2. Mødegang i Studiekredsen: LaRouches Lærebog i Økonomi 24. jan, 2017; lydfiler

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

1. del:

2. del:

Powerpoint billeder:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 2. februar 2017:
Vil Trump lave alliance med Rusland og indføre Glass/Steagall – eller knuses af økonomisk

kollaps?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Økonomisk værdi er det, der skabes for fremtiden, og ikke den værdi, det har i dag.
Fra LPAC-webcast, 27. jan. 2017

Det, vi i dag må gøre, er; der ligger et forslag til en ny nationalbank (statslig bank). Dette er noget, som hr. LaRouche har krævet – en fremgangsmåde med en statslig bank, der styres oppefra (dvs. fra regeringsniveau). Detaljerne i dette forslag er ikke nødvendigvis lige nøjagtigt, som det vil blive, men generelt; f.eks. Kina. Kina har for over $1 billiard i amerikanske statsobligationer; de får ikke nogen særlig høj rente. Selveste chefen for Chinese Investment Corporation har sagt, »Ih, hvor kunne jeg godt tænke mig at få et bedre udbytte af disse penge; at investere dem i USA på en eller anden måde.« Så måden, denne bank kunne fungere på, var, at indehavere af statsobligationer og måske langfristede kommunale obligationer og delstatsobligationer, kunne bruge dem til at blive aktieindehavere i banken; sæt dem ind i banken. Disse aktieindehavere ville så blive garanteret en

dividende som aktionærer; og denne dividende ville blive garanteret gennem nye eller tilpassede skatter. Dernæst ville banken, der nu har for $1 billiard via denne type midler, være i stand til at tilbyde lån til en lav rente, til specifikke projekter. Banken ville blive styret af folk, der rent faktisk er bekendt med industri. Fordelen ved dette er, at, i stedet for at udstede for $1 billiard i ny gæld til den rente, det måtte kræve, så kan for $1 billiard i allerede eksisterende statsobligationer danne grundlag for udstedelse af ny gangbar valuta til væsentligt lavere rente.

Ved Jason Ross.

Uddrag af International LPAC-webcast 27. jan., 2017. (Videoen kan ses her, fra 20min. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X4DwRYjHIa0)

Matthew Ogden: … Hvordan skal vi overvinde dette imperiesystem? Hvordan skal vi besejre dette britiske imperiesystem én gang for alle og indlede denne nye æra for samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater for økonomisk udvikling? Det er i virkeligheden det, Den amerikanske Revolution drejede sig om. Glem, hvad Theresa May sagde ved det Republikanske møde (under hendes besøg i Washington) om Magna Carta og Uafhængighedserklæringen i Philadelphia. Den virkelig historie om Den amerikanske Revolution, er Alexander Hamilton. Uden Alexander Hamilton og hans principper kan ingen af disse projekter lykkes. Jeg giver nu ordet til Jason Ross, som vil fremlægge nogle ting om dette spørgsmål.

Jason Ross: Sammenhængen er den, at, da Trump aflagde sin ed den 20. ds., havde en Demokrat fra Connecticut, Rosa DeLauro, allerede en uge før fremstillet et lovforslag – jeg vil blot forklare, at der er flere forslag på bordet lige nu, med hensyn til, hvordan man skal finansiere en opbygning af infrastruktur, af vareproduktion; en genoplivning af den amerikanske økonomi. Der er mange projekter, som det er umagen værd at forfølge; det store spørgsmål er, hvordan skal man

betale for det? En billiard dollar er mange penge; hvor skal de komme fra? Vil det komme fra Finansministeriet, der direkte påtager sig ny gæld til dette beløb ved at sælge statsobligationer? Hvor meget vil de skulle betale i renter på dem? Er det noget, der er bæredygtigt? For at sige det ligeud, så – som det forklares på LaRouchePAC-siden: 'Spørgsmål, der ofte stilles om Glass-Steagall og Økonomi' (se: https://larouchepac.com/econ-faqs) – hvis man begynder at udstede så meget via Finansministeriet, vil renterne stige op over, hvad de i dag er; og det vil ikke rigtig være muligt at finansiere projekter til så høje renter.

Der er også et par andre forslag, men Rosa DeLauro, sammen med 73 medsponsorer, fremstillede den 13. jan. et lovforslag. Det er HR547 og drejer sig om en national infrastruktur-udviklingsbank. Hendes håb er, at, gennem $50 mia. i statsobligationer, og $600 mia. fra pensionsfonde og andre former for investorer, vil hun kunne skaffe kapital til en bank, der så kunne udstede lån til infrastruktur og lignende formål.

Tirsdag kom et andet forslag. Senator Schumer – Demokrat fra New York – sammen med nogle andre, Demokratiske senatorer, fremstillede et forslag om $1 bia.; det er et forslag om at skabe 15 millioner jobs. Han sagde, at han ønskede at bruge: $75 mia. på skoler; $200 mia. på veje; $100 mia. på vandrensningsanlæg og vandforsyningsanlæg; $20 mia. til offentlig transport – tog og bus; $70 mia. til havne og lufthavne; $100 mia. til elektricitet; $10 mia. til VA-hospitaler (Veteran Affairs; statslige hospitaler og sundhedsklinikker til folk, der har tjent i hæren); $20 mia. til bredbånd; og de resterende $200 mia. som en hovedfond til afgørende projekter som måske Gateway Projektet – en bro over Hudsonfloden mellem New Jersey og New York.

Hvordan foreslog han at betale for dette? De sagde, at de satsede på total statslig finansiering. Det vil sige, ikke partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og den private sektor, men

gennem budgetbevillinger. Hvor skal de penge komme fra? Én idé – ikke, at de rent faktisk sagde, hvordan de ville skaffe dem – de sagde, ved at fjerne smuthuller, måske, for at skaffe flere skatteindtægter; det er rigtig mange penge, der skal skaffes dér. Én idé, der er blevet promoveret, er ideen om at sænke selskabsskatten for at hjemtage det meget store beløb i profitter, som amerikanske selskaber har skabt udenlands; som selskaberne har undgået at indføre i USA for at undgå at betale selskabsskatten på profitterne. Så én idé er altså at sænke denne selskabsskat og tilbyde et særligt incitament for selskaber til at bringe deres profitter hjem til USA, og så bruge det til finansiering.

Disse programmer vil ikke virke; og der er en betydningsfuld fejl ved dem, som Hamiltons økonomiske fremgangsmåder løser. For at gå tilbage til det, Hamilton gjorde som finansminister, to aspekter: Det ene, han indfriede statsgælden. Han udviklede en måde til at sikre, at statsgæld blev finansieret; og ved at gøre det dengang, forvandlede han det faktisk til ligeså meget cirkulerende kapital. At skyldnerbeviser fra regeringen, som blev handlet under deres pålydende værdi, fordi folk var usikre på, om de nogensinde blev indfriet, ved at udvikle skatter for at sikre, at disse rentebetalinger kunne finde sted, alle disse skyldnerbeviser, hele denne statsgæld blev i realiteten til valuta; og de kunne så bruges i økonomien til lån og den slags ting. Hamilton etablerede også en statsbank, der fik sin kapital via denne statsgæld, og dernæst skabte en gangbar valuta; han skabte statslige, amerikanske banksedler, der gjorde det muligt for lånene at gå ud og forbedre nationens produktivitet. Det endte med at blive brugt i hans bank og i den Anden Nationalbank til at finansiere infrastrukturprojekter, udvide varefremstilling, yde lån til foretagender og foretage anlægsinvesteringer, og den slags ting.

Det, vi i dag må gøre, er; der ligger et forslag til en ny nationalbank (statslig bank). Dette er noget, som hr. LaRouche

har krævet – en fremgangsmåde med en statslig bank, der styres oppefra (dvs. fra regeringsniveau). Detaljerne i dette forslag er ikke nødvendigvis lige nøjagtigt, som det vil blive, men generelt; f.eks. Kina. Kina har for over $1 billiard i amerikanske statsobligationer; de får ikke nogen særlig høj rente. Selveste chefen for Chinese Investment Corporation har sagt, »Ih, hvor kunne jeg godt tænke mig at få et bedre udbytte af disse penge; at investere dem i USA på en eller anden måde.« Så måden, denne bank kunne fungere på, var, at indehavere af statsobligationer og måske langfristede kommunale obligationer og delstatsobligationer, kunne bruge dem til at blive aktieindehavere i banken; sæt dem ind i banken. Disse aktieindehavere ville så blive garanteret en dividende som aktionærer; og denne dividende ville blive garanteret gennem nye eller tilpassede skatter. Dernæst ville banken, der nu har for $1 billiard via denne type midler, være i stand til at tilbyde lån til en lav rente, til specifikke projekter. Banken ville blive styret af folk, der rent faktisk er bekendt med industri. Fordelen ved dette er, at, i stedet for at udstede for $1 billiard i ny gæld til den rente, det måtte kræve, så kan for $1 billiard i allerede eksisterende statsobligationer danne grundlag for udstedelse af ny gangbar valuta til væsentligt lavere rente.

Disse projekter – f.eks., et nationalt højhastigheds-jernbanenet – det er den type projekter, der vil tage år at virkeliggøre og få i fuld drift; de vil ikke give en omgående indtægt. De vil ikke omgående skabe midler; nogle vil dog, via brugerbetalinger. Hvordan finansierer man dem så? Det vigtige aspekt i dette er, at via denne nye skat, der vil blive foreslået, i betragtning af, at skatten ikke ville være direkte relateret til midler, der kommer ind fra projekterne; det er en måde, hvor man finansierer eller betaler for projekter, baseret på økonomiens generelle vækst. For at bruge eksemplet med Tennessee Valley Authority (Elektrificeringen af Tennessee-dalen, et FDR-projekt), så solgte dette projekt obligationer, og de blev tilbagebetalt; projektet opfyldte

sine betalinger. Men selv indirekte, blot via de forøgede skatteindtægter, der kom ind fra denne region af landet, der fik gavn af TVA; *indirekte blev omkostningerne til TVA tilbagebetalt via nationens forøgede produktivitet.*

Så når vi taler om den form for projekter, der vil transformere økonomien som helhed, så kommer tilbagebetalingen på en indirekte måde. Det kan blive på en indirekte måde.

Lad os tænke over, hvad nogle af disse projekter kunne være. Når man overvejer den måde, hvorpå den menneskelige art har udviklet sig i tidens løb, så er det ikke glidende; der er sket i spring. Antallet af mennesker, der har levet på planeten, har ændret sig dramatisk på grund af meget specifikke forandringer i de teknologier, der var til rådighed for os. Udviklingen af landbrug; nye opdagelser inden for sundhed og industri; Renæssancen; skabelsen af selve videnskaben. Dette er ting, der er drivkraften bag menneskeslægtens fremgang.

Som et aspekt heraf transformerer vi fundamentalt vores forhold til den fysiske verden. Et eksempel er ved vores anvendelse af energi. Dette er en grafisk fremstilling, som I måske har set fere gange. Den viser, hvor meget energi, USA brugte i vort lands historie. Man kan se to ting: Det er, at, frem til mordet på Kennedy, steg den energi, der brugtes pr. person, fra under 4 kilowatt per person ved nationens begyndelse og op til 12 eller så på højdepunktet. Så altså større forbrug af energi; større intensitet i energien. Det andet aspekt er, at energitypen har ændret sig; træ blev erstattet af kul, som ikke alene kunne gøre alt det, træ kunne – som at blive varm og, ved at blive forvandlet til koks, blive brugt i metallurgi på samme måde, som trækul kunne bruges. Men derudover havde kul den enorme fordel, at der dels var enorme mængder af det, og dels, at man ikke behøvede at fjerne træer, der kunne bruges til andre formål, som at bygge møbler og huse. Olie og naturgas; olie gjorde forbrændingsmotorer mulige – en ny type energi.

Fission (sprængning af atomkernen) – kernekraft – blev aldrig virkelig udnyttet i sit fulde potentiale. Men atomkernens energi gør det muligt for os fuldstændigt at transformere det, vi gør; og at rejse ud til stjernerne med raketter med kernekraft. Teknologier, vi bare ikke har udviklet; vi bare ikke har implementeret. Opdagelsen af kontrolleret kernefusion – dette er ting, vi må arbejde på.

Så ét aspekt er, at vi har ændret vore energikilder. Vi har også ændret vores forhold til den fysiske verden.

Dette er en grafisk fremstilling af de seneste 50-60 års produktion af sjældne grundelementer. Dette er meget specielle elementer i det periodiske system; som deres navne antyder, så er de ret sjældne. Deres anvendelse i økonomien har først fundet sted relativt sent. De anvendes i elektroniske komponenter, i magneter, fosfor til skærme – computerskærme, telefonskærme; i metallurgi til meget enestående anvendelser. Dette udgør noget, hvor vi simpelt hen har transformeret vores forhold til naturen; til dette spektrum af materialer, som vi anvender i naturen.

Det største skridt fremad, som vi må opnå, er at kunne beherske fusion. Dette bilede viser det indvendige af en tokamak, en slags kerneforsøgsmaskine; og det er én af de potentielle måder, gennem hvilke vi vil blive i stand til at udvikle den enorme energi ved at sætte små atomer sammen for at få langt mere energi end selv gennem vore nuværende kernekraftværker, og som tilbyder en langt bedre måde at gå frem ved rejser ud i rummet, for fremdrift af raketter, for evnen til virkelig at komme omkring i det indre Solsystem.

Denne form for spring i det, vi er i stand til, det er rygraden i det, økonomi vil sige som en menneskelig videnskab. Tænker vi på nogle af de måder at implementere dette i USA, så er nogle af projekterne forholdsvis enkle. Nogle vil måske sige, at det, at krydse Beringstrædet, ikke er det mest simple projekt; men det er forholdsvis lige ud ad landevejen. Dette

er et ingeniørprojekt, som vi ved, hvordan man bygger; det kunne fremvise et par unikke udfordringer i betragtning af dets længde og det ikke særligt fremkommelige klima i området. Men det er den form for projekt, der fortjener investering; at forbinde verden på denne måde.

