

Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ 35 år i dag: Omsæt Lyndon LaRouches vise ord til handling for et Strategisk Forsvar af Jorden. LPAC Internationale Webcast, 23. marts. 2018

Vært **Matthew Ogden**: Det er i dag den 23. marts, 2018, en meget gunstig dato: Det er nemlig 35 års dagen for en meget vigtig dato, som var 23. marts, 1983, hvor præsident Ronald Reagan annoncerede vedtagelsen af det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ** (SDI; Strategic Defense Initiative). I dag er det et meget passende tidspunkt for at bedømme den stadigt mere presserende nødvendige vedtagelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur for planeten, og den samtidige nye økonomiske arkitektur, som må ledsage den.

Vi befinder os i et meget dramatisk øjeblik i verdenshistorien, og jeg mener, at, hvis vi træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede, så står det klart, at verdensordenen, som vi har kendt den i de seneste 70 år, er i færd med at undergå en total transformation. Og udfaldet af de strategiske kampe, der raser netop nu, både på den nationale scene her i USA, men især på den globale scene; udfaldet af disse strategiske kampe vil afgøre menneskeheds historie i mange generationer fremover.

Med de begivenheder, der har fundet sted i løbet af de seneste tre uger, siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin den 1. marts annoncerede, at Rusland havde udviklet en helt ny

generation af strategiske våben, baseret på avancerede fysiske [principper], og som er i stand til at gennemtrænge alle kendte forsvarssystemer, har vi set, hvor dramatisk nødvendigt det er, med det presserende i en sådan ny sikkerhedsarkitektur. Ikke én, der bygger på Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD; garanteret gensidig ødelæggelse), men derimod én, der bygger på win-win-overlevelse og økonomisk fremskridt *for alle nationer* på denne planet; nødvendigheden heraf bliver i stigende grad mere presserende. Jeg vil gerne fremhæve, hvad præsident Putin selv sagde i denne tale 1. marts til den føderale forsamling:

Han sagde:

» ... lad os sætte os ved forhandlingsbordet og sammen udtænke et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation. ... Dette er et vendepunkt for hele verden og for dem, der er villige til, og i stand til, at forandre sig; de, der handler og går fremad, vil tage føringen.«

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/56957>

Men, snarere end klart og nøgternt at vurdere denne ændrede, strategiske virkelighed, med denne game-changing tale af Ruslands præsident, og besvare dette tilbud for at forhandle, med hans ord, »et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation«, for endelig at bringe denne nihilistiske dødsspiral med stadigt mere dødbringende masseudslettelsesvåben til en afslutning; snarere end at gøre dette, har briterne og deres såkaldte »partnere« i Europa forsøgt at oppiske en generel støtte til en krigskonfrontation mod Rusland ved anvendelse af det, Labour-partiets leder, Jeremy Corbyn, meget korrekt karakteriserede som det, han kaldte »fejlbehæftet efterretning« og »uvederhæftige dossiers« af den type, som blev brugt til at retfærdiggøre invasionen af Irak. Og som Jeremy Corbyn advarede om, så bør vi ikke

»affinde os med en ny Kold Krig ... og en intolerance over for dissens som under McCarthy-perioden«.

Som **Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går understregede i sin internationale webcast**, så har briterne og Theresa May, i deres forsøg på at gennemtvinge en sådan krigsprovokation, overspillet deres hånd. Deres metoder og deres mål står nu afsløret for hele verden at se. På trods af Theresa Mays bestræbelser på at presse præsident Trump over i et hjørne, hvor han ikke ville vove at forsøge at tage skridt, der ville gøre det muligt for ham at honorere sin forpligtelse til at forbedre relationerne med Rusland; snarere end at lade sig blive bakket ind i et hjørne, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, så udmanøvrerede præsident Trump imidlertid hele operationen ved at tage telefonen og ringe til præsident Putin og lykønske ham med genvalget og hans næste periode som Ruslands præsident, og fortsatte med en meget sober diskussion mellem de to statsoverhoveder om nogle af de meget vigtige, fælles bestræbelser og fælles udfordringer, som disse to nationer, USA og Rusland, sammen konfronteres med; og som, hvis vi fik lov at gøre det, vi kunne arbejde sammen om at løse, såsom krisen i Syrien; såsom muligheden for et totalt gennembrud for fred på Koreahalvøen; såsom den igangværende situation i Ukraine; og meget signifikant, såsom at forhindre et nyt våbenkapløb.

Umiddelbart efter denne telefonsamtale, blev pressen, som I kan tænke jer, hysterisk, og Det Hvide Hus' pressesekretær Sarah Sanders holdt en pressekonference i briefing-værelset i Det Hvide Hus, hvor hun ikke mindre end et halvt dusin gange understregede den absolutte betydning af at opretholde en dialog mellem USA og Rusland på lederskabsniveau, omkring fælles interesser og fælles udfordringer.

Jeg vil afspille nogle eksempler på nogle af disse gentagne udtalelser fra Sarah Sanders på denne pressebriefing i Det Hvide Hus.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

SARAH SANDERS: We want to continue to have a dialogue with Russia, and continue to talk about some of the shared interests

we have, whether it's North Korea, Iran, and particularly as the

President noted today, slowing the tensions when it comes to an

arms race, something that is clearly important to both leaders....

We want to continue to have dialogue so that we can work on some of the issues that concern both countries, and we're going

to continue to do that, while also continuing to be tough on a number of things....

The President once again has maintained that it's important for us to have a dialogue with Russia so that we can focus on some areas of shared interests...

These are conversations that sometimes take place, and certainly the President finds there to be an importance in having

that dialogue with Russia so that we can talk about some of the

big problems that face the world....

We disagree with the fact that we shouldn't have conversations with Russia. There are important topics that we should be able to discuss, and that is why the President's going

to continue to have that dialogue.

Again the focus was to talk about areas of shared interests.

We know that we need to continue a dialogue. It's important for

a lot of the safety and security of people across the globe.
We
would like to be able to work with them on things like North
Korea, on Iran, and also both countries shared interest in
lowering the tensions when it comes to an arms race,
recognizing
that that's not the best thing for either country, and so we
want
to be able to have those conversations and that was the point
of
today's call.... [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's a very clear message, obviously. Now, on
the same day, President Trump himself reiterated exactly the
same
points in a couple of tweets that he posted, and I would like
to
just read you those tweets. He said:
"I called President Putin of Russia to congratulate him on
his election victory (in past, Obama called him also). The
Fake
News Media is crazed because they wanted me to excoriate him.
They are wrong! Getting along with Russia (and others) is a
good
thing, not a bad thing."
"They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria,
Ukraine, ISIS, Iran, and even the coming Arms Race. Bush
tried
to get along, but didn't have the 'smarts.' Obama and Clinton
tried, but didn't have the energy or chemistry (remember
RESET).
PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!" he concludes.
Now of course that final phrase is a quotation directly from
President Ronald Reagan. And this direct reference is a very
timely one, and perhaps is not merely a coincidental one: As
I
said, today, March 23rd, is the 35th anniversary of one of the

groundbreaking moments in modern history, and it's one which completely reshaped the global, strategic geometry at that time,

and which remains immediately relevant all the way up to the present day.

That moment, March 23rd, 1983 was representative of a complete shock, a shock wave which was felt around the world. This was the surprise announcement by President Ronald Reagan at

the conclusion of a live, national television broadcast which was

an address to the nation, nominally on national security. But what President Reagan did at the conclusion of that broadcast, to

the surprise of almost all of his leading advisors in the White

House even, was to announce what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, what President Reagan called a "vision of the future, which offers hope."

In the speech, what President Reagan did was that he committed the United States to a crash program, a crash scientific program for the development of advanced technologies

which would be based on new physical principles to (quote/unquote) "free the world from the threat of nuclear war."

And so, in so doing, President Reagan completely overthrew the ideology of retaliatory nuclear deterrence through the threat of

instantaneous, total nuclear response in the event of the detection of a nuclear attack against the territory of the United

States. This was what was so-called Mutually Assured Destruction

(MAD).

President Reagan completely rejected the very premise of Mutually Assured Destruction and in so doing, Reagan shocked

the
world, and truly did change the course of world history. So,
right now, why don't we wind the clock back 35 years, and
listen
to what the world heard on that night, March 23rd, 1983:

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me
tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national
security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've
reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in
the 21st century...

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple
premise: The United States does not start fights. We will
never

be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter
and

defend against aggression – to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the
risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking
genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making
sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United
States,

or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the
risks

to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that,
he

won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength;
weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works.

But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took
one

kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more
nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind
now

that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and

powerful

nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the

ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning

to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable – quite

the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is

based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any

attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different

world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age....

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other

occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have

proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisors, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have

underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of

rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must

thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on

both sides....

Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly

lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we

embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat

with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and

destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own

soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current

technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort...

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive

policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies,

I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research

and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of

eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This

could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose – one all people share – is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history.

There

will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it.

As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you. [end video]

OGDEN: That was 35 years ago today.

Now, just as a side note, incidentally, President Trump is not ignorant of this history. In 1999, far before he ever was a

candidate for President, in a an interview with none other than

Wolf Blitzer on CNN, President Trump actually addressed what he thought of as the necessity for the Strategic Defense Initiative, but also the necessity for sitting down and having talks to work out the tensions between the United States and Russia. Here's just a quick quote from President Trump. He said: "As far as nuclear is concerned, this country, us, we need a shield...."

Wolf Blitzer said, "A Strategic Defense Initiative?" And Trump affirmed that, saying, "Because Russia is unstable. We need a missile defense shield. People used to criticize Reagan, but now it's very developable. We need a shield.... We need a change. The ABM Treaty was 1972. Who knew what technology would develop? We have to sit down with the Russians and many others."

So, that was just a side note. That was Nov. 28, 1999. But as I think you can see, now-President Trump remains committed to that inclination to sit down with the Russians and many others —

North Korea, for example; and to resolve these nuclear threats.

If you just go back again to that date in 1983, this was 35 years ago. In President Reagan's own words, he said that what he announced that night would, indeed, change the course of world history; and it did. And, it took most of the world completely

by surprise. But, it didn't come out of nowhere, and this history is very important for viewers to understand.

Let me just read you a portion of what Lyndon LaRouche had to say at that time. This is a statement that he issued the morning following that historic speech, so this is from March 24,

1983. What Mr. LaRouche had to say was the following:

“Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the Earth-shaking impact the President’s television address last night will have throughout the world.... [T]he words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy announcement.

With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

“Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope for humanity’s future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten.”

So that was Lyndon LaRouche, March 24, 1983. Now, as LaRouche alluded to in that statement, he was no bystander or casual observer of the events of that night President Reagan announced the SDI. In fact, the grand idea behind what Reagan announced that night, came directly from none other than Lyndon

LaRouche himself. I would like to play for you a brief excerpt

of Mr. LaRouche, in his own words, speaking about the background

to what had shocked the world that night – March 23, 1983.

This

is taken from a video that LaRouche PAC published about ten years

ago, back in 2008, on the 25th anniversary of the SDI speech.

The video was titled “A Brief History of Lyndon LaRouche’s

SDI.”

So, let's listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say in that video.

LYNDON LAROUCHE

: I had been organizing the SDI operation, including initially from 1977, long before it was called an SDI. I was the one who said, “We're going to make a project of this thing.” So, I adopted this and stated this as my program in 1979, when I was running as a Presidential candidate.

Then, I had this conversation with Reagan, and then as a follow-up after he was President, we had a follow-up with various

people in the Reagan circle; including his National Security Council. I was working with the head of the National Security Council on this operation, and with people from the CIA and this

and that. I was sworn to this and sworn to that, so I was doing

the whole thing. The SDI was my work, which they liked. And there was a faction, including the President, who liked it.

He

liked it because he was against, he always hated Henry Kissinger;

and he hated Henry Kissinger particularly because of the so-called “revenge weapons.” The idea that you build super weapons, and if somebody throws a bomb at you, you obliterate the

planet. That is not considered a good defense, and he was against that. When he saw from experts that what I was saying was accepted experts – military and others – and this was French intelligence, the leadership of the Gaullist faction in France; this was the leadership of the German military; this was

the leadership of the Italian military, and all over the world.

So, I was the creator of the SDI. Reagan liked it, he adopted it. I was creating the thing in direct cooperation during the entire period, with the cooperation of the National Security Council and the heads of the CIA. People recognized that I was

right; I had the scientific capability and knowledge to do it, and we were doing it.

OGDEN: So, that's the story in Lyndon LaRouche's own words. That is merely the tip of a very fascinating iceberg. We encourage you to watch that full video that I cited that that excerpt was taken from. But also, to visit the page on the LaRouche PAC website which gives you the full background of this

story. As you can see there, the link is larouchepac.com/sdi. That gives you this full, historic background. But as you heard

Mr. LaRouche say there in that video clip, this effort on his part to craft the idea of what then became adopted by the President of the United States in the form of the SDI, this effort went all the way back to the mid-1970s. Here's an image

of a campaign pamphlet which was commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche,

titled "Sputnik of the '70s: The Science behind the Soviets' Beam

Weapon." In this pamphlet, Lyndon LaRouche called for an international crash program to develop a space-based missile defense system based on new physical principles. A Manhattan project-style mission which would provide the economic driver to

fuel global development. The pamphlet proposed "... Long-range

economic and scientific collaboration with the Soviet Union, among other nations, which would eliminate the danger of world

obliteration," and it emphasized "... Tremendous revolutionary industrial implications available to this nation and the world if

the political will of the United States forces a recommitment to

technological progress in the form of an International Development Bank and its national concomitant Third National Bank."

So, as you can see, Lyndon LaRouche's idea of this missile defense system, was always framed around the idea of not unilateral defense systems, but rather, a joint missile defense

and joint scientific and economic collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union. To do so, would be to unleash the revolutionary industrial and economic implications of

such technological breakthroughs as the basis for a new international, economic order; something which he had been involved in all the way back to at least 1971 when he first issued the proposal for a new International Development Bank – the so-called IDB. So you can see in LaRouche's idea, the kernel

of what became the SDI, always had with it a new international security architecture, overthrowing this entire reign of terror

of Mutually Assured Destruction and revenge weapons. But concomitantly, a new international economic order, which would be

driven by the revolutionary, unprecedented economic boom that would come out of the progress associated with such technological

breakthroughs around these new physical principles in the collaboration of US and Soviet scientists to develop this joint

missile defense to make International Ballistic Missile and nuclear war impotent and obsolete.

The history is as fascinating as it is extensive. Here is

not the time or the place to go through every single aspect of this history; but the full background, again as I said is available on that webpage – larouchepac.com/sdi. But if you fast forward from that pamphlet “Sputnik of the ’70s” all the way

to the lead-up into the 1980 Presidential campaign in which Lyndon LaRouche himself was a candidate for President of the United States. Let’s take a look at a picture here of Lyndon LaRouche meeting face-to-face with then-candidate Ronald Reagan

at a candidates’ forum that took place in Concord, New Hampshire.

During this face-to-face meeting and in several other opportunities to interface with the Reagan campaign team, Lyndon

LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail.

Following Reagan’s victory and his election, Lyndon LaRouche and

representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings

with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with

leading members of the National Security Council and Reagan’s intelligence community. They discussed LaRouche’s idea for this

new strategic doctrine, and the related scientific and energy policies that would go along with it. So, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned numerous reports and campaign pamphlets promoting this idea. As you can see here, this is from {Fusion}; this is a

special report titled “Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for Peace.” Here’s the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982.

Again, before the March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI. This

was titled “Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War.”

Here's another one; this is a pamphlet. "How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression." So, all along, this was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche's standpoint. As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of

Reagan's victory, 1980, '81, '82, the idea of this Beam Defense

system which would be based on new physical principles, was associated – including in the popular mind – it was associated with Lyndon LaRouche. And it had been associated with Lyndon LaRouche for at least half a decade prior to Reagan's historic,

groundbreaking speech.

The morning after Reagan's March 23rd address, the media was scrambling to try to find experts to interview to explain what it

was that Reagan had presented the night before. Naturally, they

had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization.

Here's a photograph of Paul Gallagher, who was at that time Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, appearing on

CBS' Evening News program on March 24, 1983 – the day following

Reagan's address – to explain the science behind Reagan's policy

that had been announced the evening before.

Immediately following Reagan's address to the nation, Lyndon LaRouche launched a mass educational campaign to educate the American people as to what their President had just presented.

He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work.

This image here is an array of different publications that were

issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's

announcement
of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the
scientific,
the economic, and the military-strategic implications of the
policy. There you can see one pamphlet – “Support the
President’s Strategic Defense Initiative; Kill Missiles, Not
People.”

As should be very clear, Lyndon LaRouche was in a leading
position of authority following this groundbreaking
announcement,

and the influence that his ideas had come to wield put him in
a

position of real power inside the political structure of the
Presidency of the United States. He used that influence to
launch and to escalate on his campaign to completely
reorganize

the entire international economic and strategic architecture
of

the planet. Let’s take a look at a document that Lyndon
LaRouche

released exactly one year following Reagan’s March 23, 1983
announcement of the SDI program. This was called “The
LaRouche

Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United
States and the USSR.” This was published March 30, 1984. Let
me

read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published
under

this title “The LaRouche Doctrine.” He begins by saying:

“The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The
unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and
b)

Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of
promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the
benefits

of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and
all.

“The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary, economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and those relatively subordinated nations often classed as ‘developing nations.’ Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there can be no durable peace on this planet.

“Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both, the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers.

.”.. [T]he general advancement of the productive powers of labor in all sovereign states, most emphatically so-called developing nations, requires global emphasis on: a) increasing globally the percentiles of the labor force employed in scientific research and related functions of research and development ... b) increasing the absolute and relative scales of capital-goods production and also the rate of turnover in capital-goods production; and c) combining these two factors to accelerate technological progress in capital-goods outputs.

“Therefore, high rates of export of such capital-goods output to meet the needs of developing nations are indispensable for the general development of so-called developing nations: Our common goal, and our common interest, is promoting both the

general welfare and promoting preconditions of durable peace between our two powers....

"By supplying increased amounts of high-technology capital goods to developing nations, the exporting economies foster increased rates of turnover in their own most advanced capital-goods sectors of production....

"The importer of such advanced capital goods increases the productive powers of labor in the economy of the importing nation. This enables the importing nation to produce its goods at

a lower average social cost, and enables it to provide better-quality and cheaper goods as goods of payment to the nations exporting capital goods.

"Not only are the causes of simple humanity and general peace served by such policies of practice; the arrangement is equally beneficial to exporting and importing nations....

.. [T]he general rate of advancement of the productive powers of labor is most efficiently promoted by no other policy of practice."

Then a little later in the report, he reviews the situation of strategic tensions between the USSR and the United States.

He

says:

"Since the rupture of the wartime alliance between the two powers, U.S. military policy toward the Soviet Union has passed

through two phases. The first, from the close of the war until a

point beyond the death of Joseph Stalin, was preparation for the

contingency of what was sometimes named 'preventive nuclear war.'

The second, emerging over the period from the death of Stalin into the early period of the administration of President John F.

Kennedy, was based on the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and

Flexible Response ...

"From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called 'détente,'

between the two powers. This appearance was deceptive; during the

period 1977-83, there was an accelerating deterioration in the military relationships between the two powers....

"Beginning shortly after the inauguration of President Jimmy Carter, the deterioration of the military situation accelerated....

"In response to this direction of developments, the U.S. public figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proposed that both powers

develop, deploy, and agree to develop and deploy 'strategic' defensive, anti-ballistic-missile defense based on 'new physical

principles.' This proposal was issued publicly by LaRouche beginning February 1982; he proposed to U.S.A., Western European,

and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of

such strategic defensive systems be adopted policy, as a means for escaping from the 'logic' of Nuclear Deterrence....

.. The true solution must be found in the domain of politics and economics, and the further shaping of military relations between the powers must produce military policies by each coherent with the direction of development of the needed political and economic solutions....

"On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing

community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of this planet. This shall become a community of principle

coherent

with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If any force should endeavor to destroy that community of principle,

or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the United

States will be prepared to defend that community and its members

by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient.

With

respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United States

offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might enter

fully into participation within that community of principle...

"Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in development of the frontiers of scientific research, in laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations will

be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems derived from application of 'new physical principles.'

"To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other nations in development of these new areas of scientific breakthrough for application to exploration of space.

"To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in scientific

exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements protecting national and multinational programs for colonization

of the Moon and Mars.

"At some early time, the powers shall enter into deliberations, selecting dates for initial manned colonization of

the Moon and Mars, and the establishment of international space stations on the Moon and in the orbits of Moon and Mars, stations to be maintained by and in the common interest and use of parties of all nations.

