger aktier, han har lånt på det åbne marked. Investors forventning

er den, at prisen på aktien vil falde over tid, på hvilket tidspunkt han vil købe aktierne på det åbne marked og tilbagelevere aktierne til den handler, han lånte dem af. (wiki investopedia)

---

# **Det nye paradigme er den dominerende dynamik i verden i øjeblikket; Italien leverer et bragende nederlag til EU-oligarkiet**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 4. december, 2016* – Den 9. november, 2016, morgenen efter det dramatiske præsidentvalg i USA – hvor Trumps valgsejr efterlod de fleste analytikere hjemme og i udlandet enten vrøvlende nonsens af sig, eller også i målløs tavshed – udtalte Lyndon LaRouche klart, at Trumps valgsejr var en del af en global, og ikke en lokal eller national proces, hvor hele konstruktionen med globalisering og frihandel er i færd med at smuldre. LaRouche sagde, at intet endnu er afgjort, og at processen styres af præsidenterne Putin fra Rusland og Xi fra Kina, og gennem det globale alternativ, som de præsenterer – et alternativ, der er baseret på en politik, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche længe har været forkæmpere for.


I dag fortsætter denne globale proces med at udspille sig i en accelererende rate, i en grad, hvor det nye paradigme er den dominerende dynamik i verden i dag. I Italien leverede landet et slående, 60 % mod 40 %, nederlag til Storbritanniens EU-diktatur. Søndagens folkeafstemning – i kølvandet på Brexit og



Trumps valgsejr – kunne meget vel vise sig at blive det endelige knockout-stød mod hele eurosystemet.

Samtidig med, at det transatlantiske systems gamle paradigme imploderer, tilbyder den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping aktivt hele verden at få adgang til den »udviklingsdrøm«, der på så slående vis fungerer i Kina. Som *Xinhua* skriver i en ledende artikel: »Den kinesiske drøm er en drøm for alle.« Og, ligesom sin partner Putin, fortsætter Xi med at udvide tilbuddet om produktivt samarbejde med USA til nyvalgte præsident Trump. Potentiallet er enormt – men endnu ikke realiseret.

I mellemtiden fortsætter de afdankede repræsentanter for det gamle paradigme at handle, som om der ikke har fundet et skifte sted i USA's præsidentskab, og som om det nye paradigme slet ikke eksisterer. De fortsætter med at puffe verden i retning af atomkrig, med deres outrerede og farlige provokationer imod Rusland og Kina.

Hvad vi foretager os i denne globale proces, understregede  LaRouche tilbage den 9. nov., og igen denne weekend under diskussion med sine medarbejdere på begge sider af Atlanten, er absolut afgørende. Vi må blive ved med at presse på for at få **LaRouches Fire Love** vedtaget og bruge det faktum, at der nu er en større åbenhed over for diskussioner af dristige ideer, som man så det tidligere på ugen i forbindelse med LaRouchePAC's organisering på Capitol Hill. Mange mennesker var for første gang villige til at diskutere fusionskraft, rumpolitik og endda Einsteins og Krafft Ehrickes ideer.

Vi må fremlægge for folk behovet få at vedtage Glass-Steagall og indføre et kreditsystem efter Hamiltons principper, der skal erstatte nutidens bankerotte system, og vi må vise dem, hvordan det vil virke. Og vi må frem for alt tilslibe menneskets centrale karakteristika, som muliggør en sådan uafbrudt udvikling: menneskets kreativitet.

Vi må absolut fokusere på skabelsen af en bedre kvalitet af

det menneskelige intellekt, understregede LaRouche; vi kan ikke udelade behovet for at skabe og generere genier, som Einsteins eksempel udtrykkeligt demonstrerer. Dette er den standard, der må anvendes. Vi må opgradere den måde, hvorpå vi fungerer som organisatorer, sagde han, og udsøge mennesker, som i det mindste er i besiddelse af spiren til denne kvalitet af geni, og som er villige til at bygge et nyt samfund og skabe en fremtid for menneskeheden.

Vi kan ikke gå på kompromis med udviklingen af geni. Dette kræver, at vi stræber efter at udvikle den form for kvalitet, som i det mindste må have en forsmag af geni, for vi ønsker, at befolkningen skal følge denne kurs.

Denne idé om at appellere til folk, der i det mindste har en anelse om, hvad det vil sige at bringe menneskeheden fremad, udtalte Helga Zepp-LaRouche, er også af afgørende betydning for rekrutteringen. Vi må tænde gnisten i sådanne personer for at tilslutte sig denne nye revolution, der er i gang over hele verden.

## **Supplerende materiale:**

### **Bragende nederlag for EU-Oligarkiet i italiensk folkeafstemning**

*4. dec., 2016* – Et jordskælv, denne gang af politisk art, kom søndag aften fra Italien, hvor vælgerne – iflg. de tidlige resultater – afviste den EU-dikterede forfatningsreform med et overvældende flertal på 60 % mod 40 %.

Efter Brexit og den anti-Obama/Hillary Clinton valgsejr i USA, er dette det tredje chok, der rammer, og det har implikationer for hele Europa og verden.

En turbulent fase er nu indledt. Premierminister Matteo Renzi forventes at træde tilbage, og mandag vil et spekulativt

angreb, der var annonceret på forhånd, blive udløst mod italienske værdipapirer. Dette kan udløse en bankkrise, der hurtigt kan sprede sin smitte til hele finanssystemet.

Italien står nu umiddelbart over for at træffe et valg: enten at gennemtvinge finansiell fascisme, eller forlade euroen og vedtage nationale nødrets-love. Der vil muligvis blive afholdt nyvalg snarest på baggrund af denne krise.

*Foto: Premierminister Matteo Renzi tabte stort i søndagens folkeafstemning i Italien.*

---

## **Movisol-bevægelsen i Italien på Radio Gamma 5: Italiensk folkeafstemning og LaRouches Fire Love**

*Milano, 2. dec., 2016* – Liliana Gorini, forkvinde for Movisol, den italienske LaRouche-organisation, blev i dag interviewet af Radio Gamma 5 om den forestående folkeafstemning om Forfatningen, søndag, den 4. dec., og om konferencen om Glass-Steagall i Alba den 12. nov. Det første spørgsmål var om *Financial Times*, som truer med, at otte italienske banker vil kollapse, hvis det bliver et 'Nej' til Renzis forfatningsreformer i folkeafstemningen. Gorini gjorde det klart, at banker kolliderer pga. deres eksponering til derivater, og ikke pga. et 'Nej'-resultat, og hun understregede, at støtten til et 'ja' kom fra spekulanter, såsom BlackRock og JPMorgan, som endda har skrevet Renzis Forfatningsreform, samt fra sådanne krigsforbrydere som Tony Blair; vælgerne bør spørge sig selv, hvorfor, og bør ikke

alene stemme 'Nej', men også tilslutte sig det nye paradigme, med LaRouches Fire Love og den Nye Silkevej. »Hvis 'nej' vinder, så bliver dette det næste, nødvendige skridt«, sagde hun.