Et nationalt højhastigheds-jernbanenet. Hvis vi bygger det i faser, 20.000, 40.000 mil højhastigheds-jernbanenet, vil vi transformere den måde, hvorpå vi bevæger os rundt i landet; vi vil transformere produktiviteten og værdien af hele regioner i nationen, og produktiviteten og den potentielle værdi af nationen som helhed, som Kina har set det ved at bygge sit højhastighedsnet, omkring halvdelen af rejserne er skabte rejser; det er folk, der rejser steder hen, hvor de ellers ikke ville have rejst til, hvis dette højhastighedsnet ikke var blevet bygget. Møde andre mennesker; faktisk komme rundt i deres land. Det samme, som vi kan få her. Transportere varer mere effektivt; transportere folk mere effektivt; og simpelt hen have forbindelser, der ikke eksisterer [i øjeblikket].

En fremgangsmåde til at styre ferskvandsforsyningen på kontinentet; at løse problemet med tørken, der har udfordret og skabt en hel del vanskeligheder i den sydlige og sydvestlige del af USA; det vestlige USA. Evnen til at kunne bruge afsaltet vand direkte fra havet, om nødvendigt; at skaffe vand fra Stillehavet og gøre det tilgængeligt. At transportere vand langs kontinentet som et langsigtet projekt; at fortsætte undersøgelserne af at transformere vand i atmosfæren; af at fremkalde regn; af at ændre vejrmønstret. Dette er den form for projekter i stor skala, og som ikke blot fornyer vejbelægningen og fjerner huller i vejene. Dette er den form for projekter, der betyder, at vi virkelig vil udvikle et helt nyt potentiale som en økonomi.

Med hensyn til, hvad det vil sige at finansiere disse ting, så ligger det vigtige i at forstå, hvad værdi er; og jeg mener, at dette virkelig er det centrale hovedproblem i økonomier. Lyndon LaRouche har i sine økonomiske lærebøger og sine

skrifter i årtiernes løb fastslået, at en reel definition af økonomisk værdi, af skabelsen af rigdom, kommer i de aktiviteter, der fremmer forøgelsen af den menneskelige arts potentielle befolkningstæthed [relativ til arealet]. En fysisk målestok for værdi; ikke, hvad markedet mener, noget er værd, men en reel måleenhed, der ligger uden for det, folk synes at interessere sig for lige nu. Dette gør det til en ægte videnskab.

Det betydningsfulde aspekt heri er, at værdien af alting i en økonomi ligger i relation til, hvordan det virker med hensyn til at virkeliggøre en sådan fremtid. Og jeg mener, at, via den fremgangsmåde for at skaffe kapital, der gøres mulig gennem en nationalbank af den type, som vi foreslår, til dels via den indirekte art af dens finansiering, via en skatteindtægt, der ikke specifikt kommer fra projekter, som banken finansierer; men som mere generelt gør denne finansiering mulig. Og også, at drage økonomisk fordel af, drage nytte af den generelle forøgelse af nationens produktivitet. Det giver god mening at tale om investeringer, der betaler sig selv. Nogle af dem betaler sig direkte – et forretningsforetagende ekspanderer og giver større profitter. Men, når det drejer sig om den økonomiske platform, infrastrukturen, som landet som helhed er afhængig af, disse fordele – fordelen ved videnskab, ved rumprogrammet, ved at tage til Månen. Det skabte utrolige profitter for nationen, at vi tog til Månen; en utrolig udvikling for nationen ved at åbne op for nye typer af varefremstilling og nye teknologier. Men det var ikke NASA, der skabte pengene; hele økonomien havde fordel af det, og ikke kun rent monetært.

Hvis vi kommer væk fra partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og privatsektoren, hvis vi kommer væk fra ideen om, at vi skal lave en form for handel for at hjemtage profitter fra udlandet – som til dels kan være en god idé; men den virkelige idé bag kredit, i modsætning til penge, er forskellen mellem at tænke på værdi som noget, der ligger i, hvad det skaber for

fremtiden, versus det, som markedet mener, noget er værd i dag.

Mathew Ogden: Dette er en gennemgang af den fremgangsmåde, der bygger på principper, og som hr. LaRouche i årevis har diskuteret som præcis den måde, hvorpå man kan vende USA tilbage til dette Hamilton-system. Det er ikke noget, der på nogen måde er uklart eller uforståeligt. Hvis man ser på USA's historie, så har det, hver gang, vi har haft fremgang som nation, skyldtes, at vi anvendte denne Hamilton-fremgangsmåde. Det er en enestående fremgangsmåde; det er det, der hedder Det amerikanske, økonomiske System. Det er gentagne gange blevet anvendt, med held. Abraham Lincoln havde en dyb forståelse for dette; det samme havde Franklin Roosevelt. Franklin Roosevelt forstod, at, uden at reorganisere et banksystem, der var løbet fuldstændig løbsk, ville man ikke være i stand til at bruge den nationale regerings beføjelser til at skabe denne form for produktive investeringer; det ville alt sammen være forsvundet i spekulation. Det var det grundlæggende princip for, at Glass-Steagall var det første skridt, som Franklin Roosevelt tog. Roosevelt indså, at – meget lig nutidens situation – det var en situation, hvor monetær regulering alene ikke ville vække den amerikanske økonomi til live igen. Man havde dengang en generation, som man i bogstavelig forstand kaldte »den tabte generation«; de havde ingen erhvervsmæssige færdigheder; de var demoraliseret. Mange af dem havde været vidne til Første Verdenskrigs rædsler; pessimismen hærgede. Franklin Roosevelt indså, at den mest nødvendige mobilisering var en mobilisering i fredstid for at opgradere det faglærte niveau og evnerne hos en befolkning, for at kunne vende en demoraliseret, nedtrykt befolkning til en befolkning, hvor arbejdskraftens produktive evne var tilstrækkelig til at genopbygge USA.

(Se: Udkast (dansk) til Lov om Genetablering af USA's Oprindelige Nationalbank).

Titelbillede: Alexander Hamilton, USA's første finansminister

(1789-96), skabte USA's Første Nationalbank. I baggrunden Indledningen til Fortalen til USA's Forfatning.

Ghana lægger grunden til sit kernekraftprogram

19. januar, 2017 – Et team af forskere og kernekrafteksperter er på et otte-dages IAEA-besøg i Ghana for at overvåge første fase af dette lands udviklingsprogram for kernekraft. Dette sker hovedsagligt for at sikre, at regler, manpower, sikkerhedsprotokoller og love er på plads. Generaldirektør for Ghanas Planlægningskommission for National Udvikling, dr. Nii Moi Thompson, sagde, at det var vigtigt at huske, at kernekraft ikke er noget nyt i landet, rapporterede graphic.com den 17. januar. Han sagde, at Ghanas første præsident, dr. Kwame Nkrumah, initierede programmet i 1960'erne, da præsident Kennedy aktivt promoverede udviklingen af kernekraft for nye, afrikanske nationer. »På en vis måde«, sagde Thompson, »er formålet med dette møde i dag og alt andet, der kulminerer i det, ikke nyt. Vi kræver ganske enkelt det tilbage, som vi opgav for mange år siden.«

Foto: Ghanas præsident Kwame Nkrumah og præsident John F. Kennedy under en pressekonference i Det Hvide Hus den 8. marts, 1961.

(I februar 1966, mens han var på statsbesøg i Nordvietnam og Kina, blev Nkrumahs regering væltet af et militærkup.)

Med Obamas afgang dukker nukleart plasma atter op rundt omkring på globen

Paris, 19. jan., 2017 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – For et par uger siden annoncerede den tyske stellarator i Griefswald nogle særdeles lovende resultater inden for videnskaben om plasmafysik. I Frankrig, den 14. dec., ved lokaliteten for den Franske Atomenergikommission (CEA) i Cadarache, i det sydlige Frankrig, hvor ITER er ved at blive bygget, annoncerede forskningsteams stolt, at de opnåede det første plasma i WEST-tokamakken, søsterreaktoren til den kinesiske EAST (Eksperimental Avanceret Superledende Tokamak), der satte en milepæl en måned tidligere med en 60 sekunder lang, fuldt ikke-induktiv/stabil lang puls H-modus plasma under strålefrekvens opvarmning. (!) (for nærmere forklaring, se evt. http://west.cea.fr/en/index.php)

I Frankrig er WEST-projektet (Tungsten (W; wolfram) Miljø i Stabil Tokamak) en gen-konfiguration af den franske »TORE Supra« superledende tokamak til et prøveanlæg for ITER. Siden dens konstruktion i 1980'erne er Tore Supra tokamakken videreudviklet til at forbedre plasmaydeevnen og har endda sat verdensrekord med en stationær plasma, der varede over 6 minutter med en injiceret og ekstraheret energi på 1 gigajoule (GJ).

I dag tilsigter både EAST og WEST, i et eksemplarisk samarbejde for menneskehedens fælles mål, at kvalificere »teknologiske byggesten«, dvs., gennemføre tests på forhånd, på en mindre skala, af en ny komponent ved navn »divertor« (EU300 million), som vil være afgørende for ITER. Denne divertor, der befinder sig på bunden af vakuumkammeret, er en afgørende komponent, da den modtager det meste af varmen og partikelstrømmen, der kommer fra det centrale plasma. Dens

funktion er at ekstrahere »asken« (helium) og en del af varmen, der produceres af fusionsreaktionen, samtidig med, at den minimerer kontamineringen af plasmaet af de andre urenheder.

Nu, hvor denne store milepæl er passeret, fortsætter man med forberedelserne af WEST-tokamakken til den første, eksperimentale kampagne i foråret 2017, med hensyn til at validere flere andre nye komponenter og teknologier for den 54 meter høje, gigantiske ITER fusions-tokamak.

Læsere i dag bør mindes om, at ITER begyndte i 1985 som et Reagan-Gorbatjov initiativ med ligeværdig deltagelse af Sovjetunionen, EU, USA og Japan. Dengang mente to forskere, Alvin Trivelpiece (USA) og Jevgenij Velikhov (USSR), at det næste skridt i fusionsforskning ville overstige budgettet for enhver nation, og at samarbejde ville være internationalt fordelagtigt. Siden da har USA skåret sin finansiering af ITER ned, alt imens Kina, Indien og Sydkorea har tilsluttet sig, og andre, såsom Iran, er i færd med at tilslutte sig.

NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR 2017:
Farvel til krigens paradigme?

Hvad vi skal gøre – nu!

I USA, i lighed med Danmark og andre lande, er der nogle helt afgørende ting, der må gennemføres, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremført som fire nødvendige love, der må implementeres

omgående.

1) Der skal indføres en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, men under den overskrift er der mange andre ting, der må ske. Man må gå igennem bankernes og finansverdenens aktiviteter i lighed med det, man gjorde i USA, da Roosevelt blev indsat som præsident, så man får renset op og får adskilt tingene i legitime finansielle aktiviteter, der er vigtige for realøkonomien, og så spekulation, som skal helt ud af de normale banker. Man vil så få nogle mindre almindelige banker, som man kan hjælpe, hvis de får problemer, mens alle de andre spekulative aktiviteter ikke får lov til at belaste staten og skatteyderne, når de får problemer pga. fejlslagne spekulationer. Derefter skal der

2) skabes kredit til investeringer. Staten må gå ind og regulere det ovenfra og i den udstrækning, det er nødvendigt, med statslige kreditter sikre, at der bliver foretaget de nødvendige investeringer i samfundet og dets produktive aktiviteter. Det skal bl.a. udmønte sig i

3) store infrastrukturprojekter, der kan opgradere hele økonomien. Man kan bare skele til de enorme investeringer, Kina har foretaget siden 2008, hvor Kina har brugt over 1000 mia. dollars om året på infrastruktur og i dag har verdens største og bedste netværk af højhastighedstog. Programmet for Den Nye Silkevej er da også centreret om opbygning af grundlæggende infrastruktur, ikke blot i Kina, men i stadig større dele af verden. Når det gælder Danmark, har vi et forældet jernbanenet, der skal fornyes i form af et nationalt magnettognet eller højhastighedstognet i forbindelse med bygningen af en Kattegatbro. Vi skal så hurtigt som muligt have bygget den faste forbindelse over Femern Bælt og en Helsingør/Helsingborg-forbindelse. Der er masser af motorveje og andre projekter, der bare venter på at blive bygget. Der er så meget, der skal bygges, at vi kommer til at planlægge, hvordan vi kan få nok kvalificeret arbejdskraft og byggekapacitet for at kunne få alle de mange projekter

realiseret. Alle disse projekter er nødvendige som en del af at løfte den danske økonomi op på et højere produktivitetsniveau, og samtidig skal vi have langt mere gang i forskning og udvikling.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Det sker i verden – Infrastruktur, videnskab & teknologi, nr. 12

Nyt tysk-russisk samarbejde om forskning i fusionsenergi –

Det Filippinske handelskammer kræver åbning af det skrinlagte Bataan kernekraftværk –

Kinas månemissioner skal være internationale, erklærer en regeringsperson inden for rumfart

– og meget mere.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 Ensemblet 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.

Hvordan skaber man en renæssance?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. december, 2016 – Diskussionen mellem Lyndon og Helga LaRouche og Videnskabsteamet og Komiteen for Strategi tirsdag, 27. december, eksemplificerede processen, der karakteriserer en renæssance – og en nutidig,

økonomisk genrejsning for USA. I denne dramatiske dialog kom den ene taler efter den anden frem med nye og varierende ideer – alle forskellige, men alle sammen fremprovokeret af en fælles, uudtalt hensigt, og alle tenderende imod et implicit, fælles mål samtidig med at nære hinanden, som gnister af samme bål. Man bliver mindet om Platons beskrivelse af sin dialogmetode i skriftet »Syv breve«.

De var ligesom små strømme, der samledes i åer og sluttelig i store floder, altid ført frem af en usynlig, uhåndgribelig kraft. Hvilken kraft? Den største af alle kræfter: det selvopretholdende bekræftende, menneskehedens fælles mål. Hvordan går det til, at noget, som man på ét tidspunkt ikke engang troede eksisterede, senere kan blive formålet med ens liv? Kan blive den mission, hvis betydning langt opvejer ens eget liv?

