

Hver generation bør fokusere på en total revolution i den måde, hvorpå menneskeheden fremstår som art.

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Webcast, 23. december, 2016**

Vi befinder os på tærsklen til jul; og vi mente, at det var meget vigtigt at få en diskussion i aftenens show, for vi har en ekstremt intens og vigtig politisk situation i øjeblikket. Vi håber, I alle har en fornemmelse af, hvor vigtige de umiddelbart forestående timer og dage er, og at I ikke er for optaget af julehøjtidelighedens festligheder.

På trods af de massive, falske nyheder, der i øvrigt kendes som de etablerede medier; på trods af de ting, vi dér hører, så er der i øjeblikket et betydningsfuld historisk og strategisk skifte i gang på globalt plan.

For blot at sætte fokus på ét element i dette, så er man i stor stil flippet ud over det faktum, at et lækket overgangsmemo fra Pentagon, fra den tiltrædende Trump-administration, udtrykkeligt ikke opregner Rusland som en eksistentiel trussel mod USA. Alene dette er en lille, men betydningsfuld indikation på den type overgang, vi ser. Der er mange spørgsmålstejn omkring Trump-administrationen, men det, der ganske klart er fremgået, er, at han har til hensigt at tage hele denne geopolitiske trussel om Tredje Verdenskrig af bordet. Dette er endnu en indikation på, at han ikke er indstillet på at spille hele dette Obama-Hillary Clinton,

geopolitiske spil, der går helt tilbage til George Bush-administrationen, gående ud på at forsøge at true, underminere og ødelægge Rusland og Kina i forsøg på at opretholde en eller anden form for anglo-amerikansk globalt herredømme. Dette skræmmer livet af Obama og folkene bag ham i USA, i Europa, i London og lignende steder. Det skaber på den ene side en åbenlys, klar mulighed; men også en temmelig spændt og farlig situation. For blot et par dage siden advarede hr. Larouche udtrykkeligt om, at i denne periode, selv, når det ser ud, som om vi er tæt på Trumps indsættelse, så befinder vi os stadig væk i en meget farlig overgangsperiode; og Obama sidder dér som en dræber, en morder, der har begået mord i hele verden, ødelagt nationer i hele verden, dræbt amerikanere, fuldstændigt revet forfatningsmæssige forholdsregler i stykker, og sådanne ting. Dér sidder, han, stadig i embedet, stadig ved magten. Og blot umiddelbart herefter så vi, næsten efter bogen, en bølge af handlinger af en terroristisk art over hele planeten. Der var terrorhandlingen i Tyskland, der stadig er årsag til udbredt hysteri dér, med ubesvarede spørgsmål mht., hvad det var, der rent faktisk fandt sted. Og selvfølgelig, mordet på den russiske ambassadør i Tyrkiet, som var en direkte trussel mod hele den operation, der med held køres af Putin, for at bringe stabilitet og en reel bekæmpelse af reel terrorisme i dette område, i sammenhæng med en række andre terrortrusler og forsøg på aktioner i hele verden. Det er næsten efter bogen, at denne kaos-operation så bryder ud.

Men i aften vil vi diskutere noget, der er mere gavnligt. Mike [Billington] vil gå mere i dybden med, hvor verden i realiteten er på vej hen, og kunne være på vej hen; under forudsætning af, at vi kan grundfæste dette strategiske skifte; samt, hvorfor planetens nye direktion, under lederskab af Putin, Kina og allierede kræfter, virkelig er i færd med at omstøde dette historiske paradigme, der frem til i dag har knust verden i årtier.

EVERY GENERATION SHOULD BE FOCUSSED ON A COMPLETE REVOLUTION

IN THE VERY NATURE OF MANKIND!

LaRouche PAC Webcast, Dec. 23, 2016

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Hi! Welcome to the LaRouche PAC Weekly Report for December 23, 2016. My name is Benjamin Deniston; I'll be hosting the discussion today. We're happy to be joined by Mike Billington of {Executive Intelligence Review} here in the studio; and over Google Hang-outs, we have Diane Sare, leader of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee joining us from the New Jersey-New York area.

So today we have, I think, a rather exciting and important discussion. We're here on the eve of Christmas Eve; and we thought it was very important to do a show today and have a discussion, because this is an extremely intense and important political situation right now. We hope all of you have a sense of the importance of the situation in the immediate hours and days right now; and are not too swept up in the festivities of the holidays. Despite the massive fake news operation, otherwise known as the mainstream media, despite what you're hearing from that, there is a major historical and strategic shift underway right now globally.

I think just to highlight one element of this, there's been a major freak-out around a leaked Pentagon transition memo from the incoming Trump administration, which explicitly does not list Russia as an existential threat to the United States. This alone is one more small but important indication of the type of transition we're seeing. There's a lot of questions around the

Trump administration, but what's been absolutely clear consistently is that he is looking to take this entire geopolitical threat of World War III off the table. This is just another indication showing that he is not willing to play this Obama-Hillary Clinton going back to the George Bush administration, geopolitical game of trying to threaten, undermine, and destroy Russia and China to try and maintain some kind of Anglo-American global hegemony. This is completely terrifying Obama and the people behind him in the United States, in Europe, in London and related places. This is creating on the one side obviously a clear opportunity; but also a rather tense and dangerous situation. It was just a few days ago that Mr. LaRouche emphatically warned that in this period, even if it seems like we're close to the inauguration of Trump, we still have a very dangerous transition time; and you have Obama sitting there as a killer, as a murderer, who has committed acts of murder around the world, destroyed nations around the world, killed Americans, completely ripped up Constitutional measures and those grounds. And he is sitting there, still in office, still in power; and it was only in the immediate hours and days after that that you had almost by the book, a wave of terrorist-type activity launched all over the planet. You had this terrorist event in Germany, which is still creating major hysteria over there, and there are still major questions about what actually happened with that operation. You obviously had the assassination of this Russian ambassador in Turkey, which was a direct threat to the entire operation that's been run successfully by Putin to bring stability and an actual fight against real terrorism in that region in connection with a

series

of other terrorist threats and attempted actions around the world. It's almost a by the book response of this chaos operation blowing up.

But what we're going to discuss more today is going to be very useful. Mike is going to put some depth in where the world

is actually going and could be going; assuming we can solidify this strategic shift; and why the new directionality of the planet under the leadership of Putin, China, and allied forces is

really threatening to overturn this historical paradigm that's crushed the world for many decades at this point. I want to hand

it over to Mike; and we're going to get into the discussion.

MICHAEL BILLINGTON: OK, thanks Ben. I'm certainly glad to be here. It is an incredible moment in history; it reminds me of

the opening of Dickens' {A Tale of Two Cities}, where he says, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times ..." He meant it, and it's true; we are in a revolutionary period, there's no question about that. This is sweeping the globe; it's

already largely taken over Asia, and the Brexit and the Italian

vote, the Trump vote, and so forth, indicate that people have finally reached the limit to the power of tyranny over their economy, over perpetual warfare. But a revolution doesn't necessarily have a positive outcome, and that's actually what Dickens was talking about. The French Revolution came soon after

the historic and wonderful American Revolution based on a new conception of man; based upon science and technology and a new financial system under Hamilton's ideas to defeat the power of the British Empire which lay in their global financial empire. But the French Revolution was taken over actually by the

British;

but turned into chaos. It's what Schiller said was "a great moment [in history] has found a little people." So, instead of a

great republic, you ended with the guillotine; you ended up with

Robespierre saying the revolution has no need for science, and ultimately this led to the emergence of the first fascist – Napoleon.

So, we cannot be complacent; we have a tremendous victory in

the defeat of Obama and his clone, Hillary, and their British operation. But we certainly cannot sit back and cross our fingers and hope that Trump is going to do the right thing.

It's going to be up to us. We should reflect on how the American Revolution succeeded. It succeeded because it was focussed on a

tremendous sense of history and philosophical thought; the Founding Fathers put together the {Federalist Papers}, the writings of Alexander Hamilton, which we've recently published.

If you read these, these are not easy; yet this was the basis on

which the so-called common men and women studied and came to the

conclusion that in fact this small group of leaders were leading

them in the right direction, and had created a future. It was based on poetry. In fact, Schiller was known as the Poet of Freedom and was treasured for 100 years after the American Revolution as the poet of the American Revolution; despite being

German and writing in German. But this was known to the American

people. The music; the great {Messiah} by Handel was composed in

1741 – it was known. Our Schiller Institute just performed a phenomenal version of this great work – the {Messiah} – at the Co-Cathedral of St. Joseph in Brooklyn last week in an extremely moving ceremony. These are the kinds of ceremonies that took place at that time; that lifted people to a higher sense of their humanity, of the dignity of man, and of creating a future.

So, which of these two paths are we going to be taking today? Well, it's obvious which way Obama was going; we've made that very clear. His intention was war; not only the perpetual wars in the Middle East, but leading to a war with Russia, a war with China. These are not completely resolved, but as Ben said, we're a long way away from that horror, which was facing us had we not defeated that in this final election. But the result of these 16 years of Bush and Obama can be seen in what's happened to our own country; not just the Hell that's been taken to the Middle East and other parts of the world. We now have a decline in life expectancy for the first time in our nation's history. We have a drug epidemic in which 1 out of 15 Americans are addicted to heroin or its substitutes; 1 out of 15 Americans. This is not a problem; this is a disaster, a collapse of civilization which is not only tolerated and supported openly by our President, who promotes legalizing drugs and who is doing everything in his power to stop the emergence of a war on drugs in the Philippines, which I'll come back to.

So, on the other hand, we see that Russia, under Putin's

direction, has intervened to stop this series of regime-change operations. What's happened in the tremendous victory in Aleppo

against terrorism, is that Putin has demonstrated that if you work hand-in-hand with sovereign nations, with their leaders, you

can defeat terrorism. And he basically exposed the fact that Obama – like Bush – was on the side of the terrorists; under the guise of fighting terrorism, was openly working with the Saudis and the British, who were arming and creating these terrorist movements to overthrow regimes who refused to follow their dictates – the so-called "regime-change" movement.

That's

been probably crushed; this is not completely solved, but what's

happened in Aleppo not only stops the disintegration of Syria, but it should – if properly pursued – mean the end of the regime-change criminality of both Bush and Obama once and for all.

I'm going to read to you – today happened to be the day that Putin gave his annual end of year press conference. I think

just reading one section of part of that, and paraphrasing a few

others is important. It's important for people to watch Putin;

it's done with an English voice-over. It's useful to watch to see why it is that the oligarchy is so terrified of this man.

I'm just going to read you – actually it was a question that came from a man named Yevgeny Primakov. It turns out that he is,

indeed, the grandson of the great Yevgeny Primakov who died recently; but who was the original architect of the idea of China, Russia, and India collaborating to form a new core of nations that could appeal to America to join them. Which is, of

course, what has to happen, as a basis of reversing the

imperial

decline of the human race; and which led to the BRICS, it led to

the New Silk Road. So, his grandson asked a question which said,

"Mr. Putin, Barack Obama, who is still your official colleague,

said that 37% of the Republicans sympathize with you. And hearing this, Ronald Reagan would have rolled over in his grave."

So, he says, "Our western colleagues often tell us that you have

the power to manipulate the world, to designate Presidents and to

interfere in elections here and there. How does it feel to be the most powerful person on Earth? Thank you." So, with that humorous, but very insightful question, Putin said the following:

"The current US Administration and leaders of the Democratic Party are trying to blame all their failures on outside factors!...

"We know that not only did the Democratic Party lose the presidential election, but also the Senate, where the Republicans have the majority, and Congress, where the Republicans are also in control. Did we, or I also do that?...

"It seems to me there is a gap between the elite's vision of what is good and bad and that of what in earlier times we would

have called the broad popular masses!... [A] substantial part of the American people share similar views with us on the world's organization, what we ought to be doing, and the common threats

and challenges we are facing. It is good that there are people

who sympathize with our views on traditional values because this forms a good foundation on which to build relations between two such powerful countries as Russia and the United States, build them on the basis of our peoplesâ mutual sympathy.

"I... I'm not so sure who might be turning in their grave right now. It seems to me that Reagan would be happy to see his partyâs people winning everywhere, and would welcome the victory of the newly elected President so adept at catching the public mood, and who took precisely this direction and pressed onwards to the very end, even when no one except us believed he could win.

"The outstanding Democrats in American history would probably be turning in their graves though. Roosevelt certainly would be because he was an exceptional statesman in American and world history, who knew how to unite the nation even during the Great Depressionâs bleakest years, in the late 1930s, and during World War II. Todayâs administration, however, is very clearly dividing the nation. The call for the electors not to vote for either candidate, in this case, not to vote for the President-elect, was quite simply a step towards dividing the nation. Two electors did decide not to vote for Trump, and four for Clinton, and here too they lost. They are losing on all fronts and looking for scapegoats on whom to lay the blame. I think that this is an affront to their own dignity. It is important to know how to lose gracefully."

Helga LaRouche commented when I read this to her, that this is a call not only to the Democrats in America, but to the

oligarchs throughout the world who are acting as if this revolutionary change is not taking place; as if they still have

the power to dictate policies, and who are hysterical about what

is happening in America. Putin concludes this way; he says:

"But my real hope is for us to build business-like and constructive relations with the new President and with the future

Democratic Party leaders as well, because this is in the interests of both countries and peoples."

So, this is leadership; what we so sorely miss here in the United States. There's much more; more will be made available in

the {EIR}.

Now let me turn to Asia. Asia today should – in fact China in particular, but not just China – be seen as the model which America must follow if we are to pull ourselves out of the morass

that we're in today. We've discussed this in this program and in

our publications many times: the entire Silk Road development, the development of corridors. I want to put some maps up, and just very quickly review some of the incredible development projects that are going on, virtually every single day.

This [Fig. 1] is a map published just in the last few days by something called MERICS [the Mercator Institute for China Studies]. They have a competent article on the whole Silk Road process. They've marked in this red graphic where some of the corridors are; they're not all there. Of course you have the original corridor, which was the Trans-Siberian Railroad; which

was developed with consultation and advice from Henry Carey and

the American System, who worked with the Russians to replicate what had been done in the United States with the Transcontinental

Railroad, not just to be from one end to the other, but to develop the entire region in between.

DENISTON: It's the black-gray dashed line of the existing rail lines.

BILLINGTON: Yeah, this one here, where I'm running that thing. Now, you see the lower one that goes through China, through Xinjiang Province, into Kazakhstan. This is the New Silk Road, which was developed following the 1990s, with the fall of the Soviet Union. Helga Zepp LaRouche helped organize in Beijing a conference in 1996 on what the Chinese call the New Eurasian Land-Bridge. Helga called it the New Silk Road even then.

This led to the building of this rail which is now functioning. It has several branches, both in China, and, on the far side, in Europe, as well as branches down into central Asia.

It's being upgraded. It's not connected, it doesn't have the same grade, most of it is not high-speed. So this is a work-in-process.

Now look at what's happened just in the last couple years. This red line down here, is what's called the Pakistan Corridor.

This is a connection by rail, from China, down through Pakistan,

into Baluchistan (the southern part of Pakistan), and to the Gwadar Port, which is being transformed into a major hub for oil

from the Middle East, for trade with India. Hopefully, if the India/Pakistan relationship can be resolved. Then – not on this

map – right around here in southern Iran, is the development

of

the Chabahar Port, from which there are rail connections up through Iran to Teheran, and then into Azerbaijan, and into Russia. Another north/south route; so, you have several north/south routes.

Over here, you see this red line that goes from Kunming in southern China, through Thailand, Myanmar, and into India. This

is the old Burma Road that was built during the Second World War.

Mr. Lyndon LaRouche had a hand in building the Burma Road (or worked along that Road). That's now being reconstructed. It will

eventually be a rail connection. And you see that this pipeline

– the black line here – is an offshoot from China all the way down to the coast of Myanmar, where they are now taking in shipments from Middle East oil and piping it up into China.

Over here, this corridor. You already have rail connections from Kunming down to the Laos border, and now the Chinese are building a high-speed rail through Laos, down to the Thai border.

Just in the last few months, they've concluded their plans to build a high-speed rail from the Laos border down to Bangkok.

At

this point, there's only an old railroad from Bangkok down to Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia – down here. But that will eventually be done; and in the meantime, probably the Chinese, maybe the Japanese, are building a high-speed rail from Kuala Lumpur to Singapore. So, eventually, you'll have all the way from Kunming

down to Singapore.

In Indonesia, the Chinese are building a railroad from the capital of Jakarta to Bandung. Many of you have heard of Bandung

from the famous Bandung Conference in 1955, which was the first

meeting of Asian and African leaders who had formerly been colonized, meeting without their colonial masters – the so-called Asia-Africa Conference that was organized by Sukarno and Nehru and Chou En-Lai (from China), and others. So that's in the process; other developments there.

If you look at this part of the Africa map [Fig. 2], these are some railroads that have already been constructed. Go to the next map of the two Africa maps. Okay. This [Fig. 3] is from{EIR}'s report "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge". This shows, on this side, the existing rail structures as of a few years ago. You see that basically there's no way to get from one capital to another. You can only get the raw materials from the mine out to the port, where it was shipped off to Europe and America. That's all the colonial powers cared about in developing Africa.

What you see here, is a general map of the kind of commitment that the Chinese have made to {connect every capital of Africa} with high-speed rail, several cross-continental railroads. The Chinese need raw materials, just like the Europeans did, but they're paying for it; they're {building nations}. They're building nations that have industry, agriculture, water, power, education, using a model which we used to call the American System, but which we've deserted in our country.

The same in South America. You can go to the next map [Fig. 4] here. This is also from our report. It's not quite accurate for what is in the process now, actually, because the Chinese are talking about building {two} trans-oceanic railroads: one that

goes from Peru directly into Brazil and to the coast; one that goes south of that through Bolivia. The Bolivians, of course, want that railroad to go through Bolivia.

So, again, transforming the world in a way which, of course, the U.S. long ago ceased to do; becoming more of a British-style colonial power which looted the raw materials, imposing huge amounts of debt, and then using that debt as a weapon to keep the countries in a state of backwardness.

Now, I'm going to look at two other aspects of Asia: the Philippines and Japan – where huge transformations are taking place. Most of you have seen – either in our material or just in the daily news – about Rodrigo Duterte, the new [Philippine] President who took office in June of this year, who has {totally transformed} the Philippines, with massive, massive support from the population, estimated at more than 80%. Why? It's because he took on the reality that the country had been destroyed. The history of the Philippines, in brief, was that in the 1970s and '80s, they were viewed by the rest of Asia – including Korea, by the way – as {the} model for development, under Ferdinand Marcos. They had built the first nuclear power plant. They had made the country self-sufficient in rice, by direct support for infrastructure for agriculture. They had built 11 major industrial infrastructure projects. They had built rail and road infrastructure. Imelda Marcos, whom most of you know only because she supposedly was wildly extravagant and had millions of

pairs

of shoes. Well, the reason she had the shoes was because {she built a shoe industry in the Philippines}. She brought in Italian

shoemakers; she shipped in cattle from Australia, for the leather; she created a shoe industry. And those who produced the

shoes in the Philippines were so grateful that they gave her the

first pair of any new shoe they developed. That's the reality, contrary to the "fake news" that we received back in the 1980s,

when the neo-cons, under George Schultz and Henry Kissinger and

others decided to overthrow Marcos, to make a horrible example of

him; that they would not allow Third World countries to have nuclear power, to be self-sufficient.

The result is, that what was once the greatest rising power in Southeast Asia, has become the basket case of that region. And

this is what Duterte is acknowledging. He's saying, "We've been

destroyed by the so-called big-brother, who looks down at the little brown brothers in the Philippines." And he said, "We're not going to tolerate it anymore. We're going to crush the drugs

that have been brought into our country and are destroying our children. And we're going to reject the U.S. domination of our economy, where all they want is our raw materials, and to use our

bright young people who graduate from college who have no jobs as

engineers or scientists or teachers, or nurses or doctors, even,

but who can only work all night long in call-centers, answering

calls from the master back in the United States who has a problem with his computer or his banking code." This is how the country was destroyed.

So, he's turned to China; he's turned to Russia. His Defense

Minister, Delfin Lorenzana, has gone to Russia; he's going to China. They're going to build that country. They're going to end

this drug epidemic. And for that, he's being told he's going to

be taken to the International Criminal Court for extra-judicial

murders, for human rights violations, by the fact that drug dealers who fight back are being killed. Well, this is rather hypocritical, I would say. If you count the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people that Obama has killed through extra-judicial murder – no court, no due process, no proof.