Hun citerede også general Fabio Mini om et særligt, katastrofalt aspekt af Renzis reform: at krige kan erklæres uden at spørge Parlamentet. Med hensyn til de mennesker, der stemmer 'ja', ikke, fordi de kan lide Renzi, men fordi de frygter for, hvad der vil ske, hvis hans regering falder, mindede Gorini lytterne om, hvad LaRouche plejede at sige for år tilbage om Hamlet, der »foretrak det onde, han kendte, frem for det onde, han ikke kender«. Men, fortsatte hun, »det ukendte kan snarere bringe noget godt: for eksempel Glass-Steagall, samarbejde med Rusland og Kina omkring infrastruktur og en Marshallplan for Afrika«, som modsætning til den Europæiske Unions bankerotte politik med nedskæringer og krigsprovokationer.

Der indkom spørgsmål fra lyttere om chancerne for at få Glass-Steagall vedtaget i USA. Gorini sagde, »Vi kan ikke forlade os på Trump, som nævnte Glass-Steagall i sin kampagnes sidste uger. LaRouchePAC er fuldt ud mobiliseret til at få Glass-Steagall og LaRouches Fire Love vedtaget, og der er ganske bestemt bedre chancer nu efter valget. Mange kongresmedlemmer, der er tilhænger af Glass-Steagall, blev genvalgt med op til 81 % af stemmerne, som tilfældet var med Tulsi Gabbard eller Walter Jones. Dette viser, at den amerikanske befolkning er for lovene.«


Værten Marisa Sottovia ønskede Movisol og LaRouchePAC tillykke med deres mobilisering, »som virkelig er nøglen; det er op til folket at forandre tingene«, og hun opfordrede lyttere til at gå ind på Movisols hjemmeside. <http://movisol.org/>

*Foto: Liliana Gorini, forkvinde for Movisol, taler til en forsamling i Alba (Piemonte); [se rapport her](#).*


---

# USA har brug for en massebevægelse for udvikling NU!

## LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 2. december, 2016; Leder

Matthew Ogden: Både Diane Sare og Kesha Rogers har skrevet  en artikel i denne uges *The Hamiltonian*; jeg mener, deres artikler meget fint tjener til at skabe en ramme omkring aftenens diskussion. Diane Sares artikel hedder "President Putin's Purloined Letter; the Poetic Principle in Political Affairs" (Præsident Putins stjålne brev; det poetiske princip i politiske affærer) – jeg kan godt lide bogstavrimet her. Kesha Rogers skrev en artikel, "Mankind Is Taking a Leap! You Should Ask 'How High?'" (Menneskeheden foretager et spring! Man bør spørge, 'Hvor højt?')")

Begge disse artikler tjener virkelig til at definere det, som hr. LaRouche pointerede mht. den nødvendige tankegang, når vi går frem i den nuværende situation i verden. Man må ikke blive fanget i lokal tankegang; man bør ikke tænke ud fra den laveste fællesnævner, eller tænke på alle de forskellige politiske taktikker, der plaskes ud over forsiden af *New York Times* eller *Washington Post* og de forskellige nyhedsmedier. Man må i stedet tænke som en leder; og man må tænke ud fra standpunktet om, hvad der er drivkraften bag den hastigt skiftende dynamik i globale anliggender.

Ganske kort: vi så dette meget direkte i denne uge fra et  par forskellige standpunkter. For det første, så var der en aktionsdag fra LaRouchePAC-aktivister i Washington, D.C. i onsdags. Jeg havde den store glæde at deltage. Vi havde aktivister, der kom fra hele østkysten, inkl. fra 'Manhattan-projektet' i New York City; og vi var dér for at sætte hr. LaRouches principper, i form af de **Fire Økonomiske Love**, på dagsordenen. At der ikke er noget alternativ til en omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og en omgående renæssance af Alexander Hamiltons principper. Disse er: et nationalbanksystem; direkte kredit til forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed og produktivitet i arbejdsstyrken; og princippet om videnskab som [økonomisk] drivkraft, som Kesha Rogers diskuterer i sin artikel i *The Hamiltonian*. Et aggressivt program for udforskning og udvikling af rummet, og for at opnå fusionskraft og en højere energigennemstrømningstæthed i produktionsprocessen.

Og jeg mener, dette kan ses meget klart ud fra det, der finder sted internationalt, og som hovedsagligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina. Der var for det første et meget vigtigt dokument, som netop er blevet offentliggjort, fra Kina, som vi kan diskutere lidt mere omkring. Dette dokument hedder »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«. Denne hvidbog erklærer, at udvikling er den fundamentale, umistelige rettighed. Og for det andet, så er der nu en ny, strategisk doktrin fra Rusland, som blev annonceret i summarisk form af den russiske præsident Putin i sin årlige 'Tale til nationen', hvor han sagde, at verdensdynamikken nu er forandret. Vi er nu villige til at samarbejde med USA som ligeværdige partnere omkring fælles interesser – inklusive endelig at besejre de falske, konstruerede fjender, som vi har hørt om fra Obama-administrationen gennem de seneste otte år.

Så med denne form for geometrisk strategi har vi et meget rigt felt, vi kan intervenere i, og en meget rig mulighed.

Så der er mange detaljer, som jeg gerne vil have, vi kommer

ind på under diskussionen af alle disse spørgsmål. Lad det være nok som introduktion, og lad os høre Kesha og Diane.

*(Herefter følger udskrift af diskussionen på engelsk.)*

DIANE SARE: OK, I'll just go ahead. I'm really glad with what you said, Matt; because there really is a transformation, and I think we tend to miss it. Or you catch a glimmer of it like the real joy that I certainly felt watching all the vote totals come in; and these poor silly reporters not having a clue what had hit them. But then, you get bombarded with the real fake news, which is what comes from the so-called mainstream news media; which has absolutely zero about developments in the world which are being created by billions of people. So, you have the most extraordinary, most gigantic Earth-changing events occurring under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, under the leadership of Xi Jinping, and their collaboration with leaders in South America, leaders in Africa. Not one word of it here, and then we're treated to some miniscule detail of a misplaced wart that a politician has somewhere or whatever. I think we would do well to bear in mind a little bit of what I tried to capture in that article. There is a poetic principle; there is a world revolution underway. These things are not separate, discrete events. The Brexit vote – contrary to the stupid media spin – was not a bunch of white racists who hate immigrants. Maybe there are some of those, but the real factor was that the whole euro system is bankrupt. It didn't work and it wasn't

designed  
to work; and people were rejecting it. Similarly, you had  
these  
recent votes: the winner in the French Republican Party  
nominations, François Fillon, who does not want a war with  
Russia. I think most people on the planet actually recognize  
that a nuclear war between superpowers is not a desirable  
policy  
or outcome; and it's not necessary because what President  
Putin  
is doing is leading a fight to eradicate terrorism. He has  
been  
very direct about this; especially after September of 2015, at  
his speech at the United Nations. He's reiterating again the  
call for a coalition to wipe out this terrorist scourge. So  
what  
you see in this election process here in the United States, is  
we  
have a potential now to join with the New Paradigm.

