

Hvad er en infrastrukturplatform? Uddrag af brochuren: Den kommende økonomiske mirakel i USA langs Den nye Silkevej

Det nuværende, amerikanske infrastrukturnet er en katastrofe. Nær ved halvdelen af landets vejstrækninger er i dårlig eller middelmådig tilstand. Hver dag foretages over 178 millioner rejser over broer med strukturelle mangler. Pålidelige kraftværker nedlægges til fordel for vindmøller, som blot producerer strøm, når de har lyst, hvilket forøger risikoen for strømafbrydelser. Afløbs- og flodkontrolsystemer har hårdt brug for vedligeholdelse. Udover den Nordøstlige Korridor bruges passagertog meget lidt.

Men en realøkonomisk investering svarende til over ti billioner dollars kunne bringe vores infrastrukturplatform op til et højere *realøkonomisk* niveau og åbne op for langt mere effektive metoder indenfor industri- og landbrugsproduktion, transport og vandforsyningssystemer.

De efterfølgende sider vil beskrive de hårdt tiltrængte nødvendige projekter i detaljer. Her vil vi tale om hvad infrastruktur rent faktisk er, og om Lyndon LaRouches begreb om infrastruktur-"platformen".

Infrastruktur er liv

Disse grafer (Se side 40 i pdf-versionen nedenunder) (hver prik er et land) viser hvordan levetid og spædbørnsdødelighed hænder sammen med strømforbrug.

Der findes ikke sådan noget som et rigt land, der har et lille strømforbrug. Og der er ikke sådan noget som et fattigt land, der har et stort. Tilgængeligheden af energi – specifikt elektricitet – er et *uundværligt element (sine qua non)* for moderne, industriel udvikling. Det er simpelthen ikke muligt at opnå lange levetider og høje produktionsrater uden elektricitet.

Dampmaskinen banede vejen for den industrielle revolution, som muliggjorde at det samme antal arbejdere kunne producere markant mere. Takket være dampmaskinen kunne kul give en hjælpende hånd i produktionsprocessen, og derigennem reducere afhængigheden af udmattende, manuelt arbejde.

Hvordan gøres elektricitet tilgængeligt, effektivt og i vid udstrækning? Et omfattende netværk af kraftværker og transmissionsledninger er nødvendigt – en enorm investering, men en der betaler *langt* mere tilbage end de fysiske omkostninger.

Det er umuligt at vurdere værdien af et velfungerende netværk af veje, jernbaner eller elektricitet ved at lægge alle værdierne sammen, som kommer hver fabrik eller by til gode. I stedet for gjorde Lyndon LaRouche brug af en indsigt, der var muliggjort gennem Bernhard Riemanns tilgang til de højere transcendentalfunktioner, for direkte at behandle en grundlæggende forandring i et økonomisk stade, *som en helhed*, gennem introduktionen af højere infrastrukturplatforme – en *topologisk*-lignende forandring, som skaber en nyt "infrastrukturfelt" af højere kvalitet.

I 2005 omtalte LaRouche problemet med udlicitering, som ofte skabte finansiell profit, men samtidig realøkonomiske tab:

"Overførslen af produktion fra en nation med veludviklet infrastruktur til en nation med relativt fattige mennesker med en dårligt udviklet infrastruktur, overordnet set, tenderer til at skabe et sammenbrud af planetens fysiske økonomi

betragtet som en helhed. Feltets rolle, repræsenteret af grundlæggende økonomisk infrastruktur, er blevet ignoreret, oftest med skæbnesvangre, økonomiske resultater i sidste ende for alle de involverede.”

Overvej udviklingen af USA's transportnet. Billederne på side 41 (Se pdf-versionen nedenunder) viser hvor langt man kan rejse fra New York City indenfor en hvis tidsperiode. Mellem 1800 og 1830 var området af USA, som kunne nås fra New York indenfor en uge (vist i rødt), blev udvidet enormt. Hvorfor? Se dernæst på situationen i 1857 – man kan praktisk talt se hvordan netværket strækker sig til Midtvesten sammenlignet med manglen på jernbaner længere vest på.

Det nationale jernbanenet – illustreret af den transkontinentale jernbanes fuldførelse i 1869, som blev igangsat takket være Abraham Lincolns bestræbelser – forbandt nationen, og muliggjorde at mere raffinerede produktionsprocesser, som fragtede komponenter til hinanden, kunne finde sted. Varer fra landbruget og industrien kunne nå nye områder, og landområdernes *fysiske* værdi blev transformeret i kraft af den øgede grad af forbindelse med resten af landet (og gennem havne til resten af verden). Befolkningen, —ligeså, kunne langt nemmere rejse, hvilket skabte en stærkere kulturel forbindelse over de enorme vidder.

Disse kombinerede faktorer skabte et økonomisk stade med større muligheder end før jernbanenettets eksistens (frem for blot mere af det som allerede var muligt).

Miljømæssige risici

Det er fordi vi som menneskehed, i stadig større grad interagerer med det syntetiske miljø, som vi har skabt, at vi ligger mindre under for naturens luner. Dødsfald pr. indbygger, i forbindelse med ekstreme vejrforhold, er omtrent ti gange lavere end de var for hundrede år siden. Er det fordi vejret er blevet bedre? Nej, det er fordi vi har udbygget

beskyttelsen mod oversvømmelser, strukturer i stand til at modstå jordskælv, videnskabelig infrastruktur i stand til at forudsige situationer med ekstreme vejrforhold, og transportnet, som kan understøtte sikker evakuering om nødvendigt.

Overvej et eksempel fra den biologiske evolution – varmblodede dyr er i stand til at regulere deres temperatur, i stedet for at begrænse deres levested eller aktivitet til det, som vejret dikterer. Den endotermiske teknologi (det at være varmblodet) gjorde det muligt for pattedyr at udvide deres potentielle levested ved at forandre deres forhold til deres omgivelser.

Den økonomiske, videnskabelige (og kulturelle) platform, som udviklingen af kontrolleret kernefusion åbner op for, vil medføre et nyt skridt i vores udvikling af et forbedret menneskeligt miljø – hvor afsaltning (af havvand) i, størrelsesorden med landbrugets udbytte vil gøre tørker til et fjernt minde fra den tidlige menneskehed, hvor olie, for eksempel, vil blive gemt til brug som et grundlæggende materiale i plastik.

Infrastrukturens helt særlige rolle

Infrastruktur spiller en unik rolle i økonomi og kræver regeringers særlige opmærksomhed. Det faktum, at infrastrukturens fordele er indirekte og ofte ikke pengeskabende betyder, at der ikke er noget håb for den private sektor (såsom offentlige-private partnerskaber).

Et langfristet, infrastrukturprogram med kapitale investeringer – som det, opnået gennem Franklin Roosevelts brug af Finansselskabet for Genopbygning (Reconstruction Finance Corporation), eller Alexander Hamiltons opretning af Nationalbanken – må erstatte privatiseringens plyndring og den ineffektive, stykvisse tilgang, som tynger os ned på nuværende tidspunkt.

Hvad er geopolitik? Første del: Historie.

LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, Lektion 2, 17. feb. 2018

Der var de fortsatte provokationer i Mellemøsten, provokationer i Asien, Koreakrigen, Vietnamkrigen – dette var geopolitik med det formål at bevare Det britiske Imperium. Og desværre, med mordet på Kennedy, blev USA en partner i det, man kunne kalde et »anglo-amerikansk geopolitisk imperium«.

Og hvad gik politikerne ud på? Frihandel, neoliberal økonomi, nedskæringspolitik. Svækkelse af regeringer, svækkelse af ideen om national suverænitet og etablering af institutioner som den Europæiske Union, der ønsker ikkevalgte bureaukrater til at bestemme politikker for det, der plejede at være nationalstater.

Det så ud, som om alt dette kunne ændre sig i 1989, med den kommunistiske verdens fald, med det østtyske regimes kollaps og Berlinmurens fald. På dette tidspunkt interвенerede LaRouche-organisationen meget direkte, for et alternativ til geopolitik. Lyndon LaRouche var blevet fængslet af George Bush, med assistance fra den daværende vicestatsanklager i Boston, Robert Mueller. Men Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte kampen

for det, vi dengang kaldte den Produktive Trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien, og dernæst, så tidligt som i slutningen af 1990, det, der blev kaldt den »Nye Silkevej« eller den Eurasiske Landbro, som et middel til at bringe nationer sammen og overvinde disse kunstige opdelinger, skabt af Det britiske Imperium.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Uden at tilslutte sig Asiens 'Nye Silkevej', står Trump over for et finanskrak

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 7. jan., 2018 – Præsident Donald Trumps administration kan ikke miste flere muligheder, hvis den skal udføre den plan, som det amerikanske folk, først og fremmest, valgte Trump til: At få USA ud af evindelige krige i udlandet og genopbygge og genindustrialisere nationen.

Hvis den store skattelettelse til selskaberne er alt, hvad Trump-administrationens økonomiske politik har at byde på, så står præsidenten og nationen over for et forestående finanskrak og endnu en såkaldt »stor recession«, der er meget

værre end den foregående. Den enorme selskabsgæld og aktiemarkedsboble, som allerede i et årti er blevet skabt med gratis penge fra centralbanken, og som nu er omgivet af det, analytikere kalder »alt-boblen« med andre, eksploderende gældskategorier, kan ikke klare den mindste, kommende rentestigning. Skattelettelser for selskaberne vil ikke redde denne boble, men derimod blot i højere tempo pumpe den op, indtil den eksploderer. Storbanksene på Wall Street og i London kæmper sig ud af denne gæld ved at genforsikre den – samle den i pakker og sælge den videre – vel vidende, at den ikke kan honoreres. Amerikanske bankers sikring af gæld – selskabs-junkgæld, bil- og kreditkortgæld, studentergæld osv. – er vokset med \$1,1 billion, eller 25 %, blot i 2017.

Det Hvide Hus og Kongressen må ganske enkelt trodse Wall Streets gammelkonesnak om Glass/Steagall-loven og genindføre denne lov omgående, for at isolere kommerciel bankpraksis fra denne kasinospekulation, før den eksploderer. Og de må udstede statskredit til ny infrastruktur og et videnskabsprogram som drivkraft for økonomien, og således genopbygge produktivitet og velbetalt, produktiv beskæftigelse.

Men netop heri ligger problemet. Præsidentens møde på Camp David i denne weekend med det Republikanske lederskab, og som angiveligt skulle dreje sig om en 1\$ billion stor infrastrukturplan, ser ikke ud til at fremvise den store diskussion eller det store fremskridt. Desperate tåbeligheder kommer frem – som at omdirigere måske \$2 mia. i annulleret amerikansk hjælp til Pakistan, til byggeri af veje og broer! – hvilket betyder, at Det Hvide Hus absolut ikke har nogen idé om, hvordan et investerings- og anlægsbudget til infrastruktur kan skabes eller finansieres. Selv hjælpen til genopbygning efter katastroferne i de stater og områder, der er hærget af orkanerne – og som omfatter afgørende infrastruktur til elektricitet og storm-kontrol – er blevet forsinket uden nogen som helst handling i næsten tre måneder.

Og dog vil guvernøren for Vest Virginia, når han på onsdag

holder sin tale om Statens Tilstand, bygge på en langfristet forpligtelse på \$80 mia., som han har, fra et kinesisk selskab, støttet af en statsejet bank i Kina. Guvernøren af Maryland, der nu gennemfører forundersøgelser til en maglev-linje (svævetog) fra Baltimore til Washington, har en \$5 mia. stor forpligtelse fra Japan. Er der tale om en mystisk hemmelighed?

Nej, der er snarere tale om en invitation fra Kina, der virkelig er win-win, til USA om at tilslutte sig Bælte & Vej Initiativet for storslåede infrastrukturprojekter; og en voksende »konkurrence« fra Japan for at bruge sine store kapaciteter for infrastrukturteknologi i og for andre lande, i nogle tilfælde sammen med Kina. Og Rusland og Sydkorea gør det samme med byggeri af avancerede kernekraftreaktorer.

Og der er ligeledes tale om USA's første finansminister, Alexander Hamiltons metode til kreditskabelse til ny infrastruktur og teknologier til varefremstilling, som er forklaret af Lyndon LaRouche i det 21. århundredes form. Både Kina og Japan anvender disse metoder til statslig kreditskabelse. Tilbuddet om at tilslutte sig Bælte & Vej Initiativet er der, givet af præsident Trumps gode ven, Kinas præsident Xi. Dette forklares fuldt ud i *Amerikas fremtid på den Nye Silkevej*, som er brochuren om LaRouches »Fire Økonomiske Love«, der uddeles til hele Kongressen.

Den amerikanske præsidents 'Tale om nationens tilstand' den 30. jan. bliver sidste chance for, at denne win-win-strategi skal komme fra administrationen; og Kongressen må under alle omstændigheder tage dette spørgsmål op og vedtage det som lov. Uden dette, og uden Glass-Steagall, vil vi se den gigantiske Wall Street gældsboble og »finansieringsteknikker« blive pumpet op i endnu mange uger og måneder, indtil den brister ned over den amerikanske økonomi.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump vandrer hen ad Det Hvide Hus' vestlige kolonnade / 3. jan., 2018.

Giv amerikanerne nogen anerkendelse / kredit!

Leder fra Larouche PAC, 21. juni, 2017 – Med det rette lederskab afviser amerikanere det britisk-ansporede forsøg på at »kuppe« præsident Trump, tvinge ham ud af embedet gennem impeachment, tilbagetrækning eller endda mord, fordi han ønsker samarbejde med Rusland og Kina. Dette kup, der implicerer Obamas efterretningstjenester og FBI-direktør, har drevet det Demokratiske Parti vanvittigt med antirussisk McCarthy-isme imod Trump – og det taber fortsat valg på grund af det.

Med hensyn til anti-Trump-intrigemagernes motivering, lyt blot til den fanatisk nærige, tyske finansminister, Wolfgang Schäuble, der i går angreb Trump i en tale i Berlin:

»Jeg tvivler på, at USA virkelig mener, at verdensordenen ville være lige så god, hvis Kina eller Rusland ... simpelt hen fik frie hænder til at dominere de indflydelsessfærer, de har defineret for sig selv. Det ville være enden på vores liberale verdensorden.«

Fuldstændig rigtigt – den »liberale« verdensorden, som afindustrialiserede USA's økonomi og gjorde den til en rustbunke, og som amerikanerne stemte for at blive af med. De betroede Trump atter at gøre Amerika til en industrimagt, en teknologisk magt, en magt i den nuværende og fremtidige udforskning af rummet. Kongressen – begge partier – skal omgående gå i gang med at genopbygge og erstatte nationens forældede, økonomiske infrastruktur. Samarbejde med Kina, med dets »Bælte & Vej Initiativ«, der er mange gange større end Marshallplanen, kan på dramatisk vis hjælpe, lige fra

højhastigheds-jernbanenet og til Månelandinger.

I en tale for USA's Handelskammers »topmøde« for udenlandsk investering i mandags, sagde finansminister Steven Mnuchin:

»At arbejde med udenlandske investorer vil blive en afgørende del af enhver infrastrukturplan, vi fremlægger.«

Fint. Mange kinesiske ledere af foretagender blandt de 1.200 deltagere ønsker at se Kina investere i byggeri af ny, amerikansk infrastruktur, gennem amerikanske, statslige kreditinstitutioner som de fire, store nationalbanker, der har finansieret Kinas utrolige infrastrukturgenembrud i de seneste tyve år.

Men dernæst sagde Mnuchin:

»Partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og det private er afgørende ...«

for byggeri af ny infrastruktur – den mislykkede »liberale verdensorden«. Såkaldte PPP'er (Public Private Partnerships), hvor investeringsselskaber vil have deres kapital tilbage inden for 10 år, og 10-12 % årligt afkast, bygger IKKE nye infrastrukturplatforme.

Et netværk af højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer over hele nationen?

Systemer af sluseporte, der ville have beskyttet New Orleans fra orkanen Katrina, og New Yorks transportsystem fra superstormen Sandy?

Afsaltningsanlæg og vidtrækkende vandføringssystemer til kunstvanding af det vestlige USA?

Baser til menneskelig beboelse på Månen?

PPP'er skaber ikke sådanne ting!

Men det gør statskredit. EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, sagde for et par år siden:

»Vi taler om en investering over mere end én generation. Alle de store projekter, som vi nu behøver, ligesom i fortiden, er projekter, der kræver flergenerationsinvestering. Det er at påtage sig gæld, en gæld, der løber over flere generationer. Og én af de ting, vi må mestre i denne henseende, er, hvad er menneskets natur ...

For det første, så er ideen om kredit menneskelig. Det eksisterer ikke for noget som helst, undtagen for mennesket, så vidt vi ved. Vi udarbejder derfor et monetært system, eller et finanssystem, baseret på et system med kredit, hvilket vil sige udviklingen af en person, der videregiver noget, der er til fordel for den næste generation. Og dette er ikke en proces, hvor noget fortsætter; det er en proces, hvor noget udvikles. Og udviklingsenheden er det, vi bør kalde 'kredit'.«

Store projekter ved hjælp af statslig kredit, en gæld, som den næste generation vil kunne »tilbagebetale« ved at bruge infrastrukturen på et højere, teknologisk niveau til at producere og til at leve på et højere, og mere produktivt, menneskeligt niveau. Kun nationer kan skabe den form for kredit, individuelt og gennem internationale udviklingsbanker, som LaRouche har foreslået det i femogfyrre år.

Der er ikke mere tid til at »tale om at bygge en ny infrastruktur«. En nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition til sådan kredit, må skabes nu.

Foto: Finansminister Steven Mnuchin aflægger ed i det Ovale Kontor. (Photo V.P. Mike Pence's Twitter)

Kinas succes påvirker kamp om infrastrukturinvestering i USA

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 31. maj, 2017 – Præsident Donald Trump kan være tæt på endnu et betydningsfuldt skift, væk fra »globaliseringens« døde æra – denne gang er det et amerikansk exit fra Barack Obamas nulvækst »Paris-aftale« – og han er fortsat udsat for ubarmhjertige angreb fra efterretningsstaten. Med endnu et stort, tysk medie, der bringer mord på Trump på banen, denne gang *Der Spiegel*, raser 'globalisterne' for at blive af med ham.