"The powers jointly agree upon the adoption of two tasks as the common interest of mankind, as well as the specific interest

of each of the two powers: 1) The establishment of full economic

equity respecting the conditions of individual life in all nations of this planet during a period of not more than 50 years;

2) Man's exploration and colonization of nearby space as the continuing common objective and interest of mankind during and beyond the completion of the first task. The adoption of these two working-goals as the common task and respective interest in

common of the two powers and other cooperating nations, constitutes the central point of reference for erosion of the potential political and economic causes of warfare between the powers."

That was known as the "LaRouche Doctrine," published March 30, 1984. As you can see, what Lyndon LaRouche outlined in that

document was the basis for exactly what we're calling now a new

international economic and strategic architecture. In fact, the

one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized

as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the

persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have

the

kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic development and the application of these groundbreaking new physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic

order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations

– but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB.

As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis

for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called

“developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny,

I think that the echoes couldn't be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the

1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa

or Central and South America. Or, when President Putin offers to

“sit down at the negotiating table and devise together a new and relevant system of international security and sustainable development for human civilization,” we should reflect on what was laid in that document. That LaRouche Doctrine now almost 35

years ago today, in the wake of that history-changing announcement by President Ronald Reagan, at which he called a spade a spade. The world could no longer survive under the dictatorship of Mutually Assured Destruction; that reign of terror that President Kennedy characterized as the Sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads over every man, woman, and child on this planet, threatening nuclear annihilation. What Lyndon LaRouche characterized at that moment

as the “LaRouche Doctrine” is the principle behind the new economic and new security architecture which must be adopted on

this planet today. Not as a recipe, not taking everything exactly as it was said, because clearly of course, the world has

changed; and we must apply the principles that lay at the root of

exactly what Lyndon LaRouche had in mind when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and when he proposed the subsequent

LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit

the specific conditions of today.

One thing that Lyndon LaRouche alluded to explicitly in that document, was the need for joint cooperation in the colonization

and exploration of space. In fact, that is the form that the idea of a revived SDI has actually been taken. The proposal for

not an SDI, but what’s now called an SDE – the Strategic Defense

of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India and

other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer

space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech.

What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the

late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr.

Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading

science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States

and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other, and

let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a

whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a "non-zero threat" – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was

just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is all the more timely and all the more relevant today. So, what I'd like is to just play an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast that she delivered yesterday. She takes up exactly this idea, so here's an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling it "Star Wars," and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely is in this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and the Europeans. This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among

sovereign
republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic
today
represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver
in
the economy to use the increased productivity of the real
economy
for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector,
in
order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.
And this is what we're seeing today, also, in the
collaboration between China, Russia, and the countries that
are
participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.
So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace
breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition
and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we
should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think
we
should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of
the
Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another
big
asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth. So we
need
to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all
countries
should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future
of
humanity.
This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I
mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to
overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of
cooperation
where we put all our forces together to solve those questions
which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons,
poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could

fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And I think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

OGDEN: So, that was Helga LaRouche's call to action, and I think that's a perfect concluding point for our webcast today, as we observe this very auspicious date – March 23rd – the 35th anniversary of President Reagan's groundbreaking speech announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative. Let's take that kind of sense of victory and the optimism that indeed, ideas can change the course of history, and consolidate this New Paradigm; this new security architecture and new economic architecture for the planet. The opportunity is greater than it ever has been before; but the need is ever more dire. Thank you for joining me, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Mere end nogensinde før
er det presserende nødvendigt
at afslutte geopolitik.**

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Webcast, 16. marts, 2018.

Fuldt dansk udskrift

Vi befinder os nu i en situation, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche tidligere i dag beskrev som »ildevarslande«; det var det ord, hun brugte. Hun sagde, »Dette kan kun forstås som et miljø med førkrigs-propaganda«. Hun sagde, at den respons, vi har set fra Vesten, fra flere lande i Europa og inkl. her i USA, til den bizarre sag med forgiftningen i Salisbury, Storbritannien, af en russisk eksspion, der blev britisk spion, ved anvendelse af en angivelig nervegift; hun sagde, at dette nu har skabt det, der kun kan betegnes som en ekstremt farlig situation, som meget let kunne eskalere hurtigt og føre til krig. Hun sagde, »Man må stille sig selv det indlysende spørgsmål: Hvor fører alt dette hen?«

Nøglefaktoren her, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har understreget, er timing. Denne begivenhed, og alt det, der efterfølgende har udviklet sig med den, kom direkte i hælene på: 1) præsident Putins annoncering i sin tale for den føderale forsamling den 1. marts af denne nye generation strategiske våben, der totalt har ændret den internationale, geopolitiske struktur; og 2) annonceringen fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der præsideres af kongresmedlem Devin Nunes, nogle få dage senere af, at de havde afsluttet deres efterforskning og konkluderet, at der absolut ikke fandt noget 'aftalt spil' sted mellem Trump-kampagnen og russerne. Dette var absolut hele grundlaget for Christopher Steeles Russiagate-narrativ.

LaRouchePAC Mandags- opdatering 12. marts 2018, med bl.a. uddrag af Putin- interview

Vært Matthew Ogden: I sidste uge dækkede vi det, Helga Zepp-LaRouche karakteriserede som et »Sputnik-chok«, med den russiske præsident Putins annoncering af en helt ny generation af strategiske våben, som gør alle ballistiske missilsystemer impotente og forældede, kunne man sige, for på en noget ironisk vis at låne et udtryk fra præsident Reagan. Disse nye våbensystemer, der nu er blevet testet og bevist af det russiske militær, reflekterer et virkeligt gennembrud i fysisk videnskab; det må man ikke se bort fra. Nye anvendelser af højt avancerede principper, såsom Mach 20 hypersonisk flyvning; fremdrift ved atomkraft i miniatuformat; styret laserteknologi; plasmaer, styresystemer; listen fortsætter. De har alle fuldstændig ændret den strategiske spillebane. Som vi fastslog sidste mandag, så har Putins annoncering på meget dramatisk vis lagt den omgående nødvendige skabelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur frem på bordet; en sikkerhedsarkitektur, der ikke er baseret på strategiske magtbalancer som under den Kolde Krig og gensidigt garanteret ødelæggelse (MAD-doktrinen), men én, der i stedet er baseret på gensidigt garanteret udvikling og win-win-samarbejde. Dette anerkendes på forskellig vis af ledende personer i USA og andetsteds, og

dette adresseres meget, meget direkte af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som fastslog denne pointe og krævede denne nye sikkerhedsarkitektur i sin internationale webcast i fredags. Her er, hvad Helga Zepp-LaRouche havde at sige:

»Tiden er inde til at gøre det, udenrigsminister Lavrov og præsident Putin begge har opfordret til – at sætte sig sammen ved forhandlingsbordet om en ny, global sikkerhedsarkitektur, som garanterer alles sikkerhed; USA, Rusland, Kina, Europa og naturligvis også mindre lande som de to Korea'er og mange andre lande, der stadig har mange problemer.

Øjeblikket er virkelig kommet for en komplet ændring af den strategiske organisation mellem nationer, for at satse på en global sikkerhedsarkitektur og gøre det, min mand foreslog med SDI, for sluttelig at gøre atomvåben teknologisk forældede. For, denne kurs, der kunne føre til den menneskelige arts udslettelse, må virkelig absolut forsvinde for evigt.«

Det, hun selvfølgelig refererer til, er de termonukleare våbens konstant stigende destruktive kraft, som kunne udslette ikke alene menneskeligt liv, men alt liv på Jorden, flere gange, hvis disse våben nogensinde faktisk blev brugt.

Den selv samme dag, hvor præsident Putin kom med denne annoncering i sin årlige tale til den føderale forsamling, havde han tilfældigvis et interview med Megyn Kelly på programmet.[1] Hun var tidligere hos Fox og er nu hos NBC News; og naturligvis dominerede præsident Putins overraskelsesmeddelelse hovedparten af interviewet og gav ham en chance for at uddybe netop dette punkt, nemlig de presserende nødvendige, åbne og ærlige forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland og skabelsen af en eller anden form for ny sikkerhedsarkitektur. Hvor NBC kun udsendte en forkortet og meget redigeret version af dette interview, så blev det komplette udskrift af interviewet imidlertid offentliggjort, og det er vigtigt at høre et par uddrag af denne diskussion om dette spørgsmål, hvad præsident Putin sagde om dette

spørgsmål:

Putin: »Alt det, jeg talte om i dag, skete ikke på vores initiativ; det er en respons på USA's ballistiske missilforsvarsprogram og Washingtons ensidige opsigelse af den Antiballistiske Missiltraktat (ABM) i 2002. Hvis vi taler om våbenkapløbet, så begyndte den i det øjeblik, hvor USA trak sig ud af ABM-traktaten. Vi ønskede at forhindre dette. Vi opfordrede vore amerikanske partnere til, at vi arbejdede sammen om disse programmer. For det første bad vi dem om ikke at trække sig ud af traktaten, ikke at ødelægge den. Men USA trak sig ud. Det var ikke os, der gjorde dette, men USA. Alligevel foreslog vi igen, at vi samarbejdede, selv efter dette. Jeg sagde til min daværende kollega, 'Forestil dig, hvad der ville ske, hvis Rusland og USA slog kræfterne sammen i det afgørende område for strategisk sikkerhed. Verden ville ændre sig i lang tid fremover, og niveauet af global sikkerhed ville nå op på sit hidtil højeste.' Vær venlig at lytte til mig og bring videre til jeres lyttere, hvad jeg nu vil sige. Vi holder diskussioner med vore amerikanske venner og partnere, folk, der i øvrigt repræsenterer regeringen, og når de påstår, at nogle russere blandede sig i de amerikanske valg, siger vi til dem – det gjorde vi for ikke så længe siden på et forholdsvis højt niveau: 'Men I blander jer konstant i vores politiske liv'. Vil I tro det, de benægter det ikke engang.

Ved du, hvad de sagde til os sidste gang? De sagde, 'Jo, vi blander os, men det har vi ret til, for vi spreder demokrati, og det gør I ikke, og derfor kan I ikke gøre det.'

Mener du, det er en civiliseret og moderne fremgangsmåde i internationale anliggender?

I går talte vi to om atomvåben, og om, at da USA og Sovjetunionen først indså, at de var på vej mod mulig gensidig ødelæggelse, så aftalte de regler for opførsel inden for sikkerhedssfæren, i betragtning af, at masseødelæggelsesvåben

var tilgængelige ...

Det er stadig uvist, hvad den amerikanske politik over for Rusland vil være under den nuværende administration.

Mange ting er fortsat uafklaret, eftersom det endnu ikke har været muligt for os at etablere normale kontakter.

Det står imidlertid absolut klart, at den nuværende amerikanske præsident vedtog en specifik holdning med hensyn til indenrigspolitikken og besluttede at række ud til de mennesker, der var parat til at støtte hans kampagneløfter. Dette førte til hans valgsejr, og ikke en eller anden form for udefrakommende indblanding ...

Jeg mener, han er en erfaren person, en forretningsmand med stor erfaring, og han forstår, at, hvis man må gå i partnerskab med nogen, så må man behandle sin fremtidige eller nuværende partner med respekt, i modsat fald vil intet komme ud af det. Jeg mener, at dette er en rent pragmatisk fremgangsmåde ... Selv om dette er hans første embedsperiode som præsident, så lærer han hurtigt, og han forstår ganske udmærket, at udveksling af beskyldninger eller fornærmelser på vores niveau er en vej, der ikke fører nogen steder hen. Det ville kun betyde at fratage vore lande deres sidste chance for en dialog, simpelt hen den sidste chance. Dette ville være yderst beklageligt ... Hør her, Rusland og USA bør sætte sig ned og gennemdiskutere det for at sætte tingene på plads. Det er mit indtryk, at dette er, hvad den nuværende præsident ønsker, men han bliver forhindret i at gøre det af visse kræfter. Men vi er parat til at diskutere ethvert spørgsmål, det være sig spørgsmål relateret til missiler, cyberspace eller kontraterrorbestræbelser.

Vi er parat til dette når som helst. Men USA må også være parat til det.

Den tid vil komme, hvor den politiske elite i USA vil blive tvunget af den offentlige mening til at gå i denne retning.

Vi er parate i samme øjeblik, vore partnere er parate.«

Ogden: Jeg mener, at dette er et meget direkte tilbud om, at USA og Rusland kunne sætte sig sammen og genåbne denne form for strategiske diskussioner, som var blevet lukket ned i den følgende periode af Bush-administrationen og især, absolut taget af bordet under Obama-administrationen.

Denne annoncering fra præsident Putin har interessant nok haft en virkning med at vække nogle mennesker her i USA, inkl. folk, der tidligere havde givet sig selv lov til at blive revet med i hele dette Russiagate-hysteri à la McCarthy-tiden, og som absolut bragte os til et punkt for meget farlig konfrontation. Her kommer et eksempel: En erklæring er blevet offentliggjort af nogle ledende, Demokratiske senatorer, der kræver den omgående indledning af nye, strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland. Disse senatorer er Bernie Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Dianne Feinstein og Ed Markey, som man ser af denne pressemeddelelse, som blev udlagt på senator Markeys webside. Her kommer et uddrag af, hvad denne pressemeddelelse siger:

»Midt i en forhøjet spændingstilstand over for Rusland, opfordrede de følgende senatorer Edward J. Markey (D-MA), Jeff Merkley (D-OR), Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) og Bernie Sanders (I-VT) indtrængende udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson til at indlede en ny runde af strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland, uden tøven:

Kære udenrigsminister Tillerson:

Vi skriver for at indtrængende at opfordre Udenrigsministeriet til at sammenkalde til den næste Strategiske Dialog mellem USA og Rusland så snart som muligt. En Strategisk Dialog mellem USA og Rusland er mere presserende nødvendig i kølvandet på præsident Putins offentlige tale den 1. marts, hvor han refererede til flere nye atomvåben, som Rusland angiveligt er i færd med at udvikle, inklusive et krydsermissil og en

atomundervandsdrone, og som i øjeblikket ikke er begrænset af New START-traktaten, og som ville være destabiliserende, om deployeret.

USA bør som hastesag engagere i dialog med Rusland for at undgå fejlregninger og mindske sandsynligheden for en konflikt ...

Der er ingen garanti for, at vi kan gøre fremskridt med Rusland om disse spørgsmål. Men selv på højdepunktet af spændinger under den Kolde Krig var USA og Sovjetunionen i stand til at gå ind i en dialog om spørgsmål om strategisk stabilitet.

Ledere fra begge lande mente, som vi også bør i dag, at atomvåbens utrolige, destruktive kræfter er grund nok til at gøre enhver indsats for at mindske chancen for, at de nogensinde igen vil blive brugt.«

Ogden: Dette er selvfølgelig særdeles signifikant og er en refleksion af det faktum, at Putins annoncering er kommet som en slags alarmopkald. Andre ledende personer har genlydt af den samme alarm; prof. Stephen Cohen har sagt, at vi omgående må indlede denne form for strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland; hr. Ray McGovern har fastslået samme pointe i en artikel, der blev udgivet på ConsortiumNews. Men jeg mener, at det faktum, at disse fire, Demokratiske senatorer har udstedt dette krav, bør ses som et meget signifikant, potentielt brud i hele denne kontrollerede narrativ, som er blevet påtvunget Washington, og især det Demokratiske Parti. Og alt imens Demokraterne har givet sig selv lov at falde ind i denne form for partiske spil og er blevet overtaget i de seneste måneder af denne Obama-Hillary-krigsmagermentalitet; på trods af dette, og på trods af hele denne igangværende Russiagate-narrativ, så har præsident Trump fortsat fastholdt sin overbevisning om, at samarbejde med Rusland og med Kina, for den sags skyld, ville være 'en meget god ting, ikke en dårlig ting', med hans ord. Der er virkelig reelle kriser, som denne

planet konfronteres med lige nu, som kun kan løses gennem denne form for samarbejde mellem stormagterne, og ikke ensidigt gennem et enkelt lands handlinger. Et eksempel er antiterror-styrken, som præsident Putin har opfordret til i form af en alliance mellem USA, Rusland og andre lande for faktisk at bekæmpe international terrorisme; eller, et andet fremragende eksempel, og som nu giver gevinst, er det, præsident Trump har været i stand til at opnå gennem samarbejde med Kina og hans direkte relation til præsident Xi Jinping inden for området for at fremme muligheden for fred på Koreahalvøen i en grad, der går langt længere end vi har set i årtier.

Følg resten af Matthew Ogdens opdatering på videoen. Vi kan desværre ikke udlægge et engelsk udskrift.

[1] Se https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9mhi_AyQAYw

**Maskerne falder: Vi må have
en
»Kreativitetskultur« til
erstatning
for »Dødskulturen«**

LaRouche PAC Internationale

Webcast, 2. marts., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: I sin afhandling, »Teatret som en moralsk institution«(original titel: Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet), beskrev den tyske digter fra det 18. århundrede, Friedrich Schiller, noget ironisk klassisk teater og klassisk drama som det område, »hvor alle masker falder. Sminken fjernes. Sandheden er dommer«.

I klassisk drama, såsom i tragedierne i oldtidens Grækenland, eller Shakespeares tragedier, eller Schillers egne tragedier, f.eks.; eller i de største operaer af Giuseppe Verdi for at tage et andet eksempel, blev scenen, den klassiske scene, brugt som instrument for samfundets moralske og æstetiske opdragelse. Tragedie har evnen til at fremkalde i os erkendelsen af vore egne tåbeligheder, de fejl, der findes i os. Og vi ser reflekteret på scenen foran os, de ærefrygtindgydende konsekvenser af disse fejl, disse tåbeligheder, som, ifald de fik lov at bestå, udspilles på vores egen forestillingsevnes scener og tilbagekastes til os i det frygtelige spejl i form af en rædselsvækkende og frygtindgydende forudsigelse. I disse øjeblikke transformeres vi fra at være passive tilskuere til at blive levende medlemmer af dramaet, og vi forlader teatret med ny visdom og forhåbentlig en ny vilje til at handle for, for enhver pris, at forhindre de rædsler, vi så udspilles på denne scene, i at blive til virkelighed.

Men hvis denne moralske og æstetiske opdragelse af et samfund imidlertid slår fejl, eller mislykkes, og et samfunds tåbeligheder finder sted uden at blive rettet, så ophører tragedien med at være begrænset til scenen og flyder over i

det virkelige liv, hvilket undertiden fører til ødelæggende, virkelige konsekvenser.

Vi ser nu de faktiske og ligeledes de potentielle, virkelige konsekvenser af et sygt samfunds systemiske tåbeligheder, og af en forfejlet ideologi, som nu udspilles for vore øjne. I kølvandet på de forfærdelige begivenheder i Parkland, Florida, den 14. feb., ser vi nu en generel opvågnen i vores befolkning, en erkendelse af, at der er noget i vores kultur, som er meget, *meget* sygt; at noget i vores samfund er råddent, og at noget har fået lov til at gå forfærdelig galt, og som har bragt os til dette punkt.

Og det er ikke slut med de forfærdelige begivenheder i Parkland. Vi har netop hørt, i dag, at der er en situation med en aktiv skytte, der fortsat er under udfoldelse på et college i Michigan. Og Parkland var på ingen måde det første skoleskyderi.

Dette er blevet identificeret af guvernør Matt Bevin fra Kentucky, som selv har måttet håndtere et af disse skoleskyderier, på Marshall County High School i januar. Han har identificeret dette som en »dødskultur«, hvor han sagde, at selve værdien af menneskelivet er blevet degraderet.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

I want to just play for you a short excerpt from some remarks that Gov. Matt Bevin had after this school shooting that

occurred in his own state, at Marshall County High School in Kentucky, and this was weeks before the Parkland shooting even occurred. Here's what Gov. Matt Bevin had to say.

KENTUCKY GOV. MATTHEW BEVIN: Hi this is Kentucky Gov. Matt Bevin. I want to start a dialogue with you, I want to start a conversation about something that is imperative, not only for Kentucky, but frankly for America. We have a cultural

problem.

The mores of America – there will be many that will confuse that

with morality, although morality is certainly part of it – but the mores that define who we are and what is or is not acceptable, what we do or don't tolerate, where we draw lines and

where we put boundaries, these things have been changing, and not

for the better.