Therefore, the most significant aspect of what we know  
about  
the incoming administration perhaps, are the two phone calls  
that  
Trump had with Xi Jinping and with President Vladimir Putin;  
and  
this is absolutely not missed by people of the world. I just  
wanted to give a little bit of a report on an event last night  
at  
New York University with this extraordinary woman, who is the  
second only I think woman in history to be the chairwoman of  
the  
Foreign Relations committee in the Chinese national assembly.  
Her name is Madame Fu Ying; she is extraordinarily dignified,  
calm and very confident. She began her remarks at this forum  
at  
New York University by referring to the phone call between Xi  
Jinping and Trump. She made a point of saying the Chinese are



always being accused of not contributing to good in the world, of not working with the world. So, we figured when we started the Belt and Road and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, that the United States – which is always accusing us of not wanting to work with anyone else – would have been the first in line to join. Instead, our invitation to participate in these extraordinary projects was rejected. Now, clearly there is a potential for this opportunity to be taken.

This is really very big. Similarly, the decision that Trump has made to have retired General Michael Flynn as one of his advisors; who has called for collaboration with Russia in Syria.

And Trump's reiterations of the necessity of that kind of collaboration – these things are very important. And the fact that Flynn has come out calling for a Marshall Plan for the region; which is similar to the Chinese; Xi Jinping made a tour of several of those nations not so long ago. The only way you are going to secure peace is through economic development – not on a low level, not on repairing the decrepit, aging, out-of-date infrastructure we have; but by leaping into a new domain. So, I think I'll stop there for a minute; because I think Kesha probably has a lot to add in that regard.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. Just taking from that, we really have to advance mankind; we really have to have a leap forward for mankind. This is what Mr. LaRouche is committed to; this is what

you see Russia and China committed to. I was greatly inspired by the discussion and some of the developments that came out of the President of Russia; President Putin's State of the Union address. The leap for mankind really requires putting the commitment to the future. This was really expressed very beautifully in his remarks, which captured in essence the conception that the responsibility of the nation is to foster creativity in science, and foster creativity in the youth of your nation. The best expression to doing this, in terms of scientific and technological development. In his speech he says, "Our schools must promote creativity, but children must learn to think independently, work both on their own and as part of a team, address usual tasks and formulate and achieve goals; which will help them have an interesting and prosperous life. You must promote the culture of research and engineering work. The number of cutting edge science parks for children will increase to 40 within two years; they will serve as the basis for development of a network of technical project groups across the country. Companies, universities, and research institutes would contribute to this, so our children will see clearly that all of them have equal opportunity and an equal start in life. That Russia needs their ideas and knowledge and they can prove their mettle in Russian companies and laboratories..." And he goes to say, "Our education system must be based on the principle that all

children

and teenagers are gifted and can succeed in science, in creative areas, in sports, in career, and in life."

That should be the model for every single nation.

That is

the model for our space program, and it really starts with the question of what is human nature? If we're going to advance mankind and have leaps forward? As a part of this paper that Matt mentioned, from China they're expressing the same expression

for their nation; and for mankind as a whole. It's not just "our

nation is better than yours, and we're going to have our people

pulled out of poverty and your people can stay in poverty.

They're not thinking like imperialists or wanting to keep nations

backwards; they want nations to move forward. So, China has pulled 700 million people out of poverty; you can't do that by taking baby steps and going with a few infrastructure projects.

You have to have creative leaps. This has really been expressed

for their Silk Road development offer of win-win cooperation and

their commitment to space and space as the potential for opening

for mankind across the planet and across the galaxy.

I think if people look at the very exciting developments

that we're seeing coming from Russia and China, that has to be the model. We have that potential right now, because I think what Diane pointed out – that when President-elect Trump was elected, this was a mandate. This was a repudiation of the Bush/Obama destruction of this type of potential for a future;

a

repudiation of Hillary Clinton's commitment to continuing war. The American people said, we're not going to condone this any longer.

The question is, what is the positive aspect that you're going to fight for? We've put that on the table with LaRouche's Four Laws and our commitment to a future perspective for mankind, based on this very identity that has been clearly laid out by what we could be doing if we decide to make the commitment and collaborate on the basis that Russia and China have laid out.

OGDEN: Yeah, China really is an inspiration in that regard. Let me just read a very quick quote from that paper that you referenced, Kesha. The title of this white paper, again, is "The Right to Development: China's Philosophy, Practice and Contribution"; and they start by saying, "The right to development must be enjoyed and shared by all peoples. Realizing the right to development is the responsibility of all countries and also the obligation of the international community." If you just juxtapose that to the Malthusian philosophy of the British Royal Family and others in the so-called "West" today, where they say, "Well, no, you know, the right to development – it's not a right. All peoples do not have an equal right to the same living standard, and, plus, if we were to pursue that – as Obama said when he went to Africa – 'the planet would boil over.'" I mean,

give me a break!

So, China's white paper is laying out the *opposite* philosophy, view, of man. I think, in accordance with what Putin said in that State of the Union, that, yes, every human being is a creative human being. That is the fundamental right of every human being – is to develop that creativity and to contribute it to his or her nation and to the future of mankind.

In the China white paper, they go on to state some really stunning statistics. You, Kesha, cited the lifting 700 million people out of poverty; which is just an incredible achievement in and of itself. Now only a little bit under 6%, 5.7% of the population of China, are officially under the poverty line. And in the white paper they were very proud to point out that China was actually the first to achieve this UN Millennium goal – which is a goal to lift such and such a percentage of people out of poverty. But they refuse to stop there! They say, "That's not enough. We have a goal, that we are going to eliminate poverty altogether!"

The statistics are amazing. If you compare China in 1949 to China in 2015, only a 70-year difference, the average longevity in China in 1949 was 35 years. Today it's 76 years. The enrollment of school-age children in school in 1949 was 20%. Today it's almost 100%; 99.8% of all school-age children are enrolled in schools in China. The difference between 1978 and 2015: the GDP was at RMB767 billion in 1978. Today their GDP is

RMB68,000 billion! So, that growth is unbelievable. And then there's, obviously, much less tangible things that you can measure, but which are clear to see, including the spread of art, classical culture, classical musical training among the children of China. So this is really a model for the rest of the world, an inspiration. As Xi Jinping has said, "We invite the United States, we invite the West to become a part of the New Silk Road, and to become a part of the One Belt, One Road initiative."