Men amerikanerne stemte for et fundamentalt skift i økonomisk politik for atter at gøre Amerika til en stor, *industriel og teknologisk* nation. Og nu bliver truslen mod Trump fra den såkaldte »deep state«, »staten i staten«, måske modsvaret af udfordringen med de dybe huller i vejene, og de dybe, økonomiske huller, som millioner af amerikanere er faldet ned i.

Det rapporteres, at Trump-administrationen midt i juni til Kongressen vil cirkulere et udkast til amerikanske investeringer i ny, økonomisk infrastruktur og anmode om, at der vedtages love om det hen over sommeren. Og endnu, mens den investering, Trump vil anmode om, synes at blive stadig mindre end de \$1 billion, han talte om under sin valgkampagne, så bliver modforslag fra Demokraterne stadig større.

På vegne af den Demokratiske Progressive Gruppe og valgkreds og fagforeningsgrupper, der støtter dem, fremlagde henved et dusin Demokratiske kongresmedlemmer den 25. maj et krav – i form af en kongresresolution, ikke lovgivning – om mere end \$2 billion i direkte, statslig infrastrukturinvestering hen over 10 år, med betragtelig fokus på højhastigheds-

jernbaneprojekter og nye projekter for vandveje og vandkontrol. Dette fulgte i kølvandet på et lovforslag om \$1,25 billion som statsbevillinger til ny infrastruktur over kun fem år, introduceret af kongresmedlem Brian Higgins (D-NY).

Der er to faktorer, der fremmer disse forslag: det alarmerende sammenbrud af offentlig infrastruktur i større byer og stater; og så entusiasmen hos dem, der kender til Kinas utrolige Bælt & Vej-infrastrukturplatforme og de offentlige tilbud fra Kina og Japan om at investere i en opbygning af infrastruktur i USA.

Beijings Bælt & Vej Forum den 14.-15. maj var en forbløffende succes. Schiller Instituttets stifter Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der gav en præsentation om »Verdenslandbroen« under topmødet og i årtier har arbejdet på spiren til dette Bælt & Vej-initiativ, beskrev forummet som at deltage i udformningen af verdenshistorien til det bedre. Lyndon LaRouche, ophavsmanden til ideen fra 1989 og fremefter, sagde i dag: »Vi har etableret noget på globalt plan, og det er godt.«

Kinas udstedelse af produktiv kredit for at styrke andre nationers økonomier så vel som sin egen, har været unik i verden i et årti, og en politik, der både er konfuciansk og i Hamiltons tradition. Politikken i traditionen efter Hamilton mærkes i Amerika som et potentiale.

En sigende artikel i *Asia Times* den 29. maj havde titlen, »OBOR: Hvordan infrastruktur overtrumfer politik«. Den lægger ud med at diskutere Japans »overraskende« vending mod Kinas initiativer, Bælt & Vej og Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB). Men dernæst, efter en gennemgang af viften af projekter for jernbaner, havne, elektricitet osv. i mange asiatiske lande, vender artiklen sig mod USA.

»For USA er Kinas OBOR-initiativ blevet en multidimensional udfordring, der påvirker nationale anliggender, såvel som

international politik. Kinas fokus på multilaterale udviklingsprojekter har fremhævet et ubehageligt, nationalt spørgsmål for Trump: den amerikanske, civile infrastrukturens affældige tilstand, og Kongressens modstand mod at bevilge de nødvendige midler til at gøre noget ved det ... Amerikas næststørste by, Los Angeles, er indbegrebet af Amerikas smuldrende infrastruktur. På trods af, at byen håber at sikre sig rettighederne til at være vært for 2024-Olympiaden, holdes byen tilbage pga. dens gennemhullede veje med trafikpropper, et aldrende telekommunikationssystem og manglen på pålidelig, offentlig transport. Borgmester Eric Garcetti kom endda med en dybtfølt bøn til Trumps transportminister, Elaine Chao, om at forcere en pakke på \$1,3 mia. til byens undergrundsbane – men det står ikke klart, om administrationen vil føje ham.

»Garcetti går måske til Kina for investering.«

Det viser sig, at Kinas største producent af togvogne, CRRC Corp., allerede bygger 64 nye togvogne til Los Angeles' undergrundsbane, og også til andre byer. Dette er kontrakter, der er udbudt til selskaber: men Kinas præsident Xi og ledere af statsbanker har gjort det klart, at Kina selv kunne investere i kreditydelse til store, nye infrastrukturplatforme, såvel som at være med til at bygge dem; det samme gælder for Japan.

Dette fordrer en statslig, amerikansk kreditinstitution. Ved de Progressive Demokraters begivenhed, understregede *EIR*-repræsentanter over for de tilstedeværende behovet for en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition, som den centrale kilde til kredit, der kan gøre disse projekter mulige.

Foto: Shenzhen-strækningen af Guangzhou-Hongkong Højhastigheds-jernbanen under konstruktion. Maj, 2011. (Foto: Alancrh / wikimedia commons / CC BY-SA 3.0)

Præsident Trump vil genoplive det 'Amerikanske Økonomiske System': Ved I, hvad det vil sige?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. marts, 2017 – I sine taler mandag ved et møde i Kentucky og tirsdag for møder for det Republikanske Parti, understregede præsident Donald Trump, at han har til hensigt at lede landet til en tilbagevenden til det »Amerikanske Økonomiske System«. Efter meget kvalificerede iagttageres skøn »mente præsidenten det virkelig« begge gange – han ønsker at vende tilbage til den faktiske, økonomiske politik, der blev ført af Alexander Hamilton og George Hamilton, Henry Clay og Abraham Lincoln: det »Amerikanske System«.

Er Trump den præsident, der kan føre USA tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System? Det er stadig ikke afgjort og afhænger også af landet – af os, af jer. Bør vi vende tilbage til det? Absolut.

Med enkelte undtagelser ved de fleste amerikanere, og andre landes borgere, ikke længere, hvad det Amerikanske Økonomiske System var. Det blev defineret af Abraham Lincolns økonom Henry C. Carey, for eksempel, som det »Amerikanske System«, *i direkte modsætning til det »Britiske System« med frihandel.*

De samme briter, der, i løbet af det seneste år, har stået bag McCarthy-kampagnen for at miskreditere Donald Trump og drive ham ud af Det Hvide Hus.

»Få ram på Trump«-McCarthyismen er britisk, fordi Trump – efter årtiers katastrofal »globalisering« og afindustrialisering – ønsker at vende tilbage til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System. Og han erkender fordelene ved fred, ved at standse Bush' og Obamas endeløse krige, og ved at samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at stoppe det.

Et »dossier« fra britisk efterretning om Donald Trump, produceret for Hillary Clinton, var således begyndelsen på at forvandle det Demokratiske Partis lederskab til en McCarthy-hob, på jagt efter »russere«, der lurder bag hver søjle i Det Hvide Hus.

Det Amerikanske Økonomiske Systems grundpiller var:

- 1) beskyttelse og støtte af amerikansk produktion således, at USA kunne blive den storslåede, producerende nation, det blev;
- 2) en konstant promovering og opbygning af den mest moderne, nationale infrastruktur, af de samme grunde – de transkontinentale jernbaner, det nationale hovedvejssystem, Apollo-Måneprojektet; og
- 3) et kreditsystem, baseret på national (statslig) bankpraksis, som den store finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, havde opfundet.

I dag vil dette sige at lukke Wall Streets kæmpekasinoer ved at genindføre Glass/Steagall-loven; at etablere en nationalbank i traditionen efter Hamilton, til infrastruktur og varefremstilling; at investere billioner i ny infrastruktur af den højeste, teknologiske standard; at udvikle fusionskraft, vende tilbage til Månen og det dybe rum med menneskelig kolonisering og udvikling.

Dette er, hvad *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, økonom i det Amerikanske Systems tradition, Lyndon LaRouche, for nylig har udviklet som »Fire Love« for at redde den amerikanske økonomi.

Det Amerikanske System betød også Monroe-doktrinen – at det unge USA ville gøre alt, der stod i dets magt, for at holde de britiske og franske finansimperier ude af de amerikanske kontinenter, så alle disse kontinenters nationer kunne udvikle deres økonomier og indgå gensidige handelsaftaler, til fælles fordel.

I dag vil det Amerikanske System sige at koble sig til Kinas Nye Silkevejsinitiativ, hvor 60 nationer er i færd med at indgå sådanne aftaler inden for et »win-win«-paradigme.

Schiller Instituttet og *EIR* er i færd med at opbygge en stor, international konference i næste måned i New York City for at bringe Trumps USA ind i dette nye paradigme, hvor det »Amerikanske System« kan blomstre.

Præsident Trumps forståelse af det Amerikanske System i dag er elementær, men alvorligt ment. Jo flere amerikanere, der ved, hvad det *skulle betyde*, og handler på det, desto bedre chancer er der for, at det Britiske Systems »globaliseringsæra« vil slutte under hans præsidentskab.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump modtager en NASA-flyverjakke tirsdag, den 21. marts, 2017, efter at have underskrevet 'NASA Transition Authorization Act of 2017' i det ovale værelse i Det Hvide Hus i Washington, D.C.

**Tillykke med 260-års
fødselsdagen,**

Alexander Hamilton!

»At værdsætte og stimulere det menneskelige intellekts aktivitet ved at mangedoble områderne for foretagsomhed, gennem hvilke en nations rigdom kan fremmes.«

– Alexander Hamilton (11. jan., 1757 – 12. juli, 1804).

»Sammenhængen mellem intellektets opdagelser og forøgelsen af arbejdskraftens produktive evne, er kernen i Det amerikanske, økonomiske System. Det, jeg har præsteret, er at vise, at det er muligt at forudsige rent matematisk raterne af den forøgede, fysisk-økonomiske vækst, som vil blive resultatet af en faktisk anvendelse af en specifik form for intellektuel produktion af ny teknologi. På denne baggrund har jeg været i stand til at levere et nyt, stærkere, videnskabeligt bevis for de grunde til, at Hamiltons Amerikanske System fremmer depressionsfri, økonomisk vækst, og grunden til, at Adam Smiths doktrin altid vil føre en nation ud i nye katastrofer.«

– Lyndon LaRouche, »In Defense of Alexander Hamilton«, 1987.

Læs hele Lyndon LaRouches artikel her:

http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42_4402.pdf

Trumps vending mod Glass-Steagall

åbner feltet for LaRouches Fire Love

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. oktober, 2016 – I sidste uge fremførte kandidat Donald Trump et direkte krav om gennemførelse af det 21. Århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov samtidig med, at han udstedte en ligefrem advarsel om, at Hillary Clintons sindssyge dæmonisering af Vladimir Putin og hendes krav om militær konfrontation med Rusland og Syrien allerede har bragt verden til randen af atomkrig. Hvad så siden Trumps motivation er, så har dette placeret de spørgsmål, som med Lyndon LaRouche er blevet internationalt fastlagt, i centrum for den amerikanske, politiske krise.

I dag responderede LaRouche til dette skift under en diskussion med sine medarbejdere, ni dage før det amerikanske præsidentvalg:

»Trump er kommet ud med Glass-Steagall. Han fremlagde argumentet. Desuden hader han Hillary Clinton og foragter Barack Obama. Trump har et enormt ego, og det betyder, at han ønsker at gøre noget stort og vigtigt. Men alt dette betyder, at der er noget, vi potentielt kan arbejde med. Dette betyder, at det vigtigste er det, som vi må sige den til kommende administration om det, der må gøres. Det faktum, at Trump støtter Glass-Steagall, er nu en fastslået kendsgerning, og dette er et sted at begynde, men kun et sted at begynde. Vi forstår, hvad der må gøres, overordnet set, for at vedtage en politik i Hamiltons tradition for at redde USA. Det er, hvad der virkelig tæller. Og dette budskab giver genlyd.«

Situationen i USA er fuld af dæmonisering og frygt i takt med, at amerikanske familiers levestandard i hastigt tempo kollapser, og i takt med, at borgerne ikke ser noget håb i valget.

LaRouche bemærkede:

»Situationen her er så rådden, at det giver anledning til stor bekymring. Den typiske, amerikanske borger har ingen stolthed eller tro på sig selv. Der findes ingen pragmatiske løsninger. Der findes intet i USA, med undtagelse af det, vi stiller krav om som presserende løsninger, og som begynder med Glass-Steagall, men dernæst fortsætter med en omgående lancering af massive kapitalinvesteringer af statslig kredit til infrastruktur og andre projekter, for at styrke økonomiens produktivitet som helhed. Dette betyder en genoplivelse af et statsligt, nationalt banksystem efter Hamiltons principper. Sådan skal det være.«

»Der er en reel fare for afslutningen af civilisationen. Der findes ingen andre muligheder end afgørende handlinger, af den art, som jeg har forklaret i mine **Fire Økonomiske Hovedlove**. Det er den virkelige proces.«

Disse Fire Hovedlove begynder med Glass-Steagall, sammen  med en tilbagevenden til et Nationalt Banksystem i Hamiltons tradition, som middel til at udstede kredit til realøkonomien, der som sin spydspids og drivkraft har videnskab, med udvikling af fusionskraft og en genrejsning af NASA og rumforskning og rumfart.

»Vi er på vej ind i noget, vi aldrig før har set – lige nu«, sagde LaRouche.

»Der findes ingen vilje inden for det transatlantiske område til at handle for at løse nogen af disse problemer. Det er i Eurasien, at vi finder den reelle indsats. Det er dér, de store initiativer finder sted. Putin gør vigtige ting, men han er også bevidst om sin egen positions svaghed, og han medregner dette i sine beslutninger og handlinger.«

Det er presserende nødvendigt at dumpe Obama, men tiden er knap. Vi må omgående, nu, såvel som også dagen efter valget,

handle på det skift, som Trumps initiativ har skabt, uanset udfaldet af valget – at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og det fulde LaRouche-program for at genindføre en **politik efter Hamiltons principper**.

Alexander Hamiltons vision & LaRouches Fire Love – afgørende redskaber til at redde USA.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 28. oktober, 2016

»Jeg tror, vi kan sige, at vi befinder os ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt i verdenshistorien, og ved et meget dramatisk vendepunkt for vores nation. I løbet af de seneste uger, som I har kunnet følge på LaRouchePAC's webside, har vi mobiliseret en national mobilisering for at sætte hr. Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske program på dagsordenen, under betegnelsen 'De Fire Hovedlove; de Fire Nye Love til USA's økonomiske genrejsning', og disse love er baseret på Alexander Hamiltons fundamentale principper og hans arbejde med at etablere en videnskab om økonomi, der opbyggede USA. Vi har lanceret en kampagneside for mobilisering, og jeg vil direkte fremhæve, at det er vores dagsorden at bringe det amerikanske folk ind i denne mobilisering for at gøre jeres forståelse af, hvad det er for økonomiske principper, som Hamilton skabte, dybere; og hvad det er, som hr. LaRouche har inkorporeret i disse Fire

Love.«

Engelsk udskrift:

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast October 28, 2016

**ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S VISION & LAROCHE'S FOUR LAWS –
ESSENTIAL TOOLS TO SAVE THE UNITED STATES**

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's October 28, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us here for our Friday evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio

tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and we have via video, Kesha Rogers, a member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, former candidate for the United States Congress and United States Senate, joining us from Houston, Texas.

I think it can be said that we are at a very dramatic turning point in world history and a very dramatic turning point

for our nation. Over the last several weeks, as you've been following the LaRouche PAC website, we have mobilized a national

mobilization to put on the agenda Mr. Lyndon LaRouche's economic

program; this is under the name of "The Four Cardinal Laws; the

Four New Laws for the Economic Recovery of the United States", and it's grounded in the fundamental principles of Alexander Hamilton and his work establishing a science of economics which

built the United States. We have launched a mobilization page,

and I'll say right up front that our agenda is to bring the American people into this mobilization to deepen your

understanding of what the economic principles are that Hamilton created; and what Mr. LaRouche has embodied in these Four Laws.

This is not something which is only important for the national stage; but this is shaping a paradigm shift which is currently ongoing on the international stage. We saw two weeks ago the dramatic shift, the realignment of the Philippines with President Duterte's trip to China; saying that he is realigning his country with the ideological flow of the Eurasian allied countries that are now creating a new economic paradigm. And we saw this expressed very clearly in a speech that Russian President Vladimir Putin gave at the 2016 annual Valdai international discussion club proceedings. We'll get into some of the details of that, but Putin's emphases are very clear, and I think they include some of the subjects that we will be discussing here tonight. Number one, the danger of the NATO/Obama posture which has now brought us perilously close to the outbreak of World War III; a war that nobody is seeking on the Russian side, as Putin made very clear. And also, the urgent necessity of an entirely new economic paradigm to bridge the gap between a small number of very wealthy Wall Street speculators and a very large number of poverty-stricken, not only people, but also nations; and to bring technological progress to all, and to have that be the paradigm for relations among nations.

So, we'll get into those subjects, but I think first

and
foremost, the issue of Glass-Steagall; the necessity of
shutting
down what is now clearly the bankrupt Wall Street regime, and
what has to necessarily follow after that. The Hamiltonian
Four
Laws that Mr. LaRouche has specified, I think is now very
clearly
on the agenda. So, I'm going to ask Jeff to just start with a
quick briefing of some of the matters that we've discussed
with
Mr. LaRouche over the last 24 hours, and then we can proceed
with
a discussion of the implications of these developments.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I think that there
are
four or five things that I would really highlight in terms of
significant new developments just in the time since last
Friday's
broadcast. Number one, as Matt indicated, President Putin
delivered a very powerful speech at the closing session of the
Valdai conference that took place this week in Sochi, Russia.
There were representatives there from all over the world,
including at least a number of people there from China. I
think
what President Putin did was not so much break new ground, but
make very clear that Russia and he himself are fully committed
to
moving ahead with the collaboration with China, with the other
BRICS countries on bringing about a new paradigm of relations
among nation-states; based on a policy of clear war avoidance
built around cooperative economic investments in great
projects
– including major advances in science, including the
advancement
of man's mastery over space. So, Putin in a certain sense,

reinforced what we saw at the G20 meeting in Hangzhou in China;

what we saw at the BRICS heads of state summit meeting more recently in Goa, India. So, Russia is all-in on that, and he made the point very clearly, that the collapse of the Western financial system is the principal factor driving the world towards an extraordinarily dangerous situation, where you could

have an outbreak of world war – even thermonuclear world war – as the result of provocative actions born of desperation. I think that whole picture is one element of what's really changed in this last week.