Just

the king decides: "This is my list of people to kill this week";

he and John Brennan, Director of the CIA. This is rather hypocritical. What's really behind it? {The British don't want to

stop drugs}. The banking institutions in London and New York are

{drug dependent}, meaning they're drug-money dependent, in addition to the fact that many of the bankers are high on cocaine

and heroin. They're drug dependent in the sense that the biggest

business in the world is propping up these bankrupt Western banks

who do nothing but speculate. This is the reality of this.

And of course, the main thing is that they don't want to see

this war on drugs brought home. One out of 15 Americans addicted to heroin; this is mind-boggling! And they know that the American people, if they're given a sense, like we did with our War on Drugs policy under LaRouche's direction back in the '80s and '90s; that this could capture the American people.

Lastly, let me mention Japan. The British-American strategy for containing China and Russia in the Asian side, has always been South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and Australia. And Singapore is in there someplace. Many of you know Korea's in total upheaval. The President who started off wanting to work with Russia and China, and was somehow completely taken over by Obama, turned against the collaboration with Eurasia; agreed to bring in these U.S. THAAD missiles, supposedly to protect them from North Korea. But these are missiles that go up into the high altitude. North Korea is 30 miles away from Seoul. You don't need this for Korea! You need them for China and Russia, for war. They were in the process of turning the Philippines into a massive U.S. military base, under an agreement with the former puppet-President.

In the Korea case, the President is now being impeached. She'll probably be out in April or so. The Opposition wants to stop that THAAD deployment. The Philippines we know; we've just discussed it. Just in the last week, Duterte repeated that he's probably going to absolutely cancel the strategic agreements with the United States. "We don't need foreign soldiers in our country," he said. "We're not going to have a war with China."

Now, Japan. Lyndon LaRouche has always said that there are

two Japans. There's the Japan that came out of feudalism with the Meiji Restoration, which was highly influenced by the American System. Key people who brought in the work of Henry Carey, Friedrich List, which gave rise to this great industrial explosion in Japan; which turned them into the leading nation of Asia at that time, that superseded the 5000-year old culture and tradition in China in terms of its strength. But there was also the Japan of the British Empire; the British came at the same time, and basically said, "Look, Japan, you're an island nation like we are. You need to get raw materials, you don't have them in your own country. The only way you're going to get them is by having a mighty military and colonizing; taking over countries and taking their raw materials like we have – the great British Empire." Without going through all the details, as you know, this eventually won out in the sense that Japan adopted a militarist policy and unleashed the horror of the Second World War, which started long before Pearl Harbor. It started with the invasion of China and the looting of China; but then led to the destruction of China and other countries and ultimately to the destruction of Japan.

So, President Shinzo Abe represents both of these things. He has had his problems with China; he has wanted to remilitarize to get out from under the Constitution in Japan, which basically forbade them to fight war – a Constitution worked out after World War II with General MacArthur's collaboration. And he

wants to be what he calls a "normal nation". But, he also recognizes that he's gotten nothing from the collapsing Western financial system; and he sees the future of Japan in the real development of Russia and China, of Asia; and not by taking it over this time, but by collaboration through the New Paradigm, through the New Silk Road. Through the collaboration especially with Russia. His grandfather, who was a prime minister, and his father, who was a politician, were committed to developing good relations with Russia; and he is now on course.

So, what's happened this year? It's an extraordinary transformation taking place. It began with his visit with Putin in Sochi in May; at which point he laid out an eight-point program for the development of the Russian Far East using Japanese technology and resources and financing. Also, in May, there was a meeting of the G-7 in Japan. Russia wasn't there, because they threw Russia out of the G-8; it became the G-7 again. So, he didn't meet Putin there; but at that event, Abe basically said to the other G-6 leaders – including Obama – that we were on the brink of a horrible financial breakdown crisis – worse than 2008. This was absolutely rejected.

Obama said "No, we're in a recovery; it might be too slow, but it's going well." He didn't say this, but because there's lots of money being printed to keep the speculation going in the banks; there's lots of drugs flowing everywhere, things are going fine.

So, Abe was crushed on that; the final communiqué didn't mention what Abe had said, but everybody knew. Then, in September, he went to Vladivostok for a conference organized by

Putin on the development of the Far East; and they went further ahead with these development projects. And then, finally this month, Putin came to Japan; and he went to Yamaguchi, Abe's hometown; he then went to Tokyo. He visited the karate teacher that had Putin one of the great black belts. But at that, they knew they would not be able to overcome the still-festering problem of the territorial issues of the so-called Northern Territories, or the Kurile Islands. At the very end of the Second World War, the Russians had come in to help with the war in Japan; had taken the Kuriles, which had been back and forth throughout history. These are basically four islands north of Japan. Both sides claim sovereignty; the Japanese want them back. But, what they agreed to was that they would go with a policy that had first been put forward in 1956 to divide the islands two and two, which had been stopped by the US. The Dulles brothers came in and said, "Don't you dare; you must demand all of these islands back from the Russians, or else we won't turn Okinawa back to you." So, the Japanese backed away from that deal, and after that, the Russians said, "OK, that's it. You're not going to get any of them back." So, now Putin has said, "OK, we can start joint development of these four islands. Joint development. And over time, we can go back to the 1956 agreement and come to a settlement; meaning that we'll be able to finally have a peace settlement to World War II by probably 2018."

But in the meantime, huge development projects. They made agreements for \$2.5 billion of infrastructure projects throughout the Russian Far East; ports, rail, agriculture, nuclear, pharmaceuticals, education, cultural exchanges, \$1 billion joint fund which can be leveraged into more, and this framework for

peace. So, just as Putin has largely unified the entire Middle

East – he's even now talking to Bibi Netanyahu and the Saudis; because he's in charge. Obama and the British game is largely defeated. So, they're basically creating a common policy of common interests of all these nations. And in the same way in Asia; the China Silk Road process, the new financial institutions

are bringing all of these nations together. There are still a few problems, but it's a new world; it's a new world which the United States can and must join. It's the only option.

And again, I'll repeat that while Obama's Pivot to Asia is dead, the TPP is dead, the regime-change policies are largely dead; but don't just sit back and say, "Yahoo! Trump's going to

do it for us!" Because that is not the case. This is going to

be done by us; we created the environment in America and around

the world which made it possible for these revolutionary changes

to take place. It's the power of ideas that moves history; it's

Lyndon LaRouche and Helga LaRouche and this institution who fought for these ideas before they became popular. In other words, we fought to bring these ideas into circulation; which made it possible for the emergence of people who recognized the

truth of those ideas and have begun to take them up. This is doubly true now; we're at a moment which is going to go one way

or the other. It's going to depend on you and me; on making sure

that we take this fight now at a crucial moment – what Schiller

called a great moment – and make sure that {we} define a future

that uplifts people to a level of the dignity of their true humanity through activating the creative powers that they have by

the right of being human beings created in the image of God.

This is our task, and this is where we stand today; and it's

a great time to be celebrating Christmas, but you should be thinking about George Washington leading the fight across the river on Christmas Eve. That's the way we have to approach the

fight that we have on our hands today. A good fight; one that gives us reason to be happy, but which is deadly serious.

Thank
you.

DENISTON: I think that was excellent, Mike; and I liked your concluding point. We're seeing a lot of horrific, awful things being removed; but I think Helga Zepp-LaRouche's focus on

this being the potential transition to a new historical paradigm

centered around a new positive conception about the truly creative nature of mankind, is our mission, is our unique task today. As our viewers know, Mr. LaRouche defined New York City

as a critical point of intervention on that level; to really revive that true American spirit and true American insight and understanding into this historical unifying mission for mankind

that we're talking about. So, I know Diane was part of our discussions with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche earlier today, and she was

raising some of the critical aspects that we have to focus on in

terms of getting the American people to realize that you're not

just passive observers in this process. Like you were saying,

we're not just going to sit back and root for who we think might do this or that. We have a critical leadership role – including our audience, everyone involved with us – to actually take this fight to this higher level. So, I think that Diane has some remarks on that; I know she would like to contribute here.

DIANE SARE: Mrs. LaRouche said something this morning that I think is very important, which is that in a period where everything is stable, then the subjective factor is not as crucial. That is, if everybody gets all worked up over a particular celebrity's drug addiction problem, or various fads, various emotional things that people get tangled up in; but when you have a moment like this, which on the one hand, I'm really glad that Mike just went through what he did, because I think most Americans have absolutely no idea of this incredible picture of what's happening in the world. And also, should reflect a little bit on where these countries are coming from; what did China look like 45 years ago, for example, compared to how they look now? You'd get a sense that there is no reason, except a subjective reason of the mindset of the American people, why our nation cannot similarly be self-transformed to a completely different domain, a completely different culture.

I'll say here this past weekend, we had another musical intervention. The Schiller Institute chorus, which I helped to organize and direct, sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture in a performance, a unity concert in Brooklyn of African-American spirituals, the Bach {Wachet Auf}

cantata, and Handel's {Messiah}. But what was so striking about this particular performance is, my sense was that the musicians were completely engaged. In other words, it wasn't like a stuffy thing that you go to at Lincoln Center, where everyone is going through the motions; and of course, the tuning is way too high anyway, so their voices are strained and they need all kinds of electronic adjustments and things like this. But the thing really was from the heart; and there's clearly a potential where Americans have a sense, they want something substantive. Who actually doesn't want their life to have had a purpose?

What we have right now, is a moment of extraordinary opportunity; it is also dangerous, because as you said, Ben, at the beginning, Obama issued these threats, this intent to kill as LaRouche put it, a week ago today at his crazy press conference and interview on NPR. Saying, with no evidence whatsoever that Russia had any involvement in hacking, that we will retaliate at a time and place of our choosing. Those are murderous words, and therefore, we're not at a moment of stability; and it requires from us, as Schiller would say, a certain sublime quality of thinking where we look down on the world as if from above, and consider what are the common aims of mankind and what mankind can do together. And the potential that we have, given that the defeat of Hillary Clinton was really a defeat of Bush and Obama;

it was a defeat of a 16-year legacy of evil. It doesn't guarantee – as Mike said – that what comes in under Trump is going to be good; that is for us to determine. It just indicates

that there is a tremendous potential for this, as we see with the

communication between President-elect Trump and Vladimir Putin;

that's very promising. There are other aspects of a potential with China that are very promising, and then there are some appointments that are not so promising.

It is definitely a moment for each of us to consider our responsibility to future generations; because we have a moment,

hopefully a revolutionary moment where we have not found a little

people, but a people who will grow into the situation and will take the actions that LaRouche has outlined. Specifically, the

Four Laws; beginning emphatically with Glass-Steagall, but not ending with Glass-Steagall. The fourth law is not an end, but is

really a beginning; which is the development of mankind on the imperative of exploring the Universe, of mastering thermonuclear

fusion and getting ourselves out of this Solar System. I think

that's the challenge: To objectively address where we are; to not

get flustered by every piece of crap that gets put in the mainstream press, which is a bunch of propaganda designed to make

everyone hysterical; and to really fight for the direction that

is required.

DENISTON: Another thing that does lie in that issue of the

creative development of mankind, and I was also struck in some recent discussions with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. Helga was making the point that what we're seeing now is really the realization of this World Land-Bridge perspective that she and Lyn had fought so hard for. We were discussing how this really should be seen from the standpoint of Mr. LaRouche's unique insights into the fundamental nature of human creative progress and human creative revolutions. And in a sense, what we're seeing – what Mike just presented – what's being led by China, the potential for that to expand globally with the United States jumping on board, really is a certain potential culmination of a certain platform of development for the entire planet. What that sets the base for, is the next leap for the expansion into space and the creative development of nearby space first; as Krafft Ehrlicke had been one of the leading visionaries for as a basis for the expansion further into the Solar System. I think this idea of continually defining the next levels of creative leaps, creative developments is absolutely critical; because it's not that we are completing some process of some steady state level of development, but it's the fact that mankind is always participating in creative revolutions. Every generation should be focussed on a complete revolution in the very nature of mankind. The very understanding of mankind's existence is continually being reshaped, recreated on higher and higher levels. That's the positive principle of this New Paradigm.

BILLINGTON: What Diane referred to that Helga said this morning

about certain moments in history in which the subjective becomes crucial, is a reflection of what Percy Shelley said in his "In Defense of Poetry" which we've quoted often. He develops the concept of great revolutionary moments in history, at which he says, in his describing why the poet is the legislator of history in moments of great crisis like this. But he describes how in such moments, the common person who normally doesn't have to think about profound ideas, is suddenly capable of understanding very profound concepts about man and nature – both about society and about scientific reality of the Universe. That's clearly where we stand; where we've reached a point at which there's nothing holding back any human being. Perhaps he's been drugged; perhaps he's been degraded; perhaps he's been left unemployed, driven out of the workforce. But nonetheless, it's a moment in history in which everybody can, in fact, bring themselves up to those creative capacities that they were blessed with by being a human being. To activate that now, in learning huge amounts of things in a very short period of time, is possible and necessary.

DENISTON: I think that definitely defines our mission for the next coming year – 2017. This can be the year of the shift of the United States under the leadership of what we're doing.

So, I think we gave people a very good overview of where the world stands today, and what the challenge is before us. So, unless Diane you want to have any additional ending comments,

I think we're coming to the conclusion of our discussion today.

SARE: I would just like to encourage people over this holiday period, as we're about to enter a new year, which could be a very different year, to protect your mind and not engage in degraded cultural activities. But take advantage of the LaRouche PAC website, which has phenomenal educational material. You can choose to study the Four Laws of Mr. LaRouche; read the papers of Alexander Hamilton; watch the video on Operation Phoenix – the reconstruction of Syria. There's just an abundance of material here that, if you set your mind to it, to determine that between now and the beginning of next year, to be a more ennobled human being, and more able to articulate these profound ideas and organize your friends and neighbors; then we'll be off to a very good start.

DENISTON: With that, I think we have our mission defined before us. We thank you for joining us, and we will be back next week for the next Friday webcast; and we'll be sure to be delivering some material for you between now and then. So, thank you for joining us.

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

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

Engelsk udskrift:

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

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, December 16, 2016

JASON ROSS: Hi there! It's December 16, 2016, and you're joining us for our Friday LaRouche PAC webcast. We're recording today at 3:30 in the afternoon. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be

the host today. I'm joined in the studio by Ben Deniston and via Google Hang-outs by Kesha Rogers, member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

So, the world has presently undergone a tumultuous sea-change in its orientation; away from the trans-Atlantic world of wars, of economic stagnation. We've seen this recently in such votes as the Brexit vote in England, which was a repudiation of that orientation; we've seen it in the election of Donald Trump in the United States, which certainly a repudiation of what Obama had represented and what Hillary was seen as being sure to continue. Instead, we're seeing something much better come about in potential, which is the war avoidance strategy from Russia and the economic cooperation being put forward by China through the Belt and Road initiative; which is the Chinese policy initiative which has come as a result of decades of organizing by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche and their associates for a policy which they had called the Eurasian Land-Bridge and which has now become the New Silk Road, and as China calls it, the Belt and Road initiative for cooperation on economic projects internationally.

This isn't something that the trans-Atlantic financial and military power is taking lying down. Instead, the use of war, of murder, of destabilization to prevent such cooperation has been

put into place; as we've seen with the disastrous military policy of Obama, for example, and of George Bush before him. Over the past few weeks, this has taken a turn with an increasing drumbeat of stories about Russia hacking the US election; of stories coming out, not backed by hard evidence, but by hearsay and by appealing to the words of authorities that we can presumably trust, that Vladimir Putin threw the election to Donald Trump by hacking the DNC and the emails of John Podesta, and I suppose controlling the thoughts of everybody who voted for Donald Trump.

This has been going on since the summer; this is when the DNC first announced that its email system had been compromised. At that time, in discussions around this, the Secretary General of NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, said "A severe cyber-attack may be classified as a case for the alliance – NATO. Then NATO can and must react. How? That will depend on the severity of the attack." So, putting it on the table that cyber-attacks can be met with military responses by NATO. In October, the famous James Clapper, who said that the US was not wittingly collecting material on millions of Americans when asked by Senator Wyden, Clapper – along with the head of Homeland Security – said in October that "we believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities."

Over the past weeks, we've seen front-page articles in the {New York Times}, the {Washington Post}; for example, last

Friday

the {Washington Post} without naming any sources or pointing to

any specific facts, wrote that "The CIA has concluded, in a secret assessment, that Russia intervened in the 2016 election to

help Donald Trump win the Presidency, according to officials briefed on the matter." So, no named sources. On Monday, plans

were announced to have the Electors of the Electoral College briefed by the intelligence agencies on foreign interference in

our elections; basically trying to call into question the election itself and the laws governing Electors. Just yesterday,

on NPR's "Morning Edition", President Obama said, "I think there

is no doubt that when any foreign government tries to impact the

integrity of our elections, that we need to take some action.

And we will; at a time and place of our choosing. Some of it may

be explicit and publicized; some of it may not be. But Mr. Putin

is well aware of my feelings on this, because I spoke to him directly about it." That's what Obama had to say yesterday; he

spoke about it more at his final press conference at the White House today.

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

LYNDON LAROUCHE [recording]: Those words in his mouth are,

as far as they're there, that's a threat to murder people; to murder people of importance. Because this is the way Obama's

stepfather taught him, and the way that Obama operated in killing people on Tuesdays during that episode period. So, the point is, the threat is murder; and the best thing to do is say, publicly, that the nations of the planet are now threatened by Obama's plan for mass killing of people. And that has to be said; because that's what that guy has always done, since his stepfather trained him. Obama is a killer; and therefore, he's not going to let things get by peacefully. Obama will kill, unless somebody stops him. That's the reality here. All the details and so forth, and things of your back and forth, really don't amount to much right now. Many of the people who are leading the effort of developing the world program don't need to be stirred up. It's only Obama's crowd that are dangerous; and they will kill. Therefore, it's important for those who are waiting for their opportunity but are not going to ask for it; that's where the problem comes in. Once Obama, with his crowd, starts killing people, that's going to be a bloody mess; and that's going to be the kind of thing that threatens the people of the United States and others right now. He's made it clear; the signals are all there. Obama is still going for a kill against the people of the United States and others.

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

way on things.

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

Mike Gravel is one of the signers of a letter that was released by the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity a couple of days ago in response to the {New York Times} and the general media tumult around Russia hacking the elections, Russia denying Hillary Clinton the Presidency; that she deserved as a gift from God. So, I'd like to ask Senator Gravel, who is a former adjutant top-secret control officer for the Communications Intelligence Service, and a special agent of the Counterintelligence Corps; and in addition being a former Senator from Alaska. Senator Gravel, could you tell our viewers what you think of this notion that Russia hacked the election and determined the outcome of our Presidential election here in the US?

SEN. MIKE GRAVEL: First off, it's ridiculous! It's far-fetched ridiculous! We know – and here we can be grateful to Edward Snowden – that the United States' capability, along with their partners in Britain, have the capability of vacuuming up

{every single communication in the world}. That means that the NSA has {all} of Hillary's emails; has {all} of the communications between the US and Russia. And so for the government to come out and say via the intelligence community, that this is all instigated by Russia, is just part of the demonization that we've seen taking place about Putin and Russia, as part of a plan in the United States to have regime change in Russia. Believe it. We're seeing what's happened in Syria with regime change, which is hundreds of thousands of people displaced and killed. And now we know that it was the US that financed the coup in Kiev, that unseated Ukraine's duly-elected President, who was favorable to Russia; which, of course, is normal, since they are neighbors and were essentially one country at one point. And so we destabilized that, and that was admitted to by the Under Secretary, Victoria Nuland, who's still there; was there under Clinton. She admitted that the United States had spent \$5 billion over a 10-year period, to destabilize the government of Ukraine. We succeeded.

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

So, in point of fact, we have all the knowledge in the

NSA.

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

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

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

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

ROSS: So, that interview took place on Wednesday; the same day the {New York Times} ran a front-page story – "Hacking the Democrats: How Russia Honed Its Cyber-power and Trained It on an American Election". So, it's half the front page; four full pages inside. That same day, Sam Biddle at the {Intercept} put out what had been amassed as all the public evidence that the Russian government was behind the hack; pointing out that it's not enough evidence. Comparing it to earlier invasions, such as when people working with the Chinese PLA hacked American industrial firms, the Department of Justice put out a 56-page report detailing all the specifics of how it happened; or when North Korea hacked Sony, the evidence was put forward. This time, though, it's just the say-so of intelligence officials.