One event that was happening in Washington, D.C., simultaneously with this Day of Action that the LaRouche PAC activists had on Capitol Hill, was really an unprecedented event that was sponsored by the Asia Society. It was an all-day event that was hosted by a scholar named Dr. Patrick Ho, who's the Secretary General of the China Energy Fund Committee. One of my colleagues who was there, said about the event that "This was one of those days in Washington, D.C. when all of the principles that you've been talking about as a LaRouche PAC activist for years and years and years, all of a sudden are being echoed by the person standing at the podium." We've had those experiences periodically, but this *entire* event was about the right to development, the One Belt, One Road Initiative, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the World Land-Bridge, the New Paradigm, win-win cooperation, the United States joining the Silk Road – quite literally, in those terms.

Dr. Ho actually laid out five points of advice to the new incoming [Trump] administration on how to integrate the United States into the One Belt, One Road program. His five steps are

as  
follows:

1) Consider One Belt, One Road a platform to spearhead initiatives and programs to bring closer cooperation between the United States and China;

2) Realign trade agreements with Asia-Pacific nations to accommodate the One Belt, One Road;

3) Adjust the U.S. posture towards the international development banks – that's the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund, the New Development Bank of the BRICS, and so forth – and promote their capacity to assist in support for infrastructure development;

4) Help secure security along the One Belt, One Road;

5) Get the international institutions to work with the One Belt, One Road.

So, I think that's actually a very clearly stated way to, as we say in this pamphlet that we've published from LaRouche PAC, have the United States join this new Silk Road.

These ideas, as Diane was saying, this is an active principle, this is the dynamic {elsewhere}, and our responsibility is to ensure that {this} is the dynamic shaping policy in the United States.

SARE: Along these lines – because I know there's discussion and there's an article about Sen. Schumer saying he will work with Trump on a \$1 trillion infrastructure package (something like that) – I think the idea of Hamilton and the ideas of people like Krafft Ehrlicke and what China is doing, really need to be understood by our activists, so that people can reflect.

For example, there's discussion about one of the things that was promoted in the *New York Times* for Trump to do with his infrastructures, that there should be a tunnel under the Hudson River, from New Jersey to New York. Right now I think the trains go, I don't know, every 90 seconds, or every three minutes, or something like that. There's an enormous amount of traffic. The Port Authority Bus Terminal is very old and decrepit. It's going to have to be rebuilt and relocated. The tunnels are very old.

So, this is something that has needed to be done for a long time. As everyone might imagine, there's an absolutely enormous amount of traffic between Manhattan and New Jersey across the Hudson River. So, you say, "What's wrong with a new tunnel between New Jersey and New York?" Well, in a sense, if you were to do that, it would be a sin of omission. Obviously we need a tunnel, but if the idea were to connect this tunnel to a tunnel under the Bering Strait, so that you could travel from Manhattan to Moscow, that would be a completely different idea. And I think what...

OGDEN: [cross talk] ...Manhattan to Jersey City; that's for sure! [both laugh]

SARE: Yeah! Or even, you know, for people who don't want to go to Moscow, for whatever reason. They could go to Paris, but



they could travel through Siberia. All kinds of exotic, really wonderful places. It would be quite a ride. Although, I suppose, if we get the magnetically-levitated vacuum trains, you wouldn't really get to see much. On the other hand, you'd arrive at your destination *before you left*, by the clock.

Anyway, all of these things would *completely* transform the way we think of *everything*. If you could take a train from New Jersey to San Francisco. Supposing even that it wasn't three hours – it was a normal high-speed train – so you got there in a day-and-a-half, that's a completely different phenomenon. It changes the United States: what you can ship; whom you can work with; the exchange of ideas; the exchange of goods. The ability for people to find the very most brilliant individual, whether they're in China or Somalia or India, who has expertise in a particular area, and you want to bring them in to collaborate with a team of scientists in your local laboratory. All these things become thinkable.

So, when Mr. LaRouche a few years ago had made the point that he doesn't like the term "infrastructure" anymore, because it doesn't really get at what is actually necessary; which is the question of how do you increase the productivity of every person. And that requires thinking in terms of a *platform*. The difference between not having electricity, for example, and having electricity, is not simply night and day. You just can't even compare it. It's *incommensurate*. Therefore, I think we have to be both open-minded, but we also have to set {really

high} standards for what we think we should be doing. It would be absolutely criminal, even if it did employ millions of people, to fill in every pothole in every major city in the United States. That would not lift the standard of living or the productivity of the nation as a whole; whereas a high-speed rail link that went from Manhattan to Moscow would actually have a completely transformative effect.

OGDEN: Yeah, it's these {leaps} in progress that are unquantifiable, because it's a completely different measuring rod, from one leap to the next. Last week on the webcast here on Friday night, Ben Deniston gave an excellent presentation on what's necessary for a real space colonization and exploration program. I thought one example that he used during that presentation, was really interesting. Just think about what's the difference between Lewis and Clark's Expedition to explore the Louisiana Purchase Territory and to cross the continental United States vs. what we were able to do with the trans-continental railroad. That's a different universe vs. what we would be able to do with what you're talking about, Diane, with a magnetically-levitated train that goes from New York, to Los Angeles, all the way up to Anchorage, Alaska, and across the Bering Strait, into the Eurasian landmass. Those are just quantifiably and qualitatively different modes of action. And so, yes, it's "setting the bar" incredibly high.

Kesha, in your article, you said, "You should ask: How high?"

We should leap, we should jump. Mankind should take a leap.

How

high?" It's these kinds of insights that Krafft Ehrlicke, that others, were able to discuss from the terms that now Mr. LaRouche

has {scientifically} defined, in terms of energy-flux density, how much more productivity are you able to achieve, with less effort, with less energy applied, because of these qualitative leaps in technology and in the principle that you're employing.

Before we get into a little bit more of that, I do want to

bring up, though, because you mentioned it, Diane, this article,

this interview with Sen. Chuck Schumer. Mr. LaRouche was told about this earlier today when we had a discussion with him. He placed some importance on it and said, "You know, Chuck Schumer

does play a significant role in the Democratic Party." He is now

Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, and, very significantly, led

the fight against Obama's veto of the JASTA bill; very publicly

broke with the Obama administration, in favor of the 9/11 families, in overturning the Obama veto of the JASTA bill. I'd like to say something about that later.

This article is an interview that's published on syracuse.com. It starts by saying, "U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer said Wednesday that he's optimistic Congress will strike a deal

with President-elect Donald Trump, to pass a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill within the first 100 days of the administration." However, he warned, "the bill cannot rely on what he called 'gimmicks' or tax breaks." He said "any infrastructure bill must be paid for through substantial and direct federal funding." He said, "The bill needs to be

stronger

and bolder than ever before. Simple tax credits will not work."

He also said that the so-called public-private partnership that

Trump's infrastructure plan and other incentives to build projects that would be privately owned, would not function. He said that he had personally told Trump in a private meeting, that

such a plan would lead to investment only in the most profitable

projects – people who are just trying to make a buck; and could

lead to significantly higher tolls on privately owned roads and

bridges. Instead, Schumer said, "The \$1 trillion could flow into

the U.S. Treasury to be used for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure." So, this is a direct Federal financing, not a

scheme, not a gimmick, not tax breaks, not PPPs [public-private

partnerships]. That is a significant development.