Now, I spent the last 48 hours – Wednesday and Thursday of

this week – attending an annual conference in Washington, DC of

the National Council on US-Arab Relations. There were about 1000

people there, and it was widely attended by the diplomatic community, particularly the Arab diplomatic community; by the US

business sector that deals with the Gulf States. At the very closing of the conference, Thursday evening, there was a concluding keynote presentation by General David Petraeus – formerly the head of the Central Command, formerly the Director

of the CIA. He made a very bold set of proposals that unfortunately dovetailed very precisely with the kinds of things

that have been coming out of Hillary Clinton and the Clinton campaign throughout this Presidential election. What General Petraeus called for was both the creation of safe zones inside Syrian sovereign territory, the creation of a no-fly zone over a

large portion of Syrian territory, and he called for the United

States to use both sea-based and air-based cruise missiles to knock out the Syrian air force. Now, he very cavalierly said of course this brings on the danger of a war with Russia; but he brushed that aside, saying, Vladimir Putin responds to power, and responds to serious threats to use power. Therefore, in the face of these kinds of actions, Putin will back down.

Now, we're talking about American and Russian air assets engaging in a very limited theater of action, where we've so far avoided a major incident that could have led to general war because of a deconfliction agreement that fortunately still remains in force between the US-led coalition on the one side, and Russia on the other. But what's being proposed here is a complete overturning of that policy. We know that this is exactly what Hillary Clinton is calling for in her own Presidential campaign speeches. There have been recent studies presented on behalf of the Clinton campaign by the Center for a New American Security and the Center for American Progress, that go almost as extremist as General Petraeus' statements. Basically, the war danger cannot in the least underestimated; and the fact is that President Putin – in his Valdai speech – was very clear about that danger.

Now, on the larger issue of the immediacy of the blow-out of the financial system of the trans-Atlantic region, everybody is really on the edge of their chairs over the fact that the US Department of Justice and Deutsche Bank are still parrying around

back and forth and have not reached a decision yet on a proposed 14 billion euro fine for Deutsche Bank's criminal activity during the mortgage-backed securities crisis leading into the 2008 blow-out. Deutsche Bank is on the edge of collapse; it's widely acknowledged. The major German financial press, led by {Handelsblatt}, writes about this virtually every day. We know that the Italian banking system is also on the verge of a blow-out with 360 billion euro in non-performing debt on the books of the larger Italian banks. So, it is absolutely true that we're on the precipice of a potential financial blow-out far worse than Lehman Brothers in 2008.

It's in that context, that I think it's very important to take note of the fact that earlier this week, Donald Trump delivered a speech in Charlotte, North Carolina, in which he explicitly called for the implementation of a 21st Century Glass-Steagall. He also warned that if Hillary Clinton is elected President, the chances grow enormously that we will be facing World War III at some point very soon; and he cited the Syria events that I've already talked about as a kind of a key element of that situation. Many people are scratching their heads and saying, where did this from in terms of Trump suddenly coming out for Glass-Steagall? It's only 12 days before the Presidential election that this speech came out.

I had the opportunity to someone who's been involved in Washington politics as a kind of insider for a very long time; and his view was that he was expecting something like this to come out of the Trump campaign, out of Donald Trump. It could have been more effective if it had happened in September, but whether he's being opportunistic or whether he genuinely means

it, the fact is that the Glass-Steagall issue has now been basically re-infused into the Presidential elections at a critical kind of countdown moment before November 8th. And there's really no downside to that. Whatever the outcome of the election, Glass-Steagall is an essential policy issue that must be implemented immediately. It's the first step of Mr. LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws for how to carry out an economic recovery; and Mr. LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws on based explicitly on the four key reports to Congress by Alexander Hamilton when he was Secretary of the Treasury. So, we're reaching back for policies that have a long-time proven track record of success. Donald Trump didn't just simply blurt out "Let's have Glass-Steagall." By accounts of people who closely watched that speech down in Charlotte, this was the most thoroughly composed and well organized speech of his entire Presidential campaign. The next morning, in a TV interview with Fox, Wilbur Ross, who is one of a group of "billionaires" who are key economic policy advisors to Trump, basically reinforced the point that Trump had made the day before in Charlotte. This is a bit of an exchange between Fox News' Maria Bartolino and Wilbur Ross:

BARTOLINO: Donald Trump yesterday called for a 21st Century version of the 1933 Glass-Steagall law that requires the separation of commercial and investment banking. Talk to us about this, because we all know what Dodd-Frank has done to the financial services sector; and lending has become tougher. That's become one of the issues for this economy. Tell me

about
the 21st Century version of Glass-Steagall.

Ross was absolutely clear and familiar with what Trump was referring to the night before. He said:

ROSS: Well, the banks. It isn't so much that they're too big; it's that they're too complex. Too complex and too complicated internally. Think about how much the big banks – you have to know every geography in the world; you have to know every kind of obscure kind of product in the derivatives market. That's an awful big menu for anybody to absorb. We think it might be better for the banks to stick to lending, and instead of making more restrictions on lending, make it easier for them to make loans. Think about it. When you were suing banks every day for the loans that they've made the day before, it's not the way to encourage them to make new loans. They're making banks gun-shy.

And she asks, "Are you saying there should be more separation?"

ROSS: I think the more important thing is sensible regulation rather than just regulation for the sake of regulation. When you think about it, with all these fines over sub-prime lending, can you name a single person who was ever dispossessed from a house that didn't actually have a mortgage, wasn't delinquent on it and deserved to be foreclosed? There isn't one case where that's been proven, so it's punitive

regulation, it's punitive law enforcement rather than anything very sensible.

This was clearly not just simply a stab in the dark. We don't know whether this is a serious commitment to the policy. But we do know that there is mass popular support for Glass-Steagall. That's why it wound up in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. We know there was a fight inside the Hillary Clinton campaign, in which a number of her key advisors urged her to also come out and support Glass-Steagall, which she refused to do. The Bernie Sanders supporters, the Elizabeth Warren supporters, those who are mainstay voters for the Democratic Party, are as adamant about the need for Glass-Steagall as some on the Republican side.

So, the issue is that this now squarely on the table. It's the final ten days before the Presidential elections, and so therefore, now is the moment for this issue to be driven home, forcefully, and for Congress to take this up as their first order of business when they return after the November 8th elections, regardless of the outcome. The mandate is there. It's now a fundamental issue in the Presidential debate in these closing days. Again, whether Trump is serious about this, or this was a political stunt, nevertheless, the issue has been injected very substantially into the final moments of this Presidential campaign, and there's no downside to that having happened.

OGDEN: Mr. LaRouche's ideas are very powerful, and they

stand on their own. Mr. LaRouche has not responded to the change

of the time. He has been very, very clear for years, on the {urgent} necessity of Glass-Steagall, and has forecast that we would in fact reach this point again. Deutsche Bank is blowing out. It's worse than Lehman 2008. The fact that Glass-Steagall was not reinstated, as Mr. LaRouche called for, immediately following the 2008 crash, is what has brought us to this point.

Kesha was involved in a high-profile Senate campaign, several high-profile House campaigns. Other members of the LaRouche PAC

Policy Committee also ran for federal office four, six years ago,

on a Glass-Steagall platform, and made that the definitive national issue. To the extent that there's been any serious discussion in this Presidential campaign, it has been around the

question of Glass-Steagall. This was brought up in the Democratic

debates by two candidates – Martin O'Malley, Bernie Sanders also

brought it up; Hillary Clinton said, "No!"

This is now the {defining} question. And as you said, Jeff,

what this shows is that there is {overwhelming} popular support:

both Party platforms. Now you have a situation in which the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall is virtually hegemonic. It would

be tragic were the Congress not to take the immediate action to

reinstate this – do not wait for the inauguration – immediately

after returning to Washington. Glass-Steagall has got to be reinstated, because if we wait, and Deutsche Bank or one of these

other banks blows out, I guarantee you, we are in a far worse situation that we were, even in the Crash of 2008.

So I think the defining question is there. The necessity for the depth of the Hamiltonian principles – which Mr. LaRouche has made very clear – stand on their own. It's not a question of has somebody validated Lyndon LaRouche; the question is Lyndon LaRouche's ideas stand on their own, and have been the defining questions, and have now reached the point where it's undeniably hegemonic, and the point of no return is coming very soon, unless these ideas are acted on.

STEINBERG: Let me throw something else in on this. I think there's an important lesson to be learned from the just-concluded, successful fight over the summer into September, around first, the release of the 28 pages from the original Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11; and then what followed after that, with the overwhelming House and Senate override of President Obama's veto of the JASTA Bill, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. As was the case for some time with JASTA, the issue is that once it was going to come to a vote, there was no question that there was overwhelming support for it. There was a political mobilization. LaRouche PAC led that fight, along with the families and survivors of 9/11, and others as well, to make sure it was actually brought to a vote. The same is true of Glass-Steagall right now. There's got to be a

groundswell

of pressure on the leadership of the House and Senate, to bring it to a vote.

I have no doubt whatsoever that given all of the factors that we've been discussing, that if a vote were allowed to be taken, say on November 14-15, whatever it is the day that the House and Senate return to Washington for the beginning of the "lame duck" session, that should be on the table. It should be brought to the full floor of the Senate and the House. The bills exist in both Houses. The language is compatible. This could be done in a very short period of time. If you look at the way that the JASTA vote proceeded just before the recess, the whole thing took place in the course of {one day}. There was a morning vote and debate in the House. It went immediately to the Senate in the afternoon; because the leadership recognized that the American people {demanded} that this happen. There was a mobilization. There was a sense of timing. And there is no reason in the world that the same thing can't happen before the middle of next month with respect to Glass-Steagall.

As Matt just said, and as Thomas Hoenig, [vice chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] has been arguing for years, Glass-Steagall has to be put in place {before} the blow-out, because once you get that blow-out, Congress will be stampeded by Wall Street and London into another bail-out, and you're going to be off to the races. It's going to be a

disaster.

This is something where the will of the American people has to be heard. That's the context in which we're looking at the fact that Trump chose at the last moment to inject Glass-Steagall into his campaign rhetoric for the final countdown days before the election.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. I think it's important to understand that LaRouche "drew the line in the sand" a long time ago. He set the standard of the Glass-Steagall representing the first step to bringing down Wall Street, this financial speculation, and the continued protection and defense of Wall Street, of this British imperial system of the City of London, meant the death of the nation and society as a whole, because we're seeing what this is doing to impact the United States through the continued economic collapse that's devastating the entire nation, the rate of increase in poverty. This has all been a product of Wall Street's total destruction of our nation.

And so, this fight for Glass-Steagall – LaRouche has led it in the highest terms possible, because it represents a saving of the American people. It's the identity of what has to shape the future for this nation. I think it's really important that, as we've continued to have discussions with Mr. LaRouche – the Policy Committee and others – he defined very clearly that the issue at hand is, what is going to be necessary and the standard

set for creating a standard by which credit is defined. And this

is what he has gone back to, with implementing the Hamiltonian standard for the United States and for the world with his Four Laws. Representing the context by which we can instill in the American people a standard of economic value which is not based

on money, not based on the idea that you can just pump money into

small infrastructure projects here and there. But he made very clear that you have to have an international program based on the

principle of a credit policy as Alexander Hamilton understood —

and this is why he has been very emphatic; that the American people have to read, master and understand the works of Hamilton

today as never before. This is what Franklin Roosevelt understood. People are adopting and taking up the policy for restoring Glass-Steagall which LaRouche has made a household name. Franklin Roosevelt really understood the enemy. He understood that this house of cards of Wall Street was crumbling,

it had to be brought down; just as LaRouche understands today. Many people who've put their name on the docket for Glass-Steagall have been called by Wall Street "Public Enemy Number One," and so forth.

How do we really look at this, from the standpoint of what

we're dealing with a population that has lost a sense — and Mr.

LaRouche really captured this today, very profoundly — of their

own mind; the ability of their own mind to actually know how to

fight this enemy and know how to create the future which they so

desperately desire and need? What you really see right now is that they're being given an opportunity to participate in something very profound and unique. If we look at what's being presented by LaRouche's policies being adopted throughout the world right now, the standard that's been set in China. The standard for the future that's been set in Russia to defy and to deny this policy of thermonuclear war and destruction. Of going after the future and the youth of the nation, that the international standard that's being set right now for a program based on these Hamiltonian principles, can {clearly} be seen by what China is doing and actually representing for a total revolution, total renaissance for generations to come, in the standards they're setting with their space program.

Because when Mr. LaRouche said you have to have an international program that defines an economic standard of value, of credit, in this nation and across the planet, that's the first thing to look at. The fact that China just launched a new initiative, a total breakthrough putting them front and center stage in the development of their space program; when Obama has continued to kill the space program with the egregious budget cuts, with the turning over our space program to the private sector in the United States. The policy to continue to bail out Wall Street financial speculation instead of actually giving a national mission, as Kennedy understood was absolutely important, is something that can no longer be tolerated.

The inspiration is the crucial key at hand right now. People have lost faith and confidence and inspiration in this nation,

in

the system of this nation, because it has become a system of gambling, of debt, and it has gone away from the principles which

were defined by our US Constitution. So when you look at the inspiration you're seeing from China, with the just launching of

their spacecraft with two tyconauts from China, the Shenzhou-11

to dock with the Tiangong-2 space lab, what we have now seen China do is to actually create an international process of collaboration and development. Just as they've offered for the United States to cooperate, in a win-win strategy for the Silk Road, which nations around the world are taking up. This is defining a new standard of value and wealth.

Now, what's the standard in the United States? Jeff can say

more on this, because he just did a presentation that I would encourage people to look at on the website. It's death. The drug

overdoses. If you don't have a policy of inspiration for your youth and for the nation, what are people going to turn to?

What

is going to be the standard and value and the understanding of the creativity, the creative potential of their own minds?

I'll

just say, before I got on this discussion, I was speaking to a lady 40 years old; she has a 23-year old son who she's paying thousands of dollars to get him off of drug overdoses from prescription medicines and pills. Three of his friends who she

knows very closely just died within the last year of drug overdoses from heroin. First starting with painkillers, then finding this heroin, just as you said, Jeff. Because people have

been denied a future that they can have a sense of their truly human identity; that they have a purpose and reason to live.

Wall Street can and must be brought down, because the fight that was won with JASTA was just the beginning. If we don't finish off this policy of the British Empire and the Saudis funding of terrorism and funding of drug epidemics in the United States coming from Afghanistan, the drug trafficking, everything we've been seeing as the destruction of this nation, then we won't have a nation. We're seeing that very rapidly take place; this dark age has to be stopped.

I think a lot of people are understanding that LaRouche is giving them an opportunity for life and for determining and fighting for a future.

OGDEN: Yeah, I do want Jeff to say more about that interview, that short statement that he posted on the website. Let me just underscore what you just said; I think it's extraordinarily important. People lack the confidence in their own mind; they lack the confidence in their own ability to positively imagine and create and define a future. What comes in the void of that? It's anger, it's fear, it's demoralization. Our job is to give people their dignity back. We have to give them the confidence in themselves as meaningful human beings. I think that was very clearly demonstrated with what we accomplished – the Schiller Institute along with the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – with this extraordinary series of concerts over the weekend of the 15th anniversary of September 11th in New York City. This was a presentation of Mozart's {Requiem} and four African-American spirituals at

four
different venues across New York City and New Jersey. The
confidence and the dignity that gave to people, including
people
who were engaged as you said, Jeff, in the fight, the
victorious
fight to declassify the 28 pages and to pass the JASTA bill
and
override the White House's veto, I think speaks directly to
that
point.

Coincidentally, there's one very short passage in this
speech that Putin gave at the Valdai discussion which says
almost
exactly what you just said, Kesha. He said, "It is very clear
that there is a lack of strategy and a lack of ideas for the
future. This creates a climate of uncertainty that has a
direct
impact on the public mood. Sociological studies conducted
around
the world show that people in different countries and on
different continents tend to see the future as murky and
bleak.
This is sad. The future does not entice them, but rather,
frightens them."

So, our job is to create a potential for a future
which
entices the creative dignity of people and allows them to
escape
this – as you eloquently said – dark age of drug overdoses,
death, and depression.

STEINBERG: I think it's important to also take note
of the
fact that just in the past two weeks, millions of American
households have received word that their Obamacare health
insurance premiums are going up by 20%, 30%, 50%, in some

cases I

know of directly, 70-80%. The administration was facing a torrent of news coverage admitting that Obamacare was finished.

Insurance companies are pulling out of the pools, and Obama came

out with this completely vacuous, lying statement claiming he'll

create some kind of a federal pool so that people can get reasonably-priced health insurance. The fact of the matter is,

at the very outset of this whole business, Obama shut the door on

expanding Medicare for all; shut the door on any other formulation of a single-payer plan. The cutbacks in the amount

of money being spent on health care has meant that by Hill-Burton

standards – in other words, the physical requirements; how many

hospital beds, how many doctors, how many nurses, what kinds of

specialty care have to be made available – the physical infrastructure of health care has collapsed under Obama, as people are finding their rates skyrocketing through the ceiling.

Obama personally came out with another lie to cover for the reality of what he created; namely claiming that the premium increases for most people will be covered by increases in taxpayer subsidies. But what he failed to say was that the only

people who qualify for those subsidies are people who are living

at or below one and a half times the poverty rate. So, anybody

in the middle class, anybody even barely above that 1.5 times the

poverty rate is out of luck; and they're being confronted with a choice – health care vs. housing; health care vs. food; in many, many cases health care vs. whether you can get your kids a college education. So, you've got that phenomenon that's staring the American people in the face; it's the collapse and disintegration of Obamacare, which is what Lyndon LaRouche warned about and forecast all the way back in 2009 when this thing was first started.