All of this might look like it's a bunch of flailing around to explain the electoral defeat by blaming anybody except for the terrible candidate that the Democrats had, but it's much more than this. You have to remember, this isn't just domestic theatrics; the case is being made for – as Obama put it – a revenge attack or some kind of answer being made to Russia in some way or another. That is, threatening a nuclear-armed nation

over allegations that have not been backed up with any specific evidence and frankly, of accusing Russia of things that the US admits to doing all the time. So, we asked Senator Gravel, what was the intent; why the anti-Russian hysteria? Is this just about the election? What's the push for this? This is what he had to say:

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

What we see right now, is the last regurgitation of a failed policy, one that was very dangerous. In demonizing Putin the way we've done in American media, Western media, and then turning around and levelling the charge at them that they are trying to destabilize Western and Eastern Europe, is ridiculous. I know of no instance – and I would question anybody to quote an instance – where Russia has threatened anybody in the last decade in Eastern Europe and Europe proper. He sells them oil and gas; why would he want to destabilize his customers? It makes no sense

at
all. But to the neo-cons, who are intent on trying to protect
the
hegemonic position of the United States in the world, {this
makes
a lot of good sense for them}. They need to demonize Russia
and
Putin, they need to demonize Xi and China, and assert our
military prowess in the world. We have a significant economic
position in the world, and these militarists feel they've got
to
shore that position up, with militaristic policies that make
no
sense at all.

What they should be doing, is joining with China in
the Silk
Road (One Belt, One Road) to raise the economic level of the
world to a higher level, and that would be the biggest
contribution we could make to the well-being of people around
the
world, and to the issue of having world peace. That's what we
should be doing. But that's not what's happening. What's
happening is what we learned from the study of the Thucydides
Trap, where the power which is the global power – which is the
United States – is now facing the problem of an ascending
power
like China moving in and surpassing us. Well, our egos may not
be
able to take that, but certainly the people of the world could
take it; because it would mean greater economic activity, on
the
part of China.

So, it's all mixed up with this insanity that exists
within
the American government, by a group of people called neo-cons.
They start with Cheney. They go from Cheney/Rumsfeld, that
crowd,

into the present group of neo-cons. Here you have a person like John Bolton, who's being considered for the Number Two man at the State Department. I can't think of a person who's more idiotic, as a neo-con, than John Bolton. I think Bush is just wantonly picking people, hither and yon, to satisfy the conservatives.

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

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

should US relations with China in particular be with regard to this program?

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

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

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

to many of the other countries in Asia, and is now in the lower brackets.

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

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

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

ROSS: Senator Mike Gravel, thank you very much.

SEN. GRAVEL: You're welcome.

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

like

to turn it over now to Ben Deniston.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. This should serve as a useful counterpoint, I think, to everything we were just discussing here. In the recent weeks, we've had some discussions with Lyndon LaRouche about the prospect of bringing the principle of the SDI – Strategic Defense Initiative, or in its modern form, the Strategic Defense of Earth; bringing that principle back onto the table in this potential new strategic environment where, assuming Obama doesn't get his way and doesn't start thermonuclear war before the next President even has a chance to take power, we could see a new alliance emerging between the United States, Russia, and China. And setting aside this insane geopolitical framework of viewing these nations as our adversaries and doing everything we can to undermine their growth and development and rise to world prominence. Mr. LaRouche was very supportive of this being a time in which the Strategic Defense of Earth policy can come back as a real pillar of a new security architecture for the planet; which was also a focus that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had when we were discussing it with her earlier in the week as well. This can be a critical pillar for how the security, the defense, the military institutions of nations in this new era, coming together and cooperating on the new challenges, the common threats and issues that face all nations. The reason why I say this is a principle, is because

we're in a new – I would really say for the past couple of generations – a new historical phase for mankind in this thermonuclear age. We've reached the point where if we continue a geopolitical, imperial policy where a leading power tries to maintain control at all costs, you're at the point where if that goes to full-scale war as it has in past periods, past centuries, you're talking about the annihilation of mankind. You're talking about a new phase of mankind, where full-blown warfare now has the ability to wipe out civilization as we know it. That's been an historically new environment that mankind has been dealing with in the past generations. Now, we're seeing the potential for a build-up around that kind of war to be put off the table; put on the back burner around a new administration. But what we're talking about with this Strategic Defense of Earth and in the context of the broader exploration of space, the joint development of space which Kesha will have some comments on in a little bit. This needs to become a central positive issue that we rally nations around; it can't just become "Let's not have war or conflict because it's bad"; but "Let's have a positive, truthful conception – a real principle – of what are the issues that face all nations together, that we should be rallying around in cooperation."

That was LaRouche's SDI originally; {LaRouche's SDI}, not necessarily the program that got implemented to some degree.

But

LaRouche's idea of the SDI, which was a joint open cooperative program with the Soviet Union; sharing technologies and capabilities, and jointly developing new capabilities to – as Reagan said – "render the threat of thermonuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." We'd actually be working with the Soviets to do this; and Mr. LaRouche recruited Dr. Edward Teller,

President Reagan around this idea. These were not hippie, flower-wielding peaceniks; these are not people that just ran around saying "No war. War is bad." These are pretty serious,

staunch conservative Cold Warriors to a certain degree; but they

recognized the truthful validity of what LaRouche was developing

around his idea of the SDI. Mankind had reached a point where we

needed positive, collaborative, joint development of these kinds

of capabilities for the common aims of nations. Mr. LaRouche came incredibly close, in collaboration with Reagan, Teller, and

others, to really overturning the strategic framework back in the

'80s with that program.

But that hasn't really gone away. We've discussed this on

shows in the past, but it's worth just reminding people that in

the '90s, right in the aftermath of the attempt to get the full

SDI program, there was kind of a re-emergence of the same idea around the defense of Earth. The recognition at that time –

in

the early '90s – that the Earth is actually incredibly

vulnerable to asteroid strikes, comet strikes; and we should

actually be looking at what the heck we can do on this planet to defend the planet from these kinds of potential disasters. That was something that Dr. Edward Teller, in direct collaboration with other veterans of the SDI and their direct counterparts in Russia, took up as a major focus in the '90s. You had a whole series of conferences and investigations, and proposals really, for the same type of joint open cooperation between the defense institutions and related institutions in the United States and Russia for cooperation around this common threat of the defense of Earth from not only missiles, but missiles coming from the Solar System; these asteroids. Unfortunately, it didn't fully go through at the time. We had the continuation of this geopolitical framework, which has obviously continued through Bush and now Obama. But this issue has come back up again. It was in 2012 that the Russians refloated the offer, and it was named the Strategic Defense of Earth in some of the news coverage. Direct, explicit opposition to the US and NATO advancing their missile defense systems towards Russia's borders into Eastern Europe. They said, why don't we have a joint cooperative program for a Strategic Defense of Earth against the threats of asteroids and related issues? Now, today, again with the prospect of a real shift in the United States, assuming we can contain Obama and he doesn't return to his murderous streak and orientation as Mr. LaRouche has warned, we could actually see

this principle emerge and become a central pillar of a new historical era today.

So, we thought it would be appropriate today, kind of as a counterpoint, to start to put some of this issue back on the table. I wanted to start just by illustrating some of what these threats are; what we're facing in terms of the threats to the Earth from these objects in our Solar System. If we go to the slideshow, we have a first graphic [Fig. 1] illustrating just the reality that these impacts happen; and they happen quite frankly a lot more frequently than people probably tend to realize. In the animation, you can see the famous, very well-documented, surprise Chelyabinsk impact over Russia. Which we had no warning about; we did not know was coming. This frankly very small asteroid came in and impacted with such a high speed – which is characteristic of all of these collisions in the Solar System. A lot of the energy release is due to the fact that these speeds are incredibly fast. When you get an impact of two orbiting bodies in the Solar System, you tend to get massive energy releases, explosions. Here you had a very small object intersecting the Earth; slamming into the atmosphere and releasing the energy of a small nuclear explosion as it hit. This, I think, awakened a lot of the world to the reality that these kinds of things do happen, and we have no defense. One, we didn't even see this one coming; and two, if we had seen it coming, we have no demonstrated, developed capability to defend the Earth from these kinds of challenges. I'd like to point people to on this graphic additionally, from some data that's

been released in the relatively recent period, we can see in this map of the world, an illustration of many smaller meteor impacts into the atmosphere that have occurred just between 1994 and 2013. The Chelyabinsk impact was the largest in this time range; these all were smaller than the Chelyabinsk impact, but these were still large explosions in the upper atmosphere. You can see that they've painted the entire Earth over the course of this time period; just to illustrate the fact that these impacts are constantly occurring.

Just to give another sense of defending the Earth from these asteroids, here is a schematic of the inner Solar System [Fig. 2]. You can see Jupiter's orbit as the farthest orbit out there; obviously then comes Mars, and Earth's orbit is a little bit darker than the other orbits. All of these blue lines – assuming you have high resolution to see the details of this visual – this blue haze you might see is actually composed of over 1400 orbits of asteroids that are specifically classified as particularly hazardous asteroids. That is, asteroids whose orbits cross the Earth's orbit at some point and create the potential for there to be an intersection where the asteroid is at the intersection at the same time as the Earth, and you have an impact, a collision. You can see here how crowded the inner Solar System is.

Fortunately, among these that we know of, none of these are expected to hit in the next century or any foreseeable

timeframe

as far as we know. This alone looks pretty dense, pretty packed

in the inner Solar System here. What people should really get their mind around is, this is a tiny fraction of what we expect

to be out there.

We can see here, if we take a little bit more complicated

graphic [Fig. 3] and break it down, there are literally hundreds

of thousands to millions of asteroids of the size of the Chelyabinsk meteor or bigger that we have not discovered.

Based

on our understanding of the distribution of asteroids of different sizes, we know that they're out there; we just don't know where they are. We don't know which ones might impact, which ones might not. We don't know when the impacts would be.

Here is a depiction [Fig. 4], you can see the relationship

between, on the horizontal axis in a logarithmic scale, different

sizes of near-Earth asteroids. On the far right, you can see the

very large ones in the range of kilometers across in diameter, all the way down to sizes of meters. On the vertical axis, you

can see the expected estimates of the distribution, the number,

of near-Earth asteroids of those sizes. You can see for the very

large ones, we believe there are not very many; but as you start

to get to smaller sizes, you get a geometric growth in the number

of near-Earth asteroids of these different sizes. You can also

see depicted the scale of the damage that would be inflicted on the Earth if it were to hit over an unlucky location. The Chelyabinsk impact being pretty much the smallest size that would not – kind of representing a lower limit on what doesn't do huge amounts of damage. But if it were just a little bigger, that could have caused really catastrophic effects for Chelyabinsk, Russia – that region. In this range, what people sometimes call a "city-killer" range; the size of object that would release the energy of a large thermonuclear explosion, we've discovered maybe 1% of the near-Earth asteroids in this size range.

While NASA has done a good job of finding and discovering a number of the larger objects which can do damage over a large fraction of the Earth if not effect the entirety of the Earth; we've found a good number of those for the asteroids in particular. But as you start to go to these smaller sizes, we've barely scratched the surface. As dense as you think this previous graphic is in terms of the number of bodies out there, there are orders of magnitude more that could do serious damage that we just don't know about. Again, the first step is knowing where they are and when they might hit; the second step is actually having a defense capability. We've not really done anything besides general studies and theoretical investigations on that front. So, this is still an open, unanswered challenge. But this is kind of just the first step in a real defense of

the planet Earth from these types of cosmic challenges. As people are probably aware, you also have the issue of comets. This really grabbed people's attention in the mid '90s when mankind sat on the planet Earth, looked to Jupiter, and watched a massive comet that had broken apart into a series of fragments as you can see in the upper graphic [Fig. 5] there, collide with Jupiter. In the moving animation, you see the explosion of one of these fragments as it impacted Jupiter's surface. The other bright object is one of Jupiter's moons; but this is an image in the infrared where you can see the effects of these energetic types of activities more clearly. In the purple image, you can clearly see the effects of the impact on the surface of Jupiter after the impact had occurred. These impacts let marks the size of the planet Earth on Jupiter's surface.

So, this was a big wake-up call in the mid '90s. This was comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 was one of the designations for it. Before this period, it wasn't widely accepting that we had to think about these types of impacts. When this occurred and they found this stream of comet fragments about a year before it actually hit; they looked at its orbit and said, "Wow! This is going hit Jupiter." So, everyone was sitting there watching, as this thing went up. We had the Hubble telescope, all these telescopes pointing; we saw this thing as well as we could from all over the world. This really was a major wake-up call to the fact that these impacts really do occur. They can come from

asteroids, which you saw in the illustration of the inner Solar System, but they can also come from comets; which represents a qualitatively different challenge, as we'll see in the next animation. [Fig. 6]

This should give you a sense of this greater, more difficult challenge posed by comets. This is a particular case of a comet name C1996B2; and this was discovered in January 31, 1996. That's when we first knew this comet even existed. As you can see in the animation which is based directly off of the orbital data from NASA, we discovered this comet at the beginning of this animation when it was just out past the orbit of Mars. Within two months, it made a close pass by the Earth. We had no idea it was out there until two months before it makes of close pass by the Earth. Whereas the object that hit over Russia – the Chelyabinsk impact – was measured at about 20 meters in diameter; this object is estimated to be about 5 kilometers in diameter. That's about half the diameter of the comet that's believed to have taken out the dinosaurs. As we let the animation play out, we see something very interesting that's characteristic of this distinct nature of the challenge of comets. Look at its orbit. The circular orbits you see here are the outer planets; that's Neptune's orbit. So, this has an extremely elliptical orbit that takes it far out into the depths of the Solar System. When these comets are out there in the far reaches of the Solar System, they're incredibly difficult to see. So, we only see them when they're starting to come into the

inner

Solar System. Again, as this case demonstrated, we saw this one

two months before it made a close pass. If that had been on an

impact trajectory, there would have been nothing we could have done. When we're talking about that size of an object with these

comets, we're talking about something that can wipe out civilization. That is a global catastrophic impact, an object of

that size. We're not talking about the local scale damage of the

asteroids we were talking about a second ago; we're talking about

catastrophic effects across the whole planet.

So, this is another depiction [Fig. 7] of where we think

these bodies are. Based on the orbits of these comets – sometimes technically referred to as long period comets; it's believed that many of these comets reside in the farthest outreaches of the Solar System. Far, far beyond the outer planets. This is a logarithmic scale, so you can see that this

distribution of comets – sometimes referred to as the Oort Cloud

– begins over tens of times past where Voyager has currently reached, and extends tens times farther than that. We're talking

about the very outskirts of the gravitational hold of the Sun. It's believed, again, we haven't seen this region – but based on

the orbits of comets we see coming in just in the short time period mankind has been able to make these observations – it's believed that this is a very large population of bodies out in this outer region of the Solar System. Because the gravitational

effect of the Sun is so weak out there, it doesn't take much to perturb their orbits and potentially send some into the inner Solar System. Again, with our current capabilities, we're creating scenarios when we only see them months, maybe if we're lucky a few years, before an impact. Certainly not enough time to do anything about it with our current capabilities.

Now, I just want to end on kind of an interesting note, that there are some studies – although the data is limited – indicating there might be certain cyclical natures to these large comet impacts. Some people even believe it could relate to how the Solar System moves through the galaxy; which raises some very interesting questions about how this outer region of comets could get perturbed on a periodic basis and send in what they call "showers" – cometary showers of many comets coming into the inner Solar System, creating a scenario where it's much more likely that Earth or the other planets might get hit with an impact as Jupiter got hit in the '90s.

I think it's just worth noting that one of the leading astronomers in this whole field, Eugene Shoemaker, who unfortunately passed away in the late '90s, had pioneered much of the work in this field. And for whom this comet that impact Jupiter is named; him and his wife, who discovered it together. He himself believed that it is likely that we are currently in the period of a comet shower; that was something that he published in the late '90s. Based upon the types of crater records and other evidence, he said it's not certain, but it could be the case that we're currently in the middle of what

on a human time scale is a long period in which there's an increased frequency of cometary entries into the inner Solar System and an increased likelihood of impacts occurring. Whether this directly accounts for his hypothesis or not, it was only last year that we found out that a relatively dim star had actually passed through the Oort Cloud about 70,000 years ago; which is one of the kinds of scenarios that can perturb many of these bodies. Again, since these things are so far away, it can take 70,000 years for these things to reach the inner Solar System. The point is, this is still incredibly preliminary knowledge of this region – of the Oort Cloud; of the region between the Oort Cloud and the inner Solar System. There could be a long period comet that's only ten years out, that's been travelling for 50,000 years from the Oort Cloud, or even longer; and it's now only ten years away and it's on a direct impact course with the Earth, and we wouldn't even know. It could be just in the outskirts of the outer planets region of the Solar System; not even in this far, far depths region. Again, we're talking about things that can devastate civilization completely, globally as we know it.

This discovery of this dim star passing through the Oort Cloud, we just found that out a year ago. How many other bodies are out there that might have had close passes in the geologically recent past that could be doing similar effects?

The point is, our knowledge is incredibly miniscule for something that threatens the entire planet; and our defense capability doesn't exist. This typifies just one of the issues; and I think there's a lot more we're going to get into in coming shows. But this typifies one of the issues that is front and center for this principle of the SDI, the SDE to re-emerge and center around. These are threats that don't recognize national borders; they don't recognize cultural boundaries. They challenge the entire planet and they're outside of our current capabilities. If we're going to have a sane and principled relationship for leading nations in the planet, then it has to return to these kinds of challenges. Addressing these common aims and threats as Dr. Edward Teller had spoken of, as Mr. LaRouche put on the table with this whole SDI proposal.

The point that I think we should really end on, and maybe discuss a little bit in conclusion, is that – and this is something that we've been discussing with Mr. LaRouche over the recent weeks – this isn't a separate, isolated issue. This is part of mankind becoming a Solar System species. This is part of mankind expanding to a new level, developing a platform of economic activity that makes mankind a presence, an active force in the Solar System. We can come up with specific scenarios where you can deflect one asteroid or maybe a particular telescope that can help us see some of these things; and we should be discussing and looking at those things. But the fundamental issue is, how do we expand mankind into the Solar System as a much more active and capable presence where we can

handle these kinds of challenges? How do we engage other nations in cooperation and collaboration, instead of hiding our technology and hiding our capabilities because we want to have a leg up over China or Russia? How do we jointly develop the fundamental science and technologies mankind needs to defend the planet Earth in an open, cooperative way?

If we're going to seriously, actually get into that, Mr.

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

KESHA ROGERS: Very good. I wanted to go back and really take up this conception of what it really means to advance the cause for peace. Because first of all, we have to end the perpetuation and acceptance of a big lie, a murderous lie that human beings cannot have access to that which is truthful. This is what the fight really is. When you're talking about the murderous policy of Obama, it's not a matter of opinion or whether or not you have a belief or non-belief, or like or dislike this President. This President is acting on behalf of the same factions which are indicative of what Bertrand Russell actually represented. He set back the cause of human progress

in society. To say that if you make enough people believe that snow is black, or you perpetuate a lie enough; then enough people will believe it. But now, we're seeing that that's not working anymore. That the cause that Bertrand Russell and those who were against the genius of Albert Einstein that mankind can have access to that which is truthful, that system is being destroyed; it's losing out, and there is a new era, a new system of mankind emerging that is being represented by what the United States has the potential to become if we break with the lies that have been perpetuated and say, "No more! Obama must be thrown in jail now." Anybody who's pushing this policy that we have to be at odds with nations such as Russia and China, are continuing to set back the progress of mankind. This is not just about waiting for the next election and saying OK, well we dealt with Obama and hopefully we can survive this next few weeks or so. The question is, that people who continue to allow for this murderous policy to dominate the thinking and the direction of our nation, cannot be tolerated.

I think it's important to really look at what it is that this President has done in setting back the course of human progress by his dismantling and attacks on the manned space program. What you're really dealing with right now is that we have to look at the advancement of the space program as a new

evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind. To look at the advancement of the space program not just as a discretionary budgetary matter for internal US relations, but as Mr. LaRouche

said at the onset of this election when Mr. Trump was elected, you now have a new system of international relations emerging. The United States has to join with that.