I do not think it is a coincidence that that interview comes

directly in the wake of a two-week mobilization by LaRouche PAC

activists on Capitol Hill to force the issue of Hamiltonian national banking, direct Federal credit. I know that there were

countless meetings from activists; there were several dozen meetings that Paul Gallagher personally had with staffers and Congress people on Capitol Hill to discuss the details of what Hamiltonian economics and Hamiltonian national banking actually

means. If you haven't seen it yet, I would highly recommend going back and listening to the recorded Fireside Chat that

Paul

Gallagher did last night; that was on this question of what Hamiltonian national banking really means.

So this is significant; but, indeed, we have to have the view that {we} are setting the agenda. This nation and the leadership of the country need a very intensive course in what Hamiltonian economics really means.

ROGERS: Yes, and I think that the title of our publication which we are continuing to get out *en masse*, *The Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance* is absolutely imperative to be understood as just that. We're not just talking about developing infrastructure or increasing manufacturing; because that's not what Hamilton understood in the increasing of the productivity of society. It was starting with advancing the creative powers of mankind; and Lyndon LaRouche has taken that to a very high level and conception, as you said. His work over the past 40-50 years looking at this conception of leaps in productivity of society based on this conception of the potential for mankind to advance in ways that had not been thought of before; to advance in ways where the creative leaps in mankind take the development scientifically and technologically to higher and higher states. Mr. LaRouche's understanding of this and Krafft Ehrlicke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – the rejection of his ideas by the "limits to growth" imperialist budget-cutters, who didn't want to see mankind advance in this way, was as direct as the opposition to Lyndon LaRouche. If Mr. LaRouche's policies had been put through – along with Krafft

Ehrlicke's – on the development of LaRouche's perspective in the '80s for a vibrant space program, setting the agenda of the space program to heights that had not been thought of up until that point, and continuing what John F Kennedy had laid out as a national mission for advancing not just in the moment for space development; but looking far into the future. It's interesting to go back and look at what the vision was at that time, and how far we have been set back because we've had people who decided that it's not the place of human beings to develop.

Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have continued to say, represented a quality of genius. It wasn't just that he understood aeronautics and was one of the best in terms of field of technology. He was a real philosopher; his conception of space development started from the standpoint of the development of mankind as a whole. That we on this planet, have a responsibility for the development of each and every human being on the planet; but the way we're going to achieve is – as he said on many occasions – that you have to leave the confines of one small planet. The idea that there are only limited resources here for a limited number of people is not true. There's a very beautiful conception of that drawn out by Krafft Ehrlicke in a very short writing that he wrote called "The Extra-Terrestrial Imperative; Growth and Life"; that's the model that he worked on.

I just want to read something quickly from that, because I

think

it's very indicative of what we're talking about here. People have to get these ideas in a very advanced understanding of it when we're going into Congress right now. It's not just about getting them to pass a piece of legislation. It has to be, and

we're seeing, a total shift in the thinking of the population. He says:

"There was a time when the human mind was slow to accept growing evidence that Earth is not a flat center of the universe.

Now the concept of a closed, isolated world must be overcome. Viewing our Earth from space should make it obvious that the world into which we now can grow is no longer closed. By ignoring this new reality, current predictive world dynamic models fail. Adhering to an obsolete, closed worldview, they despair of the future growth prospects. The extra-terrestrial imperative enjoins us to grow and live through open world development which contains all the futures the human mind can hold."

So, that's what we're talking about. How far can the human mind advance? How far can the human mind see into the future? That's what we're talking about right now, and we have a potential to really bring that perspective into focus if we have a revolutionary change in the way we think about society, and we think about the responsibility of the growth in society which we have to now bring on, because it's long overdue. LaRouche's solutions really put forth exactly how we bring that into being.

OGDEN: This the moment of opportunity. If you look at, as

Diane covered in the beginning of our discussion, this wave of unexpected and completely dramatic electoral results and otherwise; from Brexit to the Presidential election. We've got the Italian referendum coming up this weekend; we could see some very dramatic results out of there. Hollande has now declared that he will not be running for President of France. This is a very dramatic and uncharted period; and the potential is there, the doors are wide open. I think we have repeatedly gone back to this point, but I think we should return to it again. It should have been seen that this was not business as usual at the point that the entirety of the United States Senate and a vast majority of the U.S. House – not along party lines – rejected Obama's treasonous veto of the JASTA bill. That was in no small part the result of the activation and the leadership of the LaRouche Political Action Committee in the United States. I think we who are on this discussion right now, can say that we know directly that the role that LaRouche PAC played was central and primary in leading that fight for years. Direct collaboration with the 9/11 Families; direct collaboration with the members of the U.S. House and Senate in forcing this through. That was not something that Obama – despite all of his bluster – and the Saudi government – despite all of their millions of dollars; they just could



not

handle that. That was something that overcame everything that they tried to throw up against it.

Now you have a pathetic effort by McCain and by Lindsey Graham to try and gut the JASTA bill in the last days of the lame duck session; but this is not going anywhere. There was a very

good statement put out by Terry Strada and the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, where they said in their press release, "We wish to state our firm opposition to the proposed legislative language offered by U.S. Senators Lindsey Graham and John McCain that would effectively gut the JASTA bill;

which was overwhelmingly passed by Congress in September." Later

they say, "Notably, Graham's and McCain's efforts come in the wake of a massive lobbying campaign by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which is now employing roughly a dozen lobbying firms at

a cost of more than \$1.3 million per month." And then Terry Strada herself is quoted saying "In April of this year, Senator

Graham met with 9/11 family members and told them that he supported our cause 100%. Senator Graham is now stabbing the 9/11 Families in the back. He and Senator McCain are seeking to

torpedo JASTA by imposing changes demanded by Saudi Arabia's lobbyists. We have reviewed the language, and it is an absolute

betrayal." She says, "We, the 9/11 Families, are fortunate to have Senators John Cornyn and Chuck Schumer to block this action

in the Senate." I can tell you that Senator Schumer told me personally on Wednesday night that this effort is going nowhere;

this thing is not going to fly. So, they are holding the line very firmly. But really, they have no choice; because this victory on the JASTA bill and then everything that has come since

then, including this Presidential election, was a statement that

this is not business as usual among the American people anymore.

There is a mood of revolt among the American people.

I just want to read one very short excerpt from an article

in *The Hill* which I think excellently gets to that very point and I think is more generally applicable. The article was titled, "Note to Allies: Don't Underestimate Overwhelming Popular

Support for JASTA." The author, Alexander Nicholson, says in this article, "[O]n this particular issue..., no amount of money or insider Washington connections will be able to overturn the overwhelming will of the American people. Indeed," he says, "the

highly unexpected but highly populist-inspired election of Donald

Trump to the White House should serve as an indicator that no amount of inside-the-beltway inside baseball can achieve results

when it comes to certain issues at certain times. And this, too,

is one of those issues and times." And then he concludes the article, "The current arguments are as ineffective as the synthetic inside-the-beltway strategy it has thus far employed.