Then you've got the second phenomenon. Remember that President Obama, during his initial campaign for office back in 2008, basically distanced himself from the Bush-Cheney Iraq war, but took full ownership of the Afghanistan war; which he called a war of necessity as opposed to a war of choice. Well, we're now eight more years into it, and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime last week came out with a report that Afghanistan – under US and NATO occupation – has produced a bumper crop of opium; up 43% to 4800 tons of pure opium produced this year. We know the consequences of that; cheap heroin is flooding onto the streets of the United States in every community, not just inner-city ghetto areas, but middle-class suburbs, rural areas. There is not a county in the United States that is not experiencing an opioid epidemic; and that's not our words, those are the words of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention

—

"epidemic".

You've had a major increase every year under Obama of deaths by opioid overdoses. It goes hand-in-glove with the shutdown of the health system, the flooding of the country with illegal drugs, the refusal of the Obama administration, number one, to crack down on HSBC – the British Opium War bank that was caught by the United States Senate as the number one drug-money launderer for the Latin American drug cartels. Nothing was done; a slap on the wrist. They've even violated the deferred prosecution agreement, but we hear nothing about the consequences. Secondly, the big pharmaceutical companies and the major drug distribution companies are flooding the black market with oxycontin and other opioids. This is also being done under the watchful eye of the Department of Justice that has refused to prosecute big Pharma and these big drug distribution companies for the same argument that they make why they won't prosecute and criminally jail major bankers; they're too big to jail. The too-big-to-fail banks, the giant pharmaceutical companies that are pumping out these opioids; they are above the law, at least under the policies of the Obama administration.

So, you've got a track record of death, destruction, and despair emanating from the policies of the White House for the past eight years. Now we are at a crisis point, a social and economic crisis, a crisis of the morale of the population; yet there are clear and obvious solutions to all of these

problems.

It doesn't take brain surgery to figure out that Glass-Steagall

and the other core principles put forward by Mr. LaRouche, which

are a revised version of the core ideas on which this economy of

this great nation was built in the first place, under the leadership of Alexander Hamilton. So, these things {can} be done. One of the biggest obstacles is the fact that the collapse

of the health care system, the mass opioid addiction that's been

basically allowed to occur as an Opium War against the American

population, has reached the point where it's created a morale crisis. And that's got to be reversed.

Matt just referenced the impact of the concerts commemorating the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks that took

place in the greater New York City area the weekend of September

11th. Those kinds of things can be replicated everywhere. We can turn the situation around very quickly. We can end the scourge of Wall Street and the City of London; we can end these

wars. You've got with Russia, with China, with India, with the

other countries in Asia – Japan, Southeast Asia; they're all coming together around a new economic paradigm that's built on cooperation among nations for great projects across a vast area.

The United States desperately needs to get in on this; and President Xi Jinping's standing invitation, delivered to President Bush face-to-face, still stands. The United States should join in and become part of this World Land-Bridge process;

and if you do that, then the folly of these continuing wars and this confrontation with Putin and Russia become very obvious. It's completely ludicrous. We can move on and participate in this alternative paradigm which is right there; it's not a theoretical, it's not something in abstraction. It's going on every day of the week across all of Eurasia down into Africa. China is building a trans-continental railroad across South America. The plans for that railroad were in place in the 1870s, when American rail engineers who worked on the transcontinental railroad in the United States, went down to Peru, and went down to Brazil, and were working on those projects. The time is long overdue for the United States to get on board on something that we, as a nation, forged as key concepts back during a better period in our history.

ROGERS: And what you're dealing with is a cultural transformation. I just wanted to add that this is not something that is up to people "Oh, this is a problem I'm having in my family. The drug overdose or something that I have to deal with." You have people who have health care premiums that are going up to \$1500-2000 per month, and then they're spending thousands of dollars to get their kids and loved ones off of these drugs, and you have no help from society because the society is completely degenerating. It's only going to be through a cultural transformation based on the beauty that was exemplified and continues to be exemplified by what we're representing with these {Requiem} concerts in New York; with a commitment towards a revival of truly Classical culture. One person I was talking to, who was going through such a crisis, was

saying it would just be so beautiful and so important if you can come into my area to sing; because these people desperately need beauty. It's not going to just take each individual; but as Putin recognized, you have to have a total transformation of the culture. I was just thinking at the very end, that Matt you brought up a few quotes earlier of this speech, and I don't want to read long quotes; but I think this captures what we were just discussing very well. At the very end of Putin's speech at Valdai in Sochi, he said: "In short, we should build the foundation for the future world today by investing in all priority areas of human development. And of course, it is necessary to continue a broad-based discussion of our common future, so that all sensible and promising initiatives are heard."

This is absolutely what has to be the standard of the United States right now; shaping that future that must be brought into existence.

OGDEN: Yeah, I would recommend people read some more extensive excerpts of this speech; it's very all-encompassing. But at the same place where he said what you just cited, he called for a Marshall Plan to rebuild the war-torn areas – especially in the Middle East and North Africa; but a Marshall Plan type of approach. He called for a New International Economic Order, which would make the fruit of economic growth and technological progress accessible to all. He celebrated the joining together of the Eurasian Economic Union with the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road policy of China, to create an

integrated Eurasian space where these kinds of massive development projects can take place, as Jeff just cited. He said that the major question, the principle, has got to be how do you develop human potential? He said, "An important task of ours is to develop human potential. Only a world with ample opportunities for all, with highly-skilled workers, with access to knowledge, and a great variety of ways to realize their potential, can be considered truly free. Only a world where people from different countries do not struggle to survive, but lead full lives, can be stable."

I would recommend going back and reading some of the excerpts from Alexander Hamilton's "Report on Manufactures", because he makes exactly the same point. He says it's only a world where the diverse talents of the various of your society can be developed to their fullest potential through the application of technology, and the availability of this on the widest possible scale, that you can create the future potential for the creative labor, not just the manual labor, but the creative labor of your labor force, of your workforce, of your citizenry, which increases the potential population density of your nation; increases the productive powers of that labor force, and improves the quality of the lives of all. And only a society like that can be defined as truly free. In Hamilton's time, it was the fight against slavery; it was the fight against the manual, bestial labor of the African slaves imported to the southern states of the United States. In our time, it's the fight for a Hamiltonian policy in the present period; and I think

we just keep coming back to the point. This is the Four New Laws of LaRouche; this is the principle of Alexander Hamilton. It is happening on the international stage, as Jeff said. The One Belt, One Road policy from China; this new economic paradigm; these are taking place every single day.

The defining question is: Will the United States join that New Paradigm?

STEINBERG: It's ironic that one of the cornerstones, in light of what's going on in the real guttural side of this Presidential campaign, one of the cornerstones of Hamilton's concept in the "Report on Manufactures" was immigration; mass immigration. His policy was, bring 'em in; we'll educate them; we'll make productive American citizens out of them, no matter where they come from. That idea that there's always a shortage of precious creative labor. I think it's another point very much worth reflecting on; rather than thinking about walls and things like that. He just said, we've got to bring more people in here; because we've got productive work for them to do to build a nation.

OGDEN: Right; apropos. I just want to read the one section from the Putin speech where he says this specifically. He says, "We cannot achieve global stability unless we guarantee global economic progress. It is essential to provide conditions for 'creative labor' and economic growth at a pace that would put

an

end to the division of the world into permanent winners and permanent losers."

On that note, I want to just announce to people that {Executive Intelligence Review} is putting out a republication of the four economic reports of Hamilton. These will be available in book form, hopefully coming up the beginning next week. It's titled, {Alexander Hamilton's Vision}, and it's a republication of these four central economic reports; the "Report on Public Credit", the "Report on Manufactures", the "Report on National Banking", and Hamilton's argument "On the Constitutionality of the National Bank". As an appendix to that book, we also include the full text of Mr. LaRouche's new economic laws. That is also the headline of a special double edition of the {Hamiltonian} which came out at the beginning of this week – "The Four New Laws to Save the USA Now!" This is edition 10 of the {Hamiltonian}, and included in this is also an elaboration of some of the principles of the "Report on Manufactures", which I wrote up; "The LaRouche-Hamilton Science of Physical Economy", and there's also an article on the background of Alexander Hamilton's fight against slavery and his establishment of a new political order for the United States through the founding of this science of economics. There's also a very entertaining cartoon which was drawn by a member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, Dave Christie, called "Obamandias" based on "Ozymandias" which was a famous sonnet by Percy Bysshe Shelley. So that's available on the LaRouche PAC website.

So, I think we have definitely defined the fact that

we are
at a turning point in the history of this country and the
history
of the world. This is certainly not business as usual; and
the
hegemony of the principles that Mr. LaRouche has put on the
table
as the urgent steps to create an economic recovery for this
country now, has certainly been demonstrated very clearly.
It's
our job to continue to draw people towards the mobilization
page
on the LaRouche PAC Action Center; this is
actioncenter.larouchepac.com/four laws. You can sign up
directly
on that website; you will receive an email, you will become
part
of our national network of activists. You can participate in
the
weekly activists calls that we hold every Thursday night – our
Fireside Chats. You can submit reports of activities that
you've
engaged in. You can have all of the background material
available there – Hamilton's four economic reports are linked
on
that page – and you can become part of this movement which is
clearly defining world history.

So, thank you very much, and I'd like to thank both
Jeff and
Kesha for joining us here today. Please stay tuned to
larouchepac.com. Thank you and good night.

Lyndon LaRouche: Vi må have Alexander Hamiltons politik i et nyt udtryk for moderne tid

INKL. SÆRTRYK AF ARTIKLEN 'NYT KREDITSYSTEM'.

Lyndon LaRouche udtalte følgende til LaRouchePAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi den 17. oktober, 2016, med henvisning til præsidentvalget:

Der er en politik: Alexander Hamiltons politik, som den udtrykkes nu, i moderne form; det er, hvad vi vil have. Brug mit navn for at understrege Alexander Hamiltons navn som den person, der bør være den retningsangivende person for hele nationen. Jeg kan udrede det klart; det kan jeg gøre – jeg ved, hvordan det skal gøres. Det gør de fleste mennesker ikke; de hænger fast i fortolkninger.

Han var den ledende skikkelse i amerikansk historie, i dens tidligste del. Og i det tyvende århundrede har jeg været en ledende skikkelse i USA. Jeg siger nu, at Alexander Hamiltons lov, udtrykt i det følgende, i mine **Fire Love**, er det, der må gøres for nationen.

Vi har allerede politikken nedfældet, for vi har loven, der blev fremsat i mit navn for mere end to år siden. Dette er den lov, som bør være den retningsangivende lov, der bestemmer loven for USA som sådan.

Sig Alexander Hamilton; og Hamiltons lov og præstationer er de ting, vi peger på – dernæst bruger vi, hvad jeg har gjort, for lidt over to år siden. Jeg definerede [disse love] *på ny*, hvilket ingen anden person har gjort, undtagen i mit navn. Det er sådan, man skal se på det.

Det, jeg sagde, er meget enkelt. I 2014 fremlagde jeg en sag, den politiske sag, for USA's folk. Det var, hvad jeg gjorde. Ingen anden havde gjort nøjagtig, hvad jeg gjorde. Men jeg har imidlertid ingen garanti for at løbe omkring på ubestemt tid. Pointen er simpelt hen at få en politik, en politik, der i dette tilfældet har eksisteret, og dette skal fremlægges *som politikken*. Det er ikke et spørgsmål om personer som sådan, det er et spørgsmål om at fastslå politikken. Det, jeg gjorde for over to år siden, er nøjagtig, hvad politikken bør være. Hverken mere eller mindre.

Jeg var den person, der fastlagde de »Fire Love«. Og jeg fremsætter disse love som en korrektion, for at korrigere og fjerne de fejltagelser, som er blevet opretholdt eller indført. Og som er fejltagelser. Med andre ord, så er det politikken, der er taget under overvejelse. Og politikken har en tilhænger. Jeg er den eneste, der udfærdigede erklæringen om Alexander Hamiltons love, som jeg fastlagde dem for over to år siden. Og denne proces trodser alle de former for mismask, som på det seneste har været i valgprocessen. Punktum.

Jeg har her fremlagt en erklæring. Denne erklæring har sin egen, unikke karakteristik. Det er *denne* fremgangsmåde, der kunne vinde sagen. Det væsentlige er, at USA blev grundlagt på love, der blev skabt af Alexander Hamilton. I den nylige periode af mit liv har jeg været en ledende person med hensyn til at fremlægge dette princip. Man må udtrykke det på en meget ligefrem måde. De love, som vi ønsker at have, er de reformlove, som jeg introducerede på vegne af Alexander Hamilton. Det er måden at gøre det på. Og dette kunne være en lov, som alle nationer kan tage op og anvende.

Ideen var, at Alexander Hamilton var den person, der fastlagde det princip, som USA's love bør hvile på. Og det blev ved navn fremlagt af mig, i den lov, som jeg introducerede for at blive praktiseret som sådan.

Jeg har instrueret kandidatemnerne i det argument, at

Alexander Hamiltons program, som defineret i en fornyet form – at det er det, der må introduceres. Så enkelt er det. Planeten har brug for retningslinjer med hensyn til lov. Denne lov må anses for at være den retningsangivende lov, som er Alexander Hamiltons politik, som jeg har tilrådet nationen at praktisere. Det er en løsning, som vil virke.

NYT KREDITSYSTEM



*Denne artikel er et særtryk af et indlæg fra **Schiller Instituttets valgavis nr. 16, efteråret 2013.***

Grundlaget for et samfunds udvikling er ikke penge, men kredit. I det unge USA sørgede finansminister Alexander Hamilton for etableringen af et kreditsystem, så det valutafattige og gældsplagede USA kunne opbygge sin realøkonomi. På afgørende tidspunkter i USA's historie er man gået tilbage til et sådant kreditsystem for at få nationen på ret kurs.

Danmark kunne på lignende vis skabe billig, rigelig kredit til investeringer i infrastruktur og samfundsøkonomien.

Efter at vi gennem en Glass/Steagall-banksanering har ophævet statens forpligtelse til at indfri bank- og finansverdenens spillegæld for hundrede af mia. af kr. – og fjernet denne gæld fra bankernes regnskaber – vil de tilbageværende værdier i bankerne ikke være tilstrækkelige til at skabe den nødvendige kredit, som økonomien behøver for at fungere. Vi må derfor skabe en ny kilde til kredit. Det kan ske ved en overgang fra det nuværende monetære system til den form for kreditsystem, der, under ledelse af det unge geni Alexander Hamilton, var den afgørende kilde til USA's transformation fra en samling gældsatte kolonier til en supermagt. Det var det amerikanske kreditsystem, der, på trods af, at det undervejs blev

saboteret en stor del af tiden, sikrede USA's overlevelse og udvikling. Genindførelsen af dette kreditsystem er ikke blot en absolut nødvendighed, hvis USA skal overleve i dag, men er også et vigtigt forbillede for Danmark og Europa, hvis vi ønsker en lys fremtid, der ikke er afhængig af private finansinteresser og finansmarkedernes velvilje, men som i stedet giver os og andre nationer suverænitet og den frie vilje til at bestemme vor egen skæbne. Det amerikanske kreditsystem er dog en af de bedst bevarede hemmeligheder i såvel offentligheden som den økonomiske faglitteratur i dag, og vi vil derfor i det følgende give et indblik i afgørende aspekter af systemet og de perioder, hvor det, med stor fremgang som resultat, har været anvendt i amerikansk historie.

USA's første nationalbank



Inden for rammerne af et kreditsystem som det, USA's første finansminister Hamilton satte i værk i USA's tidlige år, er finanssystemet knyttet til den fysiske økonomi og gør det derved muligt at styre nationens opbygning med sigte på den fremtidige velstand og produktion. Dette gjorde det muligt for de amerikanske kolonier at sikre USA's faktiske økonomiske uafhængighed, da man havde vundet kampen for sin politiske løsrivelse fra

Det britiske Imperium, i stedet for blot at have politisk uafhængighed af navn. For de amerikanske, grundlæggende fædre betød national suverænitet ikke blot evnen til at drive udenlandsk aggression tilbage og sikre de nationale grænser; det krævede etableringen af et økonomisk system, der var i stand til at sikre den fortsatte udvikling af nationen og dens befolkning ved at begunstige stigningen i arbejdskraftens produktive evne gennem en nationalbank. Allerede i 1781, før krigens slutning, skrev Hamilton til Robert Morris, den finansielle tilsynsførende for Den kontinentale Kongres, og forklarede sin idé: »En Nationalbanks tilbøjelighed er at

forøge offentlig og privat kredit. Industri forøges, vareudbuddet mangedobles, landbrug og håndværk blomstrer, og heri består statens sande rigdom og fremgang. Den forvandler begge parter rigdom og indflydelse til en kommerciel kanal til gensidig nytte, der må tilbyde fordele, der er uvurderlige; der mangler et omsætningsmiddel, som denne plan yder gennem en form for skabende evne, der konverterer det, der således skabes, til et reelt og virkningsfuldt handelsinstrument. Det er udelukkende gennem en nationalbank, at vi finder bestanddelene til en sund, solid og gavnlig kredit med sikkerhed i værdipapirer.« Ved Uafhængighedskrigens slutning var den nyligt etablerede nation bankerot. En stor del af koloniernes fysiske økonomi var blevet ødelagt af kampene, og både den nationale regering og staterne befandt sig i en gældsklemme. Alene renterne på den totale gæld beløb sig til mere end hele den indkomst, der forudsås at stå til rådighed for den føderale regering. Akkumuleringen af denne gæld, oven i den fysiske ødelæggelse, frembød en bister udsigt for den nyligt uafhængige nation og en umiddelbar trussel om landets disintegration, eller endog generobring. Det var umuligt for den nye nation, med den utilstrækkelige magt, som var bevilget Kongressen i Konføderationens Lovparagraffer, at etablere et kreditsystem for at fremme en voksende nationaløkonomi med henblik på at honorere gælden. Robert Morris, Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington og andre af USA's grundlæggere var enige om, at en ny forfatning var påkrævet, som gav den nationale regering magt til at fuldføre de mål, der var skitseret i Uafhængighedserklæringen. Idet han som finansminister anvendte den nye forfatnings magt, omsatte Hamilton sin idé om kredit i praksis, som således gjorde det muligt at løse den tilsyneladende uløselige krise, hvor USA kun havde en masse gæld i stedet for det guld og sølv, der normalt var grundlaget for en valuta. Han udtænkte en plan for at sætte nationens aktive kapital fra landbrug og industri i arbejde, ved at skabe et finanssystem og en valuta, der var baseret på den fremtidige produktion, snarere end på guld,

sølv og monetaristisk gæld. Hamilton arrangerede overførslen af de forskellige koloniernes gæld til det føderale regnskab og forenede den således som en samlet national gæld samtidig med, at han skabte muligheden for, at den kunne honoreres ved at blive knyttet sammen med kredit til nye fysiske investeringer. Begrebet gæld blev således redefineret som værende ikke blot monetaristisk gæld, men gæld blev en del af en proces, gennem hvilken investering i fremtiden skabte nye kilder til rigdom og hermed midlerne til at tilbagebetale denne investering – med andre ord: Det blev en gæld til fremtiden i stedet for en gæld til fortiden. Under Hamiltons kreditsystem blev den nationale gæld til en kapitalpulje, på grundlag af hvilken man kunne investere i opbygningen af den fysiske økonomi. Det, der kunne have været en forbandelse, blev til en velsignelse. Hamiltons system etablerede det princip, at økonomiens og valutaens værdi blev fastsat på baggrund af den produktivitet, der fremkom ved den fremtidige effekt af kreditten, snarere end de akkumulerede værdier fra fortiden. Benjamin Franklins hensigt om en papirvaluta, der var i overensstemmelse med den produktive omsætning, blev virkeliggjort gennem nationalbankens brug af en kreditvaluta. Det essentielle princip i kreditsystemet var ikke anvendelsen af pengesedler i stedet for guld og sølv, men snarere, at man førte en politik for udviklingen af hele den nationale økonomi, hvor den samlede nationaløkonomis produktive evne derfor understøttede valutaen, da valutaen blev en afspejling af den fremtidige økonomiske vækst.