En generel modsætning i hele diskussionen, og som er særlig skarp i nutidens USA, var modsætningen mellem »kultur« versus »produktivitet«, som fejlagtigt opfattes som indbyrdes afvigende fra hinanden. Denne falske todeling går tilbage til Hegels løgnagtige skelnen mellem »Geisteswissenschaft« (humaniora) i modsætning til »Naturwissenschaft« (naturvidenskab) i det 19. århundrede. Det blev forværret af Bertrand Russels afskalning af videnskab, imod Einstein, med begyndelse i 1900. Franklin Roosevelt arbejdede med held på at overvinde det, indtil han i realiteten blev fjernet fra embedet af FBI, mens han endnu levede. Dernæst, efter Anden Verdenskrig, blev det yderligere opflammet af giften, der blev pumpet ud af Det britiske Imperiums Kongressen for kulturel frihed.

Kongressen for kulturel frihed i sit fulde omfang slog aldrig an i Sovjetunionen, selv om der var mange andre, alvorlige problemer; det er grunden til, at Friedrich Schiller synes mere respekteret i den sovjetiske satellitstat Østtyskland end i Vesttyskland. I sovjetisk tankegang var der altid overensstemmelse mellem produktivitet og det kulturelle

niveau. Se den sovjetiske film fra 1972, »At tæmme ilden«, et stærkt fiktionaliseret portræt af rumfartshelten S.P. Koroljov. Instruktøren Daniil Khrabrovitskij blev af censuren tvunget til at ændre næsten alle fakta og navne, men han lagde så meget desto mere vægt på visse grundlæggende sandheder. Allerede næsten i begyndelsen af filmen forsøger den russiske, videnskabelige rumfartspioner Konstantin Tsiolkovskij lidenskabeligt at forklare den unge Koroljov, hvordan og hvorfor hele landets »kulturelle niveau« må bevæges langt, langt fremad, hvis landets fabrikker skal kunne producere kosmiske raketter, kunstige satellitter (»sputniks«) og rumfartøjer.

Det meste af det, præsident Putin gør, reflekterer hans højere standpunkt om denne kamp for at opgradere russisk kultur, som det for eksempel reflekteres i hans konference ved årets afslutning.

Inden for rammerne af det nye, internationale paradigme, skabt af Vladimir Putin og det kinesiske lederskab, og efter dumpningen af Bush-Obama-diktaturet, er en renæssance og en økonomisk genrejsning i USA – én og samme sag, set fra to forskellige synsvinkler – nu umiddelbart på dagsordenen, hvis vi handler for at frembringe dem.

Foto: Prima ballerina ved Bolsjoj-balletten i Moskva Maria Alexandrova varmer op i det historiske teater før en forestilling. Foto fra 2013.

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

mellemøstekspert Karin Kneissl kom i dag med den indsigtsfulde 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 hævdelse 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

Afrika har presserende behov for, at Amerika atter bliver

stort

Et nytårsbudskab til nyvalgte præsident Trump og det amerikanske folk.

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

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

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

Men, med udgangspunkt i Øst, og under direktion af præsidenterne Putin i Rusland og Xi i Kina, kommer der betydningsfulde initiativer, der, hvis de bliver forstået korrekt, og De selv og det amerikanske folk tilslutter sig dem, kan omstøde forbandelsen med en Obama, som i realiteten ikke er andet end en marionet for det onde britiske monarki og

dets oligarkiske følge. Vi har nu, i bogstavelig forstand, mulighed for at opbygge en ny fremtid for menneskeheden – en fremtid, der hurtigt kan føre til en ny æra med samarbejde mellem nationer – og som således gør en ende på geopolitik og en konkurrence, der sætter folk og nationer op imod hinanden, til fordel for de degenererede monetarister og deres pengeimperium. Vi må gøre hele menneskeheden rig i en fremtid med kreative opdagelser, med gennembrud inden for videnskab, der vil være drivkraft for civilisationen som helhed hen imod kæmpe spring for fremskridt.

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

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

Lyndon LaRouches moderne 'opdatering' af Hamilton, som fremlægges i hans 'Fire Love', afviser det monetaristiske systems behandling af mennesker som dyr, som en hjord, der skal udtyndes af en selvudnævnt elite, og gør i stedet den uophørlige realisering af menneskets skabende potentiale til universets fremmeste kraft for forandring til det gode.

Regering – alle regeringer – må handle ud fra det princip, som er omdrejningspunktet i jeres egen Forfatning: at al politik må tjene det almene vel, nu, ved at handle nu for at forbedre de fremtidige vilkår for alle mennesker, og ikke blot for en dekadent, oligarkisk elite.

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

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

Men hvis vi skal finde vej til en fremtid med fred og fremgang, må vi henvende os til Dem, hr. Trump, og til Deres store, amerikanske republik, og kræve, at I også er med til at løfte os bort fra afgrunden, der vinker forude. Vi afrikanere trygler ikke. Vi beder ganske enkelt om, at I atter påtager

jer den storhedens kappe, som jeres nation skabtes til at bære, i en revolution mod trældom for britisk imperialisme. Lad Amerika, sammen med verdens andre store, kontinentale magter, Rusland og Kina, slutte sig til at sætte menneskets kreative udvikling i centrum for en ny æra med fred og udvikling, og vi vil få begge dele.

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

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

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

Ramasimong Phillip Tsokolibane, 23. december, 2016.

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

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

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.«

Argentinske forskere trækker en streg i sandet; Videnskab er en forudsætning for nationens udvikling

24. dec., 2016 – Efter at besætte hovedindgangshallen til Ministeriet for Videnskab og Teknologi i Buenos Aires i fem dage, og med løfte om at blive dér julen over, har unge

forskere fra det Nationale Forskningsråd for Videnskab og Teknologi (Conicet), samt deres allierede inden for den statslige sektor, tvunget den neokonservative præsident Mauricio Macri til at bøje sig og genindføre bevillinger til 343 forskere, der er blevet nægtet finansiering.

Desuden aftalte Conicet at skabe yderligere 107 »ekstraordinære bevillinger« til kandidater, de var blevet anbefalet til at modtage bevillinger, men fik at vide, at der ikke var penge, fordi Macri havde beskåret forskningsbudgettet for 2017 med 32 %. Aftalen gælder kun for et år.

Den landsomspændende protest, der omfattede syv byer, hvor Conicet har faciliteter, fremsatte direkte det fundamentale spørgsmål om, at udviklingen af den nationale videnskabs- og teknologisektor er en integreret del af national, økonomisk udvikling. Det er ligeledes almindelig udbredt, at løsningen blot er midlertidig. Den er blevet afvist af Cordoba-afdelingen af Conicet, hvis personale korrekt fastslog pointen: »Vi forsvarer landets videnskabelige system, og ikke kun 500 bevillinger; [vi forsvarer] argentinsk videnskab.« I løbet af den seneste uge har nogle af Argentinas mest prestigiøse forskere fastslået den samme pointe.

Forskningsminister Luis Baranao, der indledningsvis havde nægtet at mødes med demonstranterne og insisterer på, at Argentina »ikke har brug for mange forskere«, mødtes med Macri den 23. dec. – der gik rygter om Baranaos tilbagetræden – og mødtes dernæst med forskerne for at tilbyde regeringens kompromisløsning. Cadena 3 rapporterer, at demonstranter afviste Baranaos tilbud om at sikre dem stillinger i den private sektor, og fik ham til at forpligte sig til, at de i stedet blev garanteret en overførsel til andre statslige institutioner, universiteter og forskningsenheder.

Demonstranternes skilte under den ugelange, landsdækkende protest, omfattede budskaber såsom »Jeg ønsker at tjene mit land gennem videnskab« og lignende budskaber.

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

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

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

ved Kinas politik for Den Nye Silkevej – som den kommende amerikanske administration skal finde sin plads i – og den videre udvikling, der er nødvendig, hvis menneskeheden skal finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Trumps vælgere har brug for mere end vrede nu: De har brug for kreativitet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. december, 2016 – Alt imens et ekstraordinært drama udspiller sig i USA, hvor man bruger efterretningstjenester til at forsøge at vælte et præsidentvalg, der er afgjort, har den nyvalgte præsident talt ved en række enorme stævner i hele nationen.

Trumps vælgere har i titusindvis ventet i kulden for atter at lade deres vrede høre, imod de forhadte anslag imod deres liv, som er »globaliseringen« og dens tilhængere. Men, de har presserende brug for noget mere og bedre end vrede.

I verden uden for USA findes der et nyt, økonomisk paradigme, der især kommer fra de asiatiske magter, og som kunne vende amerikanernes held. Men som borgere må de forstå, hvordan de skal koble deres land til dette nye paradigme. Der er nye,

fremskudte grænser inden for videnskab, inklusive inden for rumfart og fusionskraft, der kan betyde en højere, menneskelig tilværelse for deres børn. De må forstå, at disse fremskudte grænser i det forgangne blev glemt i Amerika, og de må forstå, hvem de skal samarbejde med for at genoprette dem.

De må se den politiske kamp, der nu forestår, ikke som de ser en Super Bowl, hvor man hylder »dræberslag« og sårede modspillere, men derimod som man ser et Shakespeare-skuespil, der afføder *ideer*. Ikke som en heavy metal-rockkoncert, men som en opførelse af Beethovens *Ode til glæde* som Europa holdt, da det kastede Sovjetunionens kommunisme af sig.

Støtterne bag Obama og Hillary kan ikke omstøde valget. Deres mål er at bringe en anden præsident, Ruslands Putin, til fald. De er ubøjelige i deres forfølgelse af evindelig krigsførelse, krige for »regimeskifte«, hvis målskive sluttelig er Rusland og Kina. De har til hensigt at bekæmpe disse nationer, om nødvendigt gennem krig, før de rent økonomisk overgår Obamas økonomisk forfaldne USA.

De amerikanske vælgere, nu borgere, er selv med i dramaet. De må agere for at sikre, at den nye præsident ikke forsøger at fortsætte denne krigspolitik; og at han ikke forsætter Obamas – eller det Republikanske lederskabs – økonomiske og videnskabelige politik.

De kan i stedet igangsætte en mobilisering for at redde økonomien og nationen: for en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall; skabelse af en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition, til produktiv kredit; byggeri af ny infrastruktur på teknologiens fremskudte grænser – såsom højhastighedsjernbaner og magnetiske svære-jernbaner – i hele landet; genindførelse af NASA's missioner til Månen og Mars og det dybe rum, og forfølgelse af gennembrud i fusionsteknologier.

Denne form for kreativitet, hos tusinder eller endda millioner af mennesker, er det, LaRouchePAC og *EIR* eksisterer for.

Amerikanere bruger ikke denne kreativitet, før de indser, at det amerikanske valgchok var en del af et globalt fænomen, der kan føre til et nyt paradigme for menneskets rettigheder og evner.

Foto: Et nyt vindue, der for nylig blev installeret i målkammeret i National Ignition Facility (NIF), gør det muligt for NIF-teamet og besøgende gæster at kigge ind i kammeret, mens dette er vakuumforseglet til eksperimenter. Marts 2011. (Foto kredit: LLNL)

Samarbejd med Rusland for at mestre atomkernen, og rejs ud i rummet! LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 16. december, 2016

Medierne svirrer med historier om, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin hackede de amerikanske valg. Vi får kommentarer fra Lyndon LaRouche om hele denne larm, og vi hører fra et medlem af Efterretnings-veteraner for Sund Fornuft (VIPS), tidligere senator fra Alaska, Mike Gravel, om disse beskyldninger, samt om, hvad vore relationer med Rusland og Kina bør være. Dernæst bevæger vi os ud i rummet, med overvejelser over behovet for fælles, internationalt samarbejde om forsvar af Jorden mod sådanne kosmiske trusler som vildfarne asteroider og kometer, samt diskuterer den moralske forpligtelse over for fremskridt og videnskabelig opdagelse, der i sig har potentialet til at forene nationer på

basis af et nyt grundlag for internationale relationer mod fælles, menneskelige mål!

Engelsk udskrift:

We Need To Develop a Platform of Economic Activity that Makes Mankind an Active Force in the Solar System!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, December 16, 2016

JASON ROSS: Hi there! It's December 16, 2016, and you're joining us for our Friday LaRouche PAC webcast. We're recording today at 3:30 in the afternoon. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today. I'm joined in the studio by Ben Deniston and via Google Hang-outs by Kesha Rogers, member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

So, the world has presently undergone a tumultuous sea-change in its orientation; away from the trans-Atlantic world of wars, of economic stagnation. We've seen this recently in such votes as the Brexit vote in England, which was a repudiation of that orientation; we've seen it in the election of Donald Trump in the United States, which certainly a repudiation of what Obama had represented and what Hillary was seen as being sure to continue. Instead, we're seeing something much better come about in potential, which is the war avoidance strategy from Russia and the economic cooperation being put forward by China through the Belt and Road initiative; which is the Chinese policy

initiative
which has come as a result of decades of organizing by Lyndon and
Helga LaRouche and their associates for a policy which they had
called the Eurasian Land-Bridge and which has now become the New
Silk Road, and as China calls it, the Belt and Road initiative
for cooperation on economic projects internationally.

This isn't something that the trans-Atlantic financial and
military power is taking lying down. Instead, the use of war, of
murder, of destabilization to prevent such cooperation has been
put into place; as we've seen with the disastrous military policy
of Obama, for example, and of George Bush before him. Over the
past few weeks, this has taken a turn with an increasing drumbeat
of stories about Russia hacking the US election; of stories
coming out, not backed by hard evidence, but by hearsay and by
appealing to the words of authorities that we can presumably
trust, that Vladimir Putin threw the election to Donald Trump by
hacking the DNC and the emails of John Podesta, and I suppose
controlling the thoughts of everybody who voted for Donald Trump.
This has been going on since the summer; this is when the DNC
first announced that its email system had been compromised. At
that time, in discussions around this, the Secretary General of
NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, said "A severe cyber-attack may be
classified as a case for the alliance – NATO. Then NATO can and

must react. How? That will depend on the severity of the attack." So, putting it on the table that cyber-attacks can be met with military responses by NATO. In October, the famous James Clapper, who said that the US was not wittingly collecting material on millions of Americans when asked by Senator Wyden, Clapper – along with the head of Homeland Security – said in October that "we believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities."