But when you're talking about advancing the cause of peace, it's expressive of the fight that Mr. LaRouche, his wife Helga, and this organization have been advancing and leading for a very long time. Then you talk about Mr. LaRouche's policy of the Strategic Defense Initiative; a lot of people tried to lower that to a scale of just missile defense and defense of nations acting against the appearance of nuclear weapons from other nations, or just on a small scale. But what you're talking about, is the advancement of an evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind throughout the Solar System, throughout the Universe. And mankind understanding how to come together for a common aim of mankind; to submit to the development of the whole of the Solar System, which is going to increase our understanding of how to advance mankind both here on Earth and off the planet. This is what has been missing. The way people think about human economy, the way people think about relationships to the advancement of mankind in the Universe, is based on these small scale relations; but it has to be completely changed at this point in time. What Krafft Ehrlicke discussed in terms of an extraterrestrial

imperative in his third law, was really taking the lid off on human progress; that mankind was an expression of unlimited potential. He says in that third law that by expanding through the Universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of Reason and the wisdom of moral law within himself.

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

I just wanted to say that because I think that we are on the verge of a new era for mankind right now, but people have to get a sense of it. It's not going to happen unless you fight for it; unless you fight to bring it into existence. The starting point of that is that we have to develop a new system of international relations, working with Russia, with China; not as enemies, but working together to end this threat to human progress that has been going on for far too long.

ROSS: Absolutely! I think that ties it also with that

other major leap that's needed in humanity of Lyndon LaRouche's fourth law of his "Four Laws to Save the USA Now"; which is the breakthrough to get fusion power. Like this need for adopting a platform that allows us to have a control over space, that let's us really have this region of the Solar System; something that's within our power, within our reach, within our ability to interact with and intervene on if something is about to kill us all. The essential to make that happen is fusion power. No matter how efficient a windmill you design, or no matter what breakthroughs they make in building solar panels, those aren't ever going to be at all useful for moving into space. You're not going to go to Mars with a windmill. What we are going to do that's going to transform our relationship to nature – I think this idea that we must grow; it's the characteristic of the human species, this moral law that you spoke of, Kesha. This law that we have to answer to is that it's been the nature of the Universe to develop; we've seen it with the creation of the Solar System. We've seen it with the development of life on this planet into increasingly higher forms; not in a purely qualitative way, but also through some specific quantitative measures adopted by Vladimir Vernadsky, for example. Where he looked at the increase of concentration of energy in forms of life; where he looked at the increasing range of chemical elements that were used by

life;

an increasing power and density of energy flow through the biosphere. That's really up to us at this point. The Universe,

in a real way, depends upon us for those next levels of development that are the fruits of our minds. To create things

in nature that have never happened before. Just like multi-cellular life, that was a new thing that hadn't happened before; chlorophyll – life going extraterrestrial to get the power of the Sun to feed on. That was something that hadn't been

seen before. Now, it's the kinds of things that we do: electromagnetism; the breakthroughs that we have available to us

with nuclear science, with fusion power. This is the calling that we have to respond to; this is something that we can come to

in resonance with other nations around the planet and really cooperate on as a real basis for international relations. Not maintaining supremacy, or maintaining the power of a bloc; but having a serious mission that is common to all people to collaborate on and to move forward.

DENISTON: It's maybe a minor point relative to everything,

but I couldn't help noticing when Mr. Gravel mentioned that we spent \$5 billion over 10 years to destabilize Ukraine; that's more per year than our fusion budget by a fair amount. That's \$500 million a year; our fusion budget for magnetic confinement

has been significantly less than that. Just in terms of a particular reflection of the totality; we're spending more to overthrow Ukraine, to mess with Russia, than we're spending on what could be infinite power for mankind for centuries to come.

ROSS: Priorities, huh?


DENISTON: Yeah.

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

USA har brug for en massebevægelse for udvikling NU!

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast,

2. december, 2016; Leder

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

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

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

Rogers diskuterer i sin artikel i *The Hamiltonian*. Et aggressivt program for udforskning og udvikling af rummet, og for at opnå fusionskraft og en højere energigennemstrømningstæthed i produktionsprocessen.

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

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

Så der er mange detaljer, som jeg gerne vil have, vi kommer ind på under diskussionen af alle disse spørgsmål. Lad det være nok som introduktion, og lad os høre Kesha og Diane.

(Herefter følger udskrift af diskussionen på engelsk.)

DIANE SARE: OK, I'll just go ahead. I'm really glad with what you said, Matt; because there really is a transformation, and I think we tend to miss it. Or you catch a glimmer of it like the real joy that I certainly felt watching all the vote totals come in; and these poor silly reporters not having a clue what had hit them. But then, you get bombarded with the real fake news, which is what comes from the so-called mainstream

news

media; which has absolutely zero about developments in the world

which are being created by billions of people. So, you have the

most extraordinary, most gigantic Earth-changing events occurring

under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, under the leadership of

Xi Jinping, and their collaboration with leaders in South

America, leaders in Africa. Not one word of it here, and then

we're treated to some miniscule detail of a misplaced wart that a

politician has somewhere or whatever. I think we would do well

to bear in mind a little bit of what I tried to capture in that

article. There is a poetic principle; there is a world

revolution underway. These things are not separate, discrete

events. The Brexit vote – contrary to the stupid media spin –

was not a bunch of white racists who hate immigrants. Maybe

there are some of those, but the real factor was that the whole

euro system is bankrupt. It didn't work and it wasn't designed

to work; and people were rejecting it. Similarly, you had these

recent votes: the winner in the French Republican Party

nominations, François Fillon, who does not want a war with

Russia. I think most people on the planet actually recognize

that a nuclear war between superpowers is not a desirable policy

or outcome; and it's not necessary because what President Putin

is doing is leading a fight to eradicate terrorism. He has been

very direct about this; especially after September of 2015, at

his speech at the United Nations. He's reiterating again the call for a coalition to wipe out this terrorist scourge. So what you see in this election process here in the United States, is we have a potential now to join with the New Paradigm.

Therefore, the most significant aspect of what we know about the incoming administration perhaps, are the two phone calls that Trump had with Xi Jinping and with President Vladimir Putin; and this is absolutely not missed by people of the world. I just wanted to give a little bit of a report on an event last night at New York University with this extraordinary woman, who is the second only I think woman in history to be the chairwoman of the Foreign Relations committee in the Chinese national assembly. Her name is Madame Fu Ying; she is extraordinarily dignified, calm and very confident. She began her remarks at this forum at New York University by referring to the phone call between Xi Jinping and Trump. She made a point of saying the Chinese are always being accused of not contributing to good in the world, of not working with the world. So, we figured when we started the Belt and Road and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, that the United States – which is always accusing us of not wanting to work with anyone else – would have been the first in line to join. Instead, our invitation to participate in these extraordinary projects was rejected. Now, clearly there is a potential for this opportunity to be taken.

This is really very big. Similarly, the decision that

Trump

has made to have retired General Michael Flynn as one of his advisors; who has called for collaboration with Russia in Syria.

And Trump's reiterations of the necessity of that kind of collaboration – these things are very important. And the fact that Flynn has come out calling for a Marshall Plan for the region; which is similar to the Chinese; Xi Jinping made a tour

of several of those nations not so long ago. The only way you are going to secure peace is through economic development – not

on a low level, not on repairing the decrepit, aging, out-of-date

infrastructure we have; but by leaping into a new domain. So, I

think I'll stop there for a minute; because I think Kesha probably has a lot to add in that regard.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. Just taking from that, we really have

to advance mankind; we really have to have a leap forward for mankind. This is what Mr. LaRouche is committed to; this is what

you see Russia and China committed to. I was greatly inspired by

the discussion and some of the developments that came out of the

President of Russia; President Putin's State of the Union address. The leap for mankind really requires putting the commitment to the future. This was really expressed very beautifully in his remarks, which captured in essence the conception that the responsibility of the nation is to foster creativity in science, and foster creativity in the youth of your

nation. The best expression to doing this, in terms of scientific and technological development. In his speech he

says,

"Our schools must promote creativity, but children must learn to think independently, work both on their own and as part of a team, address usual tasks and formulate and achieve goals; which will help them have an interesting and prosperous life. You must promote the culture of research and engineering work. The number of cutting edge science parks for children will increase to 40 within two years; they will serve as the basis for development of a network of technical project groups across the country. Companies, universities, and research institutes would contribute to this, so our children will see clearly that all of them have equal opportunity and an equal start in life. That Russia needs their ideas and knowledge and they can prove their mettle in Russian companies and laboratories..." And he goes to say, "Our education system must be based on the principle that all children and teenagers are gifted and can succeed in science, in creative areas, in sports, in career, and in life."

That should be the model for every single nation.

That is

the model for our space program, and it really starts with the question of what is human nature? If we're going to advance mankind and have leaps forward? As a part of this paper that Matt mentioned, from China they're expressing the same expression for their nation; and for mankind as a whole. It's not just "our

nation is better than yours, and we're going to have our people pulled out of poverty and your people can stay in poverty. They're not thinking like imperialists or wanting to keep nations backwards; they want nations to move forward. So, China has pulled 700 million people out of poverty; you can't do that by taking baby steps and going with a few infrastructure projects. You have to have creative leaps. This has really been expressed for their Silk Road development offer of win-win cooperation and their commitment to space and space as the potential for opening for mankind across the planet and across the galaxy.

I think if people look at the very exciting developments that we're seeing coming from Russia and China, that has to be the model. We have that potential right now, because I think what Diane pointed out – that when President-elect Trump was elected, this was a mandate. This was a repudiation of the Bush/Obama destruction of this type of potential for a future; a repudiation of Hillary Clinton's commitment to continuing war. The American people said, we're not going to condone this any longer.

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

OGDEN: Yeah, China really is an inspiration in that regard.

Let me just read a very quick quote from that paper that you referenced, Kesha. The title of this white paper, again, is "The

Right to Development: China's Philosophy, Practice and Contribution"; and they start by saying, "The right to development must be enjoyed and shared by all peoples. Realizing

the right to development is the responsibility of all countries

and also the obligation of the international community." If you

just juxtapose that to the Malthusian philosophy of the British

Royal Family and others in the so-called "West" today, where they

say, "Well, no, you know, the right to development – it's not a

right. All peoples do not have an equal right to the same living

standard, and, plus, if we were to pursue that – as Obama said when he went to Africa – 'the planet would boil over.'" I mean,

give me a break!

So, China's white paper is laying out the *opposite* philosophy, view, of man. I think, in accordance with what Putin

said in that State of the Union, that, yes, every human being is

a creative human being. That is the fundamental right of every human being – is to develop that creativity and to contribute it

to his or her nation and to the future of mankind.

In the China white paper, they go on to state some really

stunning statistics. You, Kesha, cited the lifting 700 million

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

The statistics are amazing. If you compare China in 1949 to China in 2015, only a 70-year difference, the average longevity in China in 1949 was 35 years. Today it's 76 years. The enrollment of school-age children in school in 1949 was 20%. Today it's almost 100%; 99.8% of all school-age children are enrolled in schools in China. The difference between 1978 and 2015: the GDP was at RMB767 billion in 1978. Today their GDP is RMB68,000 billion! So, that growth is unbelievable. And then there's, obviously, much less tangible things that you can measure, but which are clear to see, including the spread of art, classical culture, classical musical training among the children of China. So this is really a model for the rest of the world, an inspiration. As Xi Jinping has said, "We invite the United States, we invite the West to become a part of the New Silk Road, and to become a part of the One Belt, One Road initiative."

One event that was happening in Washington, D.C.,

simultaneously with this Day of Action that the LaRouche PAC activists had on Capitol Hill, was really an unprecedented event

that was sponsored by the Asia Society. It was an all-day event

that was hosted by a scholar named Dr. Patrick Ho, who's the Secretary General of the China Energy Fund Committee. One of my

colleagues who was there, said about the event that "This was one

of those days in Washington, D.C. when all of the principles that

you've been talking about as a LaRouche PAC activist for years and years and years, all of a sudden are being echoed by the person standing at the podium." We've had those experiences periodically, but this *entire* event was about the right to development, the One Belt, One Road Initiative, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the World Land-Bridge, the New Paradigm, win-win cooperation, the United States joining the Silk Road – quite literally, in those terms.

Dr. Ho actually laid out five points of advice to the new

incoming [Trump] administration on how to integrate the United States into the One Belt, One Road program. His five steps are as

follows:

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

United States and China;

2) Realign trade agreements with Asia-Pacific nations to

accommodate the One Belt, One Road;

3) Adjust the U.S. posture towards the international development banks – that's the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund, the

New Development Bank of the BRICS, and so forth – and promote

their capacity to assist in support for infrastructure development;

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

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

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

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

SARE: Along these lines – because I know there's discussion and there's an article about Sen. Schumer saying he will work with Trump on a \$1 trillion infrastructure package (something like that) – I think the idea of Hamilton and the ideas of people like Krafft Ehrlicke and what China is doing, really need to be understood by our activists, so that people can reflect. For example, there's discussion about one of the things that was promoted in the *New York Times* for Trump to do with his infrastructures, that there should be a tunnel under the Hudson River, from New Jersey to New York. Right now I think the trains go, I don't know, every 90 seconds, or every three minutes, or something like that. There's an enormous amount of traffic. The Port Authority Bus Terminal is very old and decrepit. It's going to have to be rebuilt and relocated. The tunnels are very old.

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

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

SARE: Yeah! Or even, you know, for people who don't want to go to Moscow, for whatever reason. They could go to Paris, but they could travel through Siberia. All kinds of exotic, really wonderful places. It would be quite a ride. Although, I suppose, if we get the magnetically-levitated vacuum trains, you wouldn't really get to see much. On the other hand, you'd arrive at your destination *before you left*, by the clock.

Anyway, all of these things would *completely* transform the way we think of *everything*. If you could take a train from New Jersey to San Francisco. Supposing even that it wasn't three hours – it was a normal high-speed train – so you got there in

a day-and-a-half, that's a completely different phenomenon. It changes the United States: what you can ship; whom you can work with; the exchange of ideas; the exchange of goods. The ability for people to find the very most brilliant individual, whether they're in China or Somalia or India, who has expertise in a particular area, and you want to bring them in to collaborate with a team of scientists in your local laboratory. All these things become thinkable.

So, when Mr. LaRouche a few years ago had made the point that he doesn't like the term "infrastructure" anymore, because it doesn't really get at what is actually necessary; which is the question of how do you increase the productivity of every person.

And that requires thinking in terms of a *platform*. The difference between not having electricity, for example, and having electricity, is not simply night and day. You just can't

even compare it. It's *incommensurate*. Therefore, I think we have to be both open-minded, but we also have to set {really high} standards for what we think we should be doing. It would be

absolutely criminal, even if it did employ millions of people, to fill in every pothole in every major city in the United States.

That would not lift the standard of living or the productivity of

the nation as a whole; whereas a high-speed rail link that went

from Manhattan to Moscow would actually have a completely transformative effect.

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

Kesha, in your article, you said, "You should ask: How high? We should leap, we should jump. Mankind should take a leap. How high?" It's these kinds of insights that Krafft Ehrlicke, that others, were able to discuss from the terms that now Mr. LaRouche has {scientifically} defined, in terms of energy-flux density, how much more productivity are you able to achieve, with less effort, with less energy applied, because of these qualitative leaps in technology and in the principle that you're employing.

Before we get into a little bit more of that, I do want to bring up, though, because you mentioned it, Diane, this

article,
this interview with Sen. Chuck Schumer. Mr. LaRouche was told about this earlier today when we had a discussion with him. He placed some importance on it and said, "You know, Chuck Schumer does play a significant role in the Democratic Party." He is now Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, and, very significantly, led the fight against Obama's veto of the JASTA bill; very publicly broke with the Obama administration, in favor of the 9/11 families, in overturning the Obama veto of the JASTA bill. I'd like to say something about that later.

This article is an interview that's published on syracuse.com. It starts by saying, "U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer said Wednesday that he's optimistic Congress will strike a deal with President-elect Donald Trump, to pass a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill within the first 100 days of the administration." However, he warned, "the bill cannot rely on what he called 'gimmicks' or tax breaks." He said "any infrastructure bill must be paid for through substantial and direct federal funding." He said, "The bill needs to be stronger and bolder than ever before. Simple tax credits will not work." He also said that the so-called public-private partnership that Trump's infrastructure plan and other incentives to build projects that would be privately owned, would not function. He said that he had personally told Trump in a private meeting, that such a plan would lead to investment only in the most profitable projects – people who are just trying to make a buck; and could

lead to significantly higher tolls on privately owned roads and bridges. Instead, Schumer said, "The \$1 trillion could flow into the U.S. Treasury to be used for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure." So, this is a direct Federal financing, not a scheme, not a gimmick, not tax breaks, not PPPs [public-private partnerships]. That is a significant development.

I do not think it is a coincidence that that interview comes directly in the wake of a two-week mobilization by LaRouche PAC activists on Capitol Hill to force the issue of Hamiltonian national banking, direct Federal credit. I know that there were countless meetings from activists; there were several dozen meetings that Paul Gallagher personally had with staffers and Congress people on Capitol Hill to discuss the details of what Hamiltonian economics and Hamiltonian national banking actually means. If you haven't seen it yet, I would highly recommend going back and listening to the recorded Fireside Chat that Paul Gallagher did last night; that was on this question of what Hamiltonian national banking really means.

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

ROGERS: Yes, and I think that the title of our publication which we are continuing to get out *en masse*, *The Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance* is absolutely imperative to

be understood as just that. We're not just talking about developing infrastructure or increasing manufacturing; because that's not what Hamilton understood in the increasing of the productivity of society. It was starting with advancing the creative powers of mankind; and Lyndon LaRouche has taken that to a very high level and conception, as you said. His work over the past 40-50 years looking at this conception of leaps in productivity of society based on this conception of the potential for mankind to advance in ways that had not been thought of before; to advance in ways where the creative leaps in mankind take the development scientifically and technologically to higher and higher states. Mr. LaRouche's understanding of this and Krafft Ehrlicke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – the rejection of his ideas by the "limits to growth" imperialist budget-cutters, who didn't want to see mankind advance in this way, was as direct as the opposition to Lyndon LaRouche. If Mr. LaRouche's policies had been put through – along with Krafft Ehrlicke's – on the development of LaRouche's perspective in the '80s for a vibrant space program, setting the agenda of the space program to heights that had not been thought of up until that point, and continuing what John F Kennedy had laid out as a national mission for advancing not just in the moment for space development; but looking far into the future. It's interesting to go back and look at what the vision was at that time, and how far we have been set back because we've had people who decided

that it's not the place of human beings to develop.

Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have continued to

say, represented a quality of genius. It wasn't just that he understood aeronautics and was one of the best in terms of field

of technology. He was a real philosopher; his conception of space development started from the standpoint of the development

of mankind as a whole. That we on this planet, have a responsibility for the development of each and every human being

on the planet; but the way we're going to achieve is – as he said on many occasions – that you have to leave the confines of

one small planet. The idea that there are only limited resources

here for a limited number of people is not true. There's a very

beautiful conception of that drawn out by Krafft Ehrlicke in a very short writing that he wrote called "The Extra-Terrestrial Imperative; Growth and Life"; that's the model that he worked on.

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

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

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

"There was a time when the human mind was slow to accept

growing evidence that Earth is not a flat center of the universe.

Now the concept of a closed, isolated world must be overcome.

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

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

OGDEN: This the moment of opportunity. If you look at, as Diane covered in the beginning of our discussion, this wave of unexpected and completely dramatic electoral results and otherwise; from Brexit to the Presidential election. We've got the Italian referendum coming up this weekend; we could see some very dramatic results out of there. Hollande has now declared that he will not be running for President of France. This is a very dramatic and uncharted period; and the potential is there, the doors are wide open. I think we have repeatedly gone back to

this point, but I think we should return to it again. It should have been seen that this was not business as usual at the point that the entirety of the United States Senate and a vast majority of the U.S. House – not along party lines – rejected Obama's treasonous veto of the JASTA bill. That was in no small part the result of the activation and the leadership of the LaRouche Political Action Committee in the United States. I think we who are on this discussion right now, can say that we know directly that the role that LaRouche PAC played was central and primary in leading that fight for years. Direct collaboration with the 9/11 Families; direct collaboration with the members of the U.S. House and Senate in forcing this through. That was not something that Obama – despite all of his bluster – and the Saudi government – despite all of their millions of dollars; they just could not handle that. That was something that overcame everything that they tried to throw up against it.