Fysisk produktivitet

Hamilton skrev i sin »Rapport om Produktion« fra 1791 til Kongressen om virkningerne af sit system: »Det nye system fungerer som en ny kraft til industrifremstilling; det har, inden for visse rammer, en tendens til at forøge den reelle rigdom i et samfund, på samme måde som penge, som en driftig landmand låner til investering i forbedringer af sit landbrug, sluttelig vil tilføre ham reel rigdom.« Hamiltons

kreditbaserede valuta satte hele landets aktive kapital i bevægelse. Idet han reflekterede over det system, som han havde konstrueret, skrev han i sin endelige »Rapport om Offentlig Kredit« i 1795: »Offentlig kredit ... er en af hoveddrivkræfterne bag nyttig foretagsomhed og lokale forbedringer. Som erstatning for kapital er det lidt mindre nyttigt end guld og sølv, inden for landbrug, handel, produktionsvirksomhed og håndværk ... En person ønsker at gå i gang med at opdyrke et stykke land; han køber på kredit, og med tiden betaler han købsprisen med produkterne af den jord, som hans arbejdskraft har forbedret. En anden etablerer sig inden for handel; med en kredit med sikkerhed i hans retskafne karakter søger han, og finder ofte, midlerne til, med tiden, at blive en rig handelsmand. En tredje starter en forretning som fabrikant eller håndværker; han er dygtig, men har ingen penge. Det er ved hjælp af kredit, at han bliver i stand til at skaffe værktøjet, materialerne og selv det udkomme, som han behøver, indtil hans virksomhed har forsynet ham med kapital; og selv da skaffer han, fra en etableret og for øget kredit, midlerne til at udvide sine foretagender.« I Hamiltons »Rapport om Produktion« stadfæstede han det essentielle, økonomiske princip som et fysisk system for produktivitet. Den primære værdimåler er ikke kapital, men de intellektuelle evner, som forøger arbejdskraftens produktive evne. Ligesom Winthrop, Mather og Franklin før ham anskuede Hamilton ikke valuta som rigdom i sig selv, men som regeringens forfatningsmæssige forpligtelse til at fremme videnskabelig opfindsomhed og iværksætterånd. Målet for kreditsystemet var ikke at producere med det formål at få penge, men at bruge kredit som middel til at øge arbejdskraftens produktive evne. Nøglen til Hamiltons løsning var hans enestående forståelse af, at sand rigdom ikke findes i penge. Som han fastslår det: »Produktionen forøges, vareudbuddet mangedobles, landbrug og produktionsvirksomhed blomstrer, og heri består statens sande rigdom og fremgang.« Det var dette, og kun dette, der gav USA's papirvaluta en kreditfunktion.

På trods af succesen med kreditsystemet i USA's første år, lykkedes det efterfølgende for de private finansielle interesser, med centrum i Det britiske Imperium, der afskyede denne konkurrent til deres magt over økonomien, at få svækket kreditsystemet og dets tilførsel af kredit til opbygning af den nationale velstand. Da den første nationalbanks charter udløb i 1811 blev det ikke fornyet, og selv om en ny nationalbank blev etableret i 1816, så kom USA's økonomiske genrejsning først, da Nicholas Biddle blev chef for nationalbanken i 1823. Biddle var glødende tilhænger af Hamiltons idéer og arbejdede under ledelse af økonomen Mathew Carey på at genoprette USA's valuta og fysiske økonomi efter spekulationens hærgen. Under hans ledelse af nationalbanken, som tidligere under Hamiltons, indgik man fremtidsorienterede kreditaftaler snarere end at omsætte den fremtidige, potentielle rigdom til penge til nutidige betalinger. Det var Biddles princip at beskytte og nære økonomiens langsigtede virksomhed, snarere end at tillade den at blive offer for krav om omgående betaling, især betaling i guld og sølv. Landets økonomi blev i stand til at vokse i forhold til sin potentielle produktionsevne, snarere end gennem kunstig kontrol. Under Biddles embedstid fremmede

Banken, hvad der skulle vise sig at blive en af de mest teknologisk eksplosive perioder i amerikansk historie. I 1824 gennemførte formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus, Henry Clay, en lov om beskyttelsestold for at beskytte amerikansk produktion, sammen med General Surveying Act (Loven om landopmåling), som bemyndigede anvendelsen af personel fra den amerikanske hær til bygning af civile ingeniørprojekter. Med disse love på plads, og med Biddle som bankens leder, var jorden gødet for John Quincy Adams, der blev valgt som præsident i 1825. Før 1820 var der ikke en eneste jernbane, kun få kanaler, en jernindustri, der var brudt sammen, ingen moderne fabrikker af betydning, ingen udnyttelse af dampkraft

til industriformål, kun maskiner af træ i fabrikkerne og stort set ingen offentlige skoler. John Quincy Adams' præsidentskab forandrede alt. Man begyndte at bygge kanaler og veje i forceret tempo, hvilket åbnede for bosættelser i den vestlige del af Amerika. Kulminer blev udbygget med byområder, hvilket skabte de store industribyer i Midtvesten. Jernindustrien blev genfødt under toldbeskyttelse, efter mere end et århundredes undertrykkelse siden lukningen af Saugus-jernværket. Tusinder af kilometer af jernbaner blev bygget, med ingeniører fra militærakademiet i West Point som konstruktører af den store Baltimore- og Ohio-jernbane. Seks andre jernbanelinjer blev ligeledes planlagt og udarbejdet. Finansieringen og planlægningen af disse foretagender blev koordineret med føderale, delstats- og lokale myndigheder og USA's nationalbank, der fremmede og styrede hele det nationale program og koordinerede både den offentlige og private, finansielle investering i infrastruktur og industri. Efterhånden som mere landbrugsjord blev opdyrket, flere fabrikker blev etableret og flere transportnetværk til transport af landbrugsvarer og kul til fabrikkerne blev fuldført, steg mængden af bankkredit, der kunne sættes i omløb, proportionelt, idet den først fordobledes og siden tredobledes i løbet af dette årti. Under kreditsystemets korrekte funktion forvandlede betydningen af gæld. Delstaternes gæld for infrastruktur var ikke længere blot en monetaristisk forpligtelse, men blev betalt af den fremtidige udvikling af industrier. Den gæld, der skabtes til forbedringer i landet, og personlig gæld inden for landbrug og produktion, var ganske enkelt en del af den voksende økonomi under kreditsystemet. De stater, der havde påtaget sig stor gæld for kanaler og veje, planlagde udviklingen af jern- og kulindustrier og nye transportveje for de nye landområders produktion. Disse nyligt udviklede landområder og industrier langs med infrastrukturvejene forøgede indtægterne til op imod ti gange mere end den oprindelige investering.

Påtvungen monetarisme

På trods af den utrolige fremgang under denne genetablering af kreditsystemet lykkedes det Det britiske Imperium, ved hjælp af den yderst effektive britiske agent Aaron Burr og en effektiv brug af pressen, samt en del-og-hersk-praksis i det politiske liv, at skabe et katastrofalt skifte i USA's udvikling. Burr fik etableret en alliance mellem slaveejer-interesserne i syd og finanskredsene under ledelse af Martin Van Buren i nord. Denne alliance fik, ved brug af effektiv populisme, Andrew Jackson indsat som præsident. Under Jackson-administrationen blev der iværksat en intens kampagne for at forære alle statens værdier til forskellige interessegrupper, og efterfølgende brugte man alle lovlige og ulovlige midler for at få stoppet nationalbanken og dens velstandsskabende vækstpolitik. Jackson-administrationens tiltag lykkedes med at få kollapsede kreditsystemet og fremprovokerede »Panikken i 1837«, som ledte til en årelang depression. »Markedslovene« fortrængte det almene vel. Den efterfølgende Van Buren-regering krævede betaling af gæld i nutiden, uanset de fremtidige omkostninger og spildet i fortiden. Gyldige kreditaftaler blev angrebet som ødselhed og årsag til krisen på trods af, at krisen i virkeligheden var skabt med overlæg af dem, der havde styret Jackson-regeringen. Kredit blev erstattet af nedskæringer som middel til at berolige »markedet«, med gældens »rigtige« niveau bestemt på basis af et monetært snarere end et fysisk grundlag. Man prædikede den falske doktrin, at markedet selv ville frembringe det rette udbud og den rette efterspørgsel af produktion uden et overordnet program for nationsopbygning. Snarere end at blive hyldet som en stor Demokrat og »en mand af folket«, bør Jacksons brutale ødelæggelse af nationalbanken ses som et af de største forræderier, der er begået i USA's historie.

✘ Abraham Lincoln

Da Abraham Lincoln blev præsident i 1860, var der, aftenen før sydstaternes løsrivelse, ikke færre end syv tusind forskellige valutaer i omløb i USA – en nation, der var håbløst splittet,

og hvor Hamiltons forfatningsmæssige føderation næsten var gået tabt. For at redde Unionen var det nødvendigt at genoprette det nationale bank-system. Med de private New York-bankers tiltag for at afskære strømmen af indtægter til finansministeriet ved at ophøre med at købe statsobligationer og blokere for aftaler om udenlandske lån, kom finansministeriets pengesedler i miskredit, hvilket forårsagede en blokering af tilgængelig kredit. For at udmanøvrere denne finansielle krigsførelse imod nationen og finansiere den krig, der skulle redde republikken, etablerede Lincoln en ny, national kilde til kredit. Legal Tender Act (Loven om Lovligt Betalingsmiddel) fra 1862 bemyndigede udstedelsen af »USA's pengesedler« (eller »greenbacks«) med det formål at »finansiere USA's varierende gæld«. Med Kongressens vedtagelse af denne lov tog regeringen atter kontrol over den nationale valuta. Lincolns økonomiske rådgiver Henry Carey gjorde forbindelsen til den tidligere nationalbank tydelig, idet han i 1868 skrev: »USA's nationalbank gav os ikke en møntvaluta; dens sedler var gangbare næsten pga. samme grundlæggende hypotese, der har gjort de udstedte, lovlige betalingsmidler (under Legal Tender Act) anvendelige.« Lincoln tredoblede statsudgifterne for at finansiere krigen, idet han udstedte 450 millioner i greenbacks. Samtidig gik han i gang med at fjerne de tusinder af separate – og ofte falske – valutaer gennem en reorganisering af national bankpraksis. En stribe love konverterede delstatsbanker til nationale, forenede, lovregulerede enheder, der tillod koordineringen af et nationalt banksystem, som kunne udstede national kredit. Dette landsdækkende banksystem blev grundlaget for genetableringen af en enkelt valuta og genindførte således den af forfatningen bemyndigede føderale kontrol over nationens valuta og finansforhold. Således lykkedes det faktisk for Lincoln at få princippet om offentlig kredit og om en national bank til at genopstå. Men systemet med national kredit kom, som tidligere under Jackson og Van Buren, atter under angreb fra den efterfølgende Andrew Jackson-regering. Finansminister Hugh

McCulloch, i samarbejde med den britiske agent og Lincoln-desertør David Wells, indskrænkede helt unødvendigt Lincolns legale betalingsmiddel, i modstrid med industriens faktiske formåen og behov. Den efterfølgende økonomiske krise i 1870'erne, såvel som alle de efterfølgende kriser, som f.eks. efter mordet på præsident McKinley, i perioden 1929 – 1932 samt i dag, forårsagedes af den overlagte ødelæggelse af industriøkonomien og det dermed forbundne kreditsystem.

Franklin Roosevelt

✘ Mordet på Lincoln blev efterfulgt af mordene på to andre nationalistiske præsidenter, James Garfield i 1881 og William McKinley i 1901. Arven efter Hamilton gik atter tabt, og under præsident Wilson blev ethvert tilbageværende levn efter et nationalt banksystem erstattet af det forfatningsstridige føderale banksystem, Federal Reserve. Langtidsinvesteringer i nationens fremtidige udvikling blev i stigende grad fortrængt af en kultur med hasardspil og vild spekulation. Denne boble eksploderede i krakket i 1929, der markerede den værste depression, som nationen nogen sinde havde stået overfor. Aftenen før Roosevelts indsættelse var arbejdsløsheden på over 20 %, to tredjedele af staterne havde truffet nødforanstaltninger for at lukke deres banker, og industriproduktionen var det halve af, hvad den havde været før krakket. Man kan lære en afgørende lektie af Franklin Roosevelts tilnærmelse til kreditprincippet under USA's første na-tionalbank. Roosevelt var nødt til ikke blot at reorganisere bankerne, men også etablere et princip om kredit, som ellers ikke eksisterede. Hans regering reorganiserede bankerne, ikke for bankernes skyld som sådan, men for at gøre dem i stand til at operere i den nye sammenhæng med princippet om kredit, som han tilsigtede, med en plan for »Kreditinstitutioner for Industri«, der sluttelig blev til den udvidede Reconstruction Finance Corpora-tion (RFC). Roosevelt anvendte RFC, der var blevet skabt under Hoover for at indfri finansielle institutioner, som et surrogat for en

nationalbank, idet han udvidede den kraftigt til sluttelig at yde kredit for, hvad der svarer til en billion dollars i nutidige tal. RFC og lignende tiltag fremskaffede finansieringen til de store projekter på Roosevelts tid, der gennemførtes af sådanne institutioner som Public Works Administration, Works Progress Administration, Rural Electrification Administration og Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), som sammenlagt gav beskæftigelse til millioner af amerikanere og dramatisk for øgede nationens produktive evne gennem forbedringer i adgangen til elektricitet, navigation, landbrugsuddannelse, ferskvand og transport. Disse projekter kunne ikke være blevet finansieret ved at tage lån og sælge obligationer i et klima med alvorlig økonomisk depression. Regeringen greb snarere ind for at sikre, at projekter, hvis fysiske, produktive resultater mere end ville opveje omkostningerne ved deres konstruktion, ikke blev forhindret på grund af manglen på tilgængelig kapital, der var nødvendig for deres gennemførelse. RFC-udlån og TVA-lån blev både direkte tilbagebetalt, og kom også indirekte mangefold tilbage gennem statens øgede skatteindtægter, som et resultat af den forøgede produktivitet. Ved at kanalisere kredit over til specifikke projekter var Roosevelt i stand til at sikre, at kredit gik til projekter, som ville give indtægter, snarere end blot at give statslån og hjælp til banksektoren generelt, som præsident Hoover havde gjort det. Roosevelt opnåede et fungerende kreditsystem, hvor en stigende mængde af finanssystemet var knyttet til realøkonomien snarere end til bankerne. De fysiske fremskridt opbyggede den industrielle styrke, der senere gjorde det muligt at imødekomme den omfattende forsyningsmæssige logistik, der var nødvendig for at vinde Anden Verdenskrig. Det ville ikke have været muligt uden Roosevelts tilbagevenden til den amerikanske tradition for et nationalt kreditsystem.

Kreditsystem i dag



USA's økonomi er i de fem årtier, der er gået siden mordet på præsident Kennedy i 1963, blevet lagt i ruiner gennem et skifte fra en national strategi for økonomisk udvikling og promovering af videnskab og teknologisk fremskridt, til en politik, hvor private finansinteresser får lov til at diktere den økonomiske udvikling. Det har nået punktet, hvor Detroit's nylige bankerot blot er symbolet på, hvad der venter mange andre byer og delstater. Ligeledes er USA som nation fanget i en gældsfælde, som man kun kan komme ud af, hvis man genindfører Glass-Steagall og vender tilbage til sit oprindelige kreditsystem, som man har gjort det på afgørende tidspunkter gennem de seneste 230 år. Men USA er ikke det eneste land, der lider under årtiers monetaristisk dårskab. Det gør størstedelen af den vestlige verden også – Danmark inklusive. Vi må derfor lære af det amerikanske kreditsystem, så vi kan skabe vor egen version af det og dermed sikre, at vi tager magten over vor skæbne ud af hænderne på finansverdenens private finansielle interesser og lægger den tilbage, hvor den hører hjemme: I hænderne på folkevalgte politikere og institutioner, der er underlagt vor nationale kontrol, og som har til formål at sikre det almene vel for såvel os i dag, som for de mange generationer, der forhåbentlig vil følge efter.

Skab kreditter gennem Nationalbanken

Det danske folketing bør vedtage en ny lov, der bemyndiger Nationalbanken til at udstede op til 500 milliarder kroner i nationale kreditter[1], der udlånes til en rente, der kun marginalt overstiger den nationale inflation. Kreditterne kan udlånes til følgende kategorier af projekter:

1) Større infrastrukturprojekter.