You look at what's happening in popular culture; this is not a religious issue. There'll be the nay-sayers and the pooh-pooh'ers who immediately think, "oh, you're going to talk about religion." I will tell you this, I'm going to talk about

morality. Because if people don't believe they have responsibility to anyone other than themselves, that there is no

pecking order of authority, that there is no absolute right and

wrong, that everything is morally relative, when we live in that

time of morally gelatinous state, we have a problem. Because individuals, young and old alike, do assume that their actions

matter in any kind of consequential way beyond that immediate moment, and that is a problem, and this is what's happening to our culture: We are crumbling from within. And we are seeing this throughout our society. We're seeing it in our classrooms, we're seeing it in our communities, and – let's be honest – it

starts in our homes.

I am challenging everybody who has anything to do with what I'm about to say, to take this to heart and let's start a conversation. Look at our popular culture. Look at our movies,

– the violence, the disregard for the value of human life; we

are becoming increasingly desensitized, our young people are desensitized to it. We have a culture of death in America. We can pretend we don't. We can think that people can separate that from fiction, from their lives, from that which they see, but if they're immersed in it at every turn – in television, in movies, in music, all of it! Listen to the lyrics of music today, it celebrates a culture of death! Not all of it – fair enough – but an amazing amount of it. And parents, I'm asking you to wake up and be aware of what it is that your children are listening to. Do you young people, be mindful of what you put in, because it becomes a part of your entire physiology, your entire mental makeup. It becomes a part of who you are. You are a creation of what you surround yourself by. Parents and others, I'm asking you to look at what kind of movies you go to see. For those that produce movies, I'm asking you, think about what you're feeding in – I know that we live in a day and age, where we need to shock people, more than the last time, or they won't pay attention, in sensationalism, in the shock value, maybe gets people to pay attention to something, puts eyes on something, and you can make a buck. But at what price? It's robbing us of the very fabric of our nation, and it's killing our young people. Watch the television shows: We glorify murder, we glorify killing. It is becoming increasingly explicit, and we are desensitizing young people to the actual tragic reality in permanency of death. It's important for us to recognize this.

Look at the video games that are played. Yes, they may be marked for "Mature audiences," but I'm telling you, those of you

who make a dollar producing these movies, and those of you who buy them and bring them into your homes, you know full well, that

many young people – and old people – are playing these games and becoming desensitized. When you get extra points and are encouraged to brutally kill people, and when the blood and the mayhem and the carnage is increasingly real, it desensitizes people.

And if it's a shock to us now, that suddenly we are seeing a prevalence of, and increasing amount of this happening, not in a

video game, not on a television show, not in a movie, not in the

lyrics of a song, but in real life as young people act out that

which they are surrounded by, that which they're immersed in, this is a cultural problem in America! And I'm asking the people

who produce this media, the people who produce this entertainment; I'm asking the people who profit from it; I'm asking for those of you who are executives in the social media ranks – and I am a big believer in the Constitution of the United States, and in our freedom of speech – but we have got to

start to think about the {filth}, let's be honest, that is feeding through so many of the mediums, covered and protected by

things that perhaps are not good for us; protected by a Constitution that is good for us, but creating an end-result that

is not.

What are those boundaries? I don't know. Should there be any? Should there be some content that is not given to us, and

to children, without any kind of filter or screen? These are conversations we need to have: It is a cultural problem. Our culture is crumbling from within, and the cost of it is high. The societal and emotional and psychological and moral cost is becoming more than our nation can bear. I've spent time with mothers and fathers who have lost children in tragic instances. And there is no ability, there are no words to describe the grief of a parent, the grief of a sibling, the grief of a friend, the grief of a classmate, of a teacher, of a community, who have lost someone that is an immediate part of their family or their community. Something has to be done. Let's start a dialogue. How exactly it forms, I don't know. But I'm calling on other governors, I'm calling on the President of the United States, I'm calling on our U.S. Congress; I'm calling on anyone who's in a position of influence, every superintendent, every CEO of every media company that produces a video game, that is violent in its nature, the movie producers that make the movies, the record producers who produce the music that we listen to – all of you – we've got to step up. We're the adults, let's act like it! Let's step forward, let's start a conversation, and let's figure out how to try to repair this fabric of America, that's getting shredded beyond recognition. Thank you. [end video]

OGDEN: Now, Gov. Matt Bevin did something very unique there. Instead of what we've become accustomed to, in the aftermath of one of these horrific events, to point at one or another scapegoat, or one or another mechanism that failed, or one or another thing that maybe went wrong, we fail to perhaps consider that the fault lies within ourselves, that the fault

lies within our own culture.

Now, it's obviously unspeakable beyond words, for an event like one of these mass shootings or school shootings to occur even once, as we were horrified to witness. But it is absolutely

inconceivable that we've allowed these shootings to occur, again,

and again, for now almost 20 years, since the first high-profile

event happened at Columbine High School, in Littleton, Colorado

in 1999, – almost 20 years ago. But the tragedy lies in the fact that it didn't just happen once, it happened over and over,

and that the society which witnesses each one of these events might be appalled and outraged, but the underlying cause remains

unaddressed.

As the father of one of the victims in the Parkland shooting said, in tears, during a listening session that President Trump

hosted at the White House, with family members of the victims, he

said, "My child is dead! I will never, ever see her again.

But

why – why do we keep letting this occur? Why does this keep happening to so many people?" And he vowed that he will not sleep until something substantive has been done to prevent this

from ever happening again.

Now President Trump has responded to this, to Parkland in a way that no previous President has, frankly. In addition to this

listening session, which he hosted at the White House, he's held

multiple meetings with members of Congress, with governors, with

state and local elected officials to discuss actual solutions, emphasizing that something needs to be done. Action is needed, and not just posturing and not just political talk which will make us feel as if we are doing something, he said, but we must actually do something. So, while many of the so-called solutions which have been put on the table are practical, and specific, such as hardening sites, and increasing police presence, and improving the early warning system to prevent persons, like this shooter, for example, from slipping through the cracks when there were many, many warning signs stretching over years – for the first time, in addition to these practical solutions, which are necessary – for the first time, in addition to this, the more systemic and underlying problems of the culture have now been put on the table, along the lines of what Gov. Matt Bevin has raised.

I'd like to share with you, first, a short clip from a roundtable that President Trump held state and local officials on Feb. 22nd; this occurred at the White House, where President Trump himself, goes right to the core of this pervasive culture of violence, which is promulgated through popular entertainment. Listen to what President Trump had to say:

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: We have to look at the internet, because a lot of bad things are happening to young kids and young minds, and their minds are being formed. And we have to do

something about maybe what they're seeing and how they're seeing it. And also video games: I'm hearing more and more people say, the level of violence in video games is really shaping young people's thoughts. And then you go the further step, and that's the movies, you see these movies, they're so violent, and yet, a kid is able to see the movie if sex isn't involved. But killing is involved. And maybe they have to put a rating system for that. And you get into a whole, very complicated, very big deal, but the fact is that you are having movies come out that are so violent, with the killing and everything else, that maybe that's another thing we're going to have to discuss. And a lot of people are saying, you have these movies today where you can go and have a child see the movie, and yet it's so violent and so disgusting, so we may have to talk about that also.... [end video]

OGDEN: Now, this came up again at a Feb. 26th roundtable meeting which President Trump hosted with the governors from around the country. And first what you'll see in this clip is a brief mention, by President Trump in his opening remarks, of this topic, and then you'll see Gov. Matt Bevin himself, who was present, and used that forum to repeat his point about the prevailing culture of death which undermines the morality of our population and degrades the image of man and the value of human life. And he challenges {every} person in a position of

authority in this country, to use that position of authority,
to
address this cultural problem.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: We must strive to create a culture
in our country that cherishes life and condemns violence and
embraces dignity.... Matt?

KENTUCKY GOV. MATTHEW BEVIN: I do think it's important for
us to start at every level, with your office, with our
respective
offices as well, to seize the bully pulpits that we have to
talk
about the culture in this society. And I would challenge
those
in the media who would want to mock and ridicule this, and
would
want to say that anybody who advocates for this, to find some
fault in that person as a reason why that person should not be
the one advocating for a higher level of moral authority or
higher mores, to think twice, because these are your children
and
grandchildren as well. And when we mock and ridicule the very
foundational principles that this nation was built upon, where
you treat people the way you'd want to be treated, where you
respect human life, where you respect the dignity of women,
and
of children, and of people who we have increasingly degraded
in
our society. This culture of death is becoming pervasive.
And
if it's not addressed by all the imperfect people in this
room,
with a sense of purpose and a sense of aspiration, I think
we're
going to see a continued trajectory that's not good.
Many things have not changed. There have always been guns,

and there were fewer restrictions. There have always been guns in homes, and fewer rules. It isn't to say that these rules and these restrictions are necessarily bad, but what has changed is what we do or don't do as it relates to acknowledging the value and the dignity of every human life. And when you couple that with the number of psychiatric drugs that are increasingly systemic and that have very severe warnings associated with them related to depression and suicidal thoughts, you put all these things in a mess and no one among us is bold enough or willing to step up and challenge the fact, that this is a problem, this is why it goes unchallenged. And I would call on you, Sir, as I'm calling on my fellow-governors and myself, to seize the opportunities we have to call America to higher action as it relates to our mores. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Thank you Matt.

And that's why we're here. And I think – I don't know if it's going to be mentioned, but you have to also look at videos – they're {vicious}, you look at some of these videos; I mean, I don't know what this does to a young kid's mind. Somebody growing up and forming, and looking at videos where people are just being blown away left and right. The internet movies, you look at these movies that are out today, I see just by a commercial, the level of craziness and viciousness in the movies

– I think we have to look at that, too. Maybe we have to put a ratings system on that. They have a ratings system for other subjects, maybe we have to do a ratings system for that. But it has to have an impact on – it doesn't take many months – if it was 1% or less, that's a lot. That's all it takes. It just takes one person to do tremendous damage. I think it's something we have to look at also. [end video]

OGDEN: So, we can see an awakening happening in this country. And it's very significant, when confronted with the real world consequences of a failure by our society, by our very culture itself, a failure to protect our children, to protect our young people, to protect our future; where literally, we have led ourselves to a culture where {children kill children}, and this is almost becoming commonplace. Finally, people are beginning to wake up.

But the discussion, while very good, to the extent that it has progressed, it must, must go much further, and much deeper.

Let's look back 20 years, and this was at the moment that the first such high-profile, horrific school shooting happened,

which many people who were alive at that time, remember today: Columbine. Ironically, a lot of the kids that are now in school

today, have lived their life under the shadow of Columbine and were not even born at the point that that shooting occurred.

But Lyndon LaRouche, in the immediate aftermath of that horrific event, wrote a paper in which he addressed the reality

of what actually that horrific event represented. This is in

the
aftermath of that, but not only should the realization of
LaRouche's prescience for what we're seeing today, and what
we've
seen over the past 20 years be shocking to you, and think
about
how many children, and how many other victims have died and
have
suffered in the intervening period, because nothing was done,
at
that time, to address what the root cause of this sickness
was.

But also, you should be challenged by the depth of what he
addresses as the necessary cure to this cultural sickness that
has led to these events.

So let me read you some excerpts from this paper that Mr.
LaRouche wrote, and this was back in June 11, 1999. ["Star
Wars
and Littleton," {EIR} July 2, 1999:
<http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1999/eirv26n27-19990702/index.html>]

"Unless the U.S. government, and many relevant other
influentials, change their view of this problem, abandoning
the
useless approach they have publicized thus far, the horror
will
continue, gun laws or no gun laws. Unless relevant
institutions
get down to the serious business of addressing the actual
causes
for this pattern of incidents, this murderous rampage will
persist...My function, in this report, is to define the methods
which must be brought to bear, if the danger posed by this new
form of terrorism is to be brought under control... If you are
willing to be serious, at long last, you will now turn your
attention to the scientific roots of the problem....

“...Merely ending the sale of satanic video games, such as Doom..., will not put this horror back in the box from whence it came. This new problem of terrorism must be attacked, by focussing on the conditions which many readers have been complicitly condoning. Face the fact, that it might be your negligent tolerance which has contributed to the popularizing of such video games and cult films, especially the spread of these among suggestible children and adolescents.

“...What are the methods which have, similarly, turned so many among our children and adolescents into such “zombies” as those killers?...

“To grasp the horror posed by such cases, restate the same problem as a national-security topic. For that purpose, the leading subject for discussion, as posed by the Littleton and kindred cases, is {terrorism by children}. Stating the problem in that way, brings the sheer, satanic horror of the matter into focus.

“The following pages ... will represent a serious intellectual challenge for many readers, but, for those who really wish to bring an end to the spread of more horrors like the Littleton massacre, the extra reading-time and thought this report requires, is more than well worth every second spent...

“How does one corrupt innocent children into becoming psychotic-like killers? The quick answer to that question, is: {dehumanize} the image of man. The details of the way this leads to the production of youthful ‘Nintendo’ terrorists, are a more complicated matter. Nonetheless, it is no oversimplification to say, that once that first step, dehumanizing the image of man, is accomplished, the axiomatic basis has been established, to

make

war, and killing, merely a childish game...

"Before you pull that trigger, tell me: 'What is the difference between a human being and a beast?'..."

"...[T]he focus should be on the conflict between the view of mankind as specifically human, as against the intrinsically immoral view of the human species as 'just another animal.' ...

"The difference between the man and the beast lies in the quality of human cognition. This is otherwise known as those cultivatable creative mental powers through which an individual

mind may contribute to all mankind the original discovery of a single, validatable, universal physical principle. This is also

the method used in those Classical humanist modes of education,

in which the student's re-enactment of some historic discovery of

a validated universal principle, is the mode of education employed, as opposed to so-called 'textbook' learning. This is also to be recognized as the principle of metaphor central to all

Classical artistic composition since the time of Classical Greece.

"The fact that we are able to demonstrate the validity of these discovered universal physical principles, shows that the universe itself is predisposed, by design, to obey man's will when such universal principles, discovered in this way, are applied to man's increasing mastery over nature. {The act of discovery of a universal physical principle, whose application directly increases mankind's power in and over the universe, is,

in first approximation, the only rational definition of truth, the only proof that human reason is in accord with the Creator's

definition of truthfulness.}...

"This faculty, of validatable cognition, is the quality of

the human individual which sets all persons apart from, and above
the beasts....

“...See a child’s face suffused with happiness, at the moment the child senses a validatable original rediscovery of some principle. The passion which ennobles the great performance

of any accomplished work of Classical artistic composition, whether in poetry, the performance of great tragedy, great Classical painting, or music, is the same joy with which the child is illuminated by experience of a cognitive act of discovery of some principle—whether or not the child knew that many people had made that same discovery earlier....

“...The non-deductive process of discovery, which leads to proof of principle through experimental validation of that discovery as a universal principle, is the proper strict definition of the term {Reason}. ...It is that capacity for {Reason}, so defined, which defines the unique quality of the mentally healthy human specimen, as representing a distinct species, apart from and above all beasts.

“This quality of the person, this divine spark of Reason innate to the human individual, is the kernel of the proof of Moses’ formulation, that man and woman are each made (equally) in

the image of the Creator of the universe....

“An idea, is any validatable discovery of universal principle, which is generated within the mind of the knower, by

no different means than cognition, as I have defined cognition above. The tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and the dialogues of Plato, or the tragedies of Shakespeare and Schiller,

are models of artistic compositions, by means of which the artist

prompts the regeneration of his idea respecting principles of social relations, within the mind of the audience....

“...[T]he underlying social relations among persons must be,

axiomatically, the relations among their cognitive processes. The underlying issue of social relations, is how individuals interact in terms of the ordering of, or, the inertness of their respective cognitive processes...

"The progress of civilization has been shaped by a process of humanizing the image of man, as distinct from, and higher than the animals. Christ and his Apostles embedded this principle within European civilization. The process of Nietzsche's and others' de-civilization, is to attempt to reverse that process, to dehumanize the image of man, to bring man's status back ... to the status of just another lower form of life...

"...The only moral purpose of education, is to develop an entire population up to the level of scientific and moral knowledge necessary, not only to perpetuate society at no less than its present level of power in the universe, but to carry the

process of development of the whole population a step upward.

"The purpose of education is to develop the cognitive potentials of each and every person up to that standard of quality as a citizen, to develop an individual whose life qualifies as a permanent part of the simultaneity of eternity. {The proper purpose of education, is to affirm the universality of humanity, and to accomplish this through embodying the history of the discovery of universal ideas within the cultivated personality of the matriculated student.}

"See, from this standpoint, how things went so terribly wrong. Think of the successive downward steps in our educational systems and popular culture, which brought us up to the point of

decadence that phenomena like the Littleton horror are now a typical feature of our culture in this time...

"...When we allow the natural, human nature of children and adolescents to be crushed ..., when we seek to suppress the role of the cognitive function, when we substitute the act of merely

learning for the act of actually knowing, we produce, as was done, increasingly, during the first post-World War II decades,

the kind of future adult who will come to haunt us, and menace our world, when we have become old.

"What happens, when we allow those changes in national policy, which create an economy in which the adult members of the

family household must work two or three jobs, or even more, among

them, 'simply to make ends meet'? ... What happens when we have done to education what has been done during most of the recent three decades? Did you ever think about that, or do you avoid pangs of guilty pain by refusing to think about that?

"What happens, when your toleration of the past decades' changes in U.S. economic policies, creates a situation, today, when the family is no longer able (between many jobs to work each

week, and much commuting between besides), to provide nurture to

the children and adolescents of the family household? If your economic situation compels you treat your children so, as if they

were stray dogs to be let into the house at feeding and sleeping

times, how are you educating them?...

"...Think! What kind of a social identity are such unfortunate children and adolescents expressing?

"Perhaps you were building the road to the Littleton massacre? Not everyone who expresses such a poor sense of personal self-identity in those ways, is necessarily going to

go

all the way to becoming a Littleton-style terrorist; but, such low self-esteem is a step down in the direction which might lead

to such a horrible result in the succeeding generation of youth.

You may not have intended that outcome, but, year by year, the parents and grandparents built the road which made reaching that

destination possible.

"That explains, in part, how the road to the Littleton massacres was built....

"To understand the kind of mentality which fosters the proliferation of horrors such as the Littleton massacre, look at

the way in which so many in the U.S.A. responded to the way in which the British monarchy's Blair government used its U.S. puppets.... British financial oligarchy, and its debased monarchy, have openly stated their intent to revoke the doctrine

of international law established by the 1648 Peace of Westphalia,

this time in the case of Bloody Blair's Balkan War....

"The moral nation-state, the modern sovereign nation-state which our U.S. republic was intended to be, never conducts wars

for pleasure, as the Littleton killers and Blair have done, or wars for revenge....

"When we examine the role of sections of the U.S. military, in shaping the policies and techniques carried into action by the

Littleton killers, we must take into account the fact that there

is a connection between the recently increasing tendency for moral degeneration in our military and related institutions, and

the causes for the Littleton horror and related cases.... If

such

thinking within our military, is among the well-springs of phenomena such as Littleton, how shall we be rid of the latter,

without purging ourselves of the former?...

"The American way, is [to use] the power of victory to establish an order which is justly beneficial, to the victor and

formerly vanquished, to rebuild, as Lincoln's last public address

proposed to rebuild the nation as if the Civil War had never occurred.

"Similarly: only by bringing that spirit back into our nation now, can we wean the damaged souls among our adolescents,

of that wont for Nintendo warfare so horridly displayed at Littleton....

"If we take into account, together, the present physical state, and direction of the world, and also the deteriorating mental and moral condition of populations throughout most of the

planet, as in the U.S.A. itself, we have already reached the threshold of the worst disaster known to the recorded history of

the human species. Unless we reverse the policy-trends of the recent several decades, especially those cultural trends inside

the U.S.A., there is little possibility of the survival of civilization in the Americas, western Europe, or Africa much beyond the beginning of the coming century.

"For most among you, that means that you must change, must free yourself from, especially, those habits of thinking you have

built up during the recent quarter-century or longer. In a sense,

you must be prepared to go back to the way we used to think when

John F. Kennedy was President. Admittedly, there were lots of bad habits loose back then; but, that is still a good point of reference at which to begin the process of cleaning away the mass of cultural rubble which, unless cleared away, will ensure that our nation does not survive.

“Look at the Littleton horror as an omen, as the hands of the clock of history, pointing to the time in which we are living at this moment.

“You must change this nation, and perhaps yourself, too, before this nation, soon otherwise dies. Take Littleton as that kind of warning. It is past time that you acted to change the set of definitions, axioms, and postulates which have been controlling your opinions and other behavior during recent decades.”