Now you have a pathetic effort by McCain and by Lindsey Graham to try and gut the JASTA bill in the last days of the lame duck session; but this is not going anywhere. There was a very good statement put out by Terry Strada and the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, where they said in their press release, "We wish to state our firm opposition to the proposed legislative language offered by U.S. Senators Lindsey

Graham and John McCain that would effectively gut the JASTA bill;

which was overwhelmingly passed by Congress in September."

Later

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

then, including this Presidential election, was a statement that

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

There is a mood of revolt among the American people.

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

in *The Hill* which I think excellently gets to that very point and I think is more generally applicable. The article was

titled, "Note to Allies: Don't Underestimate Overwhelming Popular Support for JASTA." The author, Alexander Nicholson, says in this article, "[O]n this particular issue..., no amount of money or insider Washington connections will be able to overturn the overwhelming will of the American people. Indeed," he says, "the highly unexpected but highly populist-inspired election of Donald Trump to the White House should serve as an indicator that no amount of inside-the-beltway inside baseball can achieve results when it comes to certain issues at certain times. And this, too, is one of those issues and times." And then he concludes the article, "The current arguments are as ineffective as the synthetic inside-the-beltway strategy it has thus far employed. But the new era of empowerment of the American electorate is not to be underestimated." So, I think that is absolutely the case; and people should take heart to that. This is, indeed, a new political era for the United States; it's the "empowerment of the American electorate."

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

SARE: Just on that, I think on the one hand it's sort of obvious; although I guess it shouldn't be, because we've tolerated such criminality for the last 16 years since 9/11 occurred. Droning people, torture, and so on. The NSA spying on every detail of everything of everyone. But there's a certain limit where people just said, "No, we're not intimidated." We saw that particularly strongly in Manhattan among first responders and others who died, who are still dying as after-effects, or who had loved ones who died, or colleagues who died. There's a certain sort of sacred commitment that "We are not going back on this," and they're not afraid. The challenge now again is to raise the standard; in other words, can we fight with the same fearless passion for those things that are necessary for mankind to progress? Could we get a situation where the population just says, "Absolutely not! We're not shutting down our nuclear power plants. Are you crazy? This is unacceptable. You're saying we're not going to go back to the Moon and build the means to get onto Mars from the Moon? This is crazy!" Where no one even gives it a second thought that it's so obvious. I think that is where the two areas which Einstein excelled in both: the music – his violin as a certain source of inspiration and thought; and the science come together. When one is conscious of what it means to be truly human and creative, then anything on a lower standard than that, is the same kind of affront as the Saudi Foreign Minister traipsing through the

halls

of Congress in his robes lined with money. You just say, "Oh, this is beneath us." We saw that effect here when the Schiller

Institute Community Chorus participated in this series of performances of the Mozart *Requiem*; and there's more music coming up – again sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of

Classical Culture – on December 17th in Brooklyn. A unity concert with the conception of, what does it mean: to be human?

Because human beings are not animals, no matter how many environmentalist barbarians want to try and impose that on us. When you've located your identity in a realm which is truly beautiful, then a lot of these things that seem so difficult now

– like the difficulty of these politicians standing up to Wall Street on Glass-Steagall. Why are they afraid? Why do they find

that difficult? Because their own identities are right now on too low of a level; but if they began to look at the world from a

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

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

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

So, I think the next phase in this process is to have a

similar, almost ease; a soaring quality of mankind, even in

the
United States, to get ourselves into the realm where we
actually
should be living.

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

OGDEN: President Modi of India called it a mass
movement
for development; and I know Helga LaRouche has echoed that
call
repeatedly since he said that. And we really do see a mass
movement for development among some of these Eurasian
countries
especially, but also with them reaching out to African and
South
and Central American countries, you have a majority of the
world's population now getting in on this mass movement for
development. But that's what we need demanded from the
American
people right now; and I think we can turn this new era of
empowerment of the American electorate into a mass movement
for
development. But we have to do it from the standpoint of a
Hamiltonian renaissance in the United States. We have the
materials for that, as we've said before. The new book,
Hamilton's Vision is available on Amazon; and people can read
those four reports that he wrote to the United States Congress
as
Treasury Security. We also have the Four Laws from Mr.
LaRouche
which are available on the LaRouche PAC website, and the
related
pamphlet, "The United States Joins the New Silk Road."

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

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Thank you to both Kesha and to Diane. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Ingen tid at spille: Vedtag
Glass-Steagall, og tag til
Månen
LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast,**



25. november, 2016

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

Dette Nye Paradigme, der i øjeblikket ledes politisk og økonomisk af Rusland og Kina, kommer som et resultat af LaRouche-bevægelsens og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange organisering; der er således nu et Nyt Paradigme, der fører en stadig større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske

politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorisme (JASTA). Og som vi nu står klar til at gøre, med at få Kongressen – under denne overgangsperiode, 'lamme and'-perioden – til at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, det nødvendige første skridt for en økonomisk genrejsning. Glass-Steagall er den lov, som Franklin Roosevelt fik vedtaget, og som skabte 60+ år med stabil, kedelig, stabil, produktiv bankvirksomhed i USA; snarere end den form for spillevirksomhed, vi nu ser.

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

Programmet med nationerne i Ét bælte, én vej [OBOR], der  inkluderer både – der er to komponenter i Kinas projekt i denne henseende; det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, med nationerne vist i blå farve, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej i orange farve. Tilsammen refererer Kina til dette på kinesisk som initiativet med »Ét bælte, én vej«; på engelsk ofte blot kaldt initiativet for Bæltet og Vejen. Med hensyn til det potentiale, som dette har, er her blot nogle af tallene: 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer i Kina, alle bygget inden for det seneste årti – mere end i resten af verden tilsammen; et titals billioner af dollars i direkte investering i nationerne i området; en forøgelse af kontrakter om tjenesteydelser på over 33 % i løbet af blot ét år langs Bæltet og Vejen; Kinas Eksport/Importbank har udestående engagementer i flere end 1000 projekter og har for ganske nylig underskrevet aftaler om omkring 500 nye projekter i nationerne langs Bæltet og Vejen. Kina er i færd med at  udbygge 150.000 stipendier, som tilbyder uddannelse til 500.000 eksperter til uddannelse i Kina; har etableret 500 Konfucius-institutter i hele verden; har initieret flere end et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i

Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

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

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

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

Jeffrey Steinberg (efterretningsredaktør, EIR): Det er indledningsvist meget vigtigt at indse, at vi befinder os i en periode med forandring. Vi ved visse ting om konsekvenserne af det amerikanske præsidentvalg og andre nationale valg den 8. nov. Jeg mener, at Lozansky og Jatrus gjorde en fundamental pointe meget klart: Der forelå en meget alvorlig fare, baseret på Hillary Clintons kampagneretorik, baseret på politikker, der blev stadigt mere aggressivt forfulgt af præsident Barack Obama mod slutningen af hans otte år i embedet; at vi havde

kurs mod den værste krise mellem USA og Rusland, som vi nogen sinde har oplevet – måske endda værre end Cubakrisen i 1962. Så Hillary Clintons nederlag er virkelig afslutningen af præsidentskaberne Bush' og Obamas 16 år lange tyranni. Hvor hurtigt, vi kan vende politikken omkring under det nye Trump-præsidentskab, og i hvilken retning, udnævnelserne til hans administration vil gå, er alt sammen ukendte faktorer; vi har ingen vished om dem.

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

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

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

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

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

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske banksystem er nedsmeltet. Så Glass-Steagall er altså et presserende hastespørgsmål; og det forudsætter dernæst de andre hovedelementer i LaRouches Fire Love. Det er et

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

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

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

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

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

JASON ROSS: Hi there! Today is November 25, 2016;
and
you're joining us for our regular webcast here from

larouchepac.com. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today.

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

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

occur

in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result

of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and

Helga LaRouche; such that there is now a New Paradigm taking an

increasingly larger portion of the world in a very positive direction. Our job at present isn't to get the hottest news on

what Trump's appointments will be, etc. It is to shape US policy; as we successfully did in forcing an override against Obama's veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

And as we stand poised to do now with getting the Congress – during this lame duck session – to implement Glass-Steagall, the

necessary first step for an economic recovery. Glass-Steagall is

the law that Franklin Roosevelt had put in place that created 60+

years of stable, boring, stable productive banking in the United

States; rather than the kind of gambling that we see now.

Let me pull up this chart [Fig. 1] just to show a bit of

this success that we've seen along the Chinese economic program.

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

economic belt, which you see the nations in blue, and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in orange. Together, China refers to

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

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of the American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called, "The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for Security, Prosperity, and Peace". Two excerpts. They open their

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

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

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. For starters, it's very important to realize that we're in a period of significant flux.

There are certain things that we know about the consequences of the US Presidential elections and other Federal elections on November 8th. And I think Lozansky and Jatruss made one very fundamental point quite clearly: That there was a very grave danger based on the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton, based on the policies that were pursued even ever more aggressively towards the end of his eight years in office by President Barack Obama; that we were headed for the worst crisis between the United States and Russia that we ever experienced – worse

perhaps even than the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. So, the defeat of Hillary Clinton really is the end of the 16-year tyranny of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. How rapidly we can

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

they're not certain to us.

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

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

which was then followed by state visits by Chinese President Xi

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

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

Because

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

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

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

of a trilateral meeting would be extraordinarily valuable. I think it's important to remember that in 1944, the orientation of

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

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

World War II, and the role that the Marshall Plan played; it was not the whole thing, but it was an important element of the postwar recovery. That kind of perspective is really the winning strategy for dealing with the population growth and this spread of Saudi-sponsored jihadism throughout the Middle East-North Africa region. It extends into Southeast Asia as well.

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

voted
within a matter of hours. The override of JASTA took two
hours
in the morning for the US Senate, and two and a half or so
hours
in the afternoon for the House. It was accomplished in one
legislative day. So, there's no reason whatsoever that we
can't
move immediately – literally next week when Congress is back
in
session after Thanksgiving; and they're there for three weeks.
There's no reason that we should not have Glass-Steagall back
as
the law of the land before the Christmas recess. So that we
hit
the ground running with the new administration; and frankly,
time
is of the essence. We don't know, given the situation with
Deutsche Bank, with Royal Bank of Scotland, the largest US
too-big-to-fail banks are sitting on \$252 trillion in
derivatives. That's 30% more than it was at the time of the
2008
crash. That's on top of a very questionable capital base of
\$14
trillion; the reality is that it's probably much less than
that,
because some of the assets that are allowed to be counted as
the
capital reserves, are basically illiquid and can't be – even
on
an emergency basis – made liquid.

So, we could wake up tomorrow morning, or Monday
morning, or
the middle of next week, and find that the entire trans-
Atlantic
banking system has blown out. So, Glass-Steagall is an
urgent,

immediate issue; and it then begs the other three key elements of LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws. Which is a credit system; investment in major infrastructure projects; and a revival of the most advanced scientific programs, including a major return to space and the work internationally to finally achieve the full breakthrough on fusion. All of these things are on the table, but again, there are no guarantees, there's nothing that's even remotely certain about what's going to come next. We can breathe a little easier because danger of war with Russia, with China is greatly reduced; and there's a lot of potentiality. There's a lot of the kind of transition from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan in the air as a potential; but none of it is fully realized yet. So, people are going to have to realize this is a moment of great opportunity. It's going to be an outpouring of the population under the right kind of leadership, directed at the right policies, that can really seize the opportunity. If we wait until January or February of next year, who knows what kind of sabotage operations are going to be run?

You can go on Craig's List and find George Soros front groups, like MoveOn.org and blacklivesmatter.org, offering \$1500 a week for people to run around like idiots, protesting against the outcome of the election. There's a great deal of uncertainty, in terms of what's going on, at the same time that there's great opportunity. We've got to make sure that we take the lead in seizing the moment.

ROSS: Great! Thanks! In terms of the long-term outlook of where we're going to go, what our policy should be, a major aspect of this goes beyond legislation that affects us only here on Earth. A major component, in fact the fourth component of the Four Laws of Mr. LaRouche, the last one being the fusion driver crash program, is connected with our existence beyond the planet, also out in space. Ben wrote an article that's going to be in the upcoming issue of the *Hamiltonian* about what a U.S. space policy ought to be, and about the really long-term goals that we have to have, and why this is important and essential. So, could you tell us about that, Ben?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Gladly! As viewers are aware, this has been an ongoing subject of discussion. Mr. LaRouche, as Jason is saying, has put a major, major focus on, as a critical part of the needed recovery program and the future of mankind. In this article we tried to elevate people's thinking about space, especially in the context of so many years and administrations and decades of just zero-growth policies.

One thing that's being discussed now, which is interesting and useful, is how much NASA has been hijacked for this global warming crap. A lot of NASA's budget has been redirected to "Earth sciences." Not all Earth sciences are bad. There's a lot of interesting science to learn about the Earth. But Earth sciences is often a front to push this fraud of some man-made global warming crisis. So, there's some discussion about NASA

being redirected away from wasting their time on this phony, phony, fake crisis, which is not something we need to be concerned about, and redirecting back to exploration. Surprise, surprise. The Moon has come back now as a central subject of the discussion. Anybody who had any sense would realize that once Obama was out, this crazy asteroid mission [The Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission] would likely be tossed aside. Anybody who is serious would recognize that the Moon is the next place to get back to.

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

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

This goes directly to the vision of Krafft Ehrlicke, the early

space pioneer who worked very closely with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the '80s, who was one of the leading space visionaries, who had outlined in great detail the initial basis of mankind expanding to really becoming a Solar System species.

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

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

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

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

The real understanding of what qualitative revolutions in infrastructure systems mean for mankind's continual creative progress is not connected to the way most people use that term.

Mr. LaRouche defined the very profound and critical assessment of

looking at the development of human civilization in these stages

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

What

you began to see, with the development of inland waterways, inland river systems – he had put a big point on what Charlemagne was doing during his reign in central Europe in developing these canal systems and river systems – was a qualitative revolution above what had existed prior, with these

trans-oceanic civilizations: the development of these inland

waterways. That defined a new platform of activity that supported a qualitative leap in what civilization was able to accomplish.

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

I think back to the early phases of these frontier explorations of the American Continent. You go back to the Lewis and Clark Expeditions, where to travel from the east coast across the entire mainland of the continent to the west coast required someone like the leading skilled frontiersmen, and a very dangerous, very challenging mission, which was a very brave undertaking for a handful of people to actually be able to accomplish that. Some decades later, with the rail system, with the infrastructure of this railroad platform, any family could

do

this. With your young children, you could hop on the rail line and get across the country. Any entrepreneur could come out and

take advantage of the development of new territories that were completely inaccessible before. It was a complete transformation

in our most fundamental ability to exist on the planet in these

different territories.

Now what does this have to do with space? This is how we

should be thinking about space exploration, space development—things that we view today as incredibly expensive, difficult, dangerous missions. We should be thinking now what kind of investments can we make to ensure that those then become

regular, day-to-day even, activities that we can support very easily. What will it take to create a Solar System physical-economic platform that will enable mankind to do much more, much easier, than we can today? That's the metric we want

to set. That's the measuring rod we want to utilize, to determine

what kind of space program, what kind of policy we need today.

In breaking this down, this might not include everything,

but in some of our work in the Basement with our discussions on

this subject, I think we can really, very usefully look at three

categories of activity – three categories of infrastructure and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Developing resources. Developing the capabilities to utilize the resources available to us throughout the Solar System, not having to take everything with us everywhere we go, but be able to develop the wealth that's available out there; to utilize it on site and transport it around, even bringing stuff back to Earth that we can't necessarily get from Earth.

If you look at these three pillars, these three categories together, and if you make qualitative breakthroughs in each of these together, this really comes together to define a new platform of activity, a new standard that will enable the kind of leap that will transition us from viewing space as a Lewis and Clark style expedition, to a trans-continental railroad style relationship to the Solar System.

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

[Fig.

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

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

The graphic here displays this, in terms of travel from Earth's surface to different planetary bodies, measured in the standard terms used for Solar System travel, which is your change in speed. To get into Earth orbit requires not just going up 100 miles, but actually changing your speed, from your current velocity sitting here on the Earth, to something that will allow you to stay in orbit. If you want to change orbits, or travel around, you can measure that, in terms of changes in velocity. So that happens to be the metric here; but you can see the

lowest

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

you can see a relatively recent article covering studies in China

on interest in China to develop what some people call

single-stage-to-orbit space planes. So, you can get on a

plane

on a runway – it's probably going to be a little bit longer than

your standard runway for airplane travel – and you can ride a single space plane from the runway all the way up into Earth orbit. A lot of this depends upon much more advanced engine designs that can utilize the oxygen in the atmosphere at higher

speeds and at higher altitudes to continue to provide thrust. But these things could dramatically lower the cost, the energy requirements of getting people and payloads up into Earth orbit;

far more than a lot of the discussion about these reusable rockets and some of the developments going on in improving rocket

systems to get from Earth's surface into Earth orbit.

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

DENISTON: Yeah, absolutely. These rocket systems have to carry the oxygen as part of the rocket to combust to provide the thrust. These are more innovative engine designs – air-breathing engines that can use the oxygen in the atmosphere.

As you said, this has been researched in the United States with

different scramjet designs. Yeah, Mr. LaRouche featured some of

this, which he had developed I think in some close discussion

with some Italian colleagues at the time in his collaboration with the Fusion Energy Foundation; and had made it a major part of his "Woman on Mars" mission.

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

The next pillar, the next category is travel in space. And again, this is an issue that Mr. LaRouche has been campaigning on for decades. Space travel requires nuclear reactions; chemical fuel just doesn't have the energy density to provide quick and efficient access to the Solar System. We can get to the Moon; that's OK. It probably would be nice to get there a little bit quicker, but that's our next door neighbor in terms of the

Solar

System. If you want to get to Mars, you want to get around to other places in the Solar System, you've got to get to nuclear reactions. The heart of this is the fact that the energy density, the energy per mass of nuclear reactions is, on average, on the order of a million times greater than the energy per mass in chemical reactions; even as broad categories, setting aside the particular fuel you use in either case.

A million times is just a big number, but for one quick comparison, you take the fuel used for the Space Shuttle launch

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

is the defining characteristic that makes nuclear reactions key

to getting around the Solar System; enabling things like travelling at constant acceleration. Instead of just

initially

firing your thruster and basically floating on an orbit to get to

different planetary bodies – which is what's often proposed for

getting people to Mars; which would take on the order of six, seven, eight months to do. If you had nuclear reactions – especially fusion reactions – you can be accelerating for half the trip, and decelerating the second half of the trip; you can

cut that time down to weeks or even days.

We were all excited that New Horizons got to Pluto. Unfortunately, it didn't have the fuel in it and the engines to

slow down when it got there; which is too bad, because it spent

ten years getting there, and even just passing by in the course

of a couple of weeks, found amazing things. Imagine if it actually got to stop and stay? If you had nuclear reactions, that the type of stuff you could be doing. If you had one-gravity acceleration, so you're constantly accelerating, providing the thrust that creates the equivalent of one Earth gravity for the crew on the space ship, it would literally take

16 days to get to Pluto. Compared to New Horizons taking ten years to get there; that's when the orbits are closest, but maybe

a few more days in sub-optimal conditions.

You're talking about a complete revolution in our ability to

efficiently get around the Solar System; travel to different planetary bodies; visit multiple locations. If you want to send

people to Mars, this is the way to do it. If you want to send people out to other places, this is the way to do it. Even robotic missions; you want to get around and do way more

exploration. There's so much we don't know about all these planets, about their moons; there's just so much to figure out.