But the new era of empowerment of the American electorate is not

to be underestimated." So, I think that is absolutely the case;

and people should take heart to that. This is, indeed, a new political era for the United States; it's the "empowerment of

the

American electorate."

Now's the time to take that empowerment and just keep the momentum going; but it has to be from the standpoint of educating ourselves, as Kesha said, on the principles of Alexander Hamilton and the principles of the science of physical economy, and saying, "We now are committing ourselves to what the Chinese have called 'the inalienable right to development'; and we will not let go of our demand for that inalienable right."

SARE: Just on that, I think on the one hand it's sort of obvious; although I guess it shouldn't be, because we've tolerated such criminality for the last 16 years since 9/11 occurred. Droning people, torture, and so on. The NSA spying on every detail of everything of everyone. But there's a certain limit where people just said, "No, we're not intimidated." We saw that particularly strongly in Manhattan among first responders and others who died, who are still dying as after-effects, or who had loved ones who died, or colleagues who died. There's a certain sort of sacred commitment that "We are not going back on this," and they're not afraid. The challenge now again is to raise the standard; in other words, can we fight with the same fearless passion for those things that are necessary for mankind to progress? Could we get a situation where the population just says, "Absolutely not! We're not shutting down our nuclear power plants. Are you crazy? This is

unacceptable. You're saying we're not going to go back to the Moon and build the means to get onto Mars from the Moon? This is crazy!" Where no one even gives it a second thought that it's so obvious. I think that is where the two areas which Einstein excelled in both: the music – his violin as a certain source of inspiration and thought; and the science come together. When one is conscious of what it means to be truly human and creative, then anything on a lower standard than that, is the same kind of affront as the Saudi Foreign Minister traipsing through the halls of Congress in his robes lined with money. You just say, "Oh, this is beneath us." We saw that effect here when the Schiller Institute Community Chorus participated in this series of performances of the Mozart *Requiem*; and there's more music coming up – again sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – on December 17th in Brooklyn. A unity concert with the conception of, what does it mean: to be human? Because human beings are not animals, no matter how many environmentalist barbarians want to try and impose that on us. When you've located your identity in a realm which is truly beautiful, then a lot of these things that seem so difficult now – like the difficulty of these politicians standing up to Wall Street on Glass-Steagall. Why are they afraid? Why do they find that difficult? Because their own identities are right now on too low of a level; but if they began to look at the world from a higher standpoint – which is I'm convinced where people like

this woman from China, the Vice Foreign Minister Fu Ying – you just get a sense among some of these people that where they're coming from is a much higher level and that such a thing would be

beneath them. I imagine this was the effect of someone like President Abraham Lincoln, who was described when he was seen visiting the soldiers; because his identity was placed in a different location in a higher realm. Therefore, it wasn't just

that he was fighting against fear; there wasn't fear because there was such a firm commitment to what is right.

So, I think the next phase in this process is to have a similar, almost ease; a soaring quality of mankind, even in the United States, to get ourselves into the realm where we actually should be living.

ROGERS: Diane, you keep getting them to sing; bringing more inspiration and optimism. So, we can get more singing and get more space development, then we can really succeed.

OGDEN: President Modi of India called it a mass movement for development; and I know Helga LaRouche has echoed that call repeatedly since he said that. And we really do see a mass movement for development among some of these Eurasian countries especially, but also with them reaching out to African and South and Central American countries, you have a majority of the world's population now getting in on this mass movement for development. But that's what we need demanded from the American

people right now; and I think we can turn this new era of empowerment of the American electorate into a mass movement for development. But we have to do it from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian renaissance in the United States. We have the materials for that, as we've said before. The new book, *Hamilton's Vision* is available on Amazon; and people can read those four reports that he wrote to the United States Congress as Treasury Security. We also have the Four Laws from Mr. LaRouche which are available on the LaRouche PAC website, and the related pamphlet, "The United States Joins the New Silk Road."


So, I implore people to become as active as you can. If you haven't yet become an activist with the LaRouche PAC, now is the time to take that step. Support us in every way you can, and make yourself into a world historical individual by acting on this current, very brief window of opportunity for mankind. You can sign up on the LaRouche PAC website; you can subscribe to our YouTube channel; you can become an activist through the LaRouche PAC Action Center; and you can share this video as widely as you possibly can. Let's make this a mass movement for development!

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Thank you to both Kesha and to Diane. And please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

---

# Skiftet til det nye paradigme er virkeligheden

## – Propaganda for lokale interesser er farligt

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. november, 2016 – I denne uge kom  delegationer fra Manhattan og flere stater i det østlige USA til Washington, D.C., for personligt at inddrage kongresmedlemmer i nødvendigheden af at tage skridt til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og gennemføre LaRouches »Fire Love«, for at håndtere den aktuelle, strategiske krise. Dette politiske initiativ – sammen med pres på kongressen over hele landet – kommer på et tidspunkt med nonstop mediefiksering på nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps seneste og eventuelle udnævnelser til regeringsposter. 'Hvem er de?... Hvor dårlige er de?', osv. Mediernes spærreild, og selv selve udnævnelserne, tjener til at forvirre og demobilisere enhver, der lytter.

Det er vigtigt at modstå alle sådanne, »bottom-up« karakteriseringer, der fremhæver lokale interesser, af det, der foregår. Der er intet lokalt her: »Trump«-valgoverraskelser finder sted i hele verden, og flere vil finde sted i de kommende uger. Vælgere over hele verden afviser nu hele »globaliseringsæraen« til fordel for et nyt paradigme, der fortsat er under udformning. EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, understregede dagen efter præsidentvalgene, at valget af Trump ikke var en »lokal« begivenhed. Afvisningen af Hillary Clinton gik længere end til et spørgsmål om selve personen; den var en del af et globalt, dynamisk skifte. LaRouche manede i dag til forsigtighed: »Det er farligt at gøre det muligt for dette [forvirringen som

følge af lokalt fokus] at opstå. Man må frigøre sig fra det. Det ødelægger ens evne til at tænke og løse problemer.«

Undgå derfor vrede over enkeltpersoner; tænk på det mulige.