OGDEN: So, that was Lyndon LaRouche on June 11, 1999, almost 20 years ago. And it is shocking how prescient Mr. LaRouche’s warning were, at that time, in the aftermath of the {first} of what has proven to be countless numbers of {horrible} spectacles that we saw at that Littleton massacre. Now’s the time for us to let that sink in, and not be satisfied with just halfway, practical measures and partial solutions, but to realize in a moment of truly self-conscious reflection, in true Classical tragedy form, that the horror we’re witnessing today, really is the sign of the disintegration of our society, a potential Dark Age, as Mr. LaRouche said in that report. And a stirring within ourselves of the realization that

the only solution, is a clean break from those follies which have led us down that path, and decisive action to create a Renaissance in our understanding of what it means to be human, our view of man, a re-humanizing of the human individual, not to just try to negate evil, but to try to replace this reigning culture of violence and this culture of death, with rather, a culture of creativity, which recognizes and celebrates that unique nature of the human species. And cultivates that divine spark creativity within every human individual, {every} child. Now, as Mr. LaRouche pointed out in that report, one cannot separate this sort of sickness in our culture, from the policies which have been expressed by our governing leadership for the last 50 years; especially the policy of endless war, killing, endless warfare, which has dominated our nation, really, since the Korean conflict, but in ever-increasing rates since the death of John F. Kennedy. And this was very usefully pointed out, just last week in an interview podcast by Coleen Rowley, who was a former FBI agent, and a whistleblower, actually, in the months leading up into 9/11. And you can see there, on the screen, that her podcast with "WhoWhatWhy" is titled, "FBI Whistleblower: American Culture of Violence Starts with Perpetual Wars." In this interview, Coleen Rowley addresses the issue that this kind of "domestic terror," as she calls it, as we're seeing with these mass shootings, in schools and otherwise, really does have very much to do with this culture of violence which we now have in the United States. And she pointed to the media's role in

fostering this kind of widespread culture of violence. She stated that while the tendency in law enforcement is to try to treat every single one of these as the specific set of circumstances, which led down the path to every single one of these crimes, she said, the reality of what we are dealing with is really something much larger. She said: "Our culture is doing this, it's promoting this violent culture. And of course this is over and above the availability and easy access to weapons." You put all of this together and just those added up on their own "does explain the question. Columbine, why is this happening? Why are we experiencing an epidemic of mass violence? Again, our news never mentions that because ... we want to compartmentalize this and make it seem as if it's easily, it's not us as a culture." And then she pointed to some specifics. She said, it really is the influence of this perpetual war mentality on our society. She indicated that there are several studies that have come out, that veterans of these perpetual, endless wars are twice as likely to become mass shooters; and she also pointed out that the CIA and the Pentagon have had a sort of devil's bargain with the mass media and the entertainment media, movies and video games. And she said that "The CIA and the Pentagon have been backing, helping make about 1,800 movies," including among them are the famous "American Sniper" movie from 2014, "Zero Dark 30" from 2012, and numerous others. She said in those movies, the hero will always be someone who is wronged, and then in the end, they

shoot everyone: "A mentally impaired or emotionally troubled person is seeing themselves as that hero in those movies." That's a very useful affirmation of exactly that point, that you cannot compartmentalize, you cannot separate out all of these different, sick, sick phenomena. And our tendency is to try to scapegoat one thing, as opposed to realizing that the fault, perhaps, lies within ourselves as a culture. But it goes even further than that, and I think as Mr. LaRouche made clear, we have to not be satisfied with partial remarks, and partial considerations. In the last number of years, more than just perpetual war and bloodshed, in an age of thermonuclear weapons, the ultimate conclusion of a culture of death, and this culture of perpetual war and violence, in which human life has lost its value and weapons of greater and greater destructive capability have become the central pillar of international policy and relations of states with other states, in this age of thermonuclear weapons, the ultimate conclusion of this mentality is the extinction of the human race. We've now reached a point of decision. With the announcement just yesterday by the Russian President, of a new generation of weapons which have been developed by Russia which have the power to evade all known ballistic missile defense shields, flying at hypersonic speeds, some reaching Mach 20 – unbelievable speeds – under the power of nuclear propulsion, which allows them to fly almost endlessly, and can deliver, as he said, a doomsday payload literally anywhere on the surface of the planet at any time, truthfully, the era of belief in

survivable

limited nuclear war, or preventive nuclear first strike, or this

global strike policy, which believed that you could knock out one

nation's defenses and then launch a nuclear or conventional attack against them, that age is now definitely over.

And this announcement has really caught the world by surprise.

As Helga Zepp-LaRouche characterized this: If everything which President Putin announced is in fact real, and there's no

reason not to believe that to be the case, this is a complete "Sputnik-type" shock. It's also being compared to the Soviet development of the hydrogen bomb in the 1950s, which completely

shifted the so-called "strategic balance of power," and took the

entire idea, at that time, of a preemptive nuclear strike against

the Soviet Union off the table.

What Helga Zepp-LaRouche's assessment is, is that this announcement of an entirely new weapons system, based on "completely new physical principles," an obvious echo of course,

of the language that was originally used in discussing the Strategic Defense Initiative, the SDI, that this is a qualitative

leap of extreme significance, which shifts the entire international strategic framework.

And the follies of our belief in statecraft based on Mutually Assured Destruction, of dominance and so-called "deterrence" of geopolitics, all of these follies have now been

exposed. The mask has fallen away. And humanity itself now sits

before the judgment seat. Will we continue collectively, to

pursue an ideology of nihilism, which necessarily, in the end, must lead to the destruction of civilization and the extinction

of the human species in its ultimate consequence, if allowed to

proceed to that point? {Or}, will we finally recognize the horror, {which we ourselves have wrought}, and awaken to the awful reality of the ultimate, real-life tragedy in the making,

which is now unfolding around us

President Xi Jinping of China talks about creating a “community of common destiny.” Now obviously, he discusses that

in a beautiful sense, a win-win relationship among nations, where

all nations are working toward the mutual benefit of others and

are working towards the “common destiny of all mankind.”

Well,

ironically, that common destiny already exists, but, in a negative sense, with this thermonuclear Sword of Damocles hanging

over our heads, the potential for a “common destiny of humanity”

for a global annihilation, is a very, very real thing. As Lyndon

LaRouche made the point with regards to the warning that he delivered in that report that I read excerpts from – which he wrote, now, almost 20 years ago – when he foresaw the horrors which the events in Littleton presaged. Survival under these conditions will not come from within the theories, the axioms, the postulates, of the prevailing system, but survival can only

be delivered through the overturning of those failed ideologies

which form its foundations, and the construction of an entirely

new outlook, based on truth, truthful principles; based on a recognition of what it really means to be man.

The ultimate principle which must come before, and precede everything else, not only in philosophy and education, and social

relations, but in international strategic policy, and economic policy, is the recognition of the true nature of man, a species

which is unique from all other species in its capacity for creativity, and the necessary ordering and subordination of everything else, to the cultivation and promotion of that.

So how does that principle play out on the world stage?

It's through rejecting the kind of anti-human, anti-development,

anti-progress ideology, which has prevailed in the form of competitive strategic geopolitics, zero-sum economic

policymaking; and instead, to consciously and scientifically decide, that the common destiny which man must pursue is not thermonuclear extinction and Mutually Assured Destruction warfare, but rather, mutually beneficial development and shared

creative progress: Space exploration, the Strategic Defense of Earth from asteroids and other cosmic threats in our cosmic environment; the development of limitless power through the development of fusion energy – all of these, the list goes on and on and on.

{But this New Paradigm is already there. It's already in existence.} Just look at what China is doing, with the Silk Road, with the One Belt, One Road initiative. Look beyond all of

the propaganda that you're being fed, about "Chinese hegemony" and so forth and so on. This is where the future lies: Mutually

beneficial progress, development, the giving of the opportunity

for the full cultivation of creative reason to every man, woman

and child on this planet. The most beautiful example of this, just in the recent months, has been what China has already accomplished in the otherwise hopelessly destitute areas of Africa. And a beautiful report has just come out of Nigeria, where the idea of the Transaqua program to refill Lake Chad through massive water development and water-transfer projects, this idea which has been on the books for 20 years or more, is now becoming a reality.

These are the kinds of projects, these are the kinds of visions, these are the kinds of goals which bind us together as a

common humanity, and will affirm, for our children and for ourselves, the beauty of mankind, and the true creative nature of

this species. This is the antidote for a culture of death and a

culture of despair which has plagued our nation and this is the

vision which will inspire us, as we work to build this shared destiny, this common future.

It's not only through negating what is evil, but it's through cultivating what is good, that man can be redeemed, and

that we can cure this sickness which has infected our culture at

its very root.

So let us allow those masks to fall away, and let us allow the truth to sit in judgment, recognizing that that the fault lies within ourselves, within our very cultural values and beliefs which has led us down the road of tragedy. As the nation

has mourned alongside the victims and the family members of those

horrible events in Parkland, Florida, but has also been inspired

by the courage of those family members and those survivals who have said, "Enough is enough: Let's bring an end to the

so-called status quo. This must be allowed {never} to happen again! Let us commit ourselves to action now, before we reach the point of no return, to cure this culture, and to cure this world, of the sickness which threatens our very survival. And to

resolve, that out of evil {must} come greater good.”

For those who were victims in Florida, for those who are victims every day, of the diseases of depression and despair, addiction, overdose, opioids and heroin, and for all of us who now live under this thermonuclear Sword of Damocles which threatens to exterminate mankind in the blink of an eye, let all

of us resolve: That we will no longer accept this culture of death, which prevails not only in our media, and in our entertainment, but underlies the very economic and strategic fabric of society. If there was {ever} a moment in which it is

clear that the necessity of a New Paradigm for civilization is literally life or death, that moment is now.

So, let me conclude by returning to that essay by the poet Friedrich Schiller that I cited at the outset of this show, and

read to you the closing section of this essay, which he titles “The Theater Considered as a Moral Institution.” What Friedrich

Schiller had to say, was:

“When grief gnaws at our heart, when melancholy poisons our solitary hours; when we are revolted by the world and its affairs; when a thousand troubles weigh upon our souls, and our

sensibilities are about to be snuffed out underneath our professional burdens – then the theater takes us in, and within

its imaginary world we dream the real one away; we are given back

to ourselves; our sensibilities are reawakened; salutary emotions

agitate our slumbering nature, and set our hearts pulsating with greater vigor.

“And then, when man at last, in all districts and regions and classes, with all his chains of fad and fashion cast away, and every bond of destiny rent asunder – when man becomes his brother’s brother with a single all-embracing sympathy, resolved

once again into a single species, forgetting himself and the world, and reapproaching his own heavenly origin, each takes joy

in others’ delights, which then, magnified in beauty and strength, are reflected back to him from a hundred eyes, and now

his bosom has room for a single sentiment, and this is: to be truly human.”

So let us resolve to make mankind truly human, to be our brothers’ brother, and to usher in a culture of creativity to replace this culture of death.

Thank you very much. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Mueller-dossieret revideret:
Hvordan briterne og Obama
plattede USA
LaRouche PAC Internationale**

Webcast, 23. feb., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: I takt med, at Muellers anklageskrift mod 13 såkaldte russiske 'trolde' fortsat dominerer overskrifterne hen over weekenden, er amerikanerne i stigende grad begyndt at fatte det iboende hykleri i hele denne Russiagate-narrativ. Fra tidligere CIA-direktør James Woolsey, der af Laura Ingraham på Fox News bliver spurgt, om USA nogen sinde har blandet sig i et andet lands valg – til hvilken han måtte rømme sig og hoste og sige, »Jamen, det har vi sandsynligvis, og vil sandsynligvis fortsætte med«; og til en række blogindlæg i denne uge på tidligere forsvarsefterretningsofficer Pat Langs webside, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. Man ser her [Fig. 1] titlen på et af de seneste indlæg: »Robert Muellers Amerika – En farce pakket ind i hykleri«. Dette blev postet den 20. feb., og her er et kort uddrag af hans blogindlæg, hvor han siger:

Under overskriften »Robert Muellers Amerika – En Farce pakket ind i hykleri«, fremfører Tacitus, at anklageskriftet er »intet mindre end en køreplan for despotiske regeringer, der ville ønske at behandle enhver, der vover at udlægge afvigende materiale på internettet, som en kriminel.« I virkeligheden »er det ikke andet end en gang harsk butterdej. Det prætenderer at have et bjerg af beviser på russernes misgerninger. Men, hvis man begynder simpelt hen at stille kritiske spørgsmål om det underliggende bevis for disse misgerninger, opdager man hurtigt, at dette dokument er et stykke politisk teater snarere end en faktisk opremsning af kriminelle gerninger.«

»Der er ikke et eneste stykke solidt bevis i hele dokumentet, der underbygger« påstanden om Internet Research Agency (IRA), det russiske selskab, der angiveligt skulle have haft tilsyn

med den beskidte propagandakrig mod intetanende amerikanske vælgere. »Det er blot en konstatering af en overbevisning. Det er ikke sådan, man skriver et anklageskrift, der beskylder en for kriminelle handlinger.«

»Denne sag er således meget langt fra at være en 'slam dunk' for Mueller-teamet. Skulle det nogen sinde komme for retten, er der signifikante huller og sårbarheder i anklageskriftet, som en kompetent forsvarsadvokat kunne splitte ad. Niks. Det her handler ikke om at straffe folk, der overtræder loven. Dette er et politisk teater, der er designet til at nære memet for at promovere antirussisk hysteri.« Tacitus understreger, at enhver objektiv efterforskning af angivelig »indblanding« fra IRA kun ville kunne konkludere, at »IRA's aktiviteter er på grænsen til irrelevante og uden indvirkning«. Ingen stor afsløring her: Rusland har gennemført efterretningsoperationer i USA i 80 år. Men USA har gennemført lignende operationer »i og imod Rusland / USSR og har været involveret i hemmelige indblandinger i valg i hele verden. Dét er det hykleriske. Vi har et hysterisk anfald over latterlige internet-narrestreger, udført af en lille gruppe russere, der var dårligt finansieret og genererede liden aktivitet samtidig med, at vi ignorerer vores egen historie, hvor vi rent faktisk har væltet andre lovligt valgte regeringer. Der har vi det. Farce og hykleri.«

Hør så dette næste indlæg, publiceret i dag, den 23. feb., med titlen »Amerika blander sig i Ukraine« [Fig. 2]. Han siger:

»Historikere vil bemærke den enorme ironi, der ligger i USA's engagement i undergravende virksomhed og indblanding i valget i Ukraine, som overgår alt, Rusland har forsøgt.

De ideologiske spaltninger, der vokser i USA, begynder at ligne de krigsførende lejre, der karakteriserer den politiske verden i Ukraine. Splittelsen i Ukraine sætter grupper, der beskrives som »højrefløj«, og mange er ideologiske efterkommere af ægte nazister og nazi-sympatisører, op imod grupper med et stærkt tilhørsforhold til Rusland.

Hvem støtter USA's regering og medierne? *Nazisterne*. Du tror, jeg laver grin!«

Han fortsætter dernæst med at fremlægge OUN's historie [Organisationen af Ukrainiske Nationalister] og Stephan banderas støtte til Hitler og fortsættelsen af denne arv med Sektor Højre i dag. Dernæst fortsætter han:

»Regn mig med blandt de mennesker, der er oprørt over det hykleri og den stupiditet, der nu kommer frem i USA.

Der foregår helt tydeligt indblanding i det det amerikanske politiske landskab. Men det er altså ikke den russiske regering. Nej. Der er fremmede og hjemlige kræfter i alliance, som er ivrige efter at portrætere Rusland som en trussel mod verdensordenen, og som må modgås med højere forsvarsudgifter og hårdere sanktioner. Det er den propaganda, der dominerer medierne i USA i disse dage. Og det er i sandhed farligt for vores nations sikkerhed og frihed.«

Det står klart, som Pat Lang pointerer her i dette blogindlæg, og ligeledes, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointerede i sin internationale webcast i går, at hele denne Russiagate-historie, og desuden hele Kina-hysteriet, der i stigende grad nu oppiskes; at dette forkyndes med det formål at portrætere disse lande som en dødbringende trussel mod den herskende verdensorden, og som må tilintetgøres. Som Helga LaRouche sagde i dette klip, vi nu skal se, så man se dette som intet mindre end førkrigs-propaganda. Her er, hvad Helga havde at sige:

(her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.)

(Hele Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra 22. feb. kan læses på dansk, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23890>)

Henvisninger i den engelske tekst:

Nyt Paradigme undervisningsserie, Indtegning, program:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23703>

Helga Zepp-LaRouches introduktion 10. feb. (dansk):

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23855>

Harley Schlanger, lektion 2 17. feb., video, (engelsk):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xy87_gzTTU

“The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”,
<https://larouchepac.com/20180220/mueller-dossier-revisited-how-british-and-obama-diddled-united-states>

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: This is a case which will never go to trial, because these are people living in Russia. It's an old case, it was already discussed in 2014, and since there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Russia, the trial will never take place; and therefore Mueller does not have to provide any evidence for any of his accusations. So it's a very convenient way to keep beating the drums in an anti-Russian hysteria and it's a big, big “nothing-burger” as people have been pointing out. But it is actually a fraud against the population, because if you keep building this kind of enemy image, such as against Russia and China – and people should understand, this has nothing to do with Russian hacking, or Russian collusion; as a matter of fact, there were several people, but one of them was a leading member of the Russian Duma who said that there are very well documented cases for the United States meddling in

102

the
internal affairs of other countries, and it's fairly well
known
how many coups and regime-change operations. So obviously, at
minimum, you could say is that both sides are doing it, but
the
United States has a very long record of having tried to
intervene
in the internal affairs of other countries in multiple ways.
So, this should be understood as pre-war propaganda, and
people easily fall for things which are in the mainstream
media,
and rather, they should think twice. What Russia is doing and
what China is doing, is they are building a completely
different
model of international relationships, explicitly modeled on
noninterference, and respect for the social system of the
other
country. And therefore, this propaganda is just a terribly
dangerous scenario of lies which actually is serving as a
preparation for war, and that is what people really must get
straight.

OGDEN: So the stakes are very high, and in the same
broadcast yesterday, Helga LaRouche made the point that there
are
ongoing investigations coming out of the House Intelligence
Committee under Devin Nunes, and also the Senate Intelligence
Committee under Chuck Grassley, into the role of Christopher
Steele as a central figure in this entire Russiagate
narrative.
As she said, this leads directly to the role of British
intelligence. So, here's a second clip from yesterday's
broadcast.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Yes, it is directly British intelligence. It's not "former" MI6 agent, but it is an MI6 operation, and it involves the Foreign Office of Great Britain itself, as we saw in a case which was launched by one of the Russians who were accused of hacking, who took the Steele case to court, and then the Foreign Office intervened directly to block any revelations coming from the Steele operative of theirs. Now, that it is an incredible story: It means the British have intervened, not only in the coup against the Yanukovych government, but also in the case of the coup against President Trump. That whole Russiagate as some people funnily say is a big "regurgitated nothing-burger" – there is absolutely no substance to it. And we should just note the fact that the continuous investigations coming from the two Houses of Congress, under the leadership of Nunes and Grassley, they are still pointing absolutely to the coup-plotters who were involved with the British in this coup. In the recent developments, [House Intelligence Chair] Congressman Nunes has sent out 10 or 11 other letters to officials of the existing or former government, where they have to answer very pointed question – when did you know first about the Steele dossier? Did you discuss it with anybody else? Did Obama know it? When did he know it? And these individuals have to answers these questions by March 2nd, so it's not a long-term investigation, but it's something extremely hot. And it's not yet decided how this coup will go: If the Congress has the courage to go after those Obama intelligence officials who colluded with Great Britain, but if they do, a lot of people

could not only lose their position, but actually end up in jail,
as some judges are now already demanding.

OGDEN: So, as Helga said, this investigation continues and it continues to escalate. This is the question of the role of the British and their fellow-travellers in the American intelligence community in actually meddling in the US electoral process. Chairman Devin Nunes is scheduled to appear at the CPAC [Conservative Political Action Conference] conference today; he's scheduled to be the closing speaker. We'll see what he has to say there, but as Helga mentioned, Nunes has continued to march forward with Phase Two of his investigation into this entire Christopher Steele matter. He issued a series of questions; this is letter that was just published yesterday which was sent to the FBI and officials within the State Department. The letter is asking for questions regarding information contained in the Steele dossier, which was funded by the DNC [Democratic National Committee] and the Clinton campaign, and used in a FISA [Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act] application targetting Carter Page. He notified them, as Helga mentioned, that if their responses are not received by March 2nd, which is a week from today, then subpoenas will be issued. He said, "If you do not provide timely answers on a voluntary basis, the Committee will initiate compulsory process."

So, included in these questions is one which directly asks what did Obama know and when did he know it? So, here are a few

of the questions that are asked by Chairman Nunes [Fig. 3]:

"1. When and how did you first become aware of any of the information contained in the Steele dossier?