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

And again, the third category is developing the resources in space; developing the ability to utilize what's available to us on the Moon, on Mars, on different asteroids. This is something we don't really do at all, yet. So, you have to bring basically everything with you through that very costly energy-intensive first hurdle of getting from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, through travelling the vast distances of space. This is just this very early pioneer style mode of activity. Whereas, if we're going to be serious about this, we need to develop the capabilities to utilize the resources that are there; and eventually look to serious industrialization and development of advanced systems out in space, on-site at different planetary bodies. One critical driver to this whole thing that we've put a major focus on is the development of helium-3 from the Moon. Helium-3 being an absolutely unique, excellent fusion fuel; which is basically absent on Earth, but relatively abundant all over the lunar surface, and could be an excellent fuel for fusion propulsion in space and also to provide electricity energy back here on Earth. There's been years of serious study and designs and investigations of how to go to the Moon, develop the systems to process the regala[ph], extract the helium-3; and initiate

real industrial-style processes; developments on the lunar surface. That's just one example. You want to get oxygen, hydrogen, metals; asteroids are also potentially very useful places to develop the resources. So, as a third category, the general idea of developing advanced capabilities to utilize and create what we need in different regions of the Solar System.

If you put this together and look at these things synergistically as integrated technologies, infrastructure systems, levels of energy flux density; as a whole they define for mankind a completely different relationship to the Solar System. The question is, are we making investments that are bringing us to that level? Can we say that the investments we're going to make in this next administration are going to be taking mankind in that direction, to be able to support these qualitatively higher levels of activity to the point where we can honestly look back in a couple of generations and see the space activity going on now as equivalent to Lewis and Clark style explorations of the West; and have mankind have the capabilities to regularly visit many planetary bodies and do all we want around the Solar System? That's the vision that we need.

We were talking about this with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, and he again said, "Your starting point is Krafft Ehrlicke." And Krafft Ehrlicke's industrialization of the Moon really I think is the critical driver program that can get a lot of this going. As I said, we have helium-3 on the Moon; that puts fusion directly right there on the table. You're talking about developing

industrial capabilities and mining capabilities on the Moon. If you're serious about doing this, you want to increase our access to space from the Earth's surface. So, it is excellent that we're seeing a lot of discussion about the Moon coming on the table again; but I think the issue is, are we going to pursue this Krafft Ehrlicke vision for a real industrial development? Although he might have used different terms in discussing it, he had exactly the same conception that Mr. LaRouche has: That this is the basis for mankind's much broader expanse. Really the essential nature of the type of qualitative changes that mankind goes through in his natural growth and development as a very unique species on this Earth and hopefully tomorrow in the Solar System.

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

ROSS: Mhmm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good. I think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying the develop that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast that with what China is able to do now with building rail

networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it made it possible to open up the interior of the continents. And with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or more regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip.

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

So, I think it's very exciting. It's definitely much more

thrilling than most of the discussion that takes place about this policy or that policy, when you think big like that.

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

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

The ability to understand this concept of the platforms, of the history of economic development of the United States, a real

major aspect of economic science, comes through studying Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with

—
if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to join

us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself. The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the USA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

de se hen for lederskab? Til LaRouche Political Action Committee.

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

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

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast November 18, 2016

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

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

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

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

Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We had the opportunity just now to have a discussion with

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

is very clear. It is decisively determined that the entire reigning former system, the old system, has abruptly and

decisively come to an end. But the question still remains: What will replace it? And that is far from concrete or finalized at this point. The leadership that the LaRouche PAC has delivered and continues to deliver, is the deciding factor in that – both nationally and on the international stage. It's very clear that the dynamic is now shifted towards what Xi Jinping has led in China with the New Silk Road and in collaboration with Russian President Vladimir Putin in creating a new strategic and economic international order; and that is what is determining world events right now, far beyond anything that's happening domestically from within the borders of the United States. The question is, how do we respond to that?

The LaRouche PAC continues to lead; and as we discussed on Monday with the Policy Committee, this was a very important week.

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

leading activists of the LaRouche Political Action Committee.

We

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

and we definitely met a completely shaken up and much more open

situation than we have faced in perhaps the last 16 years in Washington, DC. Both the Republican leadership and absolutely

the Democratic leadership have received a severe drubbing; and the most sane aspects of both parties are realizing that now is

the time to come to terms with that. Where else can they turn for leadership? The LaRouche Political Action Committee.

So, what we're going to do right now is play a short excerpt

from a discussion that was led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche. These are

remarks that she delivered to those activists as sort of marching

orders before they went to Washington, DC. I think she gives a

very clear overview of exactly the situation we find ourselves in, and the responsibilities that we have. Coming out of that short audio clip, we will continue the discussion with some much

more elaborated views of what we have now been able to accomplish, and what the challenges still are ahead of us.

So,

let me play that clip for you right now:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE : OK. So, first of all, I want to say hello to you. Obviously, this is a very important intervention because the election results in the United

States, which many people did not anticipate, is really part of a

global process. It's not something which is accountable in all

the explanations given by the US media; for the most part, the cover-up or some phony explanation like it was the FBI who cost

Hillary the election and so forth and so on. What really is going on strategically is that the masses of the population of the trans-Atlantic sector in particular – also in some other parts of the world, but in Europe and the United States in

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

One immediate next point where the same kind of resentment probably will show is with the referendum in Italy where on the 4th of December – that is, in 2.5 weeks from now – they will have a referendum about a change in the constitution which as the sentiment now goes, will be also a vote against the Renzi government. Even so, he promised he would resign; now, he

doesn't want to resign. But in any case, this type of a process will continue until a remedy has been put in.

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

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

implement

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

stops and terminates the casino economy which is really the cause

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

Obviously,

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

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

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

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

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

have this intervention to really educate the Congress and the

Senate on what is really at stake. The world is now really

looking, holding their breath; will there be a change in American

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

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

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

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

the last couple of days, that the key thing is to increase the productivity of the labor force; and because of neo-liberal

policies of monetarist policies of the last one can really say decades, this productivity has gone down in the trans-Atlantic sector below the break-even point. This is why we need a national bank in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton; we need a credit policy; we need an international credit system, a new Bretton Woods system. And you obviously need a "win-win" cooperation of all nations building the New Silk Road. Also, in the United States, building the Silk Road to become a World Land-Bridge.

Now, extremely important is the fourth of the Four Laws, which basically says that we cannot get an increase in the productivity of the economy unless you go for a crash program of fusion power, and you go for a crash program of international cooperation for space research. Only if you do these kinds of avant-garde leaps in the productivity – like fusion technology brings you in a completely economic platform with the fusion torch. You will have energy security for the whole planet; you will have raw materials security because you can use any waste and differentiate out the different isotopes and reconstitute new raw materials by putting the isotopes together in the way required. So, it's a gigantic technological leap; and the same thing goes for space technology. It will have exactly the same impact as during the Apollo program when every investment in space technology, in rockets and other new materials, brought 14 cents back from each cent of investment. Everything from computer chips to Teflon cooking ware to all kinds of benefits occurred as a byproduct from space research. To get the world economy out of this present condition – especially in the

trans-Atlantic sector – you need that kind of reorientation towards the scientific and technological progress, increases in energy flux density. All of this Green ideology which is really no development ideology has to be replaced; and the world has to go back in a direction where the real physical laws of the physical universe are the criteria for truth, and not some ideology."

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

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

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

building bridges, building airports, and so forth.

The latest development in that discussion is an article that is featured on the front page of the {New York Times} today, called "Trump-size Idea for a New President; Build Something Inspiring". Good headline, and the article starts off pretty inspiringly; it says the only way that you're going to be able to unify a bitterly divided America, is by building great infrastructure projects. Not just painting rusty bridges, or laying a few miles of asphalt, but "Build something awe-inspiring. Something Americans can be proud of. Something that will repay its investment many times over for generations to come. Build the modern-day equivalent of the Golden Gate Bridge, the Hoover Dam, the Lincoln Tunnel " All of which were built by Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal administration. Then the article does also say, "Can anybody remember anything that came out of Obama's \$800 billion [stimulus package]? I don't think so." So, this article usefully cites what Franklin Roosevelt did with the PWA, the WPA: 700 miles of airport runways; 650,000 miles of rail; 78,000 bridges; 125,000 military and civilian buildings, [including] 40,000 schools. This is massive. The article also usefully says the idea that any infrastructure project today could pay for itself through user fees is a ridiculous prospect. But the alternative that this article poses is just as bad; saying, the way to do it is for government to borrow most of the money from investors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, there are some much deeper scientific points that have

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

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

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

and I think we should maybe expand from there.

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

LaRouche, increasingly in the last couple of months, has said over and over again, "Productivity; productivity; productivity."

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

just

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

country; increase the productivity of existing territories, and

that begins to create real growth. You're not going to get real

growth just by rebuilding what you have; although you need to

do

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

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

physical goods needed to support society more efficiently and at

higher qualities with less physical input per capita, you could

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

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

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

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

what are the essential principles of human economic growth?

And

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

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

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

small part of the population even in that specific endeavor; but

you're pushing the frontiers of engineering capabilities,

scientific capabilities. That actually has the most important radiating effect on the entirety of the economy, the entirety of the productive capabilities of the labor force.

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

So, those are the kinds of things that we absolutely need right now; not just repairing our existing degraded

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

DIANE SARE: Well, I'd like to just put this in a context; because we're not having a discussion here in the abstract. And I want to go back to what Mr. LaRouche did in the 1970s with the creation of the Fusion Energy Foundation, and his role in

being

brought into a team to create a Presidency. I want to be very clear with the people watching this that what we are doing is not

an academic discussion of nice things that we, sitting in a little corner, want to do. Mr. LaRouche – as you heard from what Ben laid out – had a very clear conception of the necessity

of fusion energy at that time. Also, people remember the Jimmy

Carter Presidency; small is beautiful. I think we were talking

about global cooling back then, and now it's global warming.

[One sentence paraphrase because of bad audio] What we needed to

do, in collaboration with Edward Teller, was to take the Mutually

Assured Destruction doctrine off the table. The only deterrent

to a nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union was who could blow up the world more times over. What happened was, in

the process of this, Ronald Reagan as a candidate and then as President, was recruited to this idea; and I think we've been told there a number of things which Mr. LaRouche was working on

with the Reagan administration. Not the least of which was the

SDI, which the Soviets rejected and Reagan announced, which led

in a not-so-indirect way to the Berlin Wall coming down.

Also,

there was discussion of a meeting between President Reagan and Indira Gandhi, former prime minister of India who had been leader

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

in '82; Indira Gandhi was assassinated; Mr. LaRouche was put in prison. I'm not saying that to say that we're worried about it; there's all kinds of questions of security and safety. But my point is that LaRouche personally has played a major, important role in shaping the institution of the Presidency; and his incarceration was timed for when we had earlier another such great opportunity, which was when the Soviet system collapsed economically as he warned it would. He was in prison, and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche put on the table with him the Productive Triangle and so on. We know what happened; that was sabotaged by a series of wars. The Balkans; the first Iraq War; we later had 9/11 and so on.

What we are doing today is to shape the American [nation] in participation with what is a New Paradigm; which LaRouche and his wife personally have been very much involved in creating. Two years ago, Mr. LaRouche announced that we should move the center of our American operations to New York City; which was done. In the last three or four months, we have begun circulation of a newspaper appropriately titled {The Hamiltonian}. I'll just say I found it ironic that the {New York Times} today has these headlines about infrastructure. They also have articles about how school children in Estonia and Latvia were terrified that Hillary Clinton was going to drag them into the middle ground of a war between NATO and Russia. It's very interesting.

The big title on {The Hamiltonian} this week is "We

Are

Facing a New Epoch for Mankind"; the subtitle is "The New York Times Has Become Irrelevant". So, they may be scrambling to make

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

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

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

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

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

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

John Quincy Adams in terms of their role in the United States.

And I would say geographically, if you could step away, if you could get on a space ship and look at the Earth from a distance;

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

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

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

crucial that everybody watching this, makes it a point to master

the principles in Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws. Particularly the

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

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

KESHA ROGERS: Just to follow up on that, another important aspect of the fight waged by Mr. LaRouche and his wife Helga, going back to the 1970s around the fight that you just mentioned, Diane, of the Fusion Energy Foundation, was the fight against this apparatus of a zero-growth or no-growth culture. He was very instrumental with Mrs. LaRouche and also their collaboration

with space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – who we've mentioned a lot –
on taking on this degeneracy of the attack on population reduction that was being promoted and continues to be promoted to this day. Many people may remember that there was a book put out in the 1970s by two men, Dennis Meadows and Jay Forrester. Jay Forrester just died recently at 98 years old. He was instrumental in putting out the computer models which indicated that there was a certain relationship between the limited resources on Earth and the production of food to how many people you can sustain on Earth and so forth. This is something that Mr. LaRouche has taken directly in terms of this is an attack on the human identity, an attack on the real productivity based on the creative potential of the human mind and LaRouche's model has been brought up on the increasing of the energy flux density of your economy per capita, and per land area.

I think it's really important right now to look at the fact that Mr. LaRouche sees this fight as a complete shift in the global direction of mankind; unifying mankind on a level that nations have never been unified on before. I thought it was important that yesterday, we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche – Ben, myself, and others from the leadership team; and one thing that he brought up was the integration of the space program and the development of space research, space science, and the exploration of space to Classical music – which we're really

defining in the development of our Manhattan Project, which is really shaping our organization across the country and internationally. You have seen a culture which is completely degenerated under the Bush-Obama Presidencies. You take the inspiration, the culture which shaped the identity of the fight

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

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

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

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

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

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

the integration of the classical culture as the expression of a

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

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

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

to recognize the importance internationally of what China is doing. We can say more on this later, but the fact that when

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

OGDEN: One thing you brought up, and I thought it was
good
to go back to; the conjunction of Kennedy's space program, the
kind of inspiration and culture needed. This was something

very

conscious to the Kennedy administration; not only did they bring

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

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

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

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

which will encourage great culture, classical culture around the

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

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

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

happened politically, where New York City has definitely become

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

It

was a strategic decision to center a very active organization in

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

with what Diane has been leading there with this revival of Classical music and culture. That's very important, even from the standpoint of what is our idea of man; and the dignity of human beings. Yes, granted, there were dark tones during this Presidential campaign which is not acceptable. But the idea of

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

It's one thing to point actually, Diane; that first Messiah concert which launched the New York City renaissance project, happened in the context of this racial tension that was heating up in New York at that time. So, this still is a very important aspect of addressing that.

SARE: I just wanted to add one quick thing on that note; which is a musical question actually, if you think about a symphony orchestra or a chorus and the role that individuals play as part of that body; where the whole is definitely greater than the sum of its parts. Were we to launch a transformation of society along the lines of what Mrs. LaRouche outlined in Peru; that is, the US to become integrated in part of the Belt and Road program, then I think we would quickly discover that we actually don't have enough people in this country. So that all the things that people are afraid about, about who's going to be excluded, who's going to be deported, etc.; you will find yourself looking at your fellow human beings with new eyes because of the creative potential of each individual which will be necessary to transform the nation and the world in the immediate future.

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

DENISTON: Yeah, and it's a huge subject that could be probably taken up in much more detail. It really goes to the question of what is a resource? What do we consider as a resource; and how that continually changes as mankind

develops.

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

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

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

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

isotope economy, the intimate connection with energy flux density

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

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

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

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

ways.

Helga mentioned this very exciting prospect that's been talked about to some degree for years of this fusion torch idea.

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

It

was something that we were using that was useful to us. Now, we

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

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

Mr. LaRouche's point on this as a new focus, that he's put on this in the recent period, is really critical. We got to

raise

this discussion to not just jobs, but productivity. What's your

ability to produce things? If we're serious about turning the economy around. It's kind of been referenced here and there, but

we have allies in doing that. It's not just going to be completely on our own shoulders. We have to decide to do it, but

China has said, "Hey, United States! If you want to quit this geopolitical, 19th Century crazy game and get to some serious discussion about creating a future for mankind, that's what we're

doing. So, if you want to work with us, we'd be happy to cooperate with you in a serious, honest investment and development for our nations." Many other nations are rallying around China in their effort to do that; so that's there as a critical support point, if the United States makes this shift. These are the critical issues that we've got to put on the table and fight out.

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

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

or anything of that nature. There's only one way you're going to

wipe out this casino economy, Wall Street speculation; and I think that goes the same for the measures needed with the development of the types of density and increase in energy

source

and fusion economy as Mr. LaRouche is calling for. There's a lot of compromise out there about that, too. "Fusion is a long way away; it's never going to happen. The politicians aren't going to let it happen." All of this stuff.

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

Once again, the point was, a lot of people want to compromise on these things. There cannot be compromise because there is a global shift underway; and that global shift is requiring an increase in the highest levels of scientific development that has to be implemented immediately. This is

why

Mr. LaRouche's fourth law in terms of fusion driver program, is something that – just like Glass-Steagall – cannot be compromised on; and is absolutely fundamental for pushing forth the breakthroughs which are necessary.

OGDEN: Well, that was Helga LaRouche's point during the opening segment that we played today; that it is incumbent on all the activists, all the viewers of this broadcast, to master the contents of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. This might seem like a short document, but it's a very dense document; and a lot of the subjects that Ben has brought up here today in terms of the definition of economic productivity and what the nature of mankind is. Kesha, what you were saying; there really are no limits to growth. This is not some kind of thing, where when we reach our carrying capacity, that will be it. It's mankind transforming its own species; transforming the universe, and transforming our relationship to the universe. That's what's addressed in this policy document by Lyndon LaRouche. You have to set the bar that high; it cannot be any lower than that level from which you're going to effect the kind of revolution in policy that's necessary for the entire planet at this time.

So, we have a lot of work to do. The Congress was only in session for a day and a half this week. But what that means, is that they are back in their districts; and I'm telling you,

it's

not going to be like business as usual. This is not what the conditions were before this election. It's all the more important to think from the standpoint of what Diane was mentioning in the beginning of the show: Our role is – and has

always been – to shape the institution of government of the United States from the very highest level. This is not coming in

from the outside; this is not a voice calling in the darkness. This is working with the leadership of the nations of the planet

and creating the dynamic that you now see taking over. This has

been decades in the making; but I can guarantee you, Lyndon and

Helga LaRouche have played a role that has been central to this

reality now coming into being. I'm talking about the New Silk Road; I'm talking about this trilateral relationship between Russia, China, and India, creating a new dynamic on the Eurasian

continent. Everything that's happening in South America right now is something that Lyndon LaRouche was personally involved in

over decades; and now South America coming into the New Silk Road

and joining this new World Land-Bridge is something that is very real.

Nothing is determined; but our role is to continue that

fight inside the United States, and to make this a reality – "The United States {Joins} the New Silk Road". We put it in the present tense for a reason.

So, I'd invite Diane, Kesha, if there's anything

concluding

that you'd like to say before we close out the show?

SARE: I think one great benefit of launching this recovery

and increasing the productivity is all the states which just voted to legalize marijuana, will have second thoughts about that.

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

OGDEN: You'll turn out like Gary Johnson and have an "Aleppo moment".

OK. We'll take that as a concluding point here. Please stay tuned. We will make the full speech that Helga delivered in Peru

available. The audio at least, or maybe the video. There was also a very productive dialogue that occurred with the participants of that meeting with Helga, following her keynote speech. So, that's an important thing to stay tuned for.

Also,

we will be producing a feature video – about 10 or 15 minutes in

length – on the content of the Four New Laws. That fleshes out

some of the Hamiltonian aspect of that; and it's an educational

tool to teach yourself and to teach everybody else real economics. So stay tuned for that; that will be coming to the website soon.

Thank you for watching; please subscribe to our YouTube

channel and our daily email updates. All of the information is

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

soon. Stay tuned.

**Vi må genoplive et sandt USA.
Der har aldrig været et
større øjeblik til at udvikle
LaRouches ideer.**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Webcast, 4. nov., 2016; Leder**

Matthew Ogden: Jeg tror, vi helt bestemt kan sige, at vi befinder os i en meget farlig, men afgørende periode i vores historie lige nu; både nationalt og internationalt. Tiden efter valget, der finder sted næste tirsdag, vil fordre et meget fattet, klart og sobert lederskab, som kun LaRouchePAC kan yde. Jeg tror, at vi nu ser den rolle, vi har kunnet skabe; og faktum er, at, umiddelbart efter valget, må vi have en hastedebat i USA's Kongres med en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall, som det første hasteskridt. Det afgørende, første skridt i et helt økonomisk genrejsningsprogram, som må indføres i USA; og der må gribes til afgørende handling for at forhindre præsident Obama i at lancere Tredje Verdenskrig i de sidste uger af hans embedstid.