Over the past weeks, we've seen front-page articles in the {New York Times}, the {Washington Post}; for example, last Friday the {Washington Post} without naming any sources or pointing to any specific facts, wrote that "The CIA has concluded, in a secret assessment, that Russia intervened in the 2016 election to help Donald Trump win the Presidency, according to officials briefed on the matter." So, no named sources. On Monday, plans were announced to have the Electors of the Electoral College briefed by the intelligence agencies on foreign interference in our elections; basically trying to call into question the election itself and the laws governing Electors. Just yesterday, on NPR's "Morning Edition", President Obama said, "I think there is no doubt that when any foreign government tries to impact the integrity of our elections, that we need to take some action. And we will; at a time and place of our choosing. Some of it may

be explicit and publicized; some of it may not be. But Mr. Putin is well aware of my feelings on this, because I spoke to him directly about it." That's what Obama had to say yesterday; he spoke about it more at his final press conference at the White House today.

So, we reached Lyndon LaRouche for comment about this, this morning; and I'd like to play for you his response:

LYNDON LAROUCHE [recording]: Those words in his mouth are, as far as they're there, that's a threat to murder people; to murder people of importance. Because this is the way Obama's stepfather taught him, and the way that Obama operated in killing people on Tuesdays during that episode period. So, the point is, the threat is murder; and the best thing to do is say, publicly, that the nations of the planet are now threatened by Obama's plan for mass killing of people. And that has to be said; because that's what that guy has always done, since his stepfather trained him. Obama is a killer; and therefore, he's not going to let things get by peacefully. Obama will kill, unless somebody stops him. That's the reality here. All the details and so forth, and things of your back and forth, really don't amount to much right now. Many of the people who are leading the effort of developing the world program don't need to be stirred up. It's only Obama's crowd that are dangerous; and they will kill. Therefore, it's important for those who are waiting for their

opportunity but are not going to ask for it; that's where the problem comes in. Once Obama, with his crowd, starts killing people, that's going to be a bloody mess; and that's going to be the kind of thing that threatens the people of the United States and others right now. He's made it clear; the signals are all there. Obama is still going for a kill against the people of the United States and others.

ROSS: So, there you have LaRouche's views on the expected response for Obama to take his usual course of killing to get his way on things.

Now, on Monday, the VIPS group – the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity – released a memo called "Allegations of Hacking the Election Are Baseless", in which they gave their reasons for coming to that assessment. We interviewed a leading member of the VIPS group, former Senator Mike Gravel – former Senator from Alaska – to get his take on this; and we can play that for you now.

Mike Gravel is one of the signers of a letter that was released by the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity a couple of days ago in response to the {New York Times} and the general media tumult around Russia hacking the elections, Russia denying Hillary Clinton the Presidency; that she deserved as a gift from God. So, I'd like to ask Senator Gravel, who is a former adjutant top-secret control officer for the Communications Intelligence Service, and a special agent of the

Counterintelligence Corps; and in addition being a former Senator from Alaska. Senator Gravel, could you tell our viewers what you think of this notion that Russia hacked the election and determined the outcome of our Presidential election here in the US?

SEN. MIKE GRAVEL: First off, it's ridiculous! It's far-fetched ridiculous! We know – and here we can be grateful to Edward Snowden – that the United States' capability, along with their partners in Britain, have the capability of vacuuming up {every single communication in the world}. That means that the NSA has {all} of Hillary's emails; has {all} of the communications between the US and Russia. And so for the government to come out and say via the intelligence community, that this is all instigated by Russia, is just part of the demonization that we've seen taking place about Putin and Russia, as part of a plan in the United States to have regime change in Russia. Believe it. We're seeing what's happened in Syria with regime change, which is hundreds of thousands of people displaced and killed. And now we know that it was the US that financed the coup in Kiev, that unseated Ukraine's duly-elected President, who was favorable to Russia; which, of course, is normal, since they are neighbors and were essentially one country at one point. And so we destabilized that, and that was admitted to by the Under

Secretary, Victoria Nuland, who's still there; was there under Clinton. She admitted that the United States had spent $5 billion over a 10-year period, to destabilize the government of Ukraine.
We succeeded.

Then, of course, as a reaction to that, when Russia had to continue its fresh-water port, which is Sevastopol, which became under threat, they protected it by annexing – {re}-annexing, let's put it that way – because it was part of Russia before. It was given away by Nikita Khruschev several years ago.

So, in point of fact, we have all the knowledge in the NSA. Maybe the NSA doesn't talk to the FBI, or doesn't talk to the CIA. I don't know. We've had this problem in 9/11, with nobody connecting the dots; and may have that same problem right now. But there's no question that the United States government does more activity in the cyber world than {anybody else}. Russia is probably a distant second. China is a distant second. But there's nobody that holds a candle to what we're capable of doing.

So, for our government to turn around – or {elements} within our government let's put it that way – to turn around and say that the Democratic Party was hacked and these hacks were given to WikiLeaks who then released them; well, it seems odd that the American government would have to be partners of WikiLeaks to let this stuff out. What seems more likely, is that somebody within the government, whether rogue or intent, saw this as an ability to try and embarrass Russia; embarrass Putin, and

to save face for Hillary, who was promptly losing the election with her skullduggery.

As a result of this, we now see the {New York Times} – and this should not surprise us – the {New York Times} and the {Washington Post}, the two major national newspapers of note, have done a lot of disinformation over the years, and I think this is just one more instance of that disinformation coming out of the {New York Times}. Keep in mind it's the {New York Times} that ginned up the war to invade Iraq. You can take your credits from there, as to what they're capable of doing when they put their mind to it.

So, that's essentially what I think is the case. Here too, we have enough people with skills and knowledge, particularly with our group, the former intelligence officers in the government, very senior intelligence officers – because none of us are spring chickens – to be able to question what has been put out, and say that this doesn't seem accurate, and doesn't make sense.

ROSS: So, that interview took place on Wednesday; the same day the {New York Times} ran a front-page story – "Hacking the Democrats: How Russia Honed Its Cyber-power and Trained It on an American Election". So, it's half the front page; four full pages inside. That same day, Sam Biddle at the {Intercept} put out what had been amassed as all the public evidence that the Russian government was behind the hack; pointing out that it's not enough evidence. Comparing it to earlier invasions, such as

when people working with the Chinese PLA hacked American industrial firms, the Department of Justice put out a 56-page report detailing all the specifics of how it happened; or when North Korea hacked Sony, the evidence was put forward. This time, though, it's just the say-so of intelligence officials.

All of this might look like it's a bunch of flailing around to explain the electoral defeat by blaming anybody except for the terrible candidate that the Democrats had, but it's much more than this. You have to remember, this isn't just domestic theatrics; the case is being made for – as Obama put it – a revenge attack or some kind of answer being made to Russia in some way or another. That is, threatening a nuclear-armed nation over allegations that have not been backed up with any specific evidence and frankly, of accusing Russia of things that the US admits to doing all the time. So, we asked Senator Gravel, what was the intent; why the anti-Russian hysteria? Is this just about the election? What's the push for this? This is what he had to say:

SEN. GRAVEL: The intent is to sabotage the potential new relationship [with Russia]. That's what the intent is. But here too, I think Trump has his own areas of expertise in this regard. And the new Secretary of State designate, Rex Tillison, he also has a great deal of experience with the Russian leadership. And so, as a result of that, they're going to dictate their own policy.

What we see right now, is the last regurgitation of a failed policy, one that was very dangerous. In demonizing Putin the way we've done in American media, Western media, and then turning around and levelling the charge at them that they are trying to destabilize Western and Eastern Europe, is ridiculous. I know of no instance – and I would question anybody to quote an instance – where Russia has threatened anybody in the last decade in Eastern Europe and Europe proper. He sells them oil and gas; why would he want to destabilize his customers? It makes no sense at all. But to the neo-cons, who are intent on trying to protect the hegemonic position of the United States in the world, {this makes a lot of good sense for them}. They need to demonize Russia and Putin, they need to demonize Xi and China, and assert our military prowess in the world. We have a significant economic position in the world, and these militarists feel they've got to shore that position up, with militaristic policies that make no sense at all.

What they should be doing, is joining with China in the Silk Road (One Belt, One Road) to raise the economic level of the world to a higher level, and that would be the biggest contribution we could make to the well-being of people around the world, and to the issue of having world peace. That's what we should be doing. But that's not what's happening. What's

happening is what we learned from the study of the Thucydides Trap, where the power which is the global power – which is the United States – is now facing the problem of an ascending power like China moving in and surpassing us. Well, our egos may not be able to take that, but certainly the people of the world could take it; because it would mean greater economic activity, on the part of China.

So, it's all mixed up with this insanity that exists within the American government, by a group of people called neo-cons. They start with Cheney. They go from Cheney/Rumsfeld, that crowd, into the present group of neo-cons. Here you have a person like John Bolton, who's being considered for the Number Two man at the State Department. I can't think of a person who's more idiotic, as a neo-con, than John Bolton. I think Bush is just wantonly picking people, hither and yon, to satisfy the conservatives.

I think what they're going to find is when these conservatives attempt to assert policy positions that are at variance from Donald Trump, they're going to find they're short-lived. He'll fire them. He's done that on TV and he's used to that. "Give me the wrong advice, you're fired." That's what you're going to see from a President who's going to be tweeting. He's going to be tweeting his policies to the American people and the world, all by himself, in his room, with his little computer.

ROSS: You know, if you have time for one more

question, I'd like to ask you about China, which you brought up. One of Trump's recent appointments was the former governor of Iowa, which is a state that President Xi Jinping of China has close ties to, having lived there for years, studying agriculture when he was a lower-level figure in the government. You brought up the One Belt, One Road as a potential for the US to be involved in. It's currently something that, under the Obama administration, the US has been opposing. The US did not join the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; the US urged other nations not to join it as well. What would you see as the proper or the best – what should the US role in the world be? What should US relations with China in particular be with regard to this program?

SEN. GRAVEL: Well, the U.S. role should, first and foremost, rests upon economic activity – raising the quality of life for the people in the United States and for the people in the world. That's the goal that China has set with respect to its One Belt, One Road.

We oppose that because we are refusing to accept the fact that China is the ascendant power, and that within a couple decades, will be the Number One economic power in the world; but not the military power. If you just look at the amount of money they're spending, they spend about 10% of what we do on our defense posture. As a result of that, it demonstrates they have no interest in becoming the military predominant power in the world. They're ceding that to the United States.

But that, of course, is not all that attractive, as you saw in the Pivot to Asia. Thank God that we have a new President, Duterte, in the Philippines, who is now creating a rapprochement to China, which is the most enlightened thing they could do. Their future is not with the United States; their future is as a player in the economy of South Asia. That's what a rapprochement with China portends — that both the Philippines will be the recipient of extensive One Belt, One Road financing to raise the standard of living in the Philippines, which used to be superior to many of the other countries in Asia, and is now in the lower brackets.

My recommendation is the United States and the new administration would be Trump negotiating his "deal." And the deal he can negotiate is that, yes, the United States will join with China, and will raise the economic threshold of the world.

ROSS: That sounds like an excellent direction for the US. I was wondering, do you have any other final thoughts you'd like to leave for our viewers?

SEN. GRAVEL: No, not at all, except to thank the LaRouche organization for doing good work in advancing the cause of peace, and in advancing the cause of economic growth. The only way we going to bring about world peace is when we raise the standard

of
living of the people throughout the world. Again, thank you for
the good work in that regard.

ROSS: Senator Mike Gravel, thank you very much.

SEN. GRAVEL: You're welcome.

ROSS: While keeping up front that assessment from LaRouche
that Obama the murderer is not going to take this transition,
take this shift lying down, and the use of the Russian hacking
business as an opportunity from their perspective to create
conflict, let's switch gears and discuss more about what that
better future ought to be; what our positive policy is. I'd like
to turn it over now to Ben Deniston.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. This should serve as a useful
counterpoint, I think, to everything we were just discussing
here. In the recent weeks, we've had some discussions with
Lyndon LaRouche about the prospect of bringing the principle of
the SDI – Strategic Defense Initiative, or in its modern form,
the Strategic Defense of Earth; bringing that principle back onto
the table in this potential new strategic environment where,
assuming Obama doesn't get his way and doesn't start
thermonuclear war before the next President even has a chance to
take power, we could see a new alliance emerging between the
United States, Russia, and China. And setting aside this insane
geopolitical framework of viewing these nations as our
adversaries and doing everything we can to undermine their
growth

and development and rise to world prominence. Mr. LaRouche was very supportive of this being a time in which the Strategic Defense of Earth policy can come back as a real pillar of a new security architecture for the planet; which was also a focus that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had when we were discussing it with her earlier in the week as well. This can be a critical pillar for how the security, the defense, the military institutions of nations in this new era, coming together and cooperating on the new challenges, the common threats and issues that face all nations. The reason why I say this is a principle, is because we're in a new – I would really say for the past couple of generations – a new historical phase for mankind in this thermonuclear age. We've reached the point where if we continue a geopolitical, imperial policy where a leading power tries to maintain control at all costs, you're at the point where if that goes to full-scale war as it has in past periods, past centuries, you're talking about the annihilation of mankind. You're talking about a new phase of mankind, where full-blown warfare now has the ability to wipe out civilization as we know it. That's been an historically new environment that mankind has been dealing with in the past generations. Now, we're seeing the potential for a build-up around that kind of war to be put off the table; put on the back burner around a new administration. But what we're talking about with this Strategic Defense of Earth and in the context of the broader exploration of space, the joint

development of space which Kesha will have some comments on in a
little bit. This needs to become a central positive issue that
we rally nations around; it can't just become "Let's not have war
or conflict because it's bad"; but "Let's have a positive,
truthful conception – a real principle – of what are the issues
that face all nations together, that we should be rallying around
in cooperation."