"2. In what form(s) was the information in the Steele dossier presented to you? By whom? ...

"3. Who did you share this information with? When? ...

"6. When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by a Democrat-aligned entity?

"9. Was President Obama briefed on any information contained in the dossier prior to January 5, 2017?

"10. Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media?

If so, who and when?"

So clearly it is very significant that this investigation is going all the way to the top, with Obama himself being implicated. Now recall that Chairman Grassley of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has also been asking questions about what

Obama knew and when did he know it. Take the example of the very

bizarre email that was sent by Susan Rice to herself on Inauguration Day at 12:15pm on the day that President Trump was

inaugurated; literally right before she walked out of the doors

of the White House for the last time to attend this inauguration.

The email describes a January 5, 2017 Oval Office meeting between

President Obama, former FBI James Comey, former Deputy Attorney

General Sally Yates, as well as Vice President Joe Biden and Rice

herself. The email that Susan Rice sent to herself obviously

has

been publicized by Chairman Grassley, and in this letter [Fig. 4]

that you're looking at, he published the relevant excerpt from this email. Again, this is Susan Rice, addressed to Susan Rice;

12:15pm, January 20, 2017. This is what she says:

"On January 5, following a briefing by IC leadership on Russian hacking during the 2016 Presidential election, President

Obama had a brief follow-on conversation with FBI Director Jim Comey and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates in the Oval Office.

[She mentions that Biden and herself were also present.]

"President Obama began the conversation by stressing his continued commitment to ensuring that every aspect of this issue

is handled by the Intelligence and law enforcement communities 'by the book'. The President stressed that he is not asking about, initiating or instructing anything from a law enforcement

perspective. He reiterated that our law enforcement team needs

to proceed as it normally would by the book.

"From a national security perspective, however, President Obama said he wants to be sure that, as we engage with the incoming team, we are mindful to ascertain if there is any reason

that we cannot share information fully as it relates to Russia".

"The President asked Comey to inform him if anything changes in the next few weeks that should affect how we share classified

information with the incoming team. Comey said he would."

Now, what Senator Grassley asks in his open letter to Susan Rice is the following:

"It strikes us as odd that, among your activities in the

final moments on the final day of the Obama administration, you would feel the need to send yourself such an unusual email purporting to document a conversation involving President Obama and his interactions with the FBI regarding the Trump/Russia investigation. In addition, despite your claim that President Obama repeatedly told Mr. Comey to proceed 'by the book,' substantial questions have arisen about whether officials at the FBI, as well as at the Justice Department and the State Department, actually did proceed 'by the book.'...

"4. Did anyone instruct, request, suggest, or imply that you should send yourself the aforementioned Inauguration Day email memorializing President Obama's meeting with Mr. Comey about the Trump/Russia investigation? If so, who and why?"

"12. Did President Obama have any other meetings with Mr. Comey, Ms. Yates, or other government officials about the FBI's investigation of allegations of collusion between Trump associates and Russia? If so, when did these occur, who participated, and what was discussed?"

So, these questions and these investigations are beginning to hit very close to home. Remember, Susan Rice was also caught and has admitted to requesting the unmasking of several individuals associated with the Trump campaign; Americans whose communications were collected under NSA wiretaps and surveillance. Susan Rice and other officials have now been caught on repeated occasions requesting the unmasking of these American officials; raising many questions as to what the motives were.

Now Chairman Nunes has been appearing on several talk shows and media interviews over the last several weeks. Obviously, since the publication of his memo. But he appeared last weekend

on "The Full Measure" show with host Sharyl Atkinson. In that interview, he continued to keep a laser focus. Let me just read

you a few excerpts of what Chairman Nunes had to say in that interview.

"We have a Russian Investigation going on whether or not there was collusion between any campaign and the Russians. That's

coming to a close. We've never had any evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians|. There's nothing there"|.

"[I]n that investigation, we've unearthed things that are very concerning. We know that there are un-maskings that occurred

and probably were leaked to the media"|. [W]hat we found was happening is, in the last administration, they were unmasking hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of American's names. They were unmasking people for what I would say, for lack of a better

definition, were for political purposes"|. [N]ames were unmasked.

And those names ended up in the newspaper.

"[I]t's like political dirt to create a narrative and a spin with the mainstream media"|. [T]here were unmaskings that we unearthed, then there are the FISA abuse that we've discovered.

[T]his is where the FBI and the Justice Department – because they're involved in this FISA Abuse, because they're the ones who

" go before the secret court to get the warrants, they're all involved, they're all implicated in this"|.

"It really boils down to this. You had a campaign. The Hillary Campaign and the Democratic Party went out and paid

for
dirt”|. Then they used that dirt and funneled it into the FBI.
The FBI then used that dirt to get a warrant on a US citizen
who
was part of the other campaign”|. [T]o do that, it’s wrong.
“|... As it relates to Department of Justice and the FBI, if
they need to be put on trial, we will put them on trial. The
reason that Congress exists is to oversee these agencies that
we
created. DOJ and FBI are not above the law. Congress created
them, we oversee them, and we fund them. And if they’re
committing abuse for a secret court, getting warrants on
American
citizens, you’re darn right that we’re going to put them on
trial.
“I think people are just starting to learn now what really
happened. Because as we peel more and more of this back, I
think
more and more Americans get educated. And I think that they’re
gonna demand that changes are made.”
Remember that this entire line of investigation is exactly
what was suggested in the original LaRouche PAC special
report.
Obviously, this special report on Mueller was published now
over
six months ago. But this continues to be very timely and very
relevant. An update to that report will be forthcoming, but
we
have a preview now available on the website of what will be
contained in that updated dossier. That preview is available
under the title “The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the
British
and Obama Diddled the United States”. There you can see a
screen
shot [Fig. 5] from that updated preview. This is obviously
available in full on the LaRouche PAC website, and we would
encourage you to read it in its fullest extent. It’s a fairly

long update. But what I'd like to do is just read you from the beginning of how this report is set up, a little bit of a retrospective on the effect that this Mueller dossier has had over its six-month circulation; but also the context in which you have to understand always the big strategic picture behind the events that are now unfolding on a day-to-day basis. So, this is what this updated report has to say:

"On September 29, 2017, LaRouchePAC published the original version of the dossier 'Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will do His Job If You Let Him'. To date, that dossier, now being circulated nation-wide by LaRouchePAC, represents the most thorough and the most accurate assessment as to the character of Robert Mueller, as well as the utterly fraudulent nature of the ongoing treasonous effort to bring down the Trump Presidency.

"This present report is an update to that dossier, with the emphasis on the dramatic significance of two documents which were released in the first days of February. The first is the House Intelligence document known as the 'Nunes Memo', and the second is the – by far more substantive – un-redacted document authored by Senators Grassley and Graham.

"We shall examine the importance of these two documents in depth, as well as significant other developments which flow from the impact of their release. Before doing so, however, it is of critical importance that a matter of primary overriding concern be re-stated here, at the beginning of this update.

“The British Origin of the Coup

“Nothing of any truth about the current assault on President Trump can be understood, unless one addresses the question of *why* all of this is occurring, along with the subsumed question of “*cui bono?*” This requires transcending the world of partisan

politics and inside-the-beltway gossip, and the necessity for examining the *strategic* setting and implications surrounding the coup plot.

“Everything that is now transpiring must be viewed within that truthful strategic context. During the eight years of the Obama Presidency, and the prior Administration of George W. Bush,

a profound shift in U.S. strategic policy took place. Obama, working closely with – and often under the direction of – the British, committed the United States to enforcing a global policy

of Anglo-American hegemonism, what is sometimes referred to as a

‘uni-polar world’. This took the form of escalating provocations

against Russia, and more recently the targeting of China.

Currently, this imperial Anglo-American faction is determined to

thwart China’s gigantic Belt and Road Initiative infrastructure

development of Eurasia, Africa, Southwest Asia (the Middle East),

and nations in Central and South America. This largest infrastructure development project in human history now involves

more than 68 countries.

“For the British, such geo-political designs are nothing new. British strategic policy since before World War I has been

based on geopolitics. Under the theories of Lord Halford

Mackinder, completely embraced by today's Anglo-American foreign policy establishment, control of Eurasia dictates strategic mastery of the world. China is now establishing vast transportation and other infrastructure throughout Eurasia, a region which Anglo-American policy up until now had reserved as a primitive looting ground.

"Unable to break from imperial axioms and join China's offer of win-win cooperation, let alone offer a viable alternative model which promotes the general welfare, Barack Obama and the British adopted a strategy of geopolitical containment and provocation, a New Cold War policy. It began with the Anglo-American coup in Ukraine in 2014, pushing NATO right up to

Russia's borders, and involves hostile encirclement strategies against both Russia and China, employing color revolutions, economic sanctions, overt economic, cyber, and information warfare, provocative military maneuvers, development of new nuclear and other warfare capacities, and military support of insurgents and terrorists in states friendly and/or trading with

Russia or China, such as Iran and Syria. All of this, of course,

threatens the extinction of the human race."

Now, the final aspect of that memo which is now available goes through the fact that with Trump's election, this entire agenda was derailed. As it says:

"In November 2016, it was the intention of Obama and the British that Hillary Clinton would continue this dangerous geo-political gambit. Donald Trump's victory in that election stopped this mad drive to war just as it was turning very hot.

"As we detailed in our original Mueller dossier, 'Russiagate,' – which has roiled our nation since Summer 2016, has driven most members of Congress into a McCarthyite insanity

so severe that you can literally picture them braying at the

Moon

at night, and has critically undermined Donald Trump's Presidency

– has absolutely nothing to do with any hostile action by Russia

against the United States. Its origins are to be found in the desperation of the British and American establishments, among individuals and interests who are frantic to re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama Administration."

I would strongly encourage you to read the entirety of this report, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website now.

It's

crucial, but let me just pick up on that picture, which was just

laid out in that prefatory section. As is very apparent from developments in the recent week and a half, these frantic attempts to impose the re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama administration, which the Hillary Clinton administration clearly would have continued full-bore; this attempt to re-impose

that track is now in full swing. One only has to look at the escalations that have occurred in Ukraine, the escalations which

have occurred in Syria, the calls for a response to that, and absolutely the very heated rhetoric and hysterical speeches which

were delivered at the so-called Munich Security Conference which

just occurred this week. We saw just rapid anti-Russia, anti-China speeches, one after another after another, attacking

the One Belt, One Road policy as an imperialistic scheme; trying

to identify a full spectrum intelligence operation that's being

allegedly run by the Chinese against every nation in the West, and so forth and so on.

In contrast to that, the spokesperson from China at the Munich Security Conference, very calmly and very undefensively laid out the picture of what the New Paradigm of win-win relations that China is offering to the world really entails. That was originally elaborated by Xi Jinping at his speech at the United Nations General Assembly several years ago, but it involves non-confrontation, non-meddling in foreign countries' affairs, an understanding of differences in approach and differences in political and cultural systems. But overall, not an attempt to impose one nation or one system's view of the world on other nations in a sort of unipolar or hegemonic way; but a way to say, "Let's take our differences and use them to our collective advantage. Let's put together a system of shared, mutual benefit under a vision of common destiny for mankind." Which is the way the Chinese have put it. But this is characterized as a win-win approach, as opposed to the Cold War mentality of winner take all, zero-sum game type of geopolitics.

So, Helga LaRouche in her broadcast yesterday strongly encouraged people to actually read the text of the speeches from the Munich Security Conference, both the anti-China, anti-Russia war-mongering speeches so you can see for yourself just how rabid and hysterical this prewar propaganda actually is. But also, go and read that speech from the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and you can see how the Chinese are responding.

This is the time where we desperately need a New Paradigm of international relations; and it comes under the form of that win-win relationship. The way that you can see that playing

out

on the ground, not from 300,000 feet with rhetoric; but really look at the reality on the ground, in places such as Africa, Central and South America, countries in Eurasia. These countries

are already benefitting from the infrastructure, the modern technology and the infrastructure which is being brought to those

countries by China and the One Belt, One Road initiative.

It's

high time that the United States and other countries in Western

Europe come to the table and say what China is doing is very good. This is for the benefit of these countries, and instead of

trying to shut this down and beat the drums of war, we should finally reciprocate what China is doing. We should come to the

table with intentions of good will, and we should join together

and as a community of nations, build this future which will be for the common benefit of all.

So, the LaRouche PAC class series, which we've been promoting now for several weeks, and is already ongoing, could not be more timely and more urgent. This is titled, "The End of

Geopolitics; What Is the New Paradigm?" You can register, if you

haven't already, at discover.larouchepac.com or at the link that

you see here on the screen – <http://lpac.co/np2018>. Again, there are public classes which have been available on YouTube; two so far. The first inaugural speech by Helga Zepp-LaRouche,

and then the second follow-up by Harley Schlanger last Saturday;

which was "What Is Geopolitics? Part I, the History". That

was

very informative and very in-depth. But there are also aspects

of this class series that you cannot access unless you are a registered participant; such as the discussion period which will

occur tomorrow, which will only be open to those who are registered for this class series. So, we strongly encourage you,

if you haven't yet, to register. Also, to encourage other people

that you know to register for this class series at that link that's on the screen and to become active participants in this entire series.

The time has come. We must take very seriously what's at stake here in this current unfolding battle over the soul of the

United States and the soul of the US Presidency. The ugly nature

of this operation and this apparatus continues to come to light,

but we have to continue – as the LaRouche PAC dossier does very

well – to put it into its proper strategic context and to understand *cui bono?* and what is the strategic context for this

unprecedented assault on the US democratic system and the US Presidency that we now see ongoing.

So, thank you very much for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do.

Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen Webcast, 16. feb., 2018

Gæst Paul Gallagher.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen«. Jeg har inviteret Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for Executive Intelligence Review, på showet i dag, og vi er glade for at du tager dig tid til at komme, Paul. Vi har nu mulighed for at få en meget seriøs og nøgtern diskussion om LaRouches økonomiske program: De »Fire Love«, og lige nu er dørene vidt åbne.

Med udgivelsen af den såkaldte »Udkast til Lovgivning for Genopbygning af Amerikas Infrastruktur« – Dette er programmet fra Trumps Hvide Hus, som blev sendt over til Kongressen. Det blev udgivet mandag. Alt imens indholdet af denne rapport er, for at sige det mildt, uheldigt – det har Wall Streets fingeraftryk over det hele, alene det, at dette forslag er kommet frem; men det er rent ud sagt en total taber, der har galvaniseret diskussionen nationalt, og det er virkelig begyndt at katalysere kongresmedlemmer på begge sider midtergangen til at begynde at tænke over spørgsmålet på en meget mere seriøs måde: Hvordan finansierer man infrastruktur? Hvis vi taler om \$1,5 billion, hvor skal de komme fra?

(Her følger engelsk udskrift):

And this includes, frankly, Trump himself. As President Trump said in the Letter of Transmission, that was sent over as the opening to this legislative proposal, he said: "Our nation's infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans the working, modern infrastructure they deserve.... My administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact a law that will enable America's builders to construct the new, modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land."

Now, on Tuesday, President Trump held an open, televised roundtable with different Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, and this was ostensibly to discuss the aluminum, steel industries and trade policy around that, but during that roundtable, which was televised, the discussion of the infrastructure program came up. And I'd like to just play a short clip from that roundtable; this is an exchange between President Trump and Sen. Sherrod Brown [D] from Ohio, and then Senator Blumenthal [D-CT] also gets in on this. And what you hear is that President Trump says, look, I want to have a bipartisan plan. Come back to me with a counterproposal.

What

we put out was an opening bid, but I really want a bipartisan plan. I'm ready, willing and able.

So, here's a clip from that roundtable:

[start video]

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I actually think that we can go bipartisan on infrastructure, maybe even more so, than we can on DACA. ... On infrastructure which is the purpose of what we're doing tonight, come back with a proposal. We put in our bid – come back with a proposal. We have a lot of people that are great Republicans that want something to happen. We have to rebuild our country. I said yesterday, we've spent {\$7 trillion} – when

I say "spent," and I mean wasted – not to mention all of the lives, most importantly and everything else – but we've spent \$7

trillion as of about two months ago, in the Middle East – \$7 trillion. And if you want to borrow two dollars to build a road

someplace, including your state, the great state of Ohio, if you

want to build a road, if you want to build a tunnel, or a bridge,

or fix a bridge because so many of them are in bad shape, you can't do it. And yet, we spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East.

Explain that one. [crosstalk]

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: I've love a bipartisan – we have a bipartisan proposal. We can [crosstalk] dollars on it in infrastructure. We're glad to work together on a real infrastructure bill with real dollars, plus what you can leverage

in the communities and private sector.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Do a combination.

SENATOR BROWN: It needs real dollars.

President Trump: I would love to have you get back to us quickly, 'cause we can do this quickly and we have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our roads and our bridges and our tunnels, so the faster you get back, the faster we can move. Focus on document this week, if you don't mind, right? But the faster you get back, the faster we move.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: I come back to Senator Brown's point, I think there's a opportunity for real bipartisanship here, in these two areas.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I agree, and I'd like you to come back with a suggestion on infrastructure in the plan, and I think that's a bipartisan plan. I really would like to see you come back with a counterproposal on the infrastructure. I think we're going to get that done. I really believe that's – we're going to get a lot of Democrats, we're going to get a lot of Republicans. We're going to get it done. It's something we should do. We have to fix our country: We have to fix our roads and our tunnels and bridges and everything, so, if you can work together on that, and I am ready, willing and able, on infrastructure – that is such a natural for us to get done. And I think we could probably do it. Thank you all very much. [End video]

OGDEN: So as you can see, asking them to come back with a counterproposal, he said, this is our opening bid, but the point is clear: Now is the time for us to mobilize like never

before,

to put the LaRouche plan on the table. {This} is the counterproposal.

Let me put on the screen here: first we've got our Campaign To Win the Future. This is obviously the national statement of

intent for the elections in 2018. LaRouche PAC is mobilizing a

national movement and galvanizing discussion around this program.

And then the content of that campaign can be seen on the next slide, this is "The Four Laws To Save the United States: The Economics Principles Necessary for a Recovery – Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road" and this contains full elaboration of Lyndon LaRouche's four economic laws.

So, I know that Paul is very short on time, and I would just like to ask you: Please address what the situation is now in Washington. What's coming out of this release of this so-called

legislative proposal? And what actually has to be done?

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thanks, Matt. My first reaction, when the White House plan was released – I call it the "White House plan," not the Trump plan, but the White House plan – when it was released, was that closed a certain door of people in elected

offices around the country and in Washington, constantly saying

"what is the White House going to come up with? what is the White House going to come up with? what are they going to give

us in the way of what they can get started towards infrastructure

investments? because we desperately need it?" And when it finally came out, and it was very, very, very lacking – as you said, a Wall Street plan – that closed a certain door, and immediately, thus, opened another one.

OK, now they have come out with that. Now, we have to come out with something. It's up to the rest of us, particularly those in elected office, but all of us who are active in fighting

for this: It's up to us now to shape the alternative, because this one just isn't going to work. And it's good to see that that definitely includes the President – that view. He, on another occasion, immediately after the plan was rolled out on Monday, he said that compared to the tax legislation and the military spending increases and so forth, that this infrastructure plan that the White House has put out, was really

quite unimportant. A rather surprising thing for him to say. But it indicated, when it was followed the very next day by the

comment you just saw, "give me an alternative," and then the very

day after that, in another meeting with members of Congress, when, as soon as he was prompted in any way by any of them, he came out very strongly for increasing the Federal gasoline tax by

25 cents a gallon, and applying that through the Highway Trust Fund, to infrastructure investment – not at all something which

is part of the White House plan, so-called; and not part of the

Republican leadership's plan at all.

But when he was asked, he went with that. He hasn't said this publicly, but a number of senators and representatives who

were at that second meeting, have reported it publicly in the same way. It's clear that he did say that he was for that increase in the gas tax, and as he said, he would take the political heat for backing it as President, if they would go forward with it.

So you've had, in rapid succession, a number of indications that this plan, as poor as it was that came out from the White

House, is not in fact the President's plan, and it simply closes

the door on all this waiting, and now says, where are the alternatives?

And that is very definitely what is in the LaRouche Four Laws, is the one alternative to this that will work.

Let me get into this in another way, unless you want to break it up, Matt. And if you have questions, please, interrupt.

But I wanted to read a piece that was written just two days ago by a Chinese scholar John Gong; he's a very prominent professor University of International Business and Economics in

Beijing; and he's a former executive editor of the {Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies}.