Dette er virkeligheden. Der er en dynamik i gang på internationalt plan, for et nyt paradigme for hele menneskeheden, og som er legemliggjort i den eurasiske Nye Silkevej. Præsident Vladimir Putin og præsident Xi Jinping leverer et stærkt lederskab for vejen frem, en vej, som i årtier er blevet fremlagt af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

I dag holdt Putin en tale i Moskva fra dette udsigtspunkt. Han talte om den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, »der sammenkobles med Kinas projekt for det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, som vil gøre det muligt for os at bygge et eurasisk partnerskab«. Han talte i anledning af det andet, årlige »Primakov Readings International Forum« i Moskva, for at mindes eftermælet af Jevgenij Primakovs lederskab. Putin sagde: »Hr. Primakov var ligeledes af den mening, at det ville være meget vanskeligt at håndtere nutidens store udfordringer på tilfredsstillende vis uden et seriøst partnerskab mellem Rusland og USA. Ulykkeligvis er de russisk-amerikanske relationer blevet meget forværret i løbet af de seneste år, men dette er ikke vores skyld. Nu, hvor valgkampen er ovre i USA, og en ny præsident snart vil indtage Det Hvide Hus, håber vi, at dette vil skabe en mulighed for at forbedre disse relationer, der er så vigtige, ikke alene for vore to folkeslag, men også for at sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed ... «

Ideen om nye relationer runger over hele Latinamerika, efter Xis seks dages rundrejse i forbindelse med APEC-topmødet tidligere på måneden. Den mexicanske seniordiplomat Sergio Ley har krævet, at Mexico nu »diversificerer« sine relationer inden for udenrigshandel og ikke længere har 80 % af sin handel, der finder sted med USA. Han sagde, at der nu finder »en ekstraordinær dialog på højeste niveau« sted mellem Mexico og Kina.



I opposition til dette aktive, nye paradigme for internationale, gensidigt gavnlige relationer, kommer de sidste, fortvivlede bestræbelser fra geopolitikkens afdankede repræsentanter, på at forårsage mere skade og død. Især Frankrig, Storbritannien og Obama-administrationen mobiliserer imod Rusland over Syrien. I dag meddelte Frankrig, at det vil være vært for et møde den 10. december, som vil omfatte ledere fra UK, USA, Tyskland, Italien, Saudi-Arabien og andre, om, hvordan man skal modsætte sig »den totale krigs tankegang«, som de hævder, Rusland og Syrien forfølger.

Virkeligheden er den, at den syriske regering i Aleppo med held driver terroristerne tilbage; og Rusland er i færd med at mobilisere støtte og nødhjælpsforsyninger – inklusive felthospitaler – til de tusinder af mennesker, der nu er befriet og nødlidende.

*Foto: Udsigt over Capitol fra toppen af Washington-monumentet.*

---

# **»Ideen om den Nye Silkevej imod det globale finanssystems sammenbrud« Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

Hovedtale ved 23. nationalkongres for Sammenslutningen af Økonomer i Peru, 17. november, 2016.

*Friedrich Schiller, der er en vidunderlig digter, som Schiller Instituttet er navngivet efter, havde den opfattelse, at der ikke kan være nogen modsigelse mellem at være en patriot, og så at være en verdensborger. Jeg mener, at det er muligt at*

*opnå denne idé i vores tid, for, hvis vi giver hvert barn, hver nyfødt på denne planet, en generel uddannelse, der ikke alene formidler generel historie, geologi, musik, videnskab og de skønne kunster, men også en viden om og kærlighed til de andre kulturers højeste udtryk, den tyske klassik, konfucianisme, Gupta-perioden, Cervantes, Goya, hver eneste kulturs guldalder; så ville disse børn være i stand til at udvikle hele det potentiale, som de hver især kan udfolde, og som kun nogle ganske få undtagelser tidligere kunne udfolde.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **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 stadig større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorere 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 Jatruss 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/Nordafrika-området. Det går også ind i Sydvestasien.

Der findes altså enorme potentialer; de er i vid udstrækning foreløbigt ikke realiseret med hensyn til den forandring, der kommer med den ny administration. Men, som du sagde, Jason [Ross], så er der ingen grund til at vente til januar. Den nyvalgte præsident Trump krævede udtrykkeligt, i en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Det er i begge de to store politiske partiers valgplatform for dette års valg; både Demokraterne og Republikanerne har vedtaget det. Det var en Trump-delegeret til GOP [Grand Old Party – det Republikanske Parti] komiteen for politisk strategi, der introducerede Glass-Steagall. Der er senatorerne Elizabeth Warren, og vigtigere endnu, Bernie Sanders, som siger, at de er villige til at række over midtergangen og arbejde sammen med Donald Trump, hvis samarbejdsspørgsmålene inkluderer og virkelig begynder med Glass-Steagall. Så dette er noget, der ikke behøver at vente til januar og tiltrædelsen og den nye Kongres. Der er fremstillet lovforslag for Glass-Steagall i både Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet. Et af forslagene i Huset har en ordlyd, der er identisk med Senatsforslaget. Som vi så det med vedtagelsen af

underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet, hvis lederskabet i Kongressen giver grønt lys, kan Glass-Steagall bringes til debat i begge huse og vedtages inden for få timer. Underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet tog to timer om morgenen i USA's Senat, og to en halv time eller så om eftermiddagen i Huset. Det opnåede man på en enkelt dag i Kongressen. Så der er ingen som helst grund til, at vi ikke omgående kan gennemføre det – i bogstavelig forstand i næste uge, når Kongressen atter samles efter Thanksgiving-ferien; og den vil sidde i de næste fire uger. Der er intet til hinder for, at vi kan få Glass-Steagall tilbage som landets lov før juleferien, så vi har det på plads til den nye administration; og tiden er rent ud sagt af afgørende betydning. Vi ved ikke, i betragtning af situationen med Deutsche Bank, med Royal Bank of Scotland, med de største, amerikanske for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-banker, der sidder på derivater til \$252 billion. Det er 30 % mere end det var på tidspunktet for krakket i 2008. Det sidder på toppen af et meget tvivlsomt kapitalgrundlag på \$14 billion; i virkeligheden er det sandsynligvis meget mindre end det, for nogle af de værdipapirer, som bliver talt med som kapitalreserver, er grundlæggende set illikvide og kan ikke – selv i nødstilfælde – gøres likvide.

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske banksystem er nedsmeltet. Så Glass-Steagall er altså et presserende hastespørgsmål; og det forudsætter dernæst de andre hovedelementer i LaRouches Fire Love. Det er et kreditsystem; investering i store infrastrukturprojekter; og en genoplivning af de mest avancerede, videnskabelige programmer, inklusive en storstilet tilbagevenden til rummet og det internationale arbejde for endelig at opnå det fulde gennembrud inden for fusion. Alle disse ting er på bordet, men igen, så er der ingen garantier; intet er blot tilnærmelsesvis sikkert mht., hvad det næste, der vil ske, bliver. Vi kan ånde lidt op, fordi faren for krig med Rusland og Kina er blevet meget reduceret; og der er en masse potentiale. Der er en



masse af den form for overgang som fra Jimmy Carter til Ronald Reagan i luften som et potentiale; men intet af det er endnu fuldt ud realiseret. Folk må indse, at dette er et tidspunkt med store muligheder. Det vil blive et krav fra befolkningen under det rette lederskab, der er orienteret mod de rette politikker, der virkelig kan gribe muligheden. Hvis vi venter til januar eller februar næste år, hvem ved så, hvilke slags sabotageoperationer, man vil køre?