Det kan være statsejede, brugerbetalte broprojekter, som f.eks. bygningen af Femern Bæltforbindelsen, Kattegatforbindelsen og Helsingør/Helsingborg-tunnelen. Det kan også være motorveje, jernbaner eller magnettogbaner, samt hospitaler og læreanstalter.

2) Opbygning af højteknologisk potentiale.

Opbygning af produktionssektorer i Danmark, der gør brug af ny teknologi og derigennem skaber et potentiale for øget fremtidig højteknologisk eksport. Det kan f.eks. være opbygningen af en dansk produktion af kernekraftværker, fusionskraftværker eller anden produktion, der involverer kernefysisk forskning og rumforskning. Forskning og produktion af brintbiler og brændselscelleteknologi. Udviklingen af nye keramiske materialer, superledere, nanoteknologi etc.

3) Kredit til nye anlægsinvesteringer i industri og landbrug.

Nationalbanken vil udstede kreditterne og udbetale dem, efterhånden som de behøves for opbygningen af de forskellige projekter. Projekter af type 1 vil have en tilbagebetalingstid på op til 30-50 år. Disse lån vil administreres direkte af Nationalbanken. Lån af type 2 og 3 vil administreres gennem de lokale banker på vegne af nationalbanken. Kunder, der måtte ønske lån af type 2 og 3, retter henvendelse til deres lokale pengeinstitut, der sammen med kunden laver en plan for projektet. Banken sender så en ansøgning til en kreditkomité under Nationalbanken, der bevilger lånet.

Den lokale bank kan også tilbyde en pakkeløsning, hvor nationalbankkreditten suppleres med en kredit fra det lokale pengeinstitut på kommercielle vilkår. Det lokale pengeinstitut holder øje med projektet og sørger for udbetaling af lånets rater, efterhånden som projektet skrider frem. Det lokale pengeinstitut administrerer også tilbagebetalingen af lånet. Disse lån vil have en tilbagebetalingstid på 3 – 20 år, alt efter projektets omfang. Som modydelse for det lokale pengeinstituts arbejde betaler kunden et halvt procentpoint over nationalbankens udlånsrente, der tilfalder pengeinstituttet.

Alle vore valgaviser/kampagneaviser kan læses her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/category/nyheder/publikatio>

n/kampagneavis/

Læs Alexander Hamiltons originale rapporter her: <https://larouchepac.com/20161013/alexander-hamiltons-four-economic-papers>

[1] Da de af Nationalbanken udstedte kreditter udelukkende udlånes til investeringer, der øger produktiviteten i den danske fysiske økonomi, bidrager de ikke til øget inflation. Hvis man derimod bare pumper penge og kredit ud i økonomien, f.eks. i form af hjælpepakker til finanssektoren, er der en akut fare for inflation.

GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid

De to paradigmer i stærk kontrast

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. oktober 2016 – I denne uge finder der intense møder mellem europæiske og amerikanske, politiske og militære ledere sted i hele Europa, møder, hvor man diskuterer og planlægger krige – krige i Syrien, i Irak, i Yemen og i Ukraine. Det underliggende grundlag for alle disse forhandlinger er Obamas og Londons hektiske bestræbelser på at få støtte til krig mod Rusland og Kina. Europæiske regeringer og/eller ledende institutioner yder i stigende grad modstand mod dette vanvid, men Obama og hans forsvarsminister Ash Carter er i færd med at planlægge provokationer, som kunne kickstarte en irreversibel proces hen imod krig, og således true selve civilisationen med et atomart holocaust.

Og dog er det således, at det store flertal af verden ser hen til Kina, Rusland og Indien, der **i sidste uge mødtes med deres BRIKS-partnere** Brasilien og Sydafrika i Goa, Indien, hvor de kickstarter, ikke krig, men global udvikling, med

højhastigheds-jernbaneprojekter, der forbinder nationer gennem en Verdenslandbro; hvor de underskriver aftaler om opbygning af kernekraft og anden infrastruktur og andet samarbejde omkring rumforskning; og hvor de løfter de mange millioner mennesker i Asien, Afrika og Sydamerika, der er ramt af fattigdom, op til en menneskelig levestandard sådan, som Kina har løftet 700 millioner sjæle op af fattigdom.

Hvilket paradigme vil afgøre menneskehedens fremtid? Den vil, et langt stykke hen ad vejen, blive afgjort af USA. Samtidig med, at krigspartiet mobiliserer sine kræfter, og i takt med, at det uafvendelige kollaps af Deutsche Banks derivatmættede aktiver spreder panik i det vestlige finanssystem, så undertrykkes Obamaadministrationens ødelæggelse og befolkningens had til Obama og hans klon Hillary Clinton kun delvist af det pornografiske klovneshow, som præsidentkandidaterne opfører, eller som de syge medier promoverer.

Valg til regering, som det forudsås af Amerikas grundlæggende fædre, handlede om mere end at vælge politiske repræsentanter – de udgjorde en periode, hvor intelligente mennesker adresserede og opdragede borgersamfundet omkring de fundamentale principper for naturlig lov og den mission, nationen spiller for verdens fremtid. Det er grunden til, at **Lyndon LaRouches præsidentkampagne** hen over tre årtier har haft en dyb og varig indvirkning på nationen, på trods af relativt få stemmer, og på trods af konstante angreb fra regeringens og mediernes side.

Aldrig i denne nations historie er kandidater blevet så udskældt af befolkningen, som i det aktuelle valg, selv om ingen af kandidaterne i mange tilfælde var kvalificeret til stillingen. Befolkningen har kun ét valg – at stemme for principper, og at mobilisere borgersamfundet til fordel for **LaRouches ideer, hans Fire Love** baseret på Alexander Hamiltons gennemgribende opdagelser, samt en genindførelse af klassisk musik og kultur.

Som Friedrich Schiller sagde, så må vi alle på én og samme gang være patrioter for vore nationer og verdensborgere. På denne måde kan borgere i alle nationer være med i den ærefrygtindgydende opgave, at omstøde Amerikas deroute ned i et britisk imperiehelvede, og bringe denne engang så storslåede nation ind på linje med paradigmet for menneskeligt fremskridt.

Hvad ville Hamilton have gjort? Find ud af det.

Foto: Den russiske præsident og udenrigsminister Lavrov diskuterer med den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry. December 2015. (Foto: kremlin.ru).

Det, vi har brug for i 2016: Alexander Hamiltons principper og LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 17. oktober, 2016 – Den amerikanske præsidentvalgkampes fornedrede tilstand ligger som en tung sten og tynger brystet af, ikke alene det amerikanske folk, men af verden som helhed. Amerikanere rapporterer, at de har »valgstres« i sådanne ekstreme grader, som ellers kun forårsages af de værste tilfælde af økonomisk kollaps og krig.

Medierne, med al deres »meningsløse støj og voldsomme fagter«, demoraliserer bevidst amerikanere med hensyn til deres lands

fremtid. De driver med fuldt overlæg deres repræsentanter til at skjule sig i dybe, partiske rævegrave – de samme repræsentanter, der, for blot lidt over en måned siden, var i stand til at forenes i en stor sejr over saudisk/britisk støtte til islamisk terrorisme og nedkæmpe præsident Obamas forsøg på at blokere eller nedlægge veto imod Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorismen, JASTA.

Det, som nationen og verden har brug for, er at »vælge principper«: **Alexander Hamiltons økonomiske principper**, på hvilke denne nation blev grundlagt.

Hamiltons økonomiske principper er på ny givet udtryk i Lyndon LaRouches, fra 2014 og fremefter udviklede, **»Fire Love til USA's Redning«**. De udtrykker naturlig lov, anvendt på økonomi.

Dette er i realiteten et internationalt spørgsmål; verden må nødvendigvis vedtage Hamiltons arbejder, og LaRouches Fire Love, sådan, som Kina er begyndt at demonstrere. De transatlantiske landes forskellige »Deutsche Banker«, billedligt talt, er klar til at sprænge det Londoncentrerede finanssystem gennem en nedsmeltning, og til at sprede en fattigdom, værre end den, krakket i 2008 var skyld i. Truslen om kollaps fører nu til trusler, der kommer fra Obama og briterne, om krig med Rusland.

Det, som vil være i stand til at forhindre dette, er genoprettelsen af økonomisk fremskridt og produktivitet i hele verden. Det var, hvad Alexander Hamiltons principper – på enestående vis – udrettede lige fra USA's grundlæggelse. Som USA's første præsident George Washington i et brev fra 1793 bemærkede, så syntes virkningen af Hamiltons politik »at være et mirakel«, der løftede de nye Forenede Stater ud af bankerotten og til hastig investering og vækst.

Nu anvender LaRouches Fire Love atter Hamiltons principper.

Amerikanske borgere bør indskrive Lyndon LaRouches navn på stemmesedlen ved præsidentvalget for genvedtagelsen af

Alexander Hamiltons økonomiske principper således, som LaRouche på ny har udlagt dem.

»Jeg indskriver LaRouche og Alexander Hamilton; lad os få nationen til at vælge de rigtige principper« vil skære igennem de af rædsel slåede spørgsmål, amerikanere stiller hinanden med hensyn til den forestående valgdag. Den eneste mulighed, som USA, og verden, har for at overleve, frembydes af Hamiltons principper, som disse udlægges af LaRouches Fire Love. Så træf da beslutning om fremtiden.

**»Det er ikke livets formål at leve,
så længe man kan.«**

**Det er livets formål at skabe en
fremtid for menneskeheden.«**

Lyndon LaRouche – maj, 2015.

Nøglen til sejr er at overvinde jeres frygt

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 17. oktober, 2016 – På netop samme tidspunkt, som BRIKS-landenes statsledere mødtes i Goa, Indien, for at planlægge samarbejdet om et nyt paradigme for statsligt samarbejde om store projekter, udsendte præsident Obama vicepræsident Joe Biden for at levere en direkte trussel mod Rusland. Søndag morgen lovede Biden på NBC TV, at USA ville gennemføre et hemmeligt cyberangreb mod Rusland, hvor Obama valgte tid og sted. Russiske regeringsfolk, herunder

præsidentens talsmand Peskov, har fordømt disse trusler i de skarpeste vendinger og kalder det den mest direkte trussel om krig siden Cubakrisen i 1962.

Disse trusler kommer fra en præsident Obama, der allerede har utallige menneskers blod på hænderne, gennem sine tirsdags-»dræbermøder« og den uophørlige drone-krigsførelse, som udføres på mange kontinenter – alt sammen uden nogen forfatningsmæssigt lovlig godkendelse fra Kongressen. Nu er USA åbenlyst engageret i koalitionen krigsførelse mod Yemen, på vegne af saudierne, hvor de udfører artilleribeskydning imod Yemen fra amerikanske flådeskibe i Golfen, netop, som verden viger tilbage fra de åbenlyse saudiske krigsforbrydelser, hvor de går efter civile i bombe-razziaer i Yemens hovedstad Sanaá.

Og det er denne Obama-administration, der beskylder Rusland for krigsforbrydelser i kampen for at fravriste al-Qaeda dets kontrol over dele af den syriske by Aleppo – og som igen truer Moskva med sanktioner. Udenrigsminister John Kerry var i London i søndags, efter to dages møder i Lausanne, Schweiz, om krigen i Syrien, hvor han mødtes med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov og udenrigsministre fra Saudi-Arabien, Tyrkiet, Qatar, Forenede Arabiske Emirater, Iran, Irak og Jordan. Han og den britiske udenrigsminister Boris Johnson kom ud fra deres møde i London med løfter om at indføre nye sanktioner mod Rusland – medmindre de stopper deres angreb på al-Qaeda.

Obama viderefører den tyranniske arv, der er forbundet med to tidligere Bush-præsidenter, inklusive den George H.W. Bush, som fik Lyndon LaRouches fængsling banket igennem i en hast i det, som den tidligere amerikanske justitsminister (1967-69) Ramsey Clark har kaldt det største tilfælde nogensinde af politisk motiveret anklage på baggrund af falske beviser. Politikkerne under de to Bush-administrationer, og som er blevet endnu værre under Obama, har drevet USA ud i bankerot, udslettet den smule, der var tilbage af det amerikanske

sundhedssystem, og kastet millioner af husstande på fattigdommens og den kroniske arbejdsløsheds skrotplads. 93,5 millioner amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder er ikke engang talt med i arbejdsstyrken! Netop i denne måned har 1,8 millioner amerikanske husstande modtaget standardbreve med posten, der informerede dem om, at deres Obamacare-præmier stiger med 50-70 %, alt imens deres dækning er blevet beskåret. Selv tidligere præsident Bill Clinton var fornuftig nok til offentligt at kalde dette »det mest sindssyge, han nogensinde har set«.

Obama og hans britiske herrer og saudiske partnere er i virkeligheden dem, der er bankerot. Det er *deres* transatlantiske finanssystem, der er færdigt. Som Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede søndag under samtaler med kolleger, så er den britiske økonomi totalt nedbrudt. De er desperate for at lange ud efter og fremsætte trusler imod Rusland og Kina i håb om, at deres løgne vil få fremdrift. De er bankerot, men farlige.

Kendsgerningen er, at der findes klare løsninger, begyndende med afsættelsen af Obama og den omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Hele den globale derivatboble, der beløber sig til mere end en billion dollars, må annulleres. Når disse indledende skridt er gennemført, kan en økonomisk genrejsning omgående lanceres ved at benytte Hamiltons metoder, som det for nylig er blevet præciseret i Lyndon LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love.

Det første skridt i alt dette er, at førende borgere opgiver deres frygt og tager lederskabet i at bringe Dræberen Obama til fald og igangsætte den økonomiske genrejsning, begyndende med Glass-Steagall. De seneste sejre, hvor Obama er blevet tvunget til at frigive de 28 sider, der fordømmer det saudiske monarki som ophavsmændene til angrebene d. 11. september, samt Kongressens vedtagelse af JASTA-loven, illustrerer den magt, der kan udløses gennem en koncentration af patriotiske kræfter. Det faktum, at Obamas veto af JASTA blev underkendt med et overvældende, tværpolitisk flertal i begge Kongressen

huse, er en kraftfuld påmindelse om, at det store flertal af amerikanerne hader Obama og alt, hvad han har gjort og står for. Saudierne forsøger at skjule det knusende nederlag, som de og Obama led i kampen om JASTA, ved at spendere \$100 millioner på lobbyvirksomhed, i forsøg på at fjerne den skete skade. De er dømt til at mislykkes.

Det, der nu er afgørende, er, at det samme niveau af mobilisering af førende borgere, der var aktive i JASTA-sejren, opretholdes og rettes mod Obama og gennemførelsen af Glass-Steagall og andre foranstaltninger.

Et afgørende træk for JASTA-sejren var Schiller Instituttets kors fire opførelser af Mozarts *Rekviem* i New York City-området på 15-års dagen for angrebene den 11. september. Det indsprøjtede en vital dimension af kulturel optimisme gennem forestillingernes skønhed – på et tidspunkt, hvor den desperate britiske fjende forsøger at begrave enhver kilde til optimisme gennem det pornografiske show, der kaldes præsidentvalgkampen 2016.

Uanset udfaldet på valgdagen, vil nationen og verden som helhed stadig være konfronteret med disintegrationen af hele det britiskkkørte, transatlantiske finanssystem og truslen om krig og kaos. Løsningerne for at forhindre dette kollaps er forhånden, og det er førsteprioritet på dagsordenen. Det er kilden til styrke for at overvinde vore medborgeres frygt og opnå en hårdt tilkæmpet sejr. Det kan gøres.

Foto: Den indiske premierminister, Shri Narendra Modi (midten) i BRIKS-ledernes familiefotografi ved BRIKS-topmødet i Goa, Indien, 16. oktober, 2016. [brics2016.gov.in]

Stands krakket gennem LaRouches økonomiske program efter Hamiltons principper. LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 14. oktober, 2016.

Hr. LaRouche har leveret den klare recept, såvel som løsningen. Vi begyndte at forklare dette sidste fredag med vores særlige webcast med Paul Gallagher (dansk: Glass-Steagall: Det presserende første skridt); men vi er gået videre med at forklare dette spørgsmål. De Fire Økonomiske Love efter Hamilton, som Lyndon LaRouche udarbejdede for næsten to år siden, og som begyndte med genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall, men som omfatter en recept, der er en meget præcis og videnskabeligt funderet fremgangsmåde for, hvordan man totalt skal reorganisere og genoplive ikke alene USA's økonomi, men også skabe et helt nyt, økonomisk paradigme for det transatlantiske system, i harmoni med det, der allerede stråler ud fra Eurasien. I sammenhæng hermed har hr. LaRouche prioriteret de fire, økonomiske rapporter, som blev skrevet og forelagt Kongressen af vores første finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, i 1790'erne ved selve den amerikanske republiks fødsel. Disse fire rapporter er: »Rapporten om statslig kredit«; »Rapporten om statslig bankvirksomhed«; »Argumentet for forfatningsgrundlaget for Nationalbanken«; og »Rapporten om varefremstilling«.
<https://larouchepac.com/20161013/alexander-hamiltons-four-economic-papers>

Engelsk udskrift:

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast October 14, 2016

HAMILTON'S FOUR REPORTS AND LAROCHE'S FOUR LAWS – BASIC NECESSITIES FOR MANKIND'S CONTINUED EXISTENCE

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it is October 14, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden and you're watching our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio today by Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science

Team; and we're joined via video by Kesha Rogers from Houston, Texas; and Michael Steger from San Francisco, California.

Both

of whom are leading members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

Now, I just want to begin our broadcast here today by re-emphasizing exactly what Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing every single time we've spoken to him this week. That it cannot

be said enough that the American people scored a major victory against Obama with the defeat of his treasonous veto of the JASTA

bill and the overwhelming veto override that was delivered as the

final act of the United States Congress before they left for their districts. This only demonstrates what the American people

are capable of when they overcome whatever fear, whatever intimidation has come from this Barack Obama administration; and

we can see that it's been a force for seven and a half years to

try to intimidate the American people out of taking their country

back and acting in their own self-interest. But Obama's decision

to ally with the British-Saudi treason terror faction and to veto

this JASTA bill, demonstrated who he was; it demonstrated his true colors. And the American people drew a line in the sand and said, "Enough is enough! No more of this."