Tidligere sagde Diane [Sare] – jeg citerer kort og lader hende selv sige lidt mere; men, under en diskussion med hr. og fr. LaRouche kom et meget vigtigt punkt frem. Der er en masse såkaldt »analyse« og propaganda derude i nyhedsmedierne og andetsteds, der siger, at det amerikanske folk er mere splittet end nogensinde tidligere som nation, osv., osv. Men

sandheden er, at det amerikanske folk faktisk er mere forenet end nogensinde før, omkring disse to afgørende hovedspørgsmål: den omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og nedlukning af Wall Street; og forhindring af atomkrig, at forhindre, at Obama starter Tredje Verdenskrig. Dette skyldes naturligvis ikke mindst LaRouchePAC's vedvarende indsats i løbet af de seneste år; men hovedsagligt koncentreret i de seneste måneder med det, vi har kunnet katalysere fra vores base i New York City, i Manhattan.

Lad mig blot nævne to ting, som jeg mener, demonstrerer denne pointe meget klart. Der var en ny opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort i begyndelsen af ugen, og som sagde, at, i nøgle-kampstaterne, må-vinde-staterne – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina og Florida, og et par andre stater – sagde 70 % af de sandsynlige vælgere, der blev spurgt, at Glass-Steagall, med navns nævnelse, var en nødvendighed. De var tilhængere af Glass-Steagall. 68 % sagde, at de var tilhængere af at bryde Wall Street-bankerne op. Dernæst sagde en anden opinionsundersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort tidligere på ugen – foretaget af Marylands Universitet – at 2/3 af amerikanerne, inklusive 65 % af Demokraterne, ønsker mere samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland; især mht. at løse krisen i Syrien. Det taler netop om den pointe, som du, Diane, fastslog. Men hvad der fortsat er klart, er, at det afgørende program fortsat er LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love; baseret direkte på de principper, som Alexander Hamilton brugte til at opbygge USA. Vi kan inspireres og modellere det, vi må gøre i dette land i løbet af de kommende uger og måneder, ud fra det, der finder sted med et nyt paradigme, der foregår i hele verden i andre lande, inklusive i Kina. Vi har eksempler, som Jason Ross vil gennemgå; meget solide, konkrete eksempler på, hvad man har gjort i Egypten for at bygge den nye Suezkanal, og i andre lande. Det vil Jason Ross fremlægge lidt om senere i udsendelsen; baseret på en præsentation for det Amerikanske Selskab af Civilingeniørers afdeling i New York City for et par uger siden.s

Lad os begynde diskussion herfra.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet, er dagens leder fra LaRouchePAC:

WE'VE GOT TO REVIVE A TRUE UNITED STATES.
THERE'S NEVER BEEN A GREATER MOMENT
TO DEVELOP LAROUCHE'S IDEAS.

International Webcast, Nov. 4, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's November 4, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden; and you're joining us for our weekly
Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm
joined

in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC
Science

Team; and via video, by two members of the LaRouche PAC Policy
Committee: Diane Sare, joining us from New York City; and
Michael

Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California.

Now, I think it can be said very definitively that we
are in

an extremely dangerous but decisive period in our history
right

now; both nationally and internationally. The aftermath of
this

election coming up next Tuesday is going to require very calm,
clear, and sober leadership which only LaRouche PAC can
provide.

I think what we're seeing right now is the role that we've
been

able to leverage; and the fact is, that immediately following
this election, an emergency debate will have to take place
inside

the United States Congress with a vote scheduled promptly on Glass-Steagall as the emergency first step. The critical first step in an entire recovery program that must be instituted in the United States; and decisive action must be taken to prevent President Obama from launching World War III in the remaining weeks that he has in office.

Now, Diane said earlier – which I just want to cite and let her say a little bit more on; but during a discussion we had with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, a very important point [came up]. There's a lot of so-called "analysis" and propaganda out there in the news media and elsewhere, saying that the American people are more divided than they've ever been as a nation, etc., etc. But in truth, in fact, the American people are more united than perhaps they've ever been around these two key critical issues: the immediate passage of Glass-Steagall, shutting down Wall Street; and preventing thermonuclear war, preventing Obama from starting World War III. This is obviously due in no small part to the consistent efforts of LaRouche PAC over the recent number of years; but focussed mainly over the recent number of months with what we've been able to catalyze from our base in New York City, in Manhattan.

Let me just cite two quick things that I think demonstrate this point very clearly. There was a new poll that came out at the beginning of this week that said that in the key

battleground

states, the must-win states – Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, a couple of other states – 70% of the likely voters polled said that Glass-Steagall by name was a necessity. They were in support of Glass-Steagall. 68% said that they were in support of breaking up the Wall Street banks. Then another poll

that came out earlier this week – this one done by the University of Maryland – said that 2/3 of Americans, including 65% of Democrats, want more cooperation between the United States

and Russia; particularly having to do with resolving the crisis

in Syria. So, I think that speaks exactly to the point that Diane, you were making. But what remains clear, is the critical

program remains LaRouche's Four Economic Laws; based directly on

the principles that Alexander Hamilton used to build the United

States. We can be inspired and model what we have to do in this

country over the coming weeks and months off of what is happening

with a new paradigm happening around the world in other countries, including China. We have examples that Jason Ross is

going to go through; very solid, concrete examples of what's been

done in Egypt to build the new Suez Canal, and others. So, Jason

will present some of that a little bit later in the show; based

off of a presentation that he made to the American Society of Civil Engineers chapter in New York City a couple of weeks back.

But let me just leave it at that; and I think we can

start
the discussion from there.

DIANE SARE: Well, I was – as often I am – was inspired by the local morning news; which both the local New Jersey paper I get and the {New York Times} had these articles as Matt said about how divided the population was. The truth of the matter is, the population is not divided. People are divided over which candidate they hate more; and people have enormous hatred for Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. In that regard, I just have to say that Hillary Clinton – who is the continuation of the Bush/Obama legacy and is a total stooge of the British Empire, George Soros, and everything that represents – and is putting us on a trajectory for war with Russia; she absolutely has to be stopped. And Obama absolutely has to be thrown out of the White House; and if that could have happened yesterday, that would have been excellent. And we do have the Congress coming in the week after the election. But it's not as if the American people don't realize that their standard of living has completely collapsed, particularly in the last 15 years. There is enormous rage at Wall Street; where I think there was another poll where something over 90% or 94% said that Wall Street bankers should be put in jail. So, the American people are very unified that they think that the people who actually destroyed the US economy, which is

not – as we're so often told by the Wall Street bankers and billionaires, just as in the time preceding Franklin Roosevelt –

that the people who caused the depression were all those unemployed working class people. The people who caused this are

the people who run these financial institutions – like the CEO of Wells Fargo, like George Soros; like the people who were behind the assassination of Herrhausen and then took over Deutsche Bank and turned it into a disaster. These people are responsible for this, and they should be punished in a way that

would begin to restore confidence to people that there was justice.

It is also the case that the majority of Americans are tired

of war. We have been in perpetual war frankly since the reunification of Germany – which was the intent; but particularly since September 11th. I think people can reflect on

what happened with the override of Obama's veto on JASTA; the vote against Obama was 97-1. I would say that's a pretty strongly unified Senate against the Saudi role in terrorism and

the cover-up. Whatever occurs on Tuesday and Wednesday, the potential following that is going to be extraordinary for us to

pull the nation together and demand that the policy – starting with LaRouche's Four Laws – which is Glass-Steagall and emphatically a system of national banking and credit that allows

us to fund the things that are on the most advanced scientific levels. That is, our nation can pull itself together and do this; and it is not going to be a period where people just doze

off, because as I said, everyone hates both of the candidates so

intensely that no one will feel safe giving them a grace period to see what they do.

So, I think everyone who is watching this, should mobilize; inform yourself of the program, study the material on the larouchepac.com site, and presume that 90% or more of your neighbors on what has to be done to save the nation, and that that's the direction in which we can move.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think there's been a number of cases where people have gone out to the American people and found out what's actually out there. This is an undeniable characteristic. 70% to 80% of the American people agree fundamentally on that; and they also agree that our political establishment – the people who have been run by Wall Street, by this war policy – are bankrupt. There is no trust or commitment towards their ability to lead the country; that's why you saw such an upsurge in support for populist candidates like Sanders or Trump. And that's why this Hamilton conception – and it stands out more and more as we get deeper and deeper into this kind of crisis, and closer and closer to where a decision has to be made to address it – what Mr. LaRouche did on the question of Hamilton. Because Hamilton really captures this as an essence of the unification of the American people around a conception. Hamilton's politics, Hamilton's economic policy recognized the very clear necessity of every person in the country. Hamilton, as any real economist would, recognized that we had a deficiency of people; we need more immigration, we needed more diversity. We needed

different

people from different backgrounds. That's how an actual nation

thrives and functions; there's that commitment.

I think probably the best example we have today on the planet is what you saw from Vladimir Putin's leadership.

Because

Putin came in, he was dedicated to the Russian people; there were

a lot of factions, a lot of anger, a lot of resentment towards what had happened in Russia. And Putin's commitment – as was Hamilton's, as is Lyn's and is our organization's – is a commitment to the entire development of the entire nation and all

of its people. That's what we have to have; you're not going to

find – no candidate right now is going to be perfect. That's pretty clear I think to every American. But is there a devotion,

a deeper one? What we've referenced in people like Joan of Arc;

or what you saw in examples of Abraham Lincoln? Lincoln captured

that same Hamilton almost to a deep, profound spiritual commitment to the people of the United States; all of them.

There was "malice towards none". That we're going to take the entire population of our country and develop it in a very rapid

capability. Any executive, any Presidency that comes in today

–

and one must – that adopts these programs; the Glass-Steagall, the basic Hamilton Four Laws that Lyn has put forward; our collaboration with Russia on the terrorism question, with China

on the economic question will easily gain the favor and support

of 70% to 80% if not more of the American people.

I think the one thing that stands out – because we raised this question to Mr. LaRouche over a year ago in discussion. What he raised I think is worth raising here, and I think we can discuss it more. Why do the American people then think there is this separation? How can they be easily deceived into thinking this separation exists? It's because of the attack on the human mind going back to the early 20th Century. They took the human mind and said, actually there's two different kinds of human minds. Some people have a left mind and some people have a right mind; some people have a math mind, some people have a poetry mind. They attacked the actual characteristic of human identity; that underlying, unifying creative characteristic that makes us human. They separated it out into styles and to niches and categories. Once you have that, you then have all of a sudden, people identifying in different factions or categories of society based on the way they think their mind works versus the way somebody else's mind works. That's where you get the scientific flaw; that's the fraud. That was the fraud of Bertrand Russell; that was the power of the creative genius of Hamilton, or of Einstein, or of Lyn to recognize the human mind is a universal characteristic. That's the basis of economics; that's the basis of a nation or a political process. That really is the basis of

real leadership; why Percy Shelley says the poets are the true legislators of the world, because they identify that human characteristic in human identity. I think is what is really critical; that quality of leadership today with this kind of crisis.

OGDEN: One thing I think, "with malice toward none" and with charity towards all; the sense of the development of the entire nation was a devotion that Abraham Lincoln possessed. But the key word is development. When you look at the situation at this point in the United States, after 15 years of a Bush-Cheney and Obama policy, you have mass despair, desperation, anger, rage. Why did we reach the point now where we've got an election which is unprecedented in history? Where you have drug addictions and drug overdoses that are unequalled in recent memory? Where you have no productive work for people to be engaged in? Now the working class is somehow defined as people who are greeters at Walmart, or work at temporary jobs at Target? This is not a working class; this is not a skilled labor force; this is not a population that has a sense that their lives have consequence, or meaning. I think if you look at the situation in other countries where you've had real leadership in the recent years – at the same time that we've been suffering under the lack of leadership of the Obama administration – you've had other nations who have had leaders who have been devoted to the development of their nations. And they took populations that

were similarly desperate, demoralized, enraged; take a look at Egypt, for example – and have given them a sense of mission and

purpose. The accomplishments in Egypt, the accomplishments in China; lifting 700 million people out of poverty. The kind of radiation of optimism that has come from nations such as that, through this New Silk Road paradigm and otherwise; this is something which the American people are desperate for access to.

Perhaps they don't realize that that's the key, that's what they

are seeking. But I'm sure that the expression of despair, demoralization, anger, and rage – the only antidote for that is

a commitment to the development of the nation, much in the way that Abraham Lincoln in his way, applied the principles of Alexander Hamilton and understood that that's how you bridge the

seemingly irreparable fault lines within a people. And that's how you bring people together again, with a sense of commitment

to building the future.

With that said, it would be critical for us to get a sense

of exactly, in detail, what are the particular ways in which that

kind of program could happen, with the commitment from the top,

within days, weeks, and months of a completely new paradigm and

new Presidency in the United States.

JASON ROSS: I've put together a few aids to thinking about this.

In particular, thinking about what the implementation of LaRouche's Four Laws look like. In discussing that, I also want

to think about this in terms of Hamilton. I'm very happy to say, that Hamilton's four great economic writings, along with the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, will be available on Amazon {very soon}. It's been submitted. It should only be a few more days. I'll be reading some quotes from this.

Let's take a look at what an economic recovery would look like, using LaRouche's Four Laws. Let me read what LaRouche said

the remedy to the current situation is. LaRouche writes,

"The only location for the immediately necessary action

which could prevent such an immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S.

government's now immediate decision to institute four specific cardinal measures – measures which must be fully consistent with

the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, as

had been specified by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton

while in office. (1) Immediate reenactment of the Glass-Steagall

Law, instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without

modification as to principle of action. (2) A return to a system

of top-down, thoroughly defined national banking." Skipping

ahead: "(3) The purpose of the use of a federal credit system, is

to generate high productivity trends in improvements in

employment, with the accompanying intention to increase the

physical economic productivity and standard of living of the

persons and households of the United States." And "(4)",
LaRouche
writes, "Adopt a fusion-driver 'crash program.' The essential
distinction of man from all lower forms of life, is that it
presents the means for the perfection of the specifically
affirmative aims and needs of the human individual and social
life."

Let's take a look through some of these Four Laws. The
first
step is Glass-Steagall, which I'll just say a little bit
about.

This is something we've discussed frequently [laughs] and to
great effect, I think, in our programs and on our website.

Take a look here. [Fig. 1] This is what percent of
supposed
U.S. income, what percent of the value added in our GDP, comes
from manufacturing – you see that there in blue–vs.
"f.i.r.e.,"
which stands for finance, insurance, and real estate. For over
30
years now, the world of finance itself has {supposedly},
according to official thinking, contributed as much to U.S.
productivity and economy, as has manufacturing. Flipping
houses
– that kind of thing – is now as productive as manufacturing
steel, or building things. It's crazy!

Over this period, [Fig. 2] – this is Lyndon LaRouche's
Triple Curve, a pedagogical device that he had used to
describe
the increase in monetary and financial aggregates, at the same
time that the {physical} economic output of the economy was
collapsing–something that we've been in a situation of for
decades now.

What we need to do, then, is make it {possible} to be
able
to finance a recovery. Alexander Hamilton, in his reports on
public credit and the national bank and on its

constitutionality,
describes the importance of banking. Banks can provide an essential function for the economy. They're not optional. They provide an essential useful function. Now, they're tied up, in a way, where the potential of the banking sector is impossible right now, because they're involved in all sorts of speculation and gambling. By implementing Glass-Steagall, we make it possible for the banking sector to be able to play that useful role, while jailing and shutting down all of the people behind the caused collapse that's been created and the looting that's been taking place via Wall Street.

We've got a lot of very good recent editions to our website.

The Economics Frequently Asked Questions page at larouchepac.com/econ-facts. This addresses some of these questions that come up that {you} may have heard when talking to people about these things. [For example:] "If Glass-Steagall were still law, it wouldn't have stopped the crash of 2007-8." Are you sick of hearing that? Well, you can now just send people the explanations here. You don't really need to waste your time with it. It's very clear.

So, Glass-Steagall's the first step. Step 2 that Mr. LaRouche describes is national banking. This is definitely a more complex concept. I direct people, again, to the works of Alexander Hamilton on this, to get a sense from the beginning, of what it meant to have a national bank, or the role that

banking

could play in the nation. I'd point to the success of this approach under the administrations of Hamilton, of John Quincy Adams, of Lincoln, and of Franklin Roosevelt, who, in various ways, created the effect, if not in deed, national banking, through a facility for the promotion of credit and directing it in an economy.

One of the most horrific ideas that people have about how economics works, is that you shouldn't try to direct anything; that government should always stay out; that the "invisible hand" does everything in the best possible way. This is something that Hamilton addresses very directly, countering the arguments of Adam Smith's {Wealth of Nations}, for example, in these reports.

Once we decide that we're going to have a national orientation, and actually choose a direction to go, the question then is, how do we direct this credit in the direction of programs that are going to increase the energy-flux density? How then do we understand "energy-flux density?" This is an economics concept that Mr. LaRouche has employed over the years in his understanding of economy.

We have to think about what is the basis of the transformation of the human species, over time, in a way that's uncharacteristic of any other form of life. This chart of Population Growth Over the Historical Time Period [Fig. 3] is of {human} population growth. It couldn't have been the growth of any animal species acting on its own. Animal species don't transform their relationship to nature. They can't discover

principles. They might use a tool, like a stick, to do something,
or a rock. They don't use principles as tools.

The beginning of this, the real starting point for this for us historically, certainly in Europe, or extended European civilization, is Prometheus, the Greek story of Prometheus, who really created humanity. Before Prometheus, who, as the story goes, took fire from heaven and gave it to mankind, human beings were animals. Prometheus describes that when he saw mankind, we were just animals. We had eyes to see (but we didn't understand); we had ears, but we didn't understand anything. We lived like swarming ants. What did Prometheus do? He brought fire, he brought astronomy, he brought navigation, he brought beasts of burden, he brought sailing, he brought agriculture, he brought the calendar, he brought poetry, he brought written language, mathematics, science, knowledge, fire. What defines us as a species, as in this original story of the creation of the specifically human species, is this power of fire.

We now consider the different kinds of fire that have been developed over historical time. Take a look at this [Fig. 4]. This is the Use of Different Forms of Energy over the History of the United States. Two trends we can see here: (1) the Energy Used per Person has, overall, increased – although not at a uniform rate. It's not increasing now. The other thing that we can notice, is that (2) the Type of Fuel Used has changed, over time. Wood has very niche applications at present, as a fuel. Wood is used for furniture, not for burning. Coal replaced the use of wood, saving forests, making it possible to not have to cut down all sorts of trees to make metals by making charcoal

out

of the wood. Oil and natural gas supplanted the use of coal. Nuclear fission – which never reached its full potential – in this projection, from the era of the Kennedy administration, was

expected to become a primary, dominant form of power for the United States, and, indeed, as seen in the world.

What this shows us, is, yeah, using {more} energy. The other thing is the {type} of energy. What can you do with that energy?

Think about what you can do with oil and natural gas that you can't do with coal or wood. You can't run a car with wood. You can't run a car with coal. You can run a car on oil. You can't run a train on wood! You can run a train on coal. What can we do

with nuclear power that we can't do with lower forms? Think about

how with coal we can use wood for furniture instead of for burning. Oil: that's what we make plastic out of. Oil is a useful

substance. It's a wonderful material. It's a great source of carbon, which, by its chemical nature, is able to form {enormous}

molecules. Here it is, sitting in the ground, ready to be used to

make all sorts of products, and we're burning it! It's, you know,

it's stupid!

With the potential that we've got, of shifting to a real

nuclear economy, of developing fusion, we would be reaching another stage of energy-flux density. What's the power, the throughput power of your energy source? And, what qualitative improvements does it bring? What new things does it allow you to

do?

You can't have economic development without power, without energy. Here's a chart [Fig. 5] of Electricity Use per Capita vs. GDP per Capita. I know GDP per Capita is not the best measure, but it's very clear what you see with these things. If you say, which parts of the world seen here are relatively wealthy and have higher living standards and life expectancies? Well, it's the places where you see the most light. The places where it's dark, that's not because people are people are fond of astronomy in that region and keep their lights off at night so that they can see the stars better. It's because there's not development.

Infrastructure itself really serves as the mediator, the great mediator, of higher forms of energy-flux density into the economy as a whole – the mediator of bringing new technologies into achieving a maximal expression in the economy by partaking in almost all of the processes that go on in an economy.