OGDEN: We actually have a slide with the title of that article which was written for China Global Television Network (CGTN), "Make America Great Again – With Chinese Money." And I

can read some of the quotes that people can see on the screen, and then maybe you can address what the content is.

This is what he had to say: "Trump is absolutely right that Americas crippled bridges, potholed highways, and crooked railways cannot wait any longer. America needs to be great again.

The only question is, where is the money coming from?" And then

later in the article he said, "I have a great idea. Bank of China

and other major banks from China are now flush with dollar cash

and other dollar-denominated liquid assets, totaling over \$3 trillion, mostly in the form of holdings in U.S. Treasury bills

and bonds. This money can be readily used for Chinese investors

to participate in America's infrastructure boom. By that I mean

Chinese investors can participate in those infrastructure projects as active equity investors, and maybe contractors or suppliers at the same time.

"Call it the Belt and Road. Call it America-belt-America-road. I don't care, as long as China's current account trade surplus can be somehow transformed into a capital account stock, in the form of money invested in America as permanent equity shareholders, and more importantly permanent stakeholders of a stable and prosperous Sino-U.S. economic relationship. This could be a win-win mode for both countries."

[https://news.cgtn.com/news/79596a4d33677a6333566d54/share_p.html]

So that's Dr. John Gong.

GALLAGHER: Now, that's very important, in the way it is formulated, in the precision of it. He's talking about Treasury

holdings, – he's not the first Chinese official to do this. In

fact, a year ago, in late January of 2017, Ding Xuedong, the then-chairman of the Chinese Investment Corp., which is one of their two big sovereign wealth funds, made essentially the same

proposal. He said, we have such and such a volume of long-term

U.S. Treasury holdings, they're not earners, their interest rates

are very low, their return is very low; we would like to trade them for a long-term investment in a U.S. infrastructure bill, as

he put it. And he, at the time, estimated that really, the need

for investment in the United States for new infrastructure, was
{\$8 trillion}, a figure which may seem impossibly large to many,
but actually isn't.

[http://www.larouchepub.com/pr/2017/170116_chinese_invest.html
]

Nonetheless, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has written in articles which have been published in the Chinese press, she's frequently interviewed and quoted there, – she has written exactly this proposal in articles which have been published there. I have presented exactly this idea to Chinese officials in Washington.

This is part of LaRouche's Four Laws.

But to start with, the first action implied by his four actions that have to be taken legislatively and from an executive standpoint, is the restoration of the Glass-Steagall Act and the breakup of the Wall Street banks and the hiving off of all of the casino speculative investment vehicles, special purpose vehicles and all of that, in order to protect and use the commercial banking system for investments.

You cannot get to real, major infrastructure renewal without doing that, and you could see this in the meeting that you played the clip from. There was at least one representative from Missouri, who brought up the issue, when the discussion was about

trade, and specifically whether there might be tariffs against aluminum imports from China, he brought up the fact that there is

a grave lack of capacity to produce sufficient aluminum for industry in the United States, and where is that lack coming

from? The lack of power supplies. So that, this is an infrastructure question, although if you ask the simple question,

“Is there an apparent sufficient amount of kilowatt-hours per year per capita in the United States?” Yes, there is. But is there sufficient, reliable electrical power supply – constantly

online, reliable, electrical power supply – for an expansion of

industry? The answer would in many cases be, “no.” And that was

what he was bringing up, in particular with respect to more aluminum plants in the United States. You have a grave inability

to produce enough power, particularly since the fiasco of electricity deregulation out on the West Coast 15 years ago: That

deprived the aluminum industry and shut down a very significant amount of it.

Now, if there’s going to be that kind of investment in infrastructure across the country, it’s not going to be one, or

two, or three, or four, very famous big projects, like the renovation of the whole Northeast rail corridor of Amtrak, and the bridges and the tunnels in New York and so forth. It’s not

going to be simply those things. It’s going to be, at many, many

levels around the country, the production of enough clean water

supplies, the production of enough electrical power supplies; the

replacement and renovation – mostly replacement – of the river navigation systems, locks and dams, and many of these things.

And for those, the commercial banks have to be ready to lend, because it takes a lot of employment, a lot of contracting, a

lot

of local borrowing: The banks have to be ready to lend and if you allow them to stay the big commercial banks, and the mid-size

regional banks – if you allow them to stay in the Wall Street casino, that's where they'll stay. If you say, "no, your business as a commercial bank is lending," then you have a credit

channel through the banking system through which national credit

can flow, and cooperate in this kind of thing.

So it starts with restoring bank separation under

Glass-Steagall. We're going to have a group of elected officials

from Italy in a couple of months come over and help us organize

in Washington on this, because they're fighting for it in Italy

at the national and also the local level.

Then, the specific second law of LaRouche, a national credit institution, which is able to produce large volumes of productive

credit for productive employment of the people, and for increased

productivity. And that is where not only the White House plan,

but many other plans that have been put forward, are really completely inadequate, where we do have to talk about several trillions of dollars at least of investment, and the way to do

that, is exactly the way that was reflected in that comment by Dr. Gong: That is, there is a lot of long-term Treasury debt held

out there; three major holders of this long-term Treasury debt,

which totals \$7.5-\$8 trillion, are the commercial banks of the United States, again, which hold it in their reserves and all

their excess reserves which are very large right now; second, Japan, which holds more than \$1 trillion in primarily long-term

U.S. Treasury debt; thirdly, China, which actually holds now somewhat more than Japan; about \$1.2 trillion of the same kind of

debt. Those are potential shareholders, equity holders, subscribers of that Treasury debt into a new bank created by Congress for the purpose of generating this kind of credit. That is exactly how we have proposed and circulated and organized that this is the way to form – without a tremendous amount of new borrowing – to form a sufficiently large national

bank for infrastructure; essentially by swapping existing long-term Treasury debt holdings for equity in such a new national bank created by Congress with a guarantee from the Treasury for the payment of the dividends on that equity. And with taxes – this is not free; it's never free, – but with taxes assigned to make sure that those dividends can be paid. That's where the increase in the Federal gasoline tax and potentially the use of other what you would call infrastructure

excise taxes, like the port excise tax and the navigation tax on

the locks and dams, that's where these would come in. Because if

you simply go and raise the gas tax by 25 cents and spend the money for infrastructure projects, it will not produce nearly, nearly enough. But if you use it in this way as leverage to guarantee the equity in a new national bank in exactly the way that we're seeing reflected in that proposal, that article from

Dr. Gong, then it'll work. As I said, he's not the only person,

not only among leading Chinese thinkers about this, but also from

Japan, there's the same kind of positive view of this idea.

Potentially, there you have it – an infrastructure bank. Then you have to go on and what are you going to use that credit for? It can't be used simply to repair roads and repair bridges. There are entirely new areas of technological and scientific breakthroughs which will raise productivity in the economy to a far greater extent. One of them that we identify is that a crash program is necessary to develop not only thermonuclear fusion electric energy, but the plasma technologies of infrastructure, which will probably come from such a crash program even before commercial nuclear fusion electricity arrives. We will have plasma technologies being spun off from that crash program, which will address themselves exactly to the production of the kinds of capacities that have died out in deindustrialization in the United States. But they'll do it at a higher level of technology. Those kinds of investments, are one of the Four Laws that LaRouche has called for. Also, a big increase in NASA's capabilities, going back to the Apollo Project level of effort by NASA to really go back to the Moon; industrialize, develop the Moon, develop the raw materials there, including for fusion energy production. And from there, go deeper into the Solar System and ultimately into the galaxy. This is the kind of science driver which leads up-shifts in productivity in industry. And infrastructure is really the way that these up-shifts get introduced to the economy. For example, in a high-speed rail system of cars using magnetic levitation and similar technologies, this is the way it gets introduced.

So, that opening from the President is very important. Yesterday you had comments which I think are very significant from the two leaders of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee – the Republican chairman William Shuster of Pennsylvania, the Democratic ranking member Peter DeFazio – they are normally quite a bit at odds. But in interviews yesterday which were reported today, they were reporting that they are already jointly working on a legislative alternative to exactly what you saw the President asking for there. A legislative alternative again, with real Federal dollars; the language which Senator Brown used – actually it was Senator Wyden was the other Senator – real Federal dollars. An alternative to present which the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is where legislation along these lines will have to start. So, you're seeing that; you're seeing the gas tax being discussed very widely, including by those same two leaders of that committee. You're already seeing an infrastructure bank act in the House – HR547 – of Representative Rosa DeLauro, Democrat from Connecticut, which has the backing of fully half of the Democratic Caucus in the House and is not a national infrastructure bank which would operate in the way that we've described and therefore would not be as large or as capable. But nonetheless, it's legislation which in my view is quite similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which operated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration and did so much to recover the country and then to lead the

mobilization for the war and through the war in the 1940s. So that is also something definitely within the purview of LaRouche's Four Laws.

OGDEN: The idea of national banking is, I think, really the critical idea; and it takes us obviously directly back to Alexander Hamilton. If you look at Hamilton's view on infrastructure, the idea of public infrastructure is very much an American idea, and is a major pillar of the American System. Hamilton's emphasis on the necessity for the rapid upgrading of the national infrastructure, the ports and dredging the harbors and things like this, what was called "internal improvements." But this idea of public infrastructure has an American idea to it. In fact, it was written directly into the Constitution in the form of the General Welfare. There were huge fights, including Hamilton's defense of the Constitutionality of a national bank against Thomas Jefferson around this idea of the General Welfare. I know you have to go, so maybe one more aspect that you can address before you leave, and then I can conclude the remaining portions of the show on my own. But just on this subject of the idea of the public good, the United States used to be the world's gold standard, in great modern infrastructure, public infrastructure. You can see that obviously by what Franklin Roosevelt did during the New Deal. Nations around the world were banging on our door to try to imitate what we accomplished with the Tennessee Valley Authority and so forth and so on. But now, the gold standard is swiftly being set by China and what China has done in an unparalleled way. Create this

amazing public infrastructure in a very rapid and swift manner.

Two things I think maybe could be addressed in what we need to now learn from China or relearn in terms of what we used to be committed to, is: 1) the policy approach that has made this possible in China; but also, 2) the philosophy that China is clearly committed to when it comes to this idea of the public good, the common good, or what we call in American Constitutional

language, the General Welfare. Maybe you can address that just

briefly before you leave, Paul.

GALLAGHER: There was, in the 19th Century, the American Whig and then Republican leaders were all very conscious Hamiltonians. They realized that they were attempting to develop

the country, and they were doing it – at least a lot of the time

– extraordinarily successfully with a commitment to the “internal improvements” what we call infrastructure, but the internal improvements, the national credit provision, the protection of industry; which came from Alexander Hamilton. But his overriding premise was actually none of those particular policies, but rather his stating against the tide of

opinion in the 1790s when he was Treasury Secretary and the decade before and after. He definitely took on the tide of opinion that the United States was going to be an agricultural country, a country of yeoman farmers with all of their well-known

virtues and so on and so forth. He said that the wealth of a country is found in the inventive qualities of its people, and in

the freedom and opportunity that they have to turn their inventive qualities into enterprise. And he really was responsible for the emergence of the first banks of the United

States; not only the First Bank of the United States, the first national bank, but also the first private banks of the United States, of which there were very few at that time. He saw the creation of a national bank as essentially the necessary link or liaison between the actions of the government to assist the economy and the actions of the private banks; that this was the necessary way, in which they should be related. But his principle was that the mind of the individual and the freedom of the individual and opportunity to make that into enterprise, that that was what defined the ability to produce the wealth of a country and that the wealth of a country was produced within it; it was not gained by trading with other countries – fairly, freely or otherwise. It was gained primarily by producing the wealth which the inventiveness of the people and the resources of the country made possible. And that was the function of protection when it was used, but of course, Hamilton favored more what we would call industrial subsidies than he did what we call tariffs. So that, right through Abraham Lincoln, was the creed of the great leaders of the United States in the 19th Century and considerably thereafter. We became the greatest industrial nation on Earth that way. Franklin Roosevelt revived that general outlook, although he did so without the creation of a national bank, really because of what he was working with in Congress. Otherwise, he might have preferred to do that. But he did it through such institutions

as
the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the TVA, which
became
wonders of the world. We have not really improved on that
much
in the 70-80 years since. But that idea, Hamilton's ideas
spread
very rapidly through Friedrich List, who spent a lot of time
in
the United States and was a leading Hamiltonian in the 1820s
and
1830s, and then was in the middle of the unification of
Germany
for the first time in the Customs Union of Germany in the
middle
of the 19th Century. This spread through Bismarck's policies,
who knew that he was a Hamiltonian, later in the 19th Century.
They spread through the Japanese adopting and learning a lot
of
the works of Hamilton; late in the 19th Century inviting
Hamiltonian economists from the United States to come over and
advise them. This kept being repeated in Korea again. China
has
taken this far beyond, because as you said, they're not only
applying those policies, but they're also as they always say
doing them with Chinese characteristics. Particularly now
with
Xi Jinping as the President of China, he has really defined
and
enshrined in their Constitution the principle of what a
country's
leadership is judged for is its ability to strive for the
common
welfare, the common aims of the population; what we call in
the
Constitution, the General Welfare. That has really had a very
distinctive effect on Chinese policy in the country and also

on

the policy of the Belt and Road Initiative which Xi Jinping launched, but was really already underway before he made the formal speech three and a half years ago. Already the investments by big Chinese commercial banks outside China, in these projects of energy, mining, but also a lot of infrastructure projects. These big investments were already underway in 2011, 2012; then he made the announcement in 2013, which was so very close to the policy of the World Land-Bridge which had been promoted by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche since the later 1980s. And since that time, that has really been recognized in China; they call Helga the Silk Road Lady. This policy of the common welfare is clearly one reflected in the way

that they've eliminated almost entirely down to the last few tens

of millions of people, they've almost entirely eradicated extreme

poverty in China. I just heard the World Bank chairman the day

before yesterday praising that to the skies and saying it's the

one model for the world. He said the World Bank has been trying

to do this for so many decades, to eradicate poverty, without making too much progress. China has done it, and now they are seeking to help do it in Africa and other places. They want to

invest in the Middle East in reconstruction. But this is really

the test that you are acting for the general good, for the common

welfare, which is what our Constitution commits us to.

So, in that sense, they've gone beyond, and in the process, really developed a lot of technological breakthroughs in infrastructure; and that's where you find them. That's where Roosevelt found them. The projects of the 1930s, which many

people think of as just creating a lot of work for people, and building a lot of airports and roads and bridges and things like

that; those projects – especially the hydro-electric projects and especially the Tennessee Valley Authority – were technological breakthroughs at the time. They built dams, navigation systems, hydropower systems technologically in ways which not only hadn't been done, but had been denied that they could be done even right up to that time. John F Kennedy spoke

about this later, that experts were saying that you couldn't build dams that were simultaneously for water management, for navigation, and for hydropower. The TVA did 57 such dams.

So,

they completely transformed an area of the country. These breakthroughs were made in all of this infrastructure building in

such a way, that the productivity of the U.S. economy leaped up in

the 1930s at the fastest rate of the last 150 years. A close second was the 1940s, including the war mobilization.

So that's what China is experiencing now, as they make these kinds of investments; and they're doing it with a very common welfare orientation.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, thank you very much, Paul. I'm going to let you go before we finish the remainder of our show.

But I think you've made it very clear that we are uniquely positioned to inform and ultimately shape this counterproposal and what must ultimately become the infrastructure and general economic policy of this Presidency. So, I know we have a lot of

work to do. Thank you for joining us, Paul.

GALLAGHER: Thank you. I'm sure you'll talk about the necessity to bring this up from the bottom as well; from the

local elected officials, from the state legislatures in particular and apply it to the election campaign. I think it's

probably true what Chairman Shuster said, which is that work on

this legislation will be going on until the summer. I think that's definitely true. It will become a part of the election campaign, no question. If we can get candidates out there and local elected officials out there who are for the Four Laws, we're going to shape this. So, thanks for the opportunity and having me on, and have a good time.

OGDEN: Thank you, and we'll talk to you again soon. What Paul said is absolutely correct. This is the ultimate principle

or thought behind the campaign to win the future. This is the LaRouche PAC election mobilization in 2018. We've already had a

number of state legislators endorse this campaign. We're really

on the ground in various places, including in West Virginia; doing some very significant meetings with people who are involved

in the China-West Virginia deals. We've also mobilized in a very

big way in the Midwest, which was key to the Trump election victory. We know that these former industrial states really are

the most significant in swinging these elections and creating the

constituency blocs around this idea of the LaRouche Four Economic

Laws and everything that you just heard Paul go through. This is

the urgent necessity as we mobilize around this kind of program.

I think everything that you just heard from Paul, makes it

very

clear that we are uniquely well-positioned to shape this entire

discussion. I think the opportunity is even greater now than it

was previously.

Now, let me just go over a few things that I think will make it very clear to you that there is an opportunity for a moment of

awakening, you could say, among people who have recognized that

everything that we've been committed to for the last several decades up to this point has completely failed. There were two

very informative or entertaining articles over the last week and

a half, which point to exactly this; indicate exactly this opportunity for people to perhaps open their minds and begin a more sober and serious discussion around the true principles of

economics. One of these is an article which appeared in Bloomberg, this was {Bloomberg Business Week} I believe. The title of this article was "What if China Is Exempt from the Laws

of Economics?" This is by a fellow named Michael Schuman, but the subtitle is "Beijing's policymakers seem to be doing a lot of

things right – and that may upend much of basic economic thinking, especially our faith in the power of free markets."

So, here are a couple of excerpts from that article. He says:

"Over my two decades of writing about economics, I've devised a list of simple maxims that I've found generally hold true....

"But recently, my faith in this corpus of collected wisdom has been badly shaken. By China.

"The more I apply my rules of economics to China, the more

they seem to go awry. China should be mired in meager growth, even gripped by financial crisis, according to my maxims. But obviously it's not. In fact, much of what's going on right now in

that country runs counter to what we know – or think we know – about economics. Simply, if Beijing's policymakers are right, then a lot of basic economic thinking is wrong – especially our

certainty in the power of free markets, our ingrained bias against state intervention, and our ideas about fostering innovation and entrepreneurship.

"On the surface, that probably sounds ridiculous. How could one country possibly defy the laws that have governed economies

everywhere else?...

"Yet as China marches forward, we can no longer dismiss the possibility that it's rewriting the rulebook. Beijing's policymakers are just plain ignoring what most economists would

recommend at this point in its development. And, so far, they're

getting away with it....

"... Perhaps China really is refashioning capitalism.

"Perhaps. I, for one, am still clinging to my maxims....

"... Maybe my rules of economics will hold firm after all.

But thanks to China, I'm prepared to edit them."

Now, it's not that China is rewriting the rule book. I think that what you just heard from Paul is that it's the West,

it's the United States under the influence of British free market

ideology; this free-market school economics. It's the United States and the West which have been playing by the wrong rulebook

for decades, if not generations. We've neglected the rulebook that we originally wrote. It was Alexander Hamilton, it was our

first Treasury Secretary; that's why it's called the American System of economics. Other countries have applied these principles of Hamiltonian economics and experienced the same phenomenal growth that we experienced under the influence of Hamiltonian policy. That is exactly what China is experiencing right now. It's leaving these economists scratching their heads, but perhaps they merely have to open a few history books. I think as you can tell from that Bloomberg article, it's beginning to dawn on people. "Gee! Maybe we've been wrong. Maybe we've been duped by this British free trade, free market ideology. Perhaps that's why our economies are in shambles right now."

Here's another article. This is in the {New York Times Magazine}. It came out earlier this week. This one is very interesting and goes through a lot of the history you just heard

Paul elaborate on. This is called "The Rise of China and the Fall of the 'Free Trade' Myth." The subhead is "China's economic success lays bare an uncomfortable historical truth. No one who preaches free trade really practices it." So, here's an excerpt from the article:

"[T]o grasp China's economic achievement, and its ramifications, it is imperative to ask: Why has a market economy directed by a Communist state become the world's second-largest?

Or, to rephrase the question: Why shouldn't it have? Why shouldn't China's rise have happened the way it did, with state-led economic planning, industrial subsidies and little or no regard for the rules of 'free trade'?...

“Indeed, economic history reveals that great economic powers have always become great because of activist states. Regardless of the mystical properties claimed for it, the invisible hand of self-interest depends on the visible and often heavy hand of government. To take only one instance, British gunboats helped impose free trade on 19th-century China – a lesson not lost on the Chinese.... The philosophical father of economic protectionism is, in fact, Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the American financial system, whose pupils included the Germans, the Japanese and, indirectly, the Chinese.”