You can look at what has happened in the weeks following that event. We are now directly involved through missiles and bombing in the war in Yemen; this is the decision by Barack Obama to become involved in yet another unnecessary foreign war. We are siding with the genocide and war crimes of the Saudi regime there in Yemen. The lies and the propaganda that are coming out of the Obama White House against Russia, and the actions that Russia is taking in alliance with the Syrian government in attempting to defeat ISIS and the terrorists in Aleppo are unprecedented; along with the completely unfounded propaganda and lies about so-called Russian cyber warfare and hacking and all the rest.

You can see the utter denial of the fact that we are right on the verge of a complete blow-out of the entire trans-Atlantic financial system. All you have to do is read the headlines of the major financial press to see that even {they} are admitting that Deutsche Bank is more leveraged than even Lehman Brothers was at the time of its collapse; and that Deutsche Bank could, in fact, be the next Lehman.

So, all of these three items combined should show you, as we emphasized earlier this week on the Policy Committee show on Monday, that you would have to be completely out of your mind not

to see how close we are to the combined threat of a complete blow-out of the financial system and the very real threat of the eruption of a nuclear war. Even Mikhail Gorbachov is saying we are closer to a Third World War than we have ever been before. This is the remaining months in office that Obama has.

What Mr. LaRouche has delivered as the prescription, as the solution, is very clear. We began to elaborate this last Friday during our special webcast with Paul Gallagher; but we've continued to elaborate this question. The four Hamiltonian economic laws, drafted by Lyndon LaRouche almost two years ago, which begin with the re-institution of Glass-Steagall, but contain a prescription which is a very precise and scientifically grounded approach to exactly how to completely reorganize and revive not only the United States economy, but to create an entirely new economic paradigm for the trans-Atlantic system in accord with what's already emerging out of Eurasia. In conjunction with this, Mr. LaRouche has put a premium on the four economic reports that were written and submitted to Congress by our first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, in the 1790s at the very birth of the United States republic. These are: the "Report on Public Credit"; the "Report on National Banking"; the "Argument for the Constitutionality of the National Bank"; and the "Report on Manufactures".

So, as a key component of our show today, Ben and I in conjunction with Kesha and Michael are going to elaborate a little more on what is the contents, what is the substance of

those reports from Alexander Hamilton; and then, how do they translate today in the four economic laws of Lyndon LaRouche, with a major emphasis on how a breakthrough in terms of man's exploration of space and everything that that entails in terms of the great economic leap and scientific revolution for mankind, is the application of the Hamiltonian principle for today.

But before we get to some of that more detailed discussion, I think we should just revisit a couple of the urgent points in terms of the current mobilization. The channeling of the spirit of the JASTA victory into the mobilization for the re-institution of Glass-Steagall and the proceeding toward the entirety of the four LaRouche economic laws.

BEN DENISTON: Plenty can be said, but I would just emphasize – you said it already, but I think given the state of our nation today; and I hate to mention the elections, but this is really a form of psychological warfare. This is not an election; this is a Jerry Springer episode, this is insane. But, as Matthew cited, look at what we did with JASTA. That did not require either of these candidates to do anything on that; that was an action demonstrating the institutions of the United States, the republican system of the United States. The integration between the work that we've been leading and the work the 9/11 victims' families have been leading on the ground,

working with various institutions, various regions of the country as a totality came together and slammed Obama, slammed the British, slammed these degenerate Saudis on this issue; in spite of the insanity leading the Presidential election process. So, that's the spirit we need to take right now to the current Glass-Steagall fight. This financial system is collapsing; as was said, you can see that in any major press at this point. There is no solution left in the monetarist framework the way these guys are playing it. Bail in; bail out; QE; they've been playing these games for years now, and they're reaching the end. This can't keep going; we need a reorganization of the system. If we're not going to have a Presidential candidate who's going to take the lead on that, that doesn't matter; we need to make it happen. We're not going to wait 'til after the election; we're not going to wait for one of these ridiculous fools to take the lead on this. We're going to make it happen. That's what we did with JASTA; that happened.

So, people who are cynical out there – we did it! That happened. It can happen again, and it needs to happen again. Glass-Steagall is going to completely cut off Wall Street; this is going to be a massive revolution in the United States, a massive shift of power in the United States away from the interests of Wall Street and international finance back to the sovereignty of the United States. It is the necessary indispensable first step for opening up this full recovery

program. But I think people need to have the urgency of getting this through now. Again, don't let your friends, your associates, the people you're talking to, fall into this cynical pessimism; which is really being pushed at this point, with the Jerry Springer show – aka these debates. These things can change; we can get these laws through. There's already huge momentum around the country on Glass-Steagall; there's growing recognition of LaRouche's Four Laws as the necessary next steps. So, I think the message to take away at this critical time is go out and move! This is the time to make this happen.

MICHAEL STEGER: Yeah, I think that's right. I think it's important to take a look at a couple of things in the context of this Hamilton question. Because it was about two years ago that Mr. LaRouche launched the Manhattan Project with the key focus of Alexander Hamilton at the foundation of that, as well as a commitment towards a Classical renaissance. And what we saw in the process of these last two years, was the mobilization of a key part of the American population – the New York City area; because of the questions of Glass-Steagall and of Wall Street implicitly, and the question of 9/11. There was a mobilization of that population around an optimistic vision of the country, both through Hamilton's policies, really the foundation of Hamilton setting forth the most advanced conception of human economy as a scientific practice that has been conceived yet. Mr. LaRouche said this himself, that what he took as the Four

Laws was essentially a patenting of what Hamilton had set forth in these documents. Both the power of the Federal government, and the means and mechanisms by which you can develop and foster a perpetual growth of the human species. But I think it's also important – because I think this is something that too many Americans overlook, either voluntarily, but more so involuntarily, because of the black-out in the media; that in June of 2014, we saw consolidated what Xi Jinping had put out as an international policy at the end of 2013, which was the New Silk Road perspective. In June 2014, that was consolidated by the BRICS; and largely what we've seen, given the attempts to undercut Brazil and South Africa, but we've seen an increasing level of coordination and collaboration between Russia, China, and India, that has fundamentally shifted world history. We are talking about a fundamentally new economic system; one that looks at the very policy Mr. LaRouche laid out beginning in the 1970s. At the core of that, is the question of an International Development Bank; or what the BRICS have entitled the New Development Bank. Or as a LaRouche-Hamiltonian conception of a new international credit system; that is there.

Now, not only is that economic perspective there; it is recruiting nations like Japan, the Philippines, Australia, Canada. Many nations joined the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank; nations like Egypt, and Iran. But there is also a very clear strategic component; we see this specifically in Syria. We see what Russia has done to confront Obama's war agenda. Then

the coordination between Russia and China, India, and increasing numbers of other nations throughout Eurasia. This is a unique opportunity for the American people to create a new Presidency that looks to realign with Russia, China, and these major nations. All of the propaganda against Putin, all the attacks, the lies, the mass of lies against Putin coming out of the Obama operation right now in the Presidential election is a mass cover-up of what really exists for the American people; which is a chance to go back to a LaRouche-Hamilton perspective in economic policy in the United States with very key collaborators internationally. That really is shaping the intervention we made around JASTA, both the Manhattan Project and this Russia-China intervention. The BRICS is larger, but those nations most specifically. We really have a unique opportunity to shut down this London-Wall Street financial system, which for 50-60 years and longer, essentially, but since the end of World War II has been a mass genocide program in Africa, in South America. Forced sterilizations; imposed famines; scientific frauds like global warming, the ozone layer, or human overpopulation; all of these things have been concocted as ways of undermining and destroying the human economic growth potential.

And we now see a potential today to change that. An intervention by the American people like we saw with JASTA, around this LaRouche-Hamilton perspective is absolutely key. But I think this global perspective is essential to that, to

understanding why we can be so optimistic today.

OGDEN: Yeah, I think that if you go and look at what was presented last week, Paul Gallagher presented a clear picture in terms of the proximity of the complete breakdown of this financial system; and the causes for that, the reason for that. The insanity of 0% interest rate QE bail-in, bail-out regime that has reigned since 2008; but really since the repeal of Glass-Steagall in 1999. The fact that what would be a productive economy has been completely drowned and suffocated by a shark tank – as he characterized it – of this just robbery, looting, criminal practices and complete insanity as it reigns in terms of economics. The fact that Mr. LaRouche is on the scene, and has for 50 years what has now been adopted in part by several major nations on this planet – I think most clearly evidenced by the policies of the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank and the New Silk Road projects coming out of China. We have the ability to bring Alexander Hamilton's principles to bear on this current situation. The vacuum of leadership in the face of this total meltdown of the financial system gives us a great opportunity for optimism. In fact, through reasoned leadership of the type that was exerted in the midst of this fight for JASTA, but which was really a fight against the entire imperial apparatus that has dominated this country since 9/11; you can in fact create a

policy revolution of a type which has not been seen for a long time, especially since John F Kennedy with his commitment to the space program. But really not since Franklin Roosevelt in the full extent of that kind of economic approach.

I think we should revisit these four economic principles of

Mr. LaRouche before getting a little bit more deeply into the content of the Hamilton economic reports. We begin with [No.1] the principle of Glass-Steagall, re-instituted exactly as Franklin Roosevelt did it. It proceeds directly from there, that

through a restored actual commercial banking system in which you

have the Treasury of the United States restored to its original

intended role, as Alexander Hamilton created it; the power of the

Presidency, as Abraham Lincoln demonstrated very clearly through

his use of the Greenbacks and also his national banking bills of

1863 and 1864, can reorganize this banking system, from the top

down, to restore it to its original intent; that it should be used for the productive investments of productive enterprise in

the United States and the improvement of productive enterprise.

But that's not enough! What you have to have from that standpoint, is [No. 2] a scientifically-grounded and principled

understanding of how credit, through the mechanisms that were provided by Alexander Hamilton, must be directed to {increase} the productive powers of your labor force. [No. 3] What are the

specific projects? What are the specific investments? What are

the specific cutting-edge discoveries that must be pursued that
in a scientifically provable and knowable way that will increase
the productive powers of your labor force, both individually and
as a whole? And that has to be defined from an understanding, as
Mr. LaRouche has uniquely developed it, of the principle of
energy-flux density, not a one-to-one labor power, as manual
labor per individual member of your society, but the application
of technology and ever-higher forms of technology, to create the
increases of productive powers of labor, upon which progress in
your society depends.

And then, No. 4, what are the specific future-oriented drivers that express the unique character of man? What makes man
different from a beast? How is mankind, as Vernadsky would define
it, a unique and distinct species, distinct from all other forms
of animal and other kinds of life? And, what is our imperative,
as that sort of species? I think it is no better expressed than
in the space program, as it was conceived and elaborated, as
Kesha has emphasized, by Krafft Ehricke, who Mr. LaRouche
directly mentions in that "Four Economic Laws" paper of two
years ago.

So, that was elaborated on the webcast last week. We've got,
I think, a little bit more specificity for especially that third

economic law, but I think between what Ben and I have, and then the discussion with Kesha and Michael, you can see the resonance between what Mr. LaRouche is addressing in these four economic laws, and what Alexander Hamilton originally laid out in the content of those four economic reports that he drafted to Congress in the 1790s.

BEN DENISTON: You had some quotes from those reports that you want to read?

OGDEN: Sure, we can start with that.

DENISTON: Okay.

OGDEN: Let me bring up on the screen the first slide from these Hamilton reports. [Slide 1] I'm going to focus mainly on the "Report on Manufactures." This was written in December 1791, but, as I mentioned earlier, this is merely one out of four, and in the "Report on Manufactures," actually, Hamilton refers repeatedly to his other three reports, "On the National Bank," "The Defense of the Constitutionality of the National Bank," and "On the Public Debt," or, "On the Public Credit."

I think the "Report on Manufactures" is a very important and useful place to start, because it really is nothing less than the study of the science of how the human mind, through its application by means of technology, can in fact increase the potential population density of any given economy or any given nation. This is the way that Mr. LaRouche came at this, but in fact it's very much demonstrated and laid out, explored, in an

exploratory way, in this "Report on Manufactures."

Quickly, the context of the "Report on Manufactures" – you could really call it Hamilton's "Defense of Manufactures," in the context of what was becoming a prevailing but fraudulent argument, coming from circles such as Thomas Jefferson circles and others. That the United States, as a new nation, should merely be an agrarian economy, an agrarian economy in one form or another – landlords and peasants – or just an infinite extension of agricultural lands westward, and just depend on the product of the soil as the driver of the economy. Hamilton said, this is false, this is a fraud, this must be addressed, and he wrote the "Report on Manufactures" to address this.

What Hamilton elaborates is that in fact an economy which is dependent merely on agriculture will be able to support far less people at a far lower standard of living and a far lower density of population, than an economy which also includes manufacturers, science, technology, and the application of that, through technology. A kind of argument generally used, said that anybody who was not farming and was doing something else, like manufacturing, would be producing less food, and so we would have fewer people; we would be able to support fewer people. Hamilton destroys this argument, saying in fact that it's the other way around: the more division of labor that you have, if two people are just doing agriculture, they can only support themselves.

If

instead one of them is engaged in agriculture and one in manufacturing, not only can they support the two of them, but they can support themselves and others.

Let me go back to that first slide, with that quote. Hamilton says, the purpose of this report is "to evince that the establishment and diffusion of manufacturers have the effect of rendering the total mass of useful and productive labor in a community greater than it would otherwise be." So, you can see, he's very clear in what the purpose of this study is.

Next slide. [Slide 2] He says "It may be inferred that manufacturing establishments not only occasion a positive augmentation of the produce and revenue of the society, but that they may contribute essentially to rendering them greater than they could possibly be without such establishments." So, without the use of manufacturing, the ability of the economy would be lesser than it would be with manufacturing establishments.

He says there are seven reasons for this. I'm not going to elaborate all seven, but you can see on the screen on the next slide [Slide 3] the seven reasons he has listed: "(1) The division of labor." I touched on that briefly. "(2) An extension of the use of machinery." We'll elaborate on that a little bit more. "(3) Additional employment to classes of the community not ordinarily engaged in the business." "(4) The promoting of emigration from foreign countries." That's an apropos point. "(5) The furnishing greater scope for the diversity of talents and dispositions which discriminate men from each other." We'll touch

on that a little bit more. That's an important one. "(6) The affording a more ample and various field for enterprise." And "(7) The creating in some instances a new, and securing in all, a more certain and steady demand for the surplus produce of the soil." This one is actually often overlooked, but Hamilton says this is the most important one, and I think it will be appropriate for what Ben's going to get into.

Let me elaborate just a couple of these ones. We're going to take a look at No. 2: "An extension of the use of machinery." Here's what Hamilton says about that. This is the next slide. [Slide 4] Alexander Hamilton says, "The employment of machinery forms an item of great importance in the general mass of national industry. 'Tis an artificial force brought in aid of the natural force of man; and, to all the purposes of labor, is an increase of hands; an accession of strength,{unencumbered, too, by the expense of maintaining the laborer}. He's saying you have an increase of hands, almost artificial labor, and you don't need to feed that labor.

Next slide. [Slide 5] [Hamilton continues,] "May it not therefore be fairly inferred, that those occupations, which give greatest scope to the use of this auxiliary, contribute most to the general stock of industrious effort, and, in consequence, to the general produce of industry?" So, that's the use of machinery in manufacturing.

Let's take a look at the next slide. [Slide 6] This is where he elaborates the point [No. 5] "As to the furnishing greater scope for the diversity of talents and dispositions, which discriminate men from each other." He says, "It is a just observation, that minds of the strongest and most active powers for their proper objects fall below mediocrity and labor without effect, if confined to uncongenial pursuits. And it is thence to be inferred, that the results of human exertion may be immensely increased by diversifying its objects. When all the different kinds of industry obtain in a community, each individual can find his proper element, and can call into activity the whole vigor of his nature. And the community is benefitted by the services of its respective members, in the manner, in which each can serve it with most effect."

Next slide please. [Slide 7] He continues, "If there be anything in a remark often to be met with – namely that there is, in the genius of the people of this country, a peculiar aptitude for mechanic improvements, it would operate as a forcible reason for giving opportunities to the exercise of that species of talent, by the propagation of manufactures."

OK; next slide. [Slide 8] In this one, he's elaborating his point [No. 6] about "affording a more ample and various field for enterprise." This is quoted, but I think it's very important. He says, "To cherish and stimulate the activity of the human

mind,
by multiplying the objects of enterprise, is not among the
least
considerable of the expedients, by which the wealth of a
nation
may be promoted."

Next slide. [Slide 9] He continues, "Even things in
themselves not positively advantageous, sometimes become so,
by
their tendency to provoke exertion. Every new scene, which is
opened to the busy nature of man to rouse and exert itself, is
the addition of a new energy to the general stock of the
effort."

Next slide. [Slide 10] He continues, "The spirit of
enterprise, useful and prolific as it is, must necessarily be
contracted or expanded in proportion to the simplicity or
variety
of the occupations and productions, which are to be found in a
society. It must be less in a nation of mere cultivators, than
in
a nation of cultivators and merchants, less in a nation of
cultivators and merchants, than in a nation of cultivators,
artificers and merchants.

Next slide. [Slide 11] I want to put special emphasis
on
this one, because I think it opens up the point that Mr.
LaRouche
was exploring in his Four Laws paper about physical chemistry.
Alexander Hamilton says under this one [Point No. 7], the
heading
of "As to the creating, in some instances, a new, and securing
in
all a more certain and steady demand for the surplus produce
of
the soil." Hamilton says, "This is among the most important of
the circumstances which have been indicated. It is a principal
mean, by which the establishment of manufacturers contributes

to
an augmentation of the produce or revenue of a country, and
has
an immediate and direct relation to the prosperity of
agriculture."

Next slide. [Slide 12] "It is a principal mean by
which the
establishment of manufactures contributes to an augmentation
of
the produce or revenue of a country."