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

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

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

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

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

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

This discussion is taking place 2.5 weeks after the November 8, 2016 Presidential election in the United States. Since then,

we've seen a whirlwind of speculation about Cabinet appointments, including some Cabinet appointments for the Trump administration.

We've also seen some significant international news, such as the APEC summit which occurred last weekend; the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit that included very significantly new Philippines' President Duterte and Chinese Xi Jinping among the many leaders who were there. At this conference, Duterte again emphasized that the Philippines no longer considers itself to be a US colony; and is pursuing an independent policy economically with China, countering the attempts to create conflict, for example, in the South China Sea. President Xi Jinping went on a tour of Latin America while he was at the APEC summit. So in addition to Peru – which hosted the event – he also visited Chile and Ecuador; where he spoke, among other things, about the bioceanic corridor, a plan for a rail link between the Pacific and Atlantic sides of South America; about setting up science cities. He was greeted by President Correa in Ecuador, who considered Xi Jinping's trip the most significant event to occur in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and

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

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

Along the One Belt, One Road nations which includes both the – there's two components to China's project on this; the Silk Road economic belt, which you see the nations in blue, and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in orange. Together, China refers to this in Chinese as the "One Belt, One Road" initiative; in English, often just the Belt and Road initiative. As far as the potential that this holds, these are just some of the figures: 20,000 km of high-speed rail in China, all built within the last decade – more than the rest of the world combined; tens of billions of dollars of direct investment into nations of the region; an increase in services contracts of over 33% in just

one year along the One Belt, One Road; the Export/Import Bank of China has outstanding involvement in over 1000 projects, and just recently has signed up about 500 new projects along the Belt and Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering training for 500,000 for professionals for training in China; has set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has initiated over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade agreements, and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects – including about 20 that were just set up this year among One Belt, One Road nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of the American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called, "The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for Security, Prosperity, and Peace". Two excerpts. They open their article, "With the defeat of Hillary Clinton by Donald Trump, we may never know how close America and all mankind came to nuclear war." In describing the world situation, they end with a proposal: "President Donald Trump can correct the mistakes of past U.S. presidents. Rather than adversaries Russia and China can become America's essential partners and are, we are convinced, ready to respond positively. It's time for Trump

and

America to take the initiative for U.S.-Russia-China cooperation

towards a secure, prosperous, and peaceful future. A

Trump-Putin-Xi 'Big Three Summit' should be a priority for the new U.S. President's first 100 days."

So, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to fill out the world

picture, and detail for our viewers what are the 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: Mmhm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good. I think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying to develop that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast that with what China is able to do now with building rail networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it

made it possible to open up the interior of the continents.  
And  
with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System  
becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or  
more  
regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip.

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

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

DENISTON: Mr. LaRouche's platform concept is so key. People  
just don't have the idea of this type of qualitative leaps  
that  
are natural for mankind. People are so accustomed at this

point

to just slow, incremental progress if there's any progress at all. It's going to be a fight to get people to think on this level again.

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

The ability to understand this concept of the platforms, of the history of economic development of the United States, a real major aspect of economic science, comes through studying Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with — if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to join us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself. The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the

reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the USA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## **Lyndon LaRouche interview til amerikansk radiostation**

*20. nov., 2016* – Lyndon LaRouche blev lørdag interviewet af strateg i det Republikanske Parti, Roger Stone, på dennes radioshow, »Stone Cold Truth«. Stone indledte interviewet med en lang introduktion af hr. LaRouche og bemærkede hans præsidentkampagner fra 1976-2004, samt hans tætte relation til

præsident Ronald Reagan. Stone var nordøst-koordinator for Ronald Reagans præsidentkampagne i 1980, og han forklarede sine lyttere, at han personligt vidste, at Reagan og LaRouche udviklede en venskab under denne kampagne. Han citerede Reagan for i en personlig samtale at sige, at, alt imens han ikke var enig med alt, LaRouche sagde, så var han enig i meget af LaRouches politik og anså ham for at være en ven.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## **Kun globale løsninger baseret på nye principper kan virke**

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

Det, der er brug for, er et helt nyt kreditsystem, der er baseret på de områder i verden – først og fremmest Eurasien – hvor regulær vækst i produktiviteten finder sted. En sådan global reorganisering er den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan redde hele nationer, der nu er ved at dø. Nøglespørgsmålet er: Hvordan vil betydningsfulde magter, især Kina, Rusland og USA,

tilpasse sig til det, der nu er muligt med de omstændigheder, der vokser frem efter Obama? Se det i øjnene: Obama er politisk gift, og jo før, han forsvinder fra den politiske scene, desto tidligere kan de nødvendige ændringer lanceres.

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

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

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

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

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

*Foto: Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt underskriver Bankloven*

*af 1933, Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven, 16. juni, 1933.*

---

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

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 21.  
november 2016:  
Den gamle verdensorden kommer  
ikke tilbage//  
Silkevejen er nået til Syd-  
og Mellemerika**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**Rumforskning og klassisk**



# kultur

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

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


Fremkaldt af valgchokket er en politisk følsomhed ved at overvinde den amerikanske befolknings og de europæiske

befolkningers accept af ledere, der sanseløst dræber hundreder af tusinder af mennesker og ødelægger hele nationer samtidig med, at de fordriver millioner fra deres hjem som flygtninge.

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

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

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

Frihed, fra City of Londons og Wall Streets destruktive magt over de vestlige regeringer, er nu inden for rækkevidde i takt med, at parlamentarikere, slagte af forbløffelse, i Europa og USA konfronteres med det eneste alternativ til det bankerotte, vestlige finanssystems ukontrollable kollaps: en  Glass/Steagall-reform for at lukke de for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-spillebuler på Wall Street ned, og med en

kreditpolitik i Hamiltons tradition, med princippet om national, dvs. statslig, bankpraksis til genrejsning af økonomien, rumprogrammet, videnskabelig forskning og internationalt samarbejde omkring nationsopbygning i hele verden, hvor den Nye Silkevej bringes til hele menneskeheden. (LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love til USA's – og verdens – omgående redning.)

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

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

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

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

totalt nedbrudte. Så folk har oplevet, at livet bare bliver værre for dem, og at de med Washington/New York-etablissermentet intet håb har.

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

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

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

En af de væsentligste grunde til, at Trump vandt valget, er, at han, især i den seneste fase, havde understreget, at Hillary Clinton ville betyde Tredje Verdenskrig pga. hendes politik for Syrien, fordi hun ... foreslog en frontal konfrontation med Rusland. Det var præcist at ramme hovedet på sømmet, for vi befinder os på en meget, meget farlig kurs for

*konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Og for at få verdensøkonomien ud af den nuværende tilstand, især i den transatlantiske sektor, må man have denne form for kursomlægning i retning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og en forøgelse af **energigennemstrømningstætheden**. Og hele denne Grønne

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

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