After some history, he lays out the case of Germany, and this one is interesting to focus on. He says:

“... Unified in 1871, Germany was scrambling to catch up with industrialized Britain. To do so, it borrowed from recipes of national development proposed by Hamilton soon after the Americans broke free of their British overlords. In his ‘Report on the Subject of Manufactures’, submitted to Congress in 1791, Hamilton used the potent term ‘infant’ industries to argue for economic protectionism.

“... In his view, infant nations needed room to maneuver before they could compete with established industrial powers. The United States embraced many of Hamilton’s recommendations; the beneficiaries were, first, the textile and iron industries and then steel.

“It was Hamilton’s formula, rather than free trade, that made the United States the world’s fastest-growing economy in the 19th century and into the 1920s. And that formula was embraced by

other nations coming late to international economic competition.

Hamilton's most influential student was a German economist named

Friedrich List, who lived in the United States from 1825 until the 1830s and wrote a book titled {Outlines of American Political

Economy}. On his return to Germany, List attacked the free-market

gospel preached by Britain as sheer opportunism... Applying List's lessons, Germany moved with spectacular speed from an agrarian to an industrial economy.

"... Closely following Germany's example, Japan heavily subsidized its first factories ...

"... South Korea, too, found solutions for its problems in Friedrich List rather than Adam Smith. The country's leader, Park

Chung-hee ... was also deeply familiar with German theories of protectionism. (The economist Robert Wade reported coming across

whole shelves of books by List in Seoul bookstores in the 1970s.)...

"But little did I know that Hamilton (and List) would achieve their greatest influence in post-Mao China. 'The rise of

China resembles that of the United States a century ago,' the Chinese scholar Hu Angang writes. He is not exaggerating."

Now, that's a very interesting article to appear at this moment. I'm not saying that everything the author says in his analysis is entirely accurate, or that all of the conclusions that he draws are necessarily correct. But what he does make clear is that what made America great was the policies of Alexander Hamilton. And what's making China great today are those very same Hamiltonian policies. This realization shows you

that we have a very fertile field for the reception of our so-called Four Laws campaign – Lyndon LaRouche's revival of

Hamiltonian policies. The fight which Lyndon LaRouche has led for decades to liberate the United States from this imposed free market, free trade hoax; this British ideology. To return us to the principles of Alexander Hamilton. What he did simultaneously abroad to educate these other nations on the policies of the American System and Hamiltonian economic policies. That's where China got this from; that's where you can credit the great Chinese economic miracle of the last 15 years. Do not write out of the equation the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played as spokesmen for this great Hamiltonian tradition, and urgently with updates and a profound scientific depth that Lyndon LaRouche has brought to this discussion. But the time is now, and the field is very fertile for the reception of this idea that the time has come for a Hamiltonian coalition of nations. We must join hand-in-hand with China to do exactly that; to bring development to all the nations on the planet using these American, but universal, economic principles. Now, let me just play a very short clip from a broadcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had yesterday. Because the biggest problem that you run into – and I think this is something that you run into as an organizer or as an activist – is that people fail to make the necessary leap in terms of understanding these principles because they have an axiomatic problem. There's a disconnect. The biggest problem that we have when it comes to economics today is that money is essentially God. Money has achieved this status in economics where it is everything to everyone. It's the Genesis of economics; it's the root, it's the

prime mover; it's the measuring rod, it's the purpose, it's the medium. Money is everything. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed exactly this pathology in her webcast yesterday. And she called for a public debate on this. She said, as it begins to dawn on people who have believed that everything that they had believed about economics may perhaps have been wrong, we need to question some of the most basic economic assumptions that we hold dear, and ask ourselves the question, "What is the ultimate purpose of an economy and what is the true source of true economic wealth?"

So, here's Helga LaRouche:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking. This article by Bloomberg which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he says that China is doing everything which according to his theory

are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going

back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm

von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market

model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause

of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of

the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological

discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an

increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things.

We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that. [end video]

OGDEN: So the time has come. As I said, it's a very fertile field, and this is one of the most important reasons why

we've now launched a new LaRouche PAC class series, which gets directly at these principles; not only of economics, but this is

what drives global policy. What is the purpose of economy?

What

is the true identity of man? And what should be the collaborative between peoples and between nations, to what end?

So, I'll take that as an opportunity before concluding, to remind

our viewers that tomorrow we will have the second class in our 2018 class series. This class will be titled "The End of Geopolitics, Part I: The History of Geopolitics." The guest speaker will be Harley Schlanger. Again, you can register for this entire class series, which is called "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the New Paradigm?" The registration is now

open. If you have not registered for this class series, I strongly encourage you to. The link is available on the screen

– lpac.co/np2018. You can also visit discover.larouchepac.com which will be the central hub of all of the material for this class series. Again, if you're a registered participant, not only do you have the opportunity to participate in the live public forums, such as the inaugural class that was delivered last Saturday by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, but you also have the opportunity for an in-depth engagement around the syllabus, the

required reading materials, the homework assignments, the live feedback from the teachers and from the leaders of the LaRouche

PAC class series, and also some discussion periods which are only

open to registered participants. Registration has continued to

increase. We have a large number of registered participants from

all across the United States and elsewhere around the world, too.

So, we're putting together the educated grouping, the cadre which

will be able to lead this discussion for a new economics, a New Paradigm. The field is wide open. The door is there, and all we have to do is walk through it. We are in a unique position to inform this discussion today; and it is a very urgent debate which needs to take place as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. So, thank you for joining me here today. I thank Paul for joining me. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

Lyndon LaRouche:
»En dialog mellem eurasiske

civilisationer: Jordens kommende 50 år« og »Om LaRouches opdagelse«. pdf; engelsk

☒ *»Kreativitet, som jeg her har identificeret det, er forskellen på dig og en abekat. Der er faktisk to egenskaber ved denne forskel. For det første, så kan et medlem af den menneskelige art øge hans eller hendes arts potentielle, relative befolkningstæthed gennem sin viljemæssige anvendelse af kreativitet, som ingen form for dyr kan gøre. For det andet, så afhænger samfundets fremskridt hen over successive generationer af, at disse generationer genvedtager, eller atter sætter i kraft, den skabende opdagelse af denne form for universelle, fysiske principper. Sammen kan disse to udtryk for kreativitet (som jeg definerer det) fastlægge grundlaget for det, vi kunne kalde naturlig, menneskelig moral, den form for forskel, der adskiller menneskelig moral fra aberigets kultur.«*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

»Det centrale træk af mit originale bidrag til Leibniz' videnskab om fysisk økonomi, er at give en metode til at adresse den årsagsmæssige sammenhæng mellem, på den ene side, enkeltpersoners bidrag til aksiomatisk revolutionerende fremskridt i videnskabelige og analoge former for viden, og,

på den anden side, de heraf følgende forøgelser af den potentielle befolkningstæthed i de korresponderende samfund. I sin anvendelse i politisk økonomi, fokuserer min metode på analyse af den centrale rolle af den følgende tretrins rækkefølge: For det første, aksiomatisk revolutionerende former for videnskabelig og analog opdagelse; for det andet, de heraf følgende fremskridt i principper for maskinredskaber og analoge ting; sluttelig, de heraf følgende fremskridt i arbejdskraftens produktive evne.»

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Charlottesville var en iscenesat hændelse! LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 18. august, 2017

For at sætte scenen for aftenens diskussion, der vil handle om en ny flanke af kupforsøget mod præsident Trump, vil jeg begynde med meget positive nyheder fra Kina. Her ser vi [Fig. 1] forsiden af en historie, der blev publiceret i China Daily, med titlen, »Identifikation med Kina«. Det er en historie om Helga Zepp-LaRouche og hendes arbejde over mange årtier sammen med sin mand, Lyndon LaRouche, for udvikling, for bedre forståelse og for samarbejde med Kina. Artiklen begynder med Helgas rejse til Kina i 1971 under Kulturrevolutionen, da hun

var passager om bord på et svensk fragtskib. Hun så nationer i Afrika, hun så Kina, og hun kom tilbage fra denne rejse med den absolutte overbevisning, at verden måtte ændre sig, at den måtte blive forbedret.

Vært Jason Ross: Det er 18. august, 2017... Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Will Wertz fra *Executive Intelligence Review* (EIR), og remote, Diane Sare, medlem af LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

For at sætte scenen for aftenens diskussion, der vil handle om en ny flanke af kupforsøget mod præsident Trump, vil jeg begynde med meget positive nyheder fra Kina.



Fig. 1

Her ser vi [Fig. 1] forsiden af en historie, der blev publiceret i *China Daily*, med titlen, »Identifikation med Kina«. Det er en historie om Helga Zepp-LaRouche og hendes arbejde over mange årtier sammen med sin mand, Lyndon LaRouche, for udvikling, for bedre forståelse og for samarbejde med Kina. Artiklen begynder med Helgas rejse til Kina i 1971 under Kulturrevolutionen, da hun var passager om bord på et svensk fragtskib. Hun så nationer i Afrika, hun så Kina, og hun kom tilbage fra denne rejse med den absolutte overbevisning, at verden måtte ændre sig, at den måtte blive forbedret.

I artiklen opstiller *China Daily* kontrasten mellem det potentielle samarbejde mellem Kina og USA under henholdsvis Obama-administrationen og Trump-administrationen. Artiklen siger, efter at have citeret Helga for at sige, at »Det kinesiske, økonomiske mirakel er virkelig den mest succesfulde model«, og at »i modsætning til Obama-administrationen, der var mere modvillig over for kinesiske initiativer fra Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB) og [Bælte & Vej

Initiativet]; så har den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump sat infrastruktur øverst på sin dagsorden og sendt en mellemorganisatorisk delegation under lederskab af Matthew Pottinger, seniorrådgiver i det Nationale Sikkerhedsråd, til Beijing-forummet.« Helga Zepp-LaRouche refererer her til Bælte & Vej Forum i maj måned, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche også deltog i.

Jeg mener, at artiklen virkeligt beviser, hvor stor betydning, Kina tillægger Helgas rolle, og den slutter med et citat af hende. Hun siger: »Vi er meget glade. Det er én ting, at en lille organisation som vores producerer ideer; en ganske anden ting er, at verdens største land begyndte at udføre dem«, med reference til Kinas vedtagelse af Bælte & Vej Initiativet i kølvandet på Schiller Instituttets mangeårige organisering til fordel for den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen. Hun afslutter med at sige, at hun håber, Lyndon LaRouche vil kunne besøge Kina, og han helt bestemt har stor kærlighed til landet.

Så det reelle potentiale, der eksisterer for et Nye Paradigme i verden, for USA's tilslutning til Kinas utrolige succes med at komme fri af finansspekulation, fri af Wall Street, fri af London, og for at gå i retning af udvikling i Franklin Roosevelts stil, er enormt. Det er på grund af dette potentiale, at der er en massiv indsats for at afsætte præsident Trump. Vi har været meget aktive i dette, gennem f.eks. vores reklame for *Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity's* (VIPS) Memorandum; VIPS har foreløbig udarbejdet 50 memoranda om USA's politik. Deres seneste memo om, at hele historien om Russia-gate er et svindelnummer, har virkelig haft enorm trækraft. Det er blevet taget op af Salon, Bloomberg og især *The Nation* i en meget stor artikel.



Fig. 2

Dette har i de seneste uger fremkaldt angreb fra f.eks. *The*

Hill, som vi ser her [Fig. 2]; der udgav en artikel, »*Why the Latest Theory about the DNC Not Being Hacked Is Probably Wrong*« (Hvorfor den seneste teori om, at DNC ikke blev hacket, sandsynligvis er forkert).



Fig. 3

Vi så et angreb komme ud i *Washington Post* [Fig. 3], der sagde, de ikke tror på, at *The Nation*, det magasin, der udgav en historie om VIPS-memoet; at *The Nation* er i færd med at revidere deres historie, der står tvivl om russisk hacking af DNC. *Washington Post* siger, der virkelig håber, *The Nation* får »rigtigt fat« på denne historie.

Her følger resten af webcastet i engelsk udskrift:

There has been a response that came out from two media outlets. One of them, Disobedient Media [Fig. 4], is the publication that first put out the results from the Forensicator,

who had analyzed meta-data that came from files released by the

Guccifer 2.0 persona; and also from Adam Carter [Fig. 5], who maintains a website that goes through the Guccifer 2.0 persona.

I just want to review a few highlights of what these articles have to say, because I think it's very important. The VIPS memorandum is correct; a deliberate attempt was put in place to

create false Russian footprints, false Russian evidence, to make

it appear that the DNC leaks were actually a Russian hack.

The

fact of the matter is that no actual evidence has ever been

..PAGE

presented showing that Russian actors hacked the DNC and

provided

the material that Wikileaks later published, that caused such a

commotion that it forced the resignation of Debbie Wasserman-Schultz and other top officials in the Democratic National Committee.

The attacks on the VIPS memo focus on something about data transfer speeds, which were used to show that the files that Guccifer 2.0 released, had been copied to a flash drive rather than being hacked over the internet. That's pretty much the only

thing that these articles have to complain about. They say that

the speed of transfer could have been possible over the internet.

I'll just review a very few aspects of this, which is that the information that was processed, the analysis that came from the

Forensicator and from Adam Carter, showed that not only that the

speed was too high for many internet connections but that it very

specifically matched the typical transfer speed of a USB2.0 flash

drive. They also showed that file manipulation occurred on the

East Coast time zone. They showed that the files showed evidence

of being used in a FAT file system, which is only used on flash

drives – at least in the past decades; and of course the fact that there is absolute proof that the Russian fingerprints that

were found and discovered in the documents released by Guccifer

2.0, were put there deliberately so that they could be found.

Those aspects simple are not even touched by the legacy

media's

attacks on the VIPS' revelations.

So, this whole Russia-gate thing is falling apart. The attempts by the {Washington Post}, {New Yorker} magazine to cover

things up, are really a dismal failure if you read the articles.

That brings us to the topic that we're going to be hearing from

in depth from Will Wertz; which is the latest flank in the attempt to unseat President Trump – namely, the events and the reactions to those events in Charlottesville. So Will, what can

you tell us about this?

WILL WERTZ: First of all, what I want to point out, is that what

President Trump said in his first press conference following the

Charlottesville event, that there is bigotry and violence on many

sides, is in fact true. I think that not only applies to the Charlottesville case per se, where you had Nazis on one side, you

had anti-fa on the other side, which is an anarchist, violent organization; and it's most likely that you may have had provocateurs. It's hard to believe that the FBI was not involved

in some way under the guise of monitoring the situation. But if

you stand back and look at the overall climate in the country, it's also the case that there is violence and bigotry on many sides; and specifically directed at President Trump. I want to

review some of the highlights of that, which represent an unprecedented situation in terms of violent threats against a President of the United States.

First of all, just as he was being inaugurated, the British publication {The Spectator} wrote “Will Donald Trump Be
..PAGE

Assassinated? Ousted in a Coup? Or Just Impeached?” You had a

number of statements from the would-be Hollywood royalty, including Madonna; who said, “I thought an awful lot about blowing up the White House.” Then you had CNN correspondent – former correspondent now – Kathy Griffin, who held up a mock decapitated head of the President of the United States. You also

had, over the summer, Shakespeare in the Park doing a performance

of {Julius Caesar} in which Julius Caesar was portrayed as Donald

Trump and was viciously assassinated on the stage. You had another Hollywood actor – Johnny Depp – who joked, “When was the last time an actor assassinated a President? It has been a

while, and maybe it’s time.” In July of this year, there was a

book released by a {Guardian} reporter by the name of Jonathan Friedland. It’s entitled {To Kill a President}. Just within the

last 48 hours, a Missouri state senator, Maria Chappelle-Nadal,

wrote in her Facebook “I hope Trump is assassinated.” And we should not forget that on June 14th of this year in Alexandria,

Republican Congressman Steve Scalise was shot while practicing with 20-25 other Republican Congressmen for a Congressional baseball for charity. If the police present on the scene had not

responded appropriately, you could have had a massacre of multiple Republican Congressmen or Senators.

So, let’s be honest about the threat of violence. This is virtually unprecedentedly directed at a President of the

United

States, and we have had Presidents who have been assassinated, as

people know. So this is the actual reality of the situation.

Now what I want to do, is to look at this situation in

Charlottesville, which is merely the most recent escalation of an

ongoing attempted coup against the President of the United States. It's modelled upon what was done in Ukraine – the Maidan, or the various color revolutions which preceded the coup

in Ukraine. On January 17th, just before President Trump's inauguration, President Putin of Russia said, "I have an impression they practiced in Kiev, and are ready to organize a Maidan in Washington" against President Trump. On February 21,

2017, {Executive Intelligence Review} released a 17-page dossier,

which was entitled "Obama and Soros Color Revolutions; Nazis in

Ukraine 2014, USA 2017?" If you look at the situation in Ukraine, you get a direct parallel to what is being orchestrated

in the United States. In the dossier what we disclose is that there were more than 2000 non-governmental organizations – NGOs

– in Ukraine; funded by the US government, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and George Soros' Open Society. In fact, Victoria Nuland, the State Department representative for Ukraine,

testified on December 13, 2014 as follows: "We have invested over \$5 billion to assist Ukraine in building democratic skills

and institutions."

The coup that was carried out in Ukraine was carried out by an organization called the Right Sector, and various other organizations associated with it. The Right Sector is an

organization which traces its origin back to Stepan Bandera and

..PAGE

his Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, or the OUN. Which organization collaborated with Hitler during World War II, and carried out mass exterminations of Poles and Jews. The Right Sector celebrates Bandera and actually carries out marches in Kiev and elsewhere in Ukraine celebrating him to this day.

After

World War II, Bandera, this Nazi war criminal, was recruited by

Britain's MI-6; and his top official, Mykola Lebed, who carried

out the Ukrainian exterminations, went onto a CIA payroll as of

1948, thanks to CIA Deputy Director Allen Dulles. The intention

was to use the OUN, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists,

to carry out uprisings against the Soviet Union in the post-World

War II period. People will perhaps recall that Allen Dulles and

James Angleton were very much involved in the Nazi ratlines after

World War II; helping Nazi criminals to escape. Some to South America; others like Bandera and Lebed to London or to the United

States.

Soros himself, who helped fund the Ukrainian coup, was 14 years old when the Nazis occupied Hungary, and he has publicly admitted that during that period, his father and he hid their Jewish background and worked with the Nazi occupation to confiscate the property of fellow Jews who had been sent to the

concentration camps. He actually views this experience very positively, with no regret whatsoever.

Now, let's turn to Charlottesville with this in mind. As I said, the events in Charlottesville last Saturday, I think are very clearly a pre-staged event with Nazis on the one side, anti-fa or anti-fascist violent anarchists on the other side. Remember in thinking about this what happened in Ukraine. There were snipers who fired on demonstrators, and this was blamed on Yanukovych, the President of Ukraine, who says that he never gave any such orders. It is believed that the snipers were actually organized by a third force, or by the Right Sector itself, or a combination of the two; in order to carry out the coup by blaming the violence on Yanukovych. So that should be kept in mind. There's also a longstanding methodology of the British. This was formulated in a book called {Gang Countergang} by a British general by the name of Kitson, who used this methodology in Kenya as part of a counterinsurgency operation against the Mau-Mau. Please show graphic #11 [Fig. 6]. If we look at Charlottesville, what stands out? It's that all of the key Democratic Party operatives involved in the Charlottesville event have direct connections to George Soros, to the Obama-Clinton State Department, and to John Podesta's Center for American Progress; which has become the center for the entire so-called Resist Movement against President Trump in the United States. The Center for American Progress was founded in 2003 by John Podesta. At the time, George Soros promised to donate \$3 million to its foundation. John Podesta, of course, was the campaign manager of Hillary Clinton, and had previously been a senior counselor to President Obama.

..PAGE

The mayor of Charlottesville, a man by the name of Michael Signer, gave a speech on January 31, 2017 in Charlottesville in which he said: "I am here today to declare that Charlottesville, the historic home of Thomas Jefferson, is the capital of the resistance." So, this is January 31st; President Trump had only been in office for about ten days. It's obviously several months before the events which occurred last Saturday. So, this is what we're dealing with in the city of Charlottesville; it is the capital of the resistance to President Trump. Mayor Signer had previously been a senior policy advisor to John Podesta's Center for American Progress. In 2008, he worked with John Podesta on President-elect Barack Obama's State Department transition team. Two years later, he travelled to Panjshir province, Afghanistan as a member of a USAID-sponsored mission to monitor Afghanistan's parliamentary elections. So what you have is a mayor of Charlottesville who works closely with John Podesta's Center for American Progress, which is the center of the resistance; which is obviously a Clinton-Obama operation, which is funded by George Soros. He's also someone who has experience with respect to the State Department. The individual who took the video of the car driven into the

counter protesters, which resulted in the death of Heather Heyer

and the injury of many others, was an individual by the name of

Brennan Gilmore. Gilmore is a former State Department employee.