Next slide [Slide 13] After elaborating a little bit
why
it's advantageous to have a domestic market rather than just
depending on foreign markets for your produce and products, he
says:

"It merits particularly observation that the
multiplication
of manufacturies not only furnishes a domestic market for
these
articles which have been accustomed to be produced in
abundance
in a country; but it likewise creates a demand for such as
were
either unknown or produced in considerable quantities. The
bowels as well as the surface of the Earth are ransacked for
articles which were before neglected. Animals, plants, and
minerals acquire a utility and value which were before
unexplored."

Then, jumping forward quite a bit, I just wanted to go
to
Hamilton's conclusion of the entire paper, after discussing
public credit and national banking. [Slide 14] He says:

"In countries where there is a great private wealth,
much
may be affected by the voluntary contributions of patriotic
individuals. But in a community situated like that of the
United

States, the public purse must supply the deficiency of private resource. In what can it be so useful as in promoting, prompting, and improving the efforts of industry?"

So, just before Ben picks it up, I just want to emphasize that what Alexander Hamilton is exploring, is the science of how the human mind can increase the productive powers of labor and through that, by means of the application of technology and principles that were hitherto unexplored or undiscovered, can increase the potential population density of a nation or an economy. I think this seventh point, which he puts the most premium on, is the role that manufactures can play in spurring the discovery of resources that we didn't even know were resources before. What had been previously considered just rocks or otherwise, become the most valuable resources – minerals, fuels, coal, oil, uranium; the most valuable resources for your economy. I think Alexander Hamilton would be particularly excited if he knew about the potential of the Moon to be mined for a resource that I'm sure they did not have any conception of in 1791 – helium-3 – as a source of fuel for nuclear fusion, for example. So, I just wanted to give a little bit of actual content of Alexander Hamilton's Report on Manufactures; and maybe we can use that to contextualize a little bit of what Ben's going to present here.

DENISTON: People should know, we are making these – in their totality – available on the LaRouche PAC website. This is admittedly some pretty heavy material for some of our viewers, but this is really what's needed right now. I would just

emphasize looking where we are in the United States right now, and again, a lot of people know Glass-Steagall needs to happen; a number of people have a sense of having some sovereign control over our money supply. But what Hamilton understood and what LaRouche understands, is what is the science of growth. You can have sovereign control of your money, you can cut off destructive speculation like Wall Street; you can throw that in the trash. But how do you create growth? How do you actually create a more productive economy in totality? That is what Hamilton understood; that a true credit system can facilitate these increases in the productive power of labor. That's what the American people need to understand right now; that's what we have a chance of joining internationally with what's going on around the world. But it's going to require that the United States return to our understanding of these core principles. I wanted to just take a second and pull a little bit out of what Mr. LaRouche defined as his Third Law in his policy document; and just go through a couple of historical examples to put a little bit more of a picture on this relation of the actual understanding of the productive powers of labor and the critical role that Mr. LaRouche has defined in his work furthering Hamilton's own understanding to a new degree. Mr. LaRouche's work on what he defines as "energy flux density".

But if we can go back to the slides, I have the full quote of Mr. LaRouche's Third Law up there. [Slide 15] Again, the policy document as a whole is available on our website. I just

wanted to read this and then go through a couple examples. Again, the First Law being Glass-Steagall; the Second Law being a national banking system, as Hamilton had defined. And then he presents a Third Law with this national banking system:

"The purpose of the use of a Federal credit system, is to generate high-productivity trends in improvement of employment with the accompanying intention to increase the physical economic productivity and the standard of living of the persons and the households of the United States. The creation of credit for the now urgently needed increase of the relative quality and quantity of productive employment must be ensured this time once more, as was done successfully under President Franklin Roosevelt or by like standards of Federal practice used to create a general economic recovery of the nation, per capita. And for rates of net increases in productivity and by reliance on the essential human principle which distinguishes the human personality from the systemic characteristics of lower forms of life; the net rate of energy flux density of effective practice. This means intrinsically a thoroughly scientific, rather than a merely mathematical one; and by the related increase of energy flux density per capita and for the human population when considered as each and all as a whole. The ceaseless increase of the physical productivity of employment, accompanied by its benefits for the general welfare, are a principle of Federal law which must be a paramount standard of achievement of the nation and the individual."

I think really, again, illustrates Mr. LaRouche's work

furthering this scientific understanding of economy really rooted in the work of Hamilton and those who continued this American System tradition; but applying a new scientific understanding to it. If we go to the next slide [Slide 16], I wanted to highlight a study that was done under Mr. LaRouche's direction back in the '80s. Mr. LaRouche has a long history of trying to educate the American people and institutions about real economics. I thought this was just one example, but I think it may be a helpful, specific case study to try and put some depth to the idea of the productive powers of labor and the relation of energy flux density to the productive powers of labor.

So, what do we mean by that? This is one expression of that; this is a measurement of the productivity of iron throughout the history of the United States up to 1975. Iron being by weight the most-used element by mankind as a whole. Obviously, it's the main component of steel, so this is a major part of any modern economy, is iron production. This is a rather fascinating study, where Mr. LaRouche said, don't just look at tons produced; don't just look at people employed. Look at the relation between productivity – how productive is your average laborer producing iron – and energy flux density; what's the actual energy density per time used in the actual manufacturing process of blast furnaces? If you examine this historically, you get this very fascinating and clear demonstration of what Mr.

LaRouche is talking about in terms of energy flux density and productivity. You see a consistent increase in the tons produced per average iron worker per year in this case is the actual number being used; measured against the energy flux density of the production process. The energy per area, per time; so the concentration and density of energy used in the blast furnaces to produce this iron. And you see a dramatic, many-fold increase in how productive each individual worker is as a direct function and relation of the increasing energy flux density of the productive process.

More interesting, you see this kind of comes in successive waves; and each of these waves is associated with – you'll get a rise for a certain period, and then the productivity increase will tend to level off. Then, you'll get a new technological revolution; you'll move to a higher energy density fuel, for example. Moving into better forms of coal was one example of this; types of coal that have more energy per mass, per weight.

Or moving to coke – a derivative of coal that can operate at higher temperatures and enable higher production rates. Or moving to higher technologies in the more recent period of injection of pure oxygen into the process to create even more heat and a more intense productive process. There are various technologies associated with each of those steps; you have increases in technology, increases in the energy density of the fuel producing the process. You can kind of measure that together as expressed in energy flux density; and you can see that to really understand progress – but also these qualitative

shifts in progress; these leaps that occur, these are the kind of metrics we want to look at.

When you talk about this idea of – it's not a question of the number of people you have employed; it's a question of what's the capability of your labor force to produce the goods needed at higher rates or efficiency, etc. So, I think it's just one useful case study to give some concept of the relationship between the productive powers of labor and energy flux density.

It doesn't show it in this graphic, but as I think many of our viewers wouldn't be surprised, these metrics have gone down significantly since 1975; since we really settled into a post-industrial economy which has led us to this collapse process – the abandonment of this real industrial, forward-oriented economic policy.

If we go to the next graphic [Slide 17], it's just another illustration of the same thing from the same study; but it's also just interesting to note that with each of these successive leaps, you also get higher rates of productivity per amount of energy. So, this is literally the productive output of iron per amount of energy put in. This idea that energy as a scalar value in and of itself means something is not true. The amount of energy you're using does not necessarily tell you what your economy can do, how productive you can be; but it's an issue of energy flux density. Higher energy flux densities, the same amount of energy measured in just scalar, quantitative terms becomes much more productive; because you're employing it with

higher technologies and at higher energy flux densities.

This is just one example. Similar studies can be done in various sectors of the economy; but this is the type of process that enables the productive section of your economy to continue to – as Mr. LaRouche said in the concluding section of this Third Law: "[T]o continue this process of ever increasing the productivity and ability of your labor force to produce more goods, higher quality goods, that are needed to support society." Those are the metrics that we need to understand that the credit must facilitate and go to.

I just wanted to highlight one other illustration of this energy flux density issue, but on a national scale. If we return to the slide [Slide 18], you can also see this in terms of the economy as a whole. This is a study that we developed in the Basement Team looking at the history of the United States; looking at what you could consider one metric for the energy flux density of the nation as a whole. Now, we're looking at the use of power per capita; not just what any one individual uses, but everything that goes into all forms of transportation, manufacturing, agriculture. You take the net energy investment in totality across the entire nation, average it per capita. Then here we have it divided by power sources. You can clearly see the history of the growth of the United States very clearly expressed in the increasing energy flux density of the nation.

You clearly see the Great Depression illustrated by a significant drop in the energy flux density – measured in per capita terms – of the nation. You see a dramatic rise in Franklin Roosevelt's mobilization coming out of the New Deal programs into the World War II mobilization; you clearly see that reflected in this graphic. What's the next dramatic rate of increase? Well, it's certainly associated with Kennedy's space program, starting there in the early '60s you see a dramatic leap in rate of increase of energy flux density of the nation as a whole.

Then what do you see since then? This leveling off and collapse, which is directly associated with the collapse we're seeing now today in the United States; expressed in these physical metrics. You see that what should have been an explosion of nuclear fission power was suppressed to just that tiny, red segment there. If you could see it – you might not be able to at all – there's a little green tiny layer on the very top there which is wind, solar, geothermal all combined. So, if you think you're going to support the US economy on Green technologies, you're living in a fantasy. All of the massive subsidies and investment and propping up these things has barely done anything to contribute to our actual net energy flux density for our country as a whole.

This is where we are today; this is one expression of the collapse. This is the process we have to reverse. Maybe just to illustrate one last example, I think it's really worth

comparing
this with the next graphic [Slide 19]; which was the forecast
by
the Kennedy administration in the '60s. It was forecast that
this process would increase; and the next major component
would
be the rapid expansion of nuclear fission power. You'd get
this
interesting process of these waves of fuel sources being used
and
then surpassed as society moves to the next level. The gray
on
the far right, if you haven't read it yet, that's mostly
wood-powered; in very early times, wood was the main energy
source. That was superseded by coal, as you can see in the
brown. That began to fall off as other fossil fuels – namely,
gasoline, diesel, and natural gas – became a major component
of
the economy. As you can see, under a healthy orientation, it
was
understood in the early '60s by the Kennedy administration,
that
that should then fall off, and we should see a rapid expansion
of
nuclear fission power as the next wave. So, this is what a
healthy growth process would have looked like. This is the
kind
of process we need to return to; and as Mr. LaRouche says,
increasing the energy flux density of the nation, of the
productive powers of labor, of the labor force, these are the
kinds of metrics we need to be looking at. Today, that means
fusion power. It's not illustrated in the graphic here, but
if
we're going to overcome those 30-40 years of stagnation, if
we're
going to overcome the dramatic collapse in the productive
capabilities of our labor force; we can't just continue what

was

done before. As you've seen in all these historical examples, we

need to go to the new leaps in technology, the new leaps in energy flux density, to drive the greatest increase in the productive capabilities of the labor force.

Then you have a system that will work; then the Four Laws

will work. Now, a national bank will work; now, Glass-Steagall

will work, because it will facilitate this physical growth process. As we've talked about, this means fusion power, this means the space program. It's no accident that in those graphics

we were looking at, the period of the space program is very clearly expressed in both of those; driving the increase in the

productive powers of labor, even in industries not seemingly related to the space program. But you see that driver program reflected in this iron production, for example; you see it reflected in the totality of the national energy flux density.

Which brings us to Mr. LaRouche's Fourth Law; a fusion drive

program. As he's increasingly emphasized, that is truly integrated with a real space program. So that has to be the front end of a recovery program. That'll come with all kinds of

things: rebuilding our infrastructure; rebuilding the national

transportation system; power systems; all kinds of soft infrastructure. But it has to be understood as unified around this increase of your productive capabilities; that's how an economy works.

That's what Hamilton understood, as Matthew showed us. Smash the idea that we should be just agrarian, or should we be

manufacturing? If you take people away from the other – a

complete lack of understanding of the synergistic relation of actual human revolutions in technology; revolutions in the very nature of mankind's relation to the environment more generally, which are driven by real creative discoveries, creative thought, real unique human growth. This is the message, the unifying conception that the American people need to understand and rally around, if we're going to get out of the mess we're in now. It's not going to come from any form of monetarist jiggering of the system; it has to be rooted in a real understanding of the true science of human growth, of human progress.

I know that might be a lot to throw at our viewers today, but this is the historical challenge that we're facing. We have it in our history; we have it in Hamilton; we have in Lincoln; we have it in Franklin Roosevelt. We have it in a more developed form than even them, with Mr. LaRouche's work. But it's on us to bring this to bear now as the revolution needed in the United States.

ROGERS: Before we close out, let me just add one principle from the standpoint that the underlying principle at the foundation and at the core of Hamilton's four Reports and LaRouche's Four Laws gets right at the heart of formation of our US republic and the formation of Union as Hamilton saw it. It is what is defined directly in the US Constitution, but more

directly in the Preamble to the Constitution; the idea that Hamilton was instrumental in developing. This conception that "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the General Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." What's at the core of that is the principle of the General Welfare; which is directly under attack right now by the actions of Obama. That is explicitly shown in the attacks on not only the General Welfare of the nation, but attacks on this very principle of the increase of the productive powers of your society, and on the creative and productive powers of the human mind. You can see this most explicitly in the insane recent announcement by President Obama advocating the United States go to Mars under the direction, should we say, and direct support of private industry. But in a recent conference President Obama was in – the White House Frontiers conference – the key person he was there with was a man by the name of Atul Gawande. This is a person who's been promoting the idea that the population doesn't need health care, we need to cut healthcare; we need to kill off more people. That's what's at the core of the attack on the General Welfare of our nation, is this idea of population reduction – killing off of the population.

When you look at what it was that was understood by Alexander Hamilton on this question of advancing the productive powers of labor, that was most directly expressed over a century later after the death of Alexander Hamilton, with the birth of a great pioneer by the name of Krafft Ehrlicke. Krafft Ehrlicke's understanding of the increase in the formation of a more perfect union and the productive powers of labor, came with the understanding that it was not until mankind left the confines of one small planet – Earth – and actually went out into the far reaches of our Solar System and developed the Solar System. He called explicitly for developing the Solar System through the increase in the productivity of society, the increase of manufactures, and the increase of everything that Ben just went through very thoroughly in his remarks.

I think what we get back to again, which was very clearly understood by Alexander Hamilton, as Mr. LaRouche in the foundation of his policies on physical economy, and by Krafft Ehrlicke, is at the heart of this is the conception of, and the principle of, the human mind. The human mind in the power of reason. What I wanted to do is just read a quick quote from Krafft Ehrlicke on this conception of the reasoning of the human mind at the foundation of this very principle of what increases the productive powers of labor in our society – or throughout our universe.

He says: "We are cosmic creatures by substance; by the energy on which we operate, and by the restless mind that

increasingly metabolizes information from the infinitesimal to the infinite. And on the infrastructure of knowledge, pursues its moral and social aspirations for a larger and better world against many odds. Through intelligences like ourselves, the universe – and we in it – move into a focus of self-recognition. Metal ore is turned into formation-processing computers, satellites, and deep space probes; and atoms are fused as in stars. I cannot imagine a more foreboding, apocalyptic vision of the future than a mankind endowed with cosmic powers, but condemned to solitary confinement on one small planet."

He goes on to take the principle which Alexander Hamilton had defined in his four Reports, in his Report on Manufacturing, and applies that to the development of space; particularly to the development of our sister body, the Moon. He says that the manufacturing and the development of the process which would organize the increase of society, the formation of a more perfect union, off of the planet, would actually start with the development of the Moon. And he says: "Lunar industry should be viewed as an organism that over time evolves to progressively more complex capabilities and generates sufficiently strong foundations for expansion. Lunar industry must be broad-based and diverse if it is to last. The need for economic feasibility and early returns will require a skillful interplay between market, consumer-oriented products and services, and infrastructural investments such as transportation, energy, and surface-space installations that expand food production and diversity in industrial productivity."

So, I think what is essential to understand is that Hamilton's conception was not something that was confined to one period in time, one period of history. It wasn't confined to one planet. It was actually organized – as was later understood by Krafft Ehrlicke – to the idea that man cannot be confined to one planet. If we are going to truly form a more perfect union, we have to get off the Earth and develop the entirety of the Solar System and universe we live in. And only the human mind can do that.

OGDEN: Well said. I think Hamilton would concur with that one. We can only encourage to do your own reading of these four Hamilton Reports; and as Ben said at the beginning of the show, we did make those four available on the LaRouche PAC website. There's a big picture of Hamilton; you can click on it. It's got links to the four separate reports by Hamilton; each one is a nicely formatted pdf. You can print them out and read them on your own. I would also just emphasize that larouchepac.com/fourlaws is the place where you can find LaRouche's paper from close to two years ago, as you can see on the screen. This contains the four principles of LaRouche. Put those two together, and I think if you can do the work, we can create the educated citizenry that's necessary to put these policies into practice.

So, the urgency of the mobilization for Glass-Steagall absolutely persists; we are right on the cusp of a complete meltdown of this financial system. The Glass-Steagall mobilization is one which must be generating the kind of activity that we had during the JASTA mobilization. That victory rendered the Obama regime impotent. Don't fall for the bluster and the intimidation; don't give in to the fear that the Obama administration is attempting to project right now. We had a revolution in this country with the override of the JASTA veto; and it's a completely new situation. If we maintain that kind of sense of victory and urgency, we can continue to make some very incredible breakthroughs.

I'd like to thank Ben; thank you, Kesha; thank you, Michael.

Please stay tuned. Obviously, we're going to just elaborate these discussions much more in the days to come. Thank you very much, and good night.

KAMPAGNEAVIS: GLASS-STEAGALL, IKKE EU- FASCISME!

Vi skal have ændret den økonomiske politik, inden vi får en global gentagelse af den fascisme, Europa gennemlevede i 30'erne. Vi må stoppe EU-dikterede nedskæringer, bankunion,

bankhjælpepakker i form af bail-out og bail-in og i stedet iværksætte en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og et opbygningsprogram for realøkonomien.

Vi skal have en moderne version af den anti-fascistiske politik, som præsident Roosevelt gennemførte i USA, og som formåede at bringe USA ud af depressionen – uden at den amerikanske befolkning måtte ofre deres frihed eller liv.

Schiller Instituttet fremlægger denne moderne version af Roosevelts program i denne kampagneavis som det program, som Schiller Instituttets Venner går til valg på i København og Århus.

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)