That was LaRouche's SDI originally; {LaRouche's SDI}, not
necessarily the program that got implemented to some degree. But
LaRouche's idea of the SDI, which was a joint open cooperative
program with the Soviet Union; sharing technologies and
capabilities, and jointly developing new capabilities to – as
Reagan said – "render the threat of thermonuclear weapons
impotent and obsolete." We'd actually be working with the
Soviets to do this; and Mr. LaRouche recruited Dr. Edward Teller,
President Reagan around this idea. These were not hippie,
flower-wielding peaceniks; these are not people that just ran
around saying "No war. War is bad." These are pretty serious,
staunch conservative Cold Warriors to a certain degree; but they
recognized the truthful validity of what LaRouche was developing
around his idea of the SDI. Mankind had reached a point where we
needed positive, collaborative, joint development of these kinds
of capabilities for the common aims of nations. Mr. LaRouche
came incredibly close, in collaboration with Reagan, Teller,

and
others, to really overturning the strategic framework back in the
'80s with that program.

But that hasn't really gone away. We've discussed this on
shows in the past, but it's worth just reminding people that in
the '90s, right in the aftermath of the attempt to get the full
SDI program, there was kind of a re-emergence of the same idea
around the defense of Earth. The recognition at that time – in
the early '90s – that the Earth is actually incredibly
vulnerable to asteroid strikes, comet strikes; and we should
actually be looking at what the heck we can do on this planet to
defend the planet from these kinds of potential disasters. That
was something that Dr. Edward Teller, in direct collaboration
with other veterans of the SDI and their direct counterparts in
Russia, took up as a major focus in the '90s. You had a whole
series of conferences and investigations, and proposals really,
for the same type of joint open cooperation between the defense
institutions and related institutions in the United States and
Russia for cooperation around this common threat of the defense
of Earth from not only missiles, but missiles coming from the
Solar System; these asteroids. Unfortunately, it didn't fully go
through at the time. We had the continuation of this
geopolitical framework, which has obviously continued through
Bush and now Obama. But this issue has come back up again. It

was in 2012 that the Russians refloated the offer, and it was named the Strategic Defense of Earth in some of the news coverage. Direct, explicit opposition to the US and NATO advancing their missile defense systems towards Russia's borders into Eastern Europe. They said, why don't we have a joint cooperative program for a Strategic Defense of Earth against the threats of asteroids and related issues? Now, today, again with the prospect of a real shift in the United States, assuming we can contain Obama and he doesn't return to his murderous streak and orientation as Mr. LaRouche has warned, we could actually see this principle emerge and become a central pillar of a new historical era today.

So, we thought it would be appropriate today, kind of as a counterpoint, to start to put some of this issue back on the table. I wanted to start just by illustrating some of what these threats are; what we're facing in terms of the threats to the Earth from these objects in our Solar System. If we go to the slideshow, we have a first graphic [Fig. 1] illustrating just the reality that these impacts happen; and they happen quite frankly a lot more frequently than people probably tend to realize. In the animation, you can see the famous, very well-documented, surprise Chelyabinsk impact over Russia. Which we had no warning about; we did not know was coming. This frankly very small asteroid came in and impacted with such a high speed – which is characteristic of all of these collisions in the Solar

System. A lot of the energy release is due to the fact that these speeds are incredibly fast. When you get an impact of two orbiting bodies in the Solar System, you tend to get massive energy releases, explosions. Here you had a very small object intersecting the Earth; slamming into the atmosphere and releasing the energy of a small nuclear explosion as it hit. This, I think, awakened a lot of the world to the reality that these kinds of things do happen, and we have no defense. One, we didn't even see this one coming; and two, if we had seen it coming, we have no demonstrated, developed capability to defend the Earth from these kinds of challenges. I'd like to point people to on this graphic additionally, from some data that's been released in the relatively recent period, we can see in this map of the world, an illustration of many smaller meteor impacts into the atmosphere that have occurred just between 1994 and 2013. The Chelyabinsk impact was the largest in this time range; these all were smaller than the Chelyabinsk impact, but these were still large explosions in the upper atmosphere. You can see that they've painted the entire Earth over the course of this time period; just to illustrate the fact that these impacts are constantly occurring.

Just to give another sense of defending the Earth from these asteroids, here is a schematic of the inner Solar System [Fig. 2]. You can see Jupiter's orbit as the farthest orbit out there; obviously then comes Mars, and Earth's orbit is a little bit darker than the other orbits. All of these blue lines – assuming you have high resolution to see the details of this

visual – this blue haze you might see is actually composed of over 1400 orbits of asteroids that are specifically classified as particularly hazardous asteroids. That is, asteroids whose orbits cross the Earth's orbit at some point and create the potential for there to be an intersection where the asteroid is at the intersection at the same time as the Earth, and you have an impact, a collision. You can see here how crowded the inner Solar System is.

Fortunately, among these that we know of, none of these are expected to hit in the next century or any foreseeable timeframe as far as we know. This alone looks pretty dense, pretty packed in the inner Solar System here. What people should really get their mind around is, this is a tiny fraction of what we expect to be out there.

We can see here, if we take a little bit more complicated graphic [Fig. 3] and break it down, there are literally hundreds of thousands to millions of asteroids of the size of the Chelyabinsk meteor or bigger that we have not discovered. Based on our understanding of the distribution of asteroids of different sizes, we know that they're out there; we just don't where they are. We don't know which ones might impact, which ones might not. We don't know when the impacts would be.

Here is a depiction [Fig. 4], you can see the relationship between, on the horizontal axis in a logarithmic scale, different

sizes of near-Earth asteroids. On the far right, you can see the very large ones in the range of kilometers across in diameter, all the way down to sizes of meters. On the vertical axis, you can see the expected estimates of the distribution, the number, of near-Earth asteroids of those sizes. You can see for the very large ones, we believe there are not very many; but as you start to get to smaller sizes, you get a geometric growth in the number of near-Earth asteroids of these different sizes. You can also see depicted the scale of the damage that would be inflicted on the Earth if it were to hit over an unlucky location. The Chelyabinsk impact being pretty much the smallest size that would not – kind of representing a lower limit on what doesn't do huge amounts of damage. But if it were just a little bigger, that could have caused really catastrophic effects for Chelyabinsk, Russia – that region. In this range, what people sometimes call a "city-killer" range; the size of object that would release the energy of a large thermonuclear explosion, we've discovered maybe 1% of the near-Earth asteroids in this size range.

While NASA has done a good job of finding and discovering a number of the larger objects which can do damage over a large fraction of the Earth if not effect the entirety of the Earth; we've found a good number of those for the asteroids in particular. But as you start to go to these smaller sizes,

we've
barely scratched the surface. As dense as you think this
previous graphic is in terms of the number of bodies out there,
there are orders of magnitude more that could do serious damage
that we just don't know about. Again, the first step is knowing
where they are and when they might hit; the second step is
actually having a defense capability. We've not really done
anything besides general studies and theoretical investigations
on that front. So, this is still an open, unanswered challenge.
But this is kind of just the first step in a real defense of the
planet Earth from these types of cosmic challenges. As people
are probably aware, you also have the issue of comets. This
really grabbed people's attention in the mid '90s when mankind
sat on the planet Earth, looked to Jupiter, and watched a massive
comet that had broken apart into a series of fragments as you can
see in the upper graphic [Fig. 5] there, collide with Jupiter.
In the moving animation, you see the explosion of one of these
fragments as it impacted Jupiter's surface. The other bright
object is one of Jupiter's moons; but this is an image in the
infrared where you can see the effects of these energetic types
of activities more clearly. In the purple image, you can clearly
see the effects of the impact on the surface of Jupiter after the
impact had occurred. These impacts let marks the size of the
planet Earth on Jupiter's surface.

So, this was a big wake-up call in the mid '90s. This
was

comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 was one of the designations for it. Before this period, it wasn't widely accepting that we had to think about these types of impacts. When this occurred and they found this stream of comet fragments about a year before it actually hit; they looked at its orbit and said, "Wow! This is going hit Jupiter." So, everyone was sitting there watching, as this thing went up. We had the Hubble telescope, all these telescopes pointing; we saw this thing as well as we could from all over the world. This really was a major wake-up call to the fact that these impacts really do occur. They can come from asteroids, which you saw in the illustration of the inner Solar System, but they can also come from comets; which represents a qualitatively different challenge, as we'll see in the next animation. [Fig. 6]

This should give you a sense of this greater, more difficult challenge posed by comets. This is a particular case of a comet name C1996B2; and this was discovered in January 31, 1996. That's when we first knew this comet even existed. As you can see in the animation which is based directly off of the orbital data from NASA, we discovered this comet at the beginning of this animation when it was just out past the orbit of Mars. Within two months, it made a close pass by the Earth. We had no idea it was out there until two months before it makes of close pass by the Earth. Whereas the object that hit over Russia – the Chelyabinsk impact – was measured at about 20 meters in

diameter; this object is estimated to be about 5 kilometers in diameter. That's about half the diameter of the comet that's believed to have taken out the dinosaurs. As we let the animation play out, we see something very interesting that's characteristic of this distinct nature of the challenge of comets. Look at its orbit. The circular orbits you see here are the outer planets; that's Neptune's orbit. So, this has an extremely elliptical orbit that takes it far out into the depths of the Solar System. When these comets are out there in the far reaches of the Solar System, they're incredibly difficult to see. So, we only see them when they're starting to come into the inner Solar System. Again, as this case demonstrated, we saw this one two months before it made a close pass. If that had been on an impact trajectory, there would have been nothing we could have done. When we're talking about that size of an object with these comets, we're talking about something that can wipe out civilization. That is a global catastrophic impact, an object of that size. We're not talking about the local scale damage of the asteroids we were talking about a second ago; we're talking about catastrophic effects across the whole planet.

So, this is another depiction [Fig. 7] of where we think these bodies are. Based on the orbits of these comets – sometimes technically referred to as long period comets; it's believed that many of these comets reside in the farthest outreaches of the Solar System. Far, far beyond the outer

planets. This is a logarithmic scale, so you can see that this distribution of comets – sometimes referred to as the Oort Cloud – begins over tens of times past where Voyager has currently reached, and extends tens times farther than that. We're talking about the very outskirts of the gravitational hold of the Sun. It's believed, again, we haven't seen this region – but based on the orbits of comets we see coming in just in the short time period mankind has been able to make these observations – it's believed that this is a very large population of bodies out in this outer region of the Solar System. Because the gravitational effect of the Sun is so weak out there, it doesn't take much to perturb their orbits and potentially send some into the inner Solar System. Again, with our current capabilities, we're creating scenarios when we only see them months, maybe if we're lucky a few years, before an impact. Certainly not enough time to do anything about it with our current capabilities.

Now, I just want to end on kind of an interesting note, that there are some studies – although the data is limited – indicating there might be certain cyclical natures to these large comet impacts. Some people even believe it could relate to how the Solar System moves through the galaxy; which raises some very interesting questions about how this outer region of comets could get perturbed on a periodic basis and send in what they call "showers" – cometary showers of many comets coming into the

inner Solar System, creating a scenario where it's much more likely that Earth or the other planets might get hit with an impact as Jupiter got hit in the '90s.

I think it's just worth noting that one of the leading astronomers in this whole field, Eugene Shoemaker, who unfortunately passed away in the late '90s, had pioneered much of the work in this field. And for whom this comet that impact Jupiter is named; him and his wife, who discovered it together.

He himself believed that it is likely that we are currently in the period of a comet shower; that was something that he published in the late '90s. Based upon the types of crater records and other evidence, he said it's not certain, but it could be the case that we're currently in the middle of what on a human time scale is a long period in which there's an increased frequency of cometary entries into the inner Solar System and an increased likelihood of impacts occurring. Whether this directly accounts for his hypothesis or not, it was only last year that we found out that a relatively dim star had actually passed through the Oort Cloud about 70,000 years ago; which is one of the kinds of scenarios that can perturb many of these bodies. Again, since these things are so far away, it can take 70,000 years for these things to reach the inner Solar System. The point is, this is still incredibly preliminary knowledge of this region – of the Oort Cloud; of the region between the Oort Cloud and the inner Solar System. There could be a long period comet that's only ten

years out, that's been travelling for 50,000 years from the Oort Cloud, or even longer; and it's now only ten years away and it's on a direct impact course with the Earth, and we wouldn't even know. It could be just in the outskirts of the outer planets region of the Solar System; not even in this far, far depths region. Again, we're talking about things that can devastate civilization completely, globally as we know it.

This discovery of this dim star passing through the Oort Cloud, we just found that out a year ago. How many other bodies are out there that might have had close passes in the geologically recent past that could be doing similar effects? The point is, our knowledge is incredibly miniscule for something that threatens the entire planet; and our defense capability doesn't exist. This typifies just one of the issues; and I think there's a lot more we're going to get into in coming shows. But this typifies one of the issues that is front and center for this principle of the SDI, the SDE to re-emerge and center around. These are threats that don't recognize national borders; they don't recognize cultural boundaries. They challenge the entire planet and they're outside of our current capabilities. If we're going to have a sane and principled relationship for leading nations in the planet, then it has to return to these kinds of challenges. Addressing these common aims and threats as Dr. Edward Teller had spoken of, as Mr. LaRouche put on the table with this whole SDI proposal.

The point that I think we should really end on, and maybe

discuss a little bit in conclusion, is that – and this is something that we've been discussing with Mr. LaRouche over the recent weeks – this isn't a separate, isolated issue. This is part of mankind becoming a Solar System species. This is part of mankind expanding to a new level, developing a platform of economic activity that makes mankind a presence, an active force in the Solar System. We can come up with specific scenarios where you can deflect one asteroid or maybe a particular telescope that can help us see some of these things; and we should be discussing and looking at those things. But the fundamental issue is, how do we expand mankind into the Solar System as a much more active and capable presence where we can handle these kinds of challenges? How do we engage other nations in cooperation and collaboration, instead of hiding our technology and hiding our capabilities because we want to have a leg up over China or Russia? How do we jointly develop the fundamental science and technologies mankind needs to defend the planet Earth in an open, cooperative way?

If we're going to seriously, actually get into that, Mr. LaRouche has been emphatic; that takes us right to the work of Krafft Ehricke, his collaboration with Krafft Ehricke, and these early space pioneers who really worked out the fundamental principles of mankind's development of the Solar System. I think that is fully integrated with this Strategic Defense of Earth perspective. I think Kesha might have more to say, but that's going to be a critical part of this new space paradigm that we've been discussing in recent weeks.