In 2011, Gilmore was deputy chief of mission in the Central African Republic. In 2015, he was the top aide to Tom Perriello,

a former Congressman who was appointed by Obama to be Special Envoy to the Great Lakes Region and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In 2016, Tom Perriello ran for the Democratic nomination

for Governor in the state of Virginia; a race which he eventually

lost. Brennan Gilmore was his campaign chief of staff. In his

campaign, Perriello received a total of \$500,000 from George Soros personally. He also received \$50,000 from George Soros' son Gregory. Two other sons of George Soros, not to be left out,

Alexander and Jonathan, gave a total of \$135,470 to Tom Perriello. So, Perriello received a grand total of \$685,470 from

the Soros family in his campaign. Perriello also received \$300,000 from Donald Sussman, a hedge fund manager who sits on the board of directors of Podesta's Center for American Progress.

Tom Perriello, like Charlottesville mayor Michael Signer, also worked directly for Podesta's Center for American Progress. In

fact, from 2010 to 2014, Tom Perriello was the President and CEO

of the Center for American Progress Action Fund.

We know that Brennan Gilmore was present at the scene of the Charlottesville events, because it was his video which has circulated very widely. But Tom Perriello was also present,

and

he indicates that with an article which he wrote the day after
—

August 13 — for the publication {Slate}. The article is
entitled “There Is Only One Side to the Story of
Charlottesville”. Of course, this is also the point made by
Joe

..PAGE

Biden, former Vice President, who tweeted at the time, “There
is

only one side to Charlottesville,” in opposition to what
President Trump had said.

Perriello is a native of Charlottesville, and during his
campaign for governor, he tried to position himself as the
candidate of the anti-Trump resistance movement.

Let me just add that there were three other organizations
that were present as part of the counter demonstration, all of
which were funded by George Soros: Progressive Change
Campaign

Committee; Standing Up for Racial Justice; and Refuse Fascism.
But what you have here, in summary, is a US State Department,
George Soros-funded nest of operatives who have worked for
John

Podesta’s Center for American Progress, which is the
institutional center of the resistance movement against
President

Trump. This is the operation which went into action
immediately

after the events in Charlottesville, to escalate the campaign
against President Trump; which we now see spreading throughout
the country. I would point out that this, again, as I
stressed

at the beginning, these personnel — State Department, Soros —
are the same personnel that were involved in the Maidan coup
d’etat in Ukraine against President Yanukovich. It should
also

be pointed out that the only way you can remove a President in

Ukraine, according to the Constitution, is through impeachment.

He was never impeached; it was a violation of the Constitution of

Ukraine. What happened was, an agreement was reached which was

signed on to by European countries as guarantors. When it was presented to the Maidan, they rejected it, and said that they were going to storm the Presidential residence if Yanukovich didn't reverse his position in respect to the EU association.

He

fled the country for fear of his life.

Now we all know what happened to Allende in Chile, so is that unreasonable for him to have fled? And yet, there was an unconstitutional coup and it was backed by the United States; by

Obama, by Hillary Clinton. These are the people who back Nazis

who are attacking President Trump because he says there's violence on both sides; which there very clearly is.

After the incident in Charlottesville, [former] President Obama tweeted a quote from Nelson Mandela: "No one is born hating

another person because of the color of his skin or his background

or his religion." According to twitter, this is the most popular

tweet that has ever been communicated on twitter in its entire history. I think that the Russian Foreign Ministry spokeswoman,

Maria Zakharova, gave a very good response to this. She quoted

from Mandela as follows: "No country can claim to be the policeman of the world, and no state can dictate to another what

it should do. Those that yesterday were friends of our enemies,

have the gall today to tell me not to visit my brother Qaddafi.

They are advising us to be ungrateful and forget our friend of the past.” Then Zakharova addresses Obama directly: “Mr. Obama,

a person was killed with your direct involvement who Nelson Mandela called his brother and thanked for help in gaining
..PAGE

democracy. True democracy; not one invented in the Oval Office.”

She might also have pointed out, as implied by President Putin’s

statement, that it was Obama who installed Nazis in power in Ukraine; and forced a duly-elected President to flee the country for his life.

So, I think what we have here is a very clear case of a deliberate policy being carried out in the United States to overthrow through a coup, through impeachment, or through assassination as {The Spectator} said, a President of the United

States. This has to be stopped. We are circulating a petition

on LPAC, which I would certainly encourage everyone not only to

sign, but to circulate to others. At this moment in history, it’s absolutely crucial that Americans stand up and insist that

the President move on an investigation of the VIPS’ charges as critical to undermining the entire Maidan-style color revolution

which is being attempted against the President of the United States at this moment. That is crucial because, as the article

in the {China Daily} indicates, Trump – as opposed to Obama – is someone who could potentially; and he’s given indications that

he would like to do this; would potentially work with China and

Russia on the One Belt, One Road Silk Road. At the same time, work with President Putin in a coordinated campaign to defeat terrorism. We just had more terrorist attacks in Spain within the last 24-48 hours; so this is not a fight which has been won.

Yet, it's absolutely crucial.

ROSS: I think that's a very strong case you pulled together there, Will. This is very clear; very clear this is a coup. In

terms of the response that this type of material is getting, although the people in the media, or the way that the legacy media report things, you'd think that everybody believes that Donald Trump was put in office by the Russians, and that that's

something thinks is a really important issue; that's not the response we've been getting when we've been talking to the population more generally. So, I'd like to bring on Diane Sare

at this point, and ask you, Diane, what can you tell us about the

opportunity to organize people around this One Belt, One Road Initiative and get past this Trump coup operation?

DIANE SARE: What I can report is that the American population is

not having any of this psycho Goebbels-style propaganda against

the President. It is so over the top that it is impelling and propelling people who were not even Trump voters or Trump supporters to stop at our tables. I will also say, as I told Mr.

LaRouche yesterday, that it's very important to remember in this

context that Lyndon LaRouche has a history in the United

States

as being the spokesman, the leader of something known as the American intellectual tradition. That is, there is no person alive today who has a greater understanding of the work of Alexander Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, the fight

for our republic and its roots in the work of people like ..PAGE

Nicholas of Cusa, Leibniz, and others. Then Lyndon LaRouche.

As

people know, LaRouche has been organizing this fight to get our

republic to live up the principles in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence for at least the last 50-60 years; his entire adult life since he was in the military in World War

II. So, over these decades, LaRouche has been the founder and editor of {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine; we had various newspapers published – {New Solidarity}, the {New Federalist}. We have online news services, a Facebook page.

He

ran for President eight times. As a result, LaRouche has actually a very large following in the American population, who

remember his work; who remember his taking a principled stand on

their behalf when others would not. And who paid the price for

that by undergoing a criminal witch-hunt run by exactly the same

people, down to the individuals like Robert Mueller, who are going after Trump today.

So that combination – LaRouche's record, his authority, his voice; and the fact that the American people have suffered incredible hardship over these last 16 years in particular of Bush and Obama, and the bail-outs of Wall Street and a perpetual

war policy since 9/11 – the media simply does not carry the weight. So what we are getting in the New York metropolitan area, for example yesterday, we had three teams out across the area in Westchester County, Long Island, and New Jersey. Combined, they signed up 32 new members to the LaRouche Political Action Committee; which also means a financial contribution, etc. They got probably 80-100 signatures on the petition; that we'll just mention. The kind of things that are happening is that people are coming up and identifying themselves. In one case, a person came up and said "I'm the chairman of the county Democratic Party. I don't want my party controlled by George Soros. I know this Russia-gate crap is a lie." Republican Party members are coming up and saying "We think the Republican Party should get rid of the elephant, and instead have as its mascot the Cowardly Lion from the Wizard of Oz. Why won't they stand up and defend the President?" People are really furious with both parties. They're furious with the Republican Party for not taking a stand; they're furious with the Democratic Party for taking a stand in the wrong direction. And they remember Lyndon LaRouche very well from these years of fighting. I would say, I think it's crucial what Will mentioned earlier, and what Mrs. LaRouche has been insistent on; that if President Trump were to bring the United States into collaboration with the Belt and Road of China, which would require the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, a national banking system to direct credit into fusion research; things that generate real growth or a real increase in productivity as Mr.

LaRouche outlined in his Four Laws; Trump would go down in history as one of the great leaders of all time. Now so far what

we've seen is that he has a very productive relationship with President Vladimir Putin of Russia; they met for two hours at the

..PAGE

G-20 meeting in Hamburg. You have a ceasefire in Syria as a result. ISIS is getting crushed. You have his relationship with

Xi Jinping of China, which seems to be productive; it makes it possible to resolve the North Korea situation without resorting

to war or military action of any kind. And that's the potential.

On the other hand, what you have is the death of this trans-Atlantic system; namely the British Empire, the City of London, the owners of George Soros – who may think that he owns

the Queen because he handles her offshore accounts, but I would

say it's the other way around – who are desperate. If the United States returns to its American System tradition, which is

what Lyndon LaRouche embodies, then they lose; it's the end of the empire. And it's an era of a New Paradigm for mankind where

Americans can once again have the dream that our children and our

grandchildren will live longer, be better educated, be geniuses

like Beethoven and Einstein, be free to produce from the potential of their God-given talents; that's what the Founding Fathers intended in our nation. That's the potential.

What we're seeing in the streets – and this is across the country; you have to think, this is the greater New York metropolitan area, this is not the part of the country where

President Trump won the election. We got a report yesterday from the West Coast; in the San Francisco, a couple set up in front of a post office. While the postmaster wasn't that thrilled, and had them move their table a little away from the door; they were with their signs to defend President Trump and got a very positive response. Yesterday morning we had organizers up on the Upper West Side of Manhattan; for people who know what that means, that's a liberal Democratic area. They were getting out that {Hamiltonian} that Jason, you were holding up earlier with the big headline "Russia-gate Is a Fraud!" They said when they put up the giant sign that said "Defend President Trump", it got a little bit testier; but they reported really only 1 out of 15 people getting a look on their face like they just sucked on a lemon. Everyone else was either non-responsive or downright supportive; they got out 400 copies of the newspaper there in just 2-3 hours' time. So, the truth of the matter is, the media has lost its mandate. What is published in the {New York Times}, on CNN, the {Washington Post} is simply no longer credible. People who took it upon themselves to watch President Trump's press conference with this pack of howling hyenas, saw that he actually did a very competent job; and therefore the population is prepared for a fight. But I would say that it's very urgent that everyone here take personal responsibility to not be a coward; to add your

name

to the petition; to speak about the coup that is going on against

the President. There is an attempt by the British to depose through one means or another, another American President; and what would be put in place if such a thing were to occur, would

be catastrophic for the United States and mankind. We cannot allow this to occur. I think the American people don't want it

..PAGE

to occur; this is what we've been seeing. The LaRouche Political

Action Committee and Lyndon LaRouche personally, are at the leadership of this fight.

ROSS: I think that's right on. Why don't we take a look at some of the responses that we've been getting from Facebook and

from twitter from the use of this newspaper in particular; that

"Russia-gate Is a Fraud!" Here we go; have a look at some people

on Facebook [Fig. 7]. And we've got some pictures that were sent

into us from twitter as well [Fig. 8]. If you're organizing around this, please tweet things out. #Russia fraud;

#Russia-gate; #Russia-gate fraud; use those hashtags. Make sure

that people are able to find this material, and make it very public. This is a fight that absolutely has to be won to prevent

a coup that will tie the hands of President Trump and prevent us

from being able to have the kind of future that we could have; of

development and growth and cooperation with China. I guess

you

can see a few more here [Fig. 9].

So, get out there! Do this kind of activity. Get people signing up; sign this petition, share it with everybody. When you post your picture on twitter, on Facebook, on Instagram, make

sure you're using the hashtag #Russia Fraud, or #Russia-gate Fraud, or #Russia-gate, or all three of them. And include a link

to the petition. You can contact us for your own personal link;

you can also use the link that we have displayed on the screen several times during this show – that's lpac.co/yt17 – to share

that petition with others. Do outreach. Do it in this manner,

do it in other ways. We need to raise this call to President Trump to take this British apparatus on directly. Unless it's defeated, it's not just going to give up and go away; it has to

be taken on explicitly and taken down. That's the way that we can insure the opportunity to have a different orientation for our country.

So, I think that will do it for the show this week. Very grateful to have had Will Wertz with us in the studio again for

his very comprehensive look on the theme that Charlottesville was

a very directed operation; staged event. Also, that we were able

to have Diane Sare with us today, joining us from the Manhattan

area. Thank you for watching. Please subscribe to the YouTube

channel; make sure you send out this video as well. This is a very comprehensive and excellent statement on the events of a week ago. We'll be seeing more of you here

Helga Zepp-LaRouches Appel til den amerikanske befolkning: Hjælp jeres præsident Trump med at opfylde sine valgløfter og genindføre Glass-Steagall

21. juli, 2017 – Der er nye udviklinger i verden, som de fleste amerikanere virkelig ikke har den fjerneste anelse om, fordi de gængse medier ikke rapporterer om det. Det er, at der meget hurtigt er ved at vokse en ny geometri frem i verden, som præsident Trump relaterer positivt til. For næsten fire år siden indledte Kinas præsident Xi Jinping en politik, som han kaldte den Nye Silkevej. Det, som det rent faktisk er, er – i traditionen efter den asiatiske Silkevej – at opbygge infrastrukturen i planetens indlandsområder i Asien, i Eurasien, i Afrika, i Latinamerika. Denne politik har forandret verden til det bedre. Det er blevet en særdeles attraktiv model, fordi den tilbyder den form for udvikling, der ikke var der før. Derfor er folk i Latinamerika og Afrika meget glade, for de ser for første gang håb og muligheden for at overvinde fattigdom for altid.

Præsident Trump har etableret en meget god relation med præsident Xi Jinping. Lige siden mødet på Mar-a-Lago i Florida

i april, er de to kommet virkelig godt ud af det med hinanden. Der er en meget god kemi mellem dem, og dette møde fungerer virkelig godt. Som et resultat sendte præsident Trump en repræsentation på meget højt niveau til Bælte & Vej Forum, som var et topmøde om dette nye initiativ, og som omfattede 110 nationer. USA blev repræsenteret af Matt Pottinger. I mellemtiden har de indgået mange positive aftaler – investeringsaftaler – især om eksport og import mellem USA og Kina.

Mødet mellem præsident Trump og præsident Putin fra Rusland i forbindelse med G20-topmødet i Hamborg var ligeledes meget positivt. På trods af forsøgene på at forhindre denne form for samarbejde, så indgik de en aftale om en våbenstilstand i Syrien og bragte håb om en afslutning på denne forfærdelige krig i dette land; og de-konfliktionen mellem de to militærstyrker fungerer.

På en anden front, nemlig Nordkorea, har den nye præsident Moon for Sydkorea ligeledes tilbudt direkte samarbejde mellem de to landes militær og diskussioner med Nordkorea. Dette støttes af Kina. Så med præsident Trumps nye, strategiske politik og forbedringen i relationerne mellem USA og Kina, og mellem USA og Rusland, befinder vi os potentielt i en helt ny geometri. Hvis præsidenterne for de tre mest magtfulde lande på denne planet – USA, Kina og Rusland – kan arbejde sammen om at løse problemerne i brændpunkterne, men også mere generelt etablere fuldstændig nye relationer og gå tilbage til en ny detente og afslutning af den Kolde Krig; så er dette så vigtigt for verdensfred og hele menneskehedens levebrød.

Der er dog et stort problem, en Akilleshæl. Det er, at, pga. den enorme kampagne imod Trump, Russia-gate, hele dæmoniseringen af Trump, har det endnu ikke været muligt for ham at opfylde sine valgløfter mht. økonomien. Og USA's økonomi er virkelig i færd med at kollapse; tallene er absolut afslørende. Der er bankerotter, og vi står på randen af at få endnu et kollaps som i 2008; men denne gang langt, langt

større, for alle tallene er langt værre. Infrastrukturen kollapser. I New York har man i øjeblikket »Helvedessommeren«, med brand i tog og folk i panik; dette er simpelt hen en fuldstændig uholdbar situation. Det er derfor ekstremt presserende nødvendigt, at præsident Trump bliver støttet i opfyldelsen af sine valgløfter om at investere *mindst* \$1 billion i den amerikanske infrastruktur. Han har modtaget tilbud fra Kina, der tilbyder at investere \$60 milliard i amerikanske statsobligationer, som Kina ejer, i infrastruktur i USA. Der er andre tilbud om sådanne investeringer.

Problemet er, at der netop nu foregår en stor kamp. Demokraterne, der står bag Russia-gate, vil ikke tage ansvaret for årsagerne til, at de tabte valget; men det var politikken med globalisering, der gjorde de rige rigere og flertallet af befolkningen fattigere, og så selvfølgelig disse interventionskrige, der skaber ødelæggelse over hele planeten. Og Demokraterne vil ikke tage ansvaret for dette, og de vil ikke slippe Russia-gate. Men også de neokonservative i det Republikanske Parti forsøger at forhindre Trump i at forbedre relationerne med Rusland og med Kina; og i særdeleshed i at gennemføre nye love for Wall Street.

Men, dette er den afgørende ting. Trump må opfylde sit valgløfte om at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og gå tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, som han har nævnt i flere taler; at han ønsker at gå tilbage til Alexander Hamiltons, Henry Clays, Abraham Lincolns og Henry C. Careys politik og gennemføre Glass-Steagall. Men han kan ikke gøre det alene. Han er involveret i så mange kampe, at han har brug for jer. Jeg appellerer til jer; støt jeres præsident på dette tidspunkt i hans kamp. Vi befinder os på en enorm, historisk korsvej; vi kan rent faktisk bevæge verden ind i sikkerhed og forsøge at overvinde faren for term nuklear krig og civilisationens udslettelse, for altid. Jeg sagde for flere måneder siden, at, hvis præsident Trump lykkes med at forbedre relationerne med Rusland og Kina, kan han blive én af de

største præsidenter i amerikansk historie. Det er fortsat min absolutte overbevisning; men han kan ikke gøre det alene.

Tillad mig derfor, fra udlandet, at appellere til jer som amerikanske patrioter. Hjælp præsident Trump med aktivt at opfylde sine løfter.

LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium bruger krig og penge til at kontrollere nationer.

EIR-kortvideo, 20. juni, 2017

»Briterne har altid haft magt over os ved at få os ind i krige på steder som Asien. Det er sådan, briterne kører verden; Det britiske Imperium har magten over verden ved hjælp af krige, på samme måde, som de fik imperiemagt, ved at få Europas tåbelige nationer til at gå i krig med hinanden i den såkaldte 70-års krig. Og Europas førende nationer gik i krig mod hinanden i 70 år! Mens briterne stod på sidelinjen og opmuntrede processen og grinede. Og så, i februar af 1763, i Freden i Paris, blev Det britiske Imperium erklæret som imperiet for et privat selskab ved navn Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni (British East India Company), og dette Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni overtog, og blev til, Det forenede Kongerige (UK), og har kørt lige siden frem til dets moderne modsvar – Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni gik selvfølgelig bankerot i en senere periode, der blev indført ændringer, som under Victoria; men princippet forblev det samme: med en maritim

karakteristik, det var oprindeligt bygget på den maritime magt over Middelhavet og bredte sig senere til Atlanterhavet. En søfartsmagt, der havde skabt magten over brugen af penge. Magtgrundlaget var penge. Magten over penge, som en imperieform. Al europæisk imperialism, inklusive britisk imperialism i dag, er ikke baseret på et land-territorium, men er baseret på magten over penge. Disse penge kontrolleres i realiteten af private interesser, af personer, der danner samlinger af private interesser, og som etablerer kontrol over penge, deres skabelse og management. Og nationalstater er underordnet denne internationale pengekontrol. Det britiske Imperium, der udvikledes ud af denne proces, er intet andet end dette. Det er ikke et imperium, der består af befolkningen i UK. Det er et imperium, der består af et internationalt konsortium for denne type af interesser, hvis brug af magt over penge bruges til at have magt over nationer.«

Offentliggjort den 20. juni, 2017.

Lyndon LaRouche at his best—the only statesman alive today who pulls no punches identifying the British Empire. Here, an excerpt from a September 2009 webcast.

This video is copyrighted by EIR News Service Inc. To encourage the widest distribution possible, we encourage you to spread it, repost it, and use it. We will only enforce our copyright if the video is altered in any way other than strict translation into another language or it is placed in a context, which in our sole judgement is racist or defamatory regarding any ethnic or religious group or person.