KESHA ROGERS: Very good. I wanted to go back and really take up this conception of what it really means to advance the cause for peace. Because first of all, we have to end the perpetuation and acceptance of a big lie, a murderous lie that human beings cannot have access to that which is truthful. This is what the fight really is. When you're talking about the murderous policy of Obama, it's not a matter of opinion or whether or not you have a belief or non-belief, or like or dislike this President. This President is acting on behalf of the same factions which are indicative of what Bertrand Russell actually represented. He set back the cause of human progress in society. To say that if you make enough people believe that snow is black, or you perpetuate a lie enough; then enough people will believe it. But now, we're seeing that that's not working anymore. That the cause that Bertrand Russell and those who were against the genius of Albert Einstein that mankind can have access to that which is truthful, that system is being destroyed; it's losing out, and there is a new era, a new system of mankind emerging that is being represented by what the United States has the potential to become if we break with the lies that have been perpetuated and say, "No more! Obama must be thrown in jail now." Anybody who's pushing this policy that we have to be at odds with nations such as Russia and China, are continuing to set back the progress of mankind. This is not just about waiting for

the next election and saying OK, well we dealt with Obama and hopefully we can survive this next few weeks or so. The question is, that people who continue to allow for this murderous policy to dominate the thinking and the direction of our nation, cannot be tolerated.

I think it's important to really look at what it is that this President has done in setting back the course of human progress by his dismantling and attacks on the manned space program. What you're really dealing with right now is that we have to look at the advancement of the space program as a new evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind. To look at the advancement of the space program not just as a discretionary budgetary matter for internal US relations, but as Mr. LaRouche said at the onset of this election when Mr. Trump was elected, you now have a new system of international relations emerging. The United States has to join with that.

But when you're talking about advancing the cause of peace, it's expressive of the fight that Mr. LaRouche, his wife Helga, and this organization have been advancing and leading for a very long time. Then you talk about Mr. LaRouche's policy of the Strategic Defense Initiative; a lot of people tried to lower that to a scale of just missile defense and defense of nations acting against the appearance of nuclear weapons from other nations, or just on a small scale. But what you're talking about, is the advancement of an evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind throughout the Solar System, throughout the Universe. And

mankind understanding how to come together for a common aim of mankind; to submit to the development of the whole of the Solar System, which is going to increase our understanding of how to advance mankind both here on Earth and off the planet. This is what has been missing. The way people think about human economy, the way people think about relationships to the advancement of mankind in the Universe, is based on these small scale relations; but it has to be completely changed at this point in time. What Krafft Ehricke discussed in terms of an extraterrestrial imperative in his third law, was really taking the lid off on human progress; that mankind was an expression of unlimited potential. He says in that third law that by expanding through the Universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of Reason and the wisdom of moral law within himself.

The problem is that we have lost that sense of moral law within mankind to act for the betterment of human beings and human progress. And have lost that power of Reason because we refuse to fight for that which is truthful. That has to end; that has to be stopped now. I think the fight going forward, has to be centered around this basis; that we are going to uplift human society out of the depths of despair, and actually organize around a new commitment to human progress that has been missing for far too long.

I just wanted to say that because I think that we are on the verge of a new era for mankind right now, but people have to

get
a sense of it. It's not going to happen unless you fight for it;
unless you fight to bring it into existence. The starting point
of that is that we have to develop a new system of international
relations, working with Russia, with China; not as enemies, but
working together to end this threat to human progress that has
been going on for far too long.

ROSS: Absolutely! I think that ties it also with that
other major leap that's needed in humanity of Lyndon LaRouche's
fourth law of his "Four Laws to Save the USA Now"; which is the
breakthrough to get fusion power. Like this need for adopting a
platform that allows us to have a control over space, that let's
us really have this region of the Solar System; something that's
within our power, within our reach, within our ability to
interact with and intervene on if something is about to kill us
all. The essential to make that happen is fusion power. No
matter how efficient a windmill you design, or no matter what
breakthroughs they make in building solar panels, those aren't
ever going to be at all useful for moving into space. You're not
going to go to Mars with a windmill. What we are going to do
that's going to transform our relationship to nature – I think
this idea that we must grow; it's the characteristic of the human
species, this moral law that you spoke of, Kesha. This law

that
we have to answer to is that it's been the nature of the Universe
to develop; we've seen it with the creation of the Solar System.
We've seen it with the development of life on this planet into
increasingly higher forms; not in a purely qualitative way, but
also through some specific quantitative measures adopted by
Vladimir Vernadsky, for example. Where he looked at the increase
of concentration of energy in forms of life; where he looked at
the increasing range of chemical elements that were used by life;
an increasing power and density of energy flow through the
biosphere. That's really up to us at this point. The Universe,
in a real way, depends upon us for those next levels of
development that are the fruits of our minds. To create things
in nature that have never happened before. Just like
multi-cellular life, that was a new thing that hadn't happened
before; chlorophyll – life going extraterrestrial to get the
power of the Sun to feed on. That was something that hadn't been
seen before. Now, it's the kinds of things that we do:
electromagnetism; the breakthroughs that we have available to us
with nuclear science, with fusion power. This is the calling
that we have to respond to; this is something that we can come to
in resonance with other nations around the planet and really
cooperate on as a real basis for international relations. Not
maintaining supremacy, or maintaining the power of a bloc; but
having a serious mission that is common to all people to
collaborate on and to move forward.

DENISTON: It's maybe a minor point relative to everything, but I couldn't help noticing when Mr. Gravel mentioned that we spent $5 billion over 10 years to destabilize Ukraine; that's more per year than our fusion budget by a fair amount. That's $500 million a year; our fusion budget for magnetic confinement has been significantly less than that. Just in terms of a particular reflection of the totality; we're spending more to overthrow Ukraine, to mess with Russia, than we're spending on what could be infinite power for mankind for centuries to come.

ROSS: Priorities, huh?

DENISTON: Yeah.

ROSS: All right. I think that was a good discussion; we hit on a lot of topics today. I think if we keep ourselves focussed on getting these Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche implemented and preventing the hullaballoo now around this Russian hacking, etc. In these last periods of the current administration, they're attempting to create some sort of possibly irreversible conflict with Russia; that has to be stopped, and the foundation for a new system of cooperation among nations and people has to be put into place. That's something that we're very uniquely situated to do. So, I look forward to your help in making that a possibility and seeing you next time on larouchepac.com. Good bye.

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og

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

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

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

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

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

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

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on `Donald

Trump and the New International Paradigm'

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehricke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

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

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs.

Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Discussion:

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016
Discussion
(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)
Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.
Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the 'dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.' What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.
So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWIII, 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 Gadaffi, “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 mons 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

Et Syvmileskridt – til Månen. Menneskehedens fremtidsepoke i rummet er endelig kommet

EIR, 28. nov., 2016. Af Benjamin Deniston – Hvad vil NASA's fokus blive under præsident Trump? Snarere end at kommentere de igangværende spekulationer og rygter, så lad os i stedet fokusere på det, der må ske for at sikre menneskehedens fremgangsrige fremtid i Solsystemet.

Hvad bør målet være for nutidens rumprogram? Vi ønsker helt bestemt at fuldføre inspirerende og spændende mål – at sende mennesker tilbage til Månen, få folk til Mars og forfølge en udvidet udforskning af andre planetsystemer via robotter, er alle værdige mål, der nu diskuteres.

Der er imidlertid en anden betragtning af en højere natur, som må vejlede vore handlinger nu: vil de præstationer, vi opnår, give os en platform, der kan støtte kvalitative spring til endnu større kapaciteter i fremtiden?

Nutidens rumfartspolitik bør indeholde en vision hen over flere generationer for udvikling af sådanne evner, som dernæst vil gøre det muligt for menneskeheden på regelmæssig basis at foretage titals eller hundredetals missioner af den type, som vi i øjeblikket ser som enkelte flagskibsmissioner i dag. Af årsager, som jeg i det følgende vil diskutere, er en international mission for udviklingen af Månen det klare, første skridt.

Naturligt menneskeligt fremskridt forekommer i spring

I går jublede vi af begejstring, da vi fulgte med i NASA's Curiosity-robot, som foretog sin første udforskning af Mars; i morgen bør vi have mere avancerede robotter, der udforsker mange flere planeter og disses måner (Venus, Mars, Titan,

Europa, Enceladus, Io, Triton, Ganymedes, Pluto m.fl.) For et par årtier siden blev verden grebet, da den så mennesket sætte fod på Månen; et par årtier frem i tiden bør vi være vidne til, at mennesket med relativ lethed udforsker andre planeter. Vi må se frem til interplanetariske rumrejser, udforskning og udvikling, ligesom menneskeheden for århundreder tilbage i tiden så frem til trans-oceaniske rejser – foretagender, der starter som risikable og kostbare missioner for udforskning, anført af en håndfuld modige personer, må blive mere og mere almindelige foreteelser for en større og større del af befolkningen. Dette vil tage et par generationer at opnå, men det er sluttelig det rigtige perspektiv, som er nødvendigt som vejledning vore handlinger i dag.

I begyndelsen af det 19. århundrede risikerede Lewis og Clark liv og lemmer for at rejse hen over det amerikanske kontinents vildmark, hvor de opnåede noget, som en gennemsnitlig, pensioneret fritidsentusiast med campingvogn kan opnå inden for en uges tid, eller som den gennemsnitlige flyrejsende kan opnå på en dag. I midten af det 20. århundrede var en håndfuld astronauter de første til at trodse rummets kolde vakuum under menneskehedens første rejser til Månen, hvor de opnåede noget, som vil blive almindeligt om et århundrede frem i tiden.

Er rumrejser vanskeligere end de tidlige, transkontinentale ekspeditioner? Ja, absolut – men enhver ny udfordring er altid vanskeligere end den foregående; dette er det menneskelige fremskridts natur.

Det spørgsmål, man bør stille sig, er: hvordan forvandler menneskeheden ekstraordinære, enkeltstående præstationer til ordinære, almindelige aktiviteter? Det enestående og utrolige til noget regelmæssigt og uundværligt? Hvad er det, der gør det muligt for menneskeheden på denne enestående vis at foretage sådanne dramatiske forvandlinger? Svaret gives i Lyndon LaRouches videnskab om fysisk økonomi.

LaRouches fysisk-økonomiske platform

Under denne overgangsperiode til Trump-præsidentskabet er det afgørende at hæve diskussionsniveauet til det rette grundlag. Vi kan få spændende missioner, og vi kan have inspirerende missioner, men det spørgsmål, vi bør stille, er: Vil vi få et program, hvor investeringerne vil blive grundlaget for at skabe et helt nyt niveau af aktiviteter, som vil gøre det muligt for os at gøre ting i en helt anden størrelsesorden, end det var muligt forud for denne investering? Vil dette skabe det, som hr. LaRouche engang definerede som en »fysisk-økonomisk platform«?[1] Vil dette skabe en helt ny platform for aktiviteter, for potentiale – for infrastruktur, for energigennemstrømningstæthed i teknologier – som tilsammen understøtter et kvalitativt nyt niveau af potentiel aktivitet for menneskeheden?

Det er det spørgsmål, som vi ønsker at lægge frem på bordet nu. Dette fører direkte til Krafft Ehrickes vision, den Krafft Ehricke[2], som var en tidlig rumfartspioner, der arbejdede meget tæt sammen med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1980'erne. Han var en af de førende rumfarts-visionære, som meget detaljeret skitserede det indledende grundlag for, at menneskeheden kan avancere til at blive en art, der lever i hele Solsystemet.

Den virkelige forståelse af, hvad kvalitative revolutioner i infrastruktursystemer betyder for menneskehedens forsatte kreative fremskridt, har ingen forbindelse med

den måde, hvorpå de fleste mennesker bruger denne betegnelse. En bedre repræsentation ville være at tænke på det som at fremme »platforme« for menneskelig udvikling. Gå to tusinde år tilbage i tiden, hvor de dominerende kulturer var trans-oceaniske, maritime kulturer. Det, man begyndte at se med udviklingen af vandveje i indlandsområder, flodsystemer i indlandsområder – såsom det, Karl den Store bedrev under sin regeringstid i Centraleuropa, med at udvikle disse kanalsystemer og flodsystemer – var en kvalitativ revolution ud over det, der tidligere havde været, med disse trans-

oceaniske civilisationer. Udviklingen af disse indlands-vandveje definerede et ny platform for aktiviteter, der understøttede et kvalitativt spring i det, civilisationen var i stand til at opnå.

Det næste spring kom med udviklingen af jernbanesystemer, især transkontinentale jernbaner, der typificeres af det, som Lincoln havde været spydspids for med den transkontinentale jernbane tværs over Amerika. Transkontinentale jernbanesystemer, og de nye energi-gennemstrømningstætheder, som frembragtes gennem den kulfyrede dampmaskine, skabte en ny platform, der for første gang understøttede udviklingen af kontinenternes indre områder (som således åbnede op for, at enorme nye territorier kunne udvikles), og som tilvejebragte en ny, rum-tid-sammenhængskraft i økonomien (som muliggjorde nye strømme af varer, produktionsprocesser og højere niveauer af generel produktivitet for arbejdsstyrken).

Disse transkontinentale jernbanesystemer definerede en kvalitativ forøgelse af menneskehedens »potentielle, relative befolkningstæthed«, den måleenhed, som LaRouche har udviklet for at forstå videnskaben om økonomisk vækst. Det gjorde ting, der på et tidspunkt var utroligt kostbare eller krævende eller risikable, til faste hverdagsaktiviteter.

Hvordan kan vi skabe et lignende skift med hensyn til menneskehedens forhold til Solsystemet? Hvad er nøgleteknologierne, energi-gennemstrømningstætheder og infrastrukturer i en fysisk-økonomisk Solsystemsplatform?

Fysisk-økonomisk Solsystemsplatform

Selv om det ikke diskuteres med hensyn til samme grad af reference, så har de fundamentale elementer i en Solsystemsplatform være velkendt siden Krafft Ehrickes og hans kollegers arbejde. For bekvemmelighedens skyld kan vi her fastslå tre afgørende kategorier at fokusere på:

* Adgang til rummet – På grund af de massive energikrav for at

overvinde Jordens tyngdekraft, har man sagt, »når man først kommer i kredsløb om Jorden, er man halvejs til et hvilket som helst sted i Solsystemet«. Hvis man kun taler om energikravene, så er dette absolut sandt (for eksempel brugte Apollo-programmets Saturn V-raket langt mere brændstof på turen fra Jordens overflade og til kredsløbet om Jorden, end den brugte til at flyve den kvart million mil fra Jordens kredsløbsbane og til Månen). I dag koster det $10.000 at bringe et pund last til Jordens kredsløbsbane med raketaffyringssystemer. Med de aktuelle bestræbelser på at sænke omkostningerne, kunne traditionelle raketflyvninger til Jordens kredsløbsbane måske skæres ned til en tiendedel af de aktuelle omkostninger (i heldigste fald). Nye teknologier byder imidlertid på langt større forbedringer. Det, som NASA definerer som »tredje generations affyringsfartøjer« og 'air-breathing' raketter, kan reducere omkostningerne til mellem en tiendel og en hundrededel af det nuværende omkostningsniveau.[3] Med avancerede versioner af disse systemer kunne astronauter ride et rumfartøj ved at lette fra en lufthavns-startbane og flyve hele vejen til Jordens kredsløbsbane. [4] Endnu videre kunne magnetisk levitations-vakuumrørs-raketaffyringssystemer reducere omkostningerne til blot 0,2 % af det aktuelle niveau og gøre lavt jordkredsløb lige så tilgængeligt som internationale rejser.[5]

* Fusionsfremdrift i rummet – Den energi, der udløses af kernereaktioner, er forbløffende en million gange større end kemiske reaktioner (per masse). For eksempel kunne den samme mængde energi, som indeholdes i Rumfærgens 3,8 mio. pund kemisk brændstof (i dens to solide boostere og dens flydende brændstoftank) opnås gennem blot ti pund nukleart brændstof. Når man fatter de enorme afstande, der er involveret i rejser ud i Solsystemet, bliver det klart, at rejser ud i det dybe rum uden kernekraft er lige så fjollet som rejser over et kontinent uden fossilt (kemisk) brændstof – det kan i begrænset grad gøres, men det understøtter ikke den nødvendige aktivitetsplatform. Fremdrift ved hjælp af fission, og

vigtigere endnu, fusion, er afgørende for hurtig og regelmæssig adgang til andre planetlegemer. Hvor nutidens rejser til Mars kræver måneders rejsetid, kan fremdrift gennem fusion gøre Mars til et spørgsmål om ugers, eller endda kun nogle dages, rejsetid.

* Udvikling af rum-resurser – Udviklingen og anvendelsen af de resurser, der er tilgængelige uden for Jorden, vil hæve menneskeheden op over selvforsynende ekskursioner ud i rummet og til niveauet for en aktiv, organiserende kraft i Solsystemet. Evnen til at udvikle resurserne, der er tilgængelige på Månen, asteroider, Mars eller enhver anden, potentiel destination i Solsystemet, reducerer den ekstremt kostbare nødvendighed af at bringe alt fra Jorden, og indleder den storslåede proces med at skabe selvforsynende systemer for økonomisk aktivitet i rummet, der skaffer nødvendige varer til rumaktiviteter og endda tilbage til Jorden. Udover de mere indlysende resurser som vand, ilt og brint, så er der stor fokus på et fusionsbrændstof, som næsten er totalt fraværende på Jorden, men som dækker Månens overflade, nemlig helium-3. Avanceret (aneutronisk) fusionsreaktion, med helium-3 som brændstof, kunne drive rumfartøjer rundt i hele Solsystemet, samt levere energi til Jorden i mange århundreder.[6]

Taget samlet skaber teknologiske og infrastrukturmæssige gennembrud i hver af disse tre kategorier en kombination, der skaber en ny, fysisk, økonomisk platform, der fuldstændigt redefinerer menneskehedens forhold til Solsystemet – ligesom jernbaner og dampmaskiner havde transformeret menneskehedens forhold til kontinenterne for to århundreder siden.

Destination Månen

Hvis det gøres korrekt, kan en mission for udviklingen af en permanent base og fremstillingsoperationer på Månen være den bedste program for drivkraften bag skabelsen af en fysisk-økonomisk platform i Solsystemet. Månens nære beliggenhed gør den tilgængelig for udvikling, og dens enestående resurser af

helium-3 kan give brændstof for fusionsfremdrift i rummet (og fusionskraft på Jorden), så vel som også definere et program, der kan være drivkraft for udviklingen af udvinding af mineraler, deres forarbejdning og fremstillingskapaciteter, i rummet. Nye raketaffyringssystemer vil sænke omkostningerne ved transport mellem Jorden og Månen, og på dramatisk vis øge adgangen til hele Solsystemet.

Verden har allerede kastet sit blik i denne retning. Både Kina og Rusland satser på Månen med henblik på mange af disse mål, og chefen for det Europæiske Rumagentur har givet Europas støtte til international udvikling af Månen.

Under en diskussion for nylig med Lyndon LaRouche, udtalte han: »Udgangspunktet er Krafft Ehricke.« Og Krafft Ehrickes industrialisering af Månen udgør den afgørende drivkraft bag at få alt dette i gang. Vi har helium-3 på Månen; det bringer spørgsmålet om fusionskraft direkte på bordet. Vi taler om at udvikle industrikapaciteter og kapaciteter til udvinding af mineraler på Månen. Hvis vi er seriøse omkring dette, vil vi øge vores adgang til rummet fra Jordens overflade. Så det er fremragende, at vi nu ser en masse diskussion om Månen, som nu igen kommer frem på bordet; men jeg mener, at spørgsmålet her er, vil vi forfølge denne Krafft Ehrickes vision om en reel, industriel udvikling?

For præsident Trump synes det klart, at Månen er det indlysende valg. Spørgsmålet er, om dette vil blive begyndelsen til en ny, transformerende platform, som kvalitativt vil hæve menneskehedens kapaciteter til et helt nyt niveau. Vil dette være indledningen til den næste revolution i menneskehedens fortsatte, kreative fremrykning i Universet? Det er den fulde forståelse af dette spørgsmål, som kræves på nuværende tidspunkt.

Denne artikel forekommer første gang i Executive Intelligence Review, 2. dec., 2016. Artiklen har ikke tidligere været udgivet på dansk.

Titelfoto: Maleri af et nukleart godstransportfartøj, til industrialiseringen af Månen, af Krafft Ehricke.

Indsat foto: Foto fra letsgoseit.com, af Krafft Ehricke fra portrætsamlingen i Rumfartens Internationale Hall of Fame.

---

[1] Se International webcast 24. sept., 2010, med Lyndon LaRouche, "The New Economy," Executive Intelligence Review, October 1, 2010.

[2] Krafft Ehricke, 1917 – 1984.

[3] Se NASA's "Advanced Space Transportation Program" webpage, https://www.nasa.gov/centers/marshall/news/background/facts/astp. html

[4] F.eks. har det britiske firma Reaction Engines Limited designet et rumfly, Skylon, med deres motor, Synergetic AirBreathing Rocket Engine (SABRE). U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory har ligeledes arbejdet på at udvikle et design for rumfly, som ville bruge samme motor, SABRE, og Kinas Rumfartsforsknings- og Telnologiselskab (CASTC) forfølger deres egen designs for rumfly.

[5] Se “Maglev Launch: Ultra Low Cost Ultra/High Volume Access to Space for Cargo and Humans,” 2010, af James Powell, George Maise, og John Rather (http://www.startram.com/). China’s Southwest Jiaotong University arbejder på lignende designs under et projekt, der ledes af dr. Deng Zigang.

[6] Se “Helium-3 Fusion: Stealing the Sun’s Fire,” af Natalie Lovegren, 21st Century Science & Technology, Special Report: Physical Chemistry (2014).

Kan et nul være negativt? – Ja, når det er sort! Rusland og Kina satser på kreativitet. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

3. december, 2016 – At der i dag findes to helt forskellige paradigmer i verden, der bestemmer nationers adfærd, bliver klarere dag for dag. Medens modstanden i den transatlantiske verden mod det mislykkede globaliseringsparadigme bliver stadig stærkere, og etablissementet så meget desto mere sammenbidt søger at fastholde det, så satser de stater, der samarbejder med Den nye Silkevej, stadig tydeligere på deres befolknings kreativitet og samarbejdet om menneskehedens fælles mål.

De vestlige politikere og medier, der er vant til kun at betragte Putin gennem dæmoniseringsbrillerne, ville stå sig vel ved for én gangs skyld at gennemlæse Putins årlige 'Tale til nationen', som han holdt for den russiske Duma, uden fordomme. Efter fravalget af Obama – for det var også, hvad Hillary Clintons nederlag var – og efter Donald Trumps første telefonsamtaler med Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping, har der åbnet sig en reel chance for at normalisere forholdet mellem de tre vigtigste nationer her på Jorden. Og kun en selvmorderisk nar ville ønske at vrage en sådan mulighed.

Når man tager den samlede kronologi for alle Putins tilbud til Vesten i betragtning, indbefattet hans forhåbningsfulde tale til den tyske forbundsdag i 2001 og talen til München-sikkerhedskonferencen i 2007, hvor han gav udtryk for stærk skuffelse, så burde man tage hans ord for pålydende, når han siger: »Vi ønsker ikke konfrontation med nogen. Det har vi lige så lidt, som vore partnere i det globale fællesskab, brug for. I modsætning til vore kolleger i udlandet, der betragter Rusland som en fjende, søger vi ikke, og har heller ikke søgt, modstandere. Vi har brug for venner. Men vi vil ikke tillade, at vore interesser skades eller ignorereres.«

Længere fremme i sin tale understregede Putin, at kravet om viden og moral i undervisningssystemet, som forudsætning for samfundets levedygtighed, var en prioritet. De unge menneskers interesse for den nationale klassiske litteratur, kultur og historie må vækkes, og skolerne må fremme kreativitet, samtidig med, at børnene lærer at tænke selvstændigt, såvel som også lærer at arbejde både selvstændigt og som en del af et team, løse stillede opgaver og formulere og realisere målsætninger. Godt nok er kravet om begavelse vigtigt, men grundlæggende set må opdragelsen hvile på det princip, at alle børn og teenagere er begavede og i stand til at opnå resultater inden for videnskab, de kreative områder samt i livet. Det er statens opgave at fremme disse talenter.

Putin understregede også den fundamentale betydning af grundforskning, som basis for økonomisk vækst og sociale fremskridt. Over 200 laboratorier er allerede etableret, som, takket være de store statstilskud, de modtager, må blive i stand til at operere på globalt niveau, og som vil blive ledet af videnskabsfolk, der er med til at bestemme retningen af den globale, videnskabelige udvikling. Det er i denne sammenhæng også vigtigt at overvinde de i Rusland siden zartiden eksisterende flaskehalse for, at disse forskningsresultater også kan komme produktionen af forbrugsvarer til gode.

De mennesker, der aktivt dæmoniserer Putin, burde også studere den tale, som Putin holdt den foregående dag ved Det internationale Forum for Primakov-forelæsninger til ære for

den tidligere statsminister og 'store tænker', Jevgenij Primakov, der døde for 18 måneder siden.
Også her stod de amerikansk-russiske relationer højt på dagsordenen. Putin henviste til Primakovs overbevisning om, at, »uden et oprigtigt partnerskab mellem Rusland og USA«, ville det blive vanskeligt at klare de »store udfordringer« i verden – især i kampen mod terrorismen i Mellemøsten.
Primakov havde, ifølge den russiske præsident, haft en »virkeligt strategisk vision«, der havde gjort det muligt for ham »at kigge ud i fremtiden og se, hvor uholdbar og ensidig« modellen om en unipolær verden var. Det var Primakov, der som den første gik ind for et trilateralt samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien, og ud fra hvilket BRIKS, »der nu vinder indflydelse og betydning i verden«, har udviklet sig. Primakovs holden fast ved de tætte relationer med partnerne i Fællesskabet af Uafhængige Stater (CIS) »er rygraden i vores integrationspolitik i Eurasien … Vi håber, at dialog med vore partnere, indbefattet en dialog om sammenkoblingen med Kinas projekt om det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, vil sætte os i stand til at opbygge et stort, eurasisk partnerskab«.

Den umistelige ret til udvikling
Et andet dokument, som de vestlige politikere og medier, med deres geopolitiske tankegang, burde studere, er en ny hvidbog fra den kinesiske regering om »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«, hvor det bekræftes, at der findes en »umistelig rettighed« for alle lande og folkeslag til at udvikle sig. »Retten til udvikling må tilhøre og være fælles for alle folk. Det er alle landes ansvar at virkeliggøre retten til udvikling, og det er ligeledes det internationale fællesskabs pligt«, står der i dokumentet. »Det forpligter regeringerne i alle lande til at formulere udviklingsstrategier og forholdsregler, der passer til deres egen virkelighed, og det fordrer det internationale samfunds koncentrerede anstrengelser som helhed. Kina opfordrer alle lande til at stræbe efter en ligeværdig, åben, omfattende og

innovativ, fælles udvikling, og hvidbogen kræver en fælles udvikling og at der skabes betingelser for, at alle folkeslag kan tage del i retten til udvikling.«
Hvidbogen beskriver imidlertid meget mere – nemlig, at Kinas udviklingsmodel og Kinas politiske og sociale struktur har været en udelt succes. Og, alt imens denne model fortsat udvikler sig, så foregår det i et tempo og på en måde, der bestemmes af det kinesiske folk selv. Det påpeges, at Kina allerede har løftet 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, og at i dag kun 5,7 % af befolkningen lever under fattigdomsgrænsen – hvilket gør Kina til den første nation, som det er lykkedes at nå FN's Millennium-mål for fattigdomsbekæmpelse. Kina er endda fast besluttet på helt at overvinde fattigdom. I marts 2016 offentliggjordes »udkast til den 13. femårsplan for Folkerepublikken Kinas nationale, økonomiske og sociale udvikling«, hvor regeringen fremlægger en strategi for helt at udrydde fattigdom blandt landbefolkningen allerede i år 2020.

»En ny bølge af velstand«
Hvis man ikke ønsker at lytte til Putin eller Kina, kan man også studere en ny hvidbog fra bygge- og anlægsmaskine-producenten Caterpillar om betydningen af »Bælt-og-Vej«-initiativet. Det vil udløse »en ny bølge af velstand« for Kina og den øvrige verden, står der i den. Opbygningen af et infrastrukturnet, som er en prioritet i initiativet, vil muliggøre en fri strøm og en mere effektiv udnyttelse af resurserne, integration af markederne og koordinering af nationernes økonomiske politik.
Opbygningen af infrastruktur vil være med til at sænke transportomkostningerne, øge udviklingslandenes konkurrenceevne og reducere ubalancen landene imellem. Caterpillar betragter »Bælt-og-Vej«- initiativet som en »åben og medinddragende« ramme, der gør det muligt for alle landene langs ruten at tage del i opbygningen af projektet. »Dette bør og kan ikke være en bestræbelse alene fra Kinas side«, står

der i dokumentet.
Virksomheden påskønner de forretningsmuligheder, som dette initiativ åbner op for, og håber at kunne deltage endnu mere i projekter langs ruten, forklarede Chen Qihua, vicepræsident for Caterpillar og direktør for Caterpillar Kina.
Og endelig burde de vestlige politikere og medier gøre sig klart, at der i befolkningen er bred opbakning til det internationale samarbejde, netop på områderne for videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt. Den europæiske rumfartsorganisation ESA's borgerdialog i organisationens 22 lande fastslog, at 88 % af de adspurgte understøttede ledelsens rumprogram, og 96 % følte sig overbeviste om, at verdensrummet frembyder muligheder, der ikke forefindes på Jorden, men som bør udforskes.
I sin rapport om meningsmålingen ved flyvestationen Upjever i Friesland sagde den tidligere ESA-astronaut Thomas Reiter, der nu er ESA's hovedkoordinator for den internationale rumstations anliggender, at der er grund til optimisme – på trods af den endeløse strid om budgettet på europæisk niveau. De €8 mia., der er blevet brugt i de sidste 5 år, har skabt økonomiske værdier for €14,5 mia. for Europa og dets borgere.
»Det drejer sig også om det politiske aspekt af samarbejdet: Dette fungerer ganske godt, trods konflikterne på Jorden«, sagde Reiter. 95 stater deltager i ISS' forskningsarbejde, »hvor man deroppe forfølger mål til gavn for alle mennesker«.
Reiter udtalte sig også optimistisk om udsigterne for udforskningen af Månen, især Månens bagside. Herfra vil man senere også kunne udsende missioner til den videre udforskning af verdensaltet.
Bernhard von Weyhe, leder af kommunikationsafdelingen i kontrolcentret (ESOC) i ESA-centeret i Darmstadt, talte i et interview med avisen *Allgemeine Zeitung* om den »brofunktion«, som rumforskningen har for menneskeheden. »Den fælles bemandede rumfart kræver samarbejde, og gjorde det også under koldkrigstiden. Rumfart har altid været et område, hvor man har haft et intensivt internationalt samarbejde, og brofunktionen består stadig. Rumfart er pr. definition et

samarbejdsprojekt.«
Fællesnævneren for alle disse udtalelser er: Menneskehedens fremtid ligger i samarbejdet mellem nationerne om økonomisk udvikling af alle verdens lande og om samarbejdet om menneskehedens fælles mål, især om udviklingen af teknologi og videnskab og menneskenes skabende evner. Det lønner sig stærkt at investere i dette samarbejde. Den, der ikke fatter dette og i stedet blot stræber mod et »sort nul«, kommer i sidste ende til at stå tilbage med tomme hænder.

Foto: I september 2015 blev astronaut Andreas Mogensen den første dansker i rummet, hvor han deltog i forskningsopgaver om bord på den Internationale Rumstation, ISS.

»Mere end nogensinde før har Republikken brug for videnskabelige forskere!«, lyder franske parlamentarikeres resolution

Paris, 4. dec., 2016 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – Alt imens Lyndon LaRouche og hans medarbejdere for årtier siden stort set stod alene, da de fordømte og afslørede ankomsten af en »ny mørk tidsalder«, så er der i dag, konfronteret med det aktuelle sammenbrud af generel viden i Vesten, endelig visse mennesker, der synes villige til at komme til fornuft. Dette synes klart at være tilfældet for tre dusin franske parlamentsmedlemmer på tværs af partier, som den 15. nov. i Nationalforsamlingen introducerede en tekst til et »Forslag

til resolution om videnskab og fremskridt i Republikken« (nr. 4214 og 4215).

Resolutionen opfordrer skarpt regeringen til at tage dristige skridt til drastisk at hæve uddannelsen af alle borgere inden for videnskab, især i skoler og i de offentlige medier, og fortalen til resolutionen nævner nogle af fransk histories bedste traditioner, især École Polytechnique, som blev grundlagt af Lazard Carnot og Gaspard Monge, og som blev model for det amerikanske militærakademi i West Point. For eksempel påpeger resolutionen på bemærkelsesværdig vis, at nedgangen af videnskabelige kundskaber er et resultat af den voksende forveksling af »meninger« og så »kundskaber«, der er baseret på videnskabelige hypoteser.

Uddrag af fortalen: »'Republikken har ikke brug for videnskabsfolk!' var de ord, som Revolutionstribunalets præsident udtalte, da han fordømte kemikeren Lavoisier i 1794 efter konventionens undertrykkelse af Videnskabsakademiet [grundlagt af Colbert og Leibniz] … Hvis denne form for obskurantisme (fjendtlighed over for oplysning) synes umoderne i dag … så må vi [til gengæld] konfrontere et klima, hvor man ikke har tillid til videnskabelige institutioner og forskere, som faktisk udgør en stærk grundpille for vores republik.«

»Med udviklingen af den moderne industrielle tid kom der spring i fremskridt og frihed til at skabe med fremkomsten af store opfindere (Lavoisier, Faraday, Edison, Darwin, Pasteur, Poincaré, Marie Curie, Einstein, Pauling, Planck, Schrödinger, De Gennes, Charpak … og selv Steve Jobs). I dag er betydningen af en videnskabskultur, og den plads, som den indtager, i klar tilbagegang i vores land og vores Republik.

Alt imens de favoriserer adgangen til kultur, så forstærker fremkomsten af digitalisering og brugen af internettet en afregulering af markedet inden for videnskabelig information, som viger pladsen til fordel for spredningen af de farligste overbevisninger i en grad, hvor både offentlige myndigheder

såvel som borgere har vanskeligt ved at identificere, hvordan de skal rangere nødvendige elementer med henblik på at træffe gyldige videnskabelige og teknologiske beslutninger.

Kilden til denne bekymrende udvikling er den i stigende grad markante forveksling af resultatet af viden, der opnås gennem en strengt videnskabelig undersøgelse, og så det, der blot er et resultat af overbevisninger og misinformation. Dette er i stigende grad det samme som, at man sætter spørgsmålstegn ved videnskabeligt arbejdes voksende kulturelle værdi og sociale indflydelse.

Gennem opretholdelsen af forvekslingen mellem viden og meninger i den offentlige og digitale sfære, truer den heraf følgende mistillid den videnskabelige forsknings aktiviteter og fundamenter … «

Fortalen konkluderer:

»Videnskabens sprog må atter finde sin rette plads i centrum for de store debatter i vort demokrati, både i valgte institutioner og i ministerierne. På deres tid hævede sådanne statsmænd som Pierre Mendès France, general de Gaulle og François Mitterand videnskabelig forskning og dens anvendelse til rangen af national prioritet. Dette er ikke længere tilfældet i dag, og der stilles spørgsmålstegn ved selve fremskridtets natur. Det må naturligvis bringes under kontrol og gøres tilgængeligt, men Republikken må have tillid til videnskabeligt fremskridt, som var og er hovedfaktoren for økonomisk, medicinsk, socialt og miljømæssigt fremskridt. Mere end nogensinde før, har Republikken brug for forskere.«

Foto: Den 17. oktober, 2014, blev der i Frankrig afholdt landsdækkende demonstrationer til fordel for en opgradering af videnskabelig forskning på uddannelsesinstitutionerne. Også på Mont Blanc!

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 energi-gennemstrømningstæthed 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 Ehricke 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 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 Ehricke, 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 Ehricke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehricke – 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

Ehricke'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 Ehricke, 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 Ehricke 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.

Det franske valg ødelægger yderligere briternes og Obamas krigspolitik

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. november, 2016 – François Fillons overvældende valgsejr i søndagens franske primærvalg, til at være præsidentkandidat for Frankrigs Republikanske Parti, er et yderligere bevis på, at den menneskelige race ikke vil tolerere Barack Obamas fremstød for krig med Rusland. Ligesom Hillary Clinton førte Fillons modstander en kampagne mod Rusland, mens Fillon førte en kampagne for at arbejde sammen med Rusland om at nedkæmpe terroristerne i Syrien, om at afslutte de anti-russiske sanktioner og udvide det økonomiske samarbejde, og han vandt næsten to tredjedele af stemmerne.

Hillary Clinton, der kørte sin kampagne som en fortsættelse af Obamas krigshyl mod Rusland, forsøger nu desperat at give Putin skylden for sit nederlag! Det vanvittige i hendes påstand om, at Putin brugte at udsende »falske nyheder« og bedrive computerhacking for at stjæle det amerikanske valg, og som nu skaber overskrifter over hele USA, siger intet om Putin, men alt om tilstanden af mentalt sammenbrud hos krigspartiet i USA – de neokonservative i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske Parti, der samledes bag Hillary og blev slået af vælgerne, især af arbejdsstyrken på landet og i byerne.

I realiteten bidrog Putin faktisk til Obama/Hillary-krigspartiets nederlag, men ikke hemmeligt eller under dække. Hans vedvarende krav om, at USA holder op med at sponsorere terrorister under dække af at bevæbne den »moderate opposition« i Syrien med henblik på at vælte den legitime

regering, og hans opfordring til samarbejde om krigen mod terror, var med til at afsløre Obama og Hillary for det, de er.

På lignende vis blev Xi Jinpings gentagne opfordringer til USA om at tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevejsproces med global nationsopbygning afvist af både Obama og Hillary til fordel for militær konfrontation med Kina og afslørede således deres imperiesyn over for en befolkning, der i stigende grad beundrer den utrolige udviklingsproces, som Kina har igangsat, både internt i landet og internationalt.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der tidligere har stillet op til kanslerposten i Tyskland, sagde i dag, at, på trods af Fillons økonomiske politik i Thatcher-traditionen, så demonstrerer valget af ham den voksende afsky i Europa for det anti-russiske hysteri og faren for krig. Trumps åbne erklæring om, at han vil arbejde med Putin for at besejre terrorisme, fik taberen Obama til i denne måned at forsøge at salve Tysklands Angela Merkel til sin efterfølger, som »leder for den frie verden« i en kampagne imod Rusland. Men Merkel er nu lige så isoleret, som Obama var – ligesom Olympens falske guder, der udråber deres krav over verden, mens Olympens bjerg smuldrer under deres fødder.

Samme dag som det franske valg vandt schweizerne en solid sejr i en folkeafstemning, der var lanceret af den 'grønne' bevægelse mod kernekraft, for at lukke nationens kernekraftværker ned. Igen er budskabet til verden det, at den »nye, mørke tidsalders« mentalitet med afindustrialisering og permanente krige, ikke længere kan tolereres af menneskeslægten. Det er især et budskab til Merkel, der er imod kernekraft, om, at hendes tid er forbi.

Den vestlige verden oplever for tiden en revolutionær transformation. LaRouche-bevægelsen har i årevis tvunget befolkningen i USA og Europa, ofte imod dens vilje, til at se på det nye paradigmes nye lederskab, som kommer fra Rusland og

Kina, og til at sammenligne det med den politik, der dikteres af London og Wall Street, og som økonomisk og kulturelt har ødelagt de transatlantiske nationer. Denne sandhed kan ikke længere undertrykkes. Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag til sine medarbejdere: »Vi indtager en ledende position netop nu. Vi er ovenpå. Vi ved, hvad det er, vi gør, så lad os få en sejr.«

Foto: Daværende franske premierminister, hr. François Fillon, møder IAEA-generaldirektør Yukiya Amano & Chef de Cabinet, hr. Rafael Grossi, 2011. (Foto: IAEA Imagebank CC-SA)

Rusland tilbyder aftale om nuklear oparbejdning til Tyskland; russisk-tysk forum om råmaterialer afholdt i Düsseldorf

25. nov., 2016 – På det Russisk-tyske Forum for Råmaterialer i Düsseldorf i går, præsenterede Valery Jazev, præsident for mineindustriens entreprenører, Tomsk-specialforskningsprogrammet for en oparbejdningsreaktor, der skal oparbejde brugt atombrændsel. Målet er at udvikle en reaktor til kommerciel brug, der kan oparbejde fra alle former for brugt atombrændsel og radioaktivt materiale.

Tomsk-projektet involverer, forklarede Jazev, arbejde på udviklingen af radioaktive materialer til medicinsk brug, så vel som også mærkning af materialer til industribrug. Jasev

sagde, at Rusland er forud for alle andre nationer inden for denne sektor, med et 10-15 år langt forskningsforspring, og at Rusland om nogle få år vil være i besiddelse af en profitabel teknologi til global eksport. Rusland kunne også tilbyde denne teknologi til at oparbejde brugt atommateriale fra Tyskland, som vil få brug for en sådan teknologi, når de i 2022 afslutter anvendelse af atomkraft. Dette kunne betyde et vigtigt russisk bidrag til et energipartnerskab med Tyskland.

Fremtrædende tyskere ved samme begivenhed, f.eks. Klaus Töpfer og vicekansler Sigmar Gabriel, valgte imidlertid ikke at tage imod tilbuddet, men førte i stedet en masse nonsenssnak om »andre synspunkter, som naturligvis må tages i betragtning« og i øvrigt insisterede på den tyske regerings vanvittige strategi for fornybar energi. Dette inkluderer Gabriels synspunkter om retningen af »moderniseringspartnerskabet« med Rusland, nemlig reduceringen af CO2-udslip. Ildevarslende, at Gabriel præsenterede dette som et område for samarbejde uden for sanktionerne.

»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.