We now consider the fourth of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws, which is the call for a crash program on nuclear fusion. This [Fig. 6] is a chart that was created back in 1976, which frequent viewers of this website no doubt have seen several times. What this chart showed was, based on how much money was devoted to achieving the fusion breakthrough, at what year it was anticipated that the great breakthrough for a commercial fusion reactor would take place. In '76 it was considered that if a maximum possible effort were put into this – something on the scale of the Manhattan Project, or the Apollo Project to go to the Moon – if we took that approach with fusion, it was

anticipated that we would have had it over 25 years ago! Even at a moderate level of funding, we should have had it a decade ago, according to this projection, which isn't necessarily exactly right. Actual funding for fusion has been {below the level} that was anticipated in the '70s to {never achieve fusion}. In other words, there has been a decision not to reach the next level of Promethean fire; not to make that breakthrough on fusion.

Why would that happen? Who would hold back the development of fusion power? Is it the oil industry trying to make money selling more oil? No; that is way too simplistic. It is the brutish outlook of the British Empire, of Zeus earlier – Zeus, the character from the Prometheus story. Zeus, the tyrannical god who created his own power in part by holding back others. By preventing mankind from making this step, this is one of the greatest crimes that has ever been committed; the deliberate underfunding of fusion and the campaign to prevent its development.

I don't want to go on forever; let me just show a few projects that the US ought to participate in with a sane outlook.

There's a different paradigm going on in the world right now, with the BRICS highly representing this; it represents the decades of work by LaRouche and the LaRouche Movement. Organizing for this World Land-Bridge proposal; something that's been promoted for decades now. This proposal, the power of this idea to change the world, is absolutely being realized at present. This concept that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been organizing for, is now Chinese policy; the One Belt, One Road

program that is now bringing together over 70 nations [representing] the majority of the world's population. The greatest potential for economic growth in the world; this is a policy that is taking place.

Instead, the United States under Obama – who should be thrown out of office yesterday, as Diane said, if not last week,

last month, last year; those would all be even better – is holding these things back. What would it look like if we joined?

One thing would be the Bering Strait crossing; a proposal that was first discussed over a century ago. Really bringing the United States, via land, into coordination and connection with Eurasia and Africa, with the rest of the world in a very serious way; a new way and a more efficient way than sea-borne shipping.

Within the United States, we've got [Fig. ??] to test your geography here, this is the US on the left; and on the right that

is China. Similar nations. Look at all that high-speed rail in

China that you see in blue, and probably some of the red; since

this map was made, they've probably completed it, they're building it so rapidly. The United States doesn't have a high-speed rail network; we barely have a rail network. Instead,

we use the less-efficient form of road transportation for freight

and for people stuck in traffic jams. What would it mean to build a network that makes the United States more efficient, more

productive? How many jobs would be involved in building new cities, in building the kinds of power plants that would be required? What kind of power could we have over our physical economy with the really full development of control over the

water cycle? It is within our means to create desalination right now in California to provide for coastal water needs if we wanted to do that. It's within our ability to serious and in-depth research on atmospheric ionization and other technologies to control the water cycle. It's within our ability to transfer water that has already fallen on land; but we need to insure that there's actually enough to make that a possibility.

So, let me read a couple of quotes from Alexander Hamilton here, in terms of where an understanding of an increase in energy flux density, of where economic growth comes from. It doesn't come from money; it comes from the human mind. Here's Treasury Secretary Hamilton. He's describing in the beginning of his "Report on Manufactures" whether it makes sense to have a manufacturing economy, as opposed to a purely agricultural one; which today seems like a stupid argument to even have, but it was something that Thomas Jefferson didn't get, for example. Because he wanted to keep the American economy from developing; he didn't have that same outlook of human beings – clearly – that Alexander Hamilton did.

So, Hamilton writes that "the work of artificers as opposed to cultivators", that is, manufacturing as opposed to farming, "is susceptible of a greater improvement in a proportionately greater degree of improvement of its productive powers; whether by the accession of skill, or from the application of ingenious

machinery" – labor saving. How does the development of a new technology transform the potential of a production in an economy?

This is a quote Matt had used: Hamilton writes – on page 148 when you get the book – "It merits particular observation that the multiplication of manufactories not only furnishes a market

for those 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 inconsiderable 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. Iron ore wasn't iron ore before the Iron Age; it was

a rock. Malachite wasn't copper ore before the Bronze Age; it was just a green rock that Egyptians used for mascara." You

transform the value of the things around you; the mind transforms

what those things are. That rock was transformed into ore by the

human mind. We change the universe through our discoveries; we

transform our relationship to it, we change what it is, what it

can participate in.

Hamilton understood that the purpose of the United States

was nothing less than the promotion of the General Welfare.

This

quote is a bit long to read, but it's on page 187; and it's where

he describes that there shouldn't be a limitation – except

what

comes up in the Constitution – that the promotion of the General

Welfare he says "the term General Welfare, doubtless intended to

signify more than was expressed or imported in those parts of the

Constitution and Congress' powers which preceded it. This phrase

is as comprehensive as any that could have been used, because it

was not fit that the Constitutional authority of the Union to appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within

narrower limits than the General Welfare." The real point to take is that it's a different economic outlook. What China is

doing is great, but it's not up to the level of what it should be. The concept embodied in the One Belt, One Road project is

positive; it's very good. But what really needs to be brought to

this is the explicit understanding of its basis in the human identity. The human ability to make discoveries that

transform

our relationship to Nature; that's the key to economics. We see

its effects in various studies we might do about how building a

road transforms the amount of agricultural production in an area;

or how bringing in a stable power supply allows factories not to

have to turn off every three hours when the power goes out – what transformations that has. But the real key is to give a

mission to people by participating in the ability to bring that

to a yet higher level of understanding, of living standards, and

of participation in that process. That's the key thing;

create a society where people are able to participate knowingly in that increase.

OGDEN: As Jason said, the four economic reports that Hamilton wrote were the founding documents of the American republic in a very real sense; and he was conscious of that. He said, we can have political independence, but without economic independence we are nothing; we won't survive as a country. And there are scientific principles which need to be understood and applied. But just as those were the founding documents at that point, we now have a founding document of a new era in the economy of the United States in this LaRouche Four Economic Laws. It's a distillation and an elaboration of the principles that Alexander Hamilton understood, for the 21st Century, for today. A commitment to the fusion program, a commitment to space exploration on a massive scale. The same way that Franklin Roosevelt had the New Deal, the same way John F Kennedy had the new frontiers, we have a new paradigm. And it's a vision of the future which, if fully committed to, will absolutely within the lifetimes of the people who are living today, transform what the human species is capable of. And it's that sense of the opportunity of an evolution of the entire human species to an entirely new level of capability; that's what we experienced in the aftermath of Hamilton's breakthrough, the aftermath of the American Revolution. It's an opportunity in perhaps a larger

and
more comprehensive form today, where you have the opportunity
for
a collaboration among nations that is unprecedented in the
history of mankind.

So, if you hold up against that, the kind of
criminality of
Wall Street; the kind of rabid war-mongering and saber-
rattling,
the threat of World War III and thermonuclear war; I think the
gut feeling of the American people around Glass-Steagall,
around
stopping World War III, this is something which – as Diane
said
– has the potential to unify the population in a way perhaps
we've never seen before or in a long time. But it has to be
developed to a level which contains the type of depth that you
just witnessed with the presentation that Jason just gave.

SARE: I just want to add – I know we're getting close
to
the end of our time, but Mr. LaRouche has said on numerous
occasions that the American people need to assemble
themselves;
that they have lost confidence in their own ability to reason
through the crisis and to act in their own interest. But I
think
what we've seen in this presentation is what LaRouche has been
putting forward frankly for years; and the material that is on
our website allows us to have the program and the conception.
Particularly the conception of what it means to be human;
which
is what the United States is based on, according to Alexander
Hamilton and our Constitution. That is something around which
the American people can mobilize; just as when the Berlin Wall
came down, the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1989. You had an
economic system that completely collapsed, and people turned

to
Beethoven and Schiller. Well, we are seeing such a moment now
in
the trans-Atlantic system; and we have here Alexander Hamilton
and Lyndon LaRouche. I am confident, although we cannot count
on
anything 100%, that the population of the United States can be
mobilized on this level, and not something lower; and that
that
potential will become very apparent in the next few days.

STEGER: I think it's just worth stating – China just
accomplished another major advancement in their space program.
They launched the Long March 5 rocket; this is a 25-ton
payload
rocket. Japan is now going to be working with Russia it looks
like, based on the discussion that Putin and Prime Minister
Abe
will be having in December, of Japan making an even larger
investment into the new Cosmodrome, the new space city up in
the
Far East of Russia near the Pacific. These nations are
dedicated
to this kind of advancement; and it only condemns further what
Obama has done these last eight years. The first initial
steps
of this Presidency were to tear down the very space program
that
these nations have now recreated in their own way on an
advanced
scale. An Apollo project-like scale of development is what
you
see now in China with their space program. How dare Obama do
this? How dare Hillary Clinton think that she can win a
Presidency while chaining herself to this insane legacy? The
drone killings; the murders; the wars; the bail-outs; the
shutdown of the space program as the first act of the

Presidency;
the failure of Obamacare? Bill Clinton had the intelligence to recognize this Obamacare was the most insane policy anybody ever adopted; and as soon as he said that, I guess he was thrown into the broom closet, because you haven't seen him since. Then you see Obama and Hillary marching hand-in-hand; it really is insane. Obama should be condemned in every possible way. And if Hillary is going to tie herself to this legacy – blaming the KGB on email leaks from her server? Blaming the KGB and Putin because she has not operated in a way of the dignity of the US Presidency to lead the American people at a time of crisis? To bomb countries like Libya? To support the overthrow of Assad and the possible conflict with Russia?

You have to remind Americans – and I think what Jason's presentation did so well – what the Four Laws indicate; what a real Presidency looks like. What is the true United States? For 30 years, FBI and British factors and our own government, like the Bush family, went after Lyndon LaRouche and our organization. We've lost a sense of what the real United States is; the world has. And during that period of time, the world has gone nearly crazy; barreling towards world war and nuclear destruction. We've got to revive a true United States. We need it in the United States, and so does the world. There's never been a

greater moment to develop that around Lyn's ideas.

OGDEN: Good! I think that's a perfect conclusion. So, as Jason said, {The Vision of Alexander Hamilton} book will be available within the coming days. It's something to absolutely purchase and find access to; we'll make that clear. And if you haven't yet, please sign up for the daily emails from larouchepac.com; these are the critical strategic updates that are coming into your inbox on a daily basis. We make sure that you have that at your fingertips. Things are going to change very rapidly over the coming days; and you need to be connected. So, please sign up for the daily LaRouche PAC email list.

Thank you very much for joining us here today; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

**Det kommende verdenslederskab
udgøres af Glass-Steagall
og LaRouches Fire Økonomiske
Love.**

Dansk uddrag af LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 28. okt., 2016.

Dette er ikke noget, der kun er vigtigt for den nationale scene; men dette er i færd med at udforme et paradigmeskifte, som i øjeblikket finder sted på den internationale scene. For to uger siden så vi det dramatiske skift, hvor Filippinerne, med præsident Duterte's besøg i Kina, ændrede sin kurs til at komme på linje med Kinas; hvor han siger, at han nu ændrer sit lands kurs i overensstemmelse med den ideologiske strømning i de eurasiske, allierede lande, der nu er i færd med at skabe et nyt, økonomisk paradigme. Vi så dette meget tydeligt i en tale, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holdt ved Valdai-diskussionsklubbens årlige sammentræf 2016 i Sotji, Rusland. Vi vil gå nærmere i detaljer med dette, men Putins understregninger er meget klare, og jeg mener, at de omfatter nogle af de spørgsmål, vi vil diskutere i aften. For det første, faren ved NATO's/Obamas holdning, der nu har bragt os i farlig nærhed af et udbrud af Tredje Verdenskrig; en krig, som ingen på den russiske side søger, som Putin gjorde det meget klart. Og ligeledes det presserende nødvendige, totalt nye, økonomiske paradigme for at slå bro over svælget mellem et lille antal meget rige Wall Street-spekulanter, og et meget stort antal fattigdomsramte, ikke alene mennesker, men hele nationer; og desuden, at bringe teknologisk fremskridt til alle og gøre dette til paradigmet for relationer nationerne imellem.

Matthew Ogden: 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 har vi, som I har kunnet følge på LaRouchePAC's webside, 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.

Dette er ikke noget, der kun er vigtigt for den nationale scene; men dette er i færd med at udforme et paradigmeskifte, som i øjeblikket finder sted på den internationale scene. For to uger siden så vi det dramatiske skift, hvor Filippinerne, med præsident Duterte's besøg i Kina, ændrede sin kurs til at komme på linje med Kinas; hvor han siger, at han nu ændrer sit lands kurs i overensstemmelse med den ideologiske strømning i de eurasiske, allierede lande, der nu er i færd med at skabe et nyt, økonomisk paradigme. Vi så dette meget tydeligt i en tale, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holdt ved Valdai-diskussionsklubbens årlige sammentræf 2016 i Sotji, Rusland. Vi vil gå nærmere i detaljer med dette, men Putins understregninger er meget klare, og jeg mener, at de omfatter nogle af de spørgsmål, vi vil diskutere i aften. For det første, faren ved NATO's/Obamas holdning, der nu har bragt os i farlig nærhed af et udbrud af Tredje Verdenskrig; en krig, som ingen på den russiske side søger, som Putin gjorde det meget klart. Og ligeledes det presserende nødvendige, totalt nye, økonomiske paradigme for at slå bro over svælget mellem et lille antal meget rige Wall Street-spekulanter, og et meget stort antal fattigdomsramte, ikke alene mennesker, men hele nationer; og desuden, at bringe teknologisk fremskridt til alle og gøre dette til paradigmet for relationer nationerne imellem.

Vi vil komme ind på disse spørgsmål, men først og fremmest

spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall; nødvendigheden af at nedlukke det, der nu tydeligvis er det bankerotte Wall Street-regime, og spørgsmålet om, hvad der nødvendigvis må efterfølge denne nedlukning. De Fire Love efter Hamiltons principper, som hr. LaRouche har udarbejdet, er nu helt klart på dagsordenen, mener jeg. Jeg vil bede Jeffrey Steinberg lægge ud med en kort briefing om nogle af de spørgsmål, som vi har drøftet med hr. LaRouche i løbet af de seneste 24 timer, og dernæst kan vi fortsætte med en diskussion over implikationerne af disse udviklinger.

Jeffrey Steinberg: Der er fire eller fem ting, som jeg gerne vil sætte fokus på mht. signifikante, nye udviklinger blot siden sidste fredags webcast. For det første, som Matt netop påpegede, så holdt præsident Putin en meget magtfuld tale under den afsluttende session af Valdai-konferencen, der fandt sted i denne uge i Sotji, Rusland. Tilstede var repræsentanter fra hele verden, inkl. i hvert fald flere folk fra Kina. Jeg mener, at det, som præsident Putin gjorde, ikke så meget var at bryde ny jord, som det var at gøre det meget klart, at Rusland, og han selv, fuldt ud har helliget sig til at gå fremefter med samarbejdet med Kina og de andre BRIKS-lande om at virkeliggøre et nyt paradigme for relationerne nationalstaterne imellem. Dette nye paradigme er baseret på en politik for klar forebyggelse af krig, opbygget omkring kooperative økonomiske investeringer i store projekter – inklusive betydelige fremskridt inden for videnskab, som inkluderer fremme af menneskets herredømme over rummet. På en vis måde forstærkede Putin det, vi så på BRIKS-topmødet for statsoverhoveder for nylig i Goa, Indien. Rusland er helt med her, og han pointerede meget klart, at det vestlige finanssystems kollaps er den hovedfaktor, der driver verden hen imod en ekstraordinært farlig situation, hvor der kunne komme et udbrud af en verdenskrig – endda en atomar verdenskrig – som følge af provokerende handlinger, der er affødt af desperation. Jeg mener, at dette er et af de elementer af det, der virkelig er forandret i løbet af denne

seneste uge.

Jeg har tilbragt de seneste 48 timer – onsdag og torsdag i denne uge – med at deltage i en årlig konference i Washington, D.C., i det Nationale Råd for Amerikansk-arabiske Relationer. Der var omkring 1000 mennesker til stede dér, og der var stort fremmøde fra det diplomatiske samfund, især det arabiske, diplomatiske samfund; og fra den amerikanske erhvervssektor, der handler med Golfstaterne. Ved slutningen af konferencen, torsdag aften, var der en afsluttende hovedtale af general David Petraeus – tidligere chef for Centralkommandoen, og tidligere direktør for CIA. Han fremlagde en række meget dristige forslag, som desværre meget præcist faldt i tråd med den slags ting, vi har set komme fra Hillary Clinton og Clinton-kampagnen i hele denne præsidentvalgkamp. Det, som general Petraeus krævede, var både oprettelsen af sikkerhedszoner på suverænt, syrisk territorium, skabelsen af en flyveforbudszone over en stor del af syrisk territorium, og han opfordrede til, at USA skulle bruge både sø- og landbaserede krydsermissiler til at tilintetgøre det syriske luftvåben. Se, han sagde meget henkastet, at dette selvfølgelig fremkalder faren for en krig med Rusland; men det fejede han til side og sagde, at Vladimir Putin responderer til magt, og responderer til alvorlige trusler om magtanvendelse. Putin vil derfor, konfronteret med denne form for handlinger, trække sig, sagde Petraeus.

Vi taler her om, at amerikanske og russiske aktiver fra luftvåbnene, der engagerer sig på en meget afgrænset skueplads for handling, hvor vi hidtil har undgået en betydelig hændelse, der kunne have ført til generel krig, pga. en aftale om dekonfliktion (fælles forholdsregler, der skal sikre, at en optrapning pga. fejlregninger eller misforståelser ikke finder sted, -red.), som heldigvis stadig er i kraft mellem den amerikanskledede koalition på den ene side, og Rusland på den anden. Men det, der her foreslås, er en total omstødelse af denne politik. Vi ved, at dette er præcis, hvad Hillary

Clinton kræver i sine egne taler i præsidentkampagnen. Der har været nylige undersøgelser, fremlagt på vegne af Clinton-kampagnen af Centret for en Ny Amerikansk Sikkerhed og Centret for Amerikansk Fremgang, der udtrykker noget nær den samme ekstremistiske holdning, som general Petraeus udtrykker i sine udtalelser. Faren for krig kan slet ikke undervurderes; og faktum er, at præsident Putin – i sin Valdai-tale – var meget klar omkring denne fare.

Se, med hensyn til det overordnede spørgsmål om, hvor umiddelbart forestående, nedsmeltningen af det transatlantiske finanssystem er, så sidder alle virkelig på kanten af deres stol over det faktum, at det amerikanske Justitsministerium og Deutsche Bank stadig befinder sig i en afparering frem og tilbage og endnu ikke er nået frem til en beslutning omkring den foreslåede bøde på 14 mia. euro for Deutsche Banks kriminelle aktivitet under krisen omkring værdipapirer med sikkerhed i ejendomsPapirer, som var forløber for krisen med nedsmeltningen i 2008. Deutsche Bank befinder sig på randen af kollaps; dette anerkendes bredt. De førende, tyske finansmedier, med *Handelsblatt* i spidsen, skriver om dette stort set hver eneste dag. Vi ved, at det italienske banksystem også befinder sig på randen af nedsmeltning, med lån, der ikke giver afkast (insolvente lån), til nominelt 360 mia. euro på regnskaberne i de store, italienske banker. Så det er absolut sandt, at vi befinder os på den yderste kant af en potentiel finansiel nedsmeltning, der er langt værre end Lehman Brothers i 2008.

Det er i denne sammenhæng, at, mener jeg, det er meget vigtigt at mærke sig den kendsgerning, at Donald Trump tidligere på ugen holdt en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, hvor han udtrykkeligt krævede, at man implementerede en Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede. Han advarede også om, at, hvis Hillary Clinton bliver valgt til præsident, vokser chancerne for, at vi meget snart vil stå over for Tredje Verdenskrig, enormt; og han nævnte begivenhederne i Syrien, som jeg allerede har

omtalt, som en slags hovedelement i denne situation. Mange mennesker klør sig i hovedet og siger, hvor kom dette fra, mht., at Trump pludselig går ind for Glass-Steagall? Det er kun 12 dage før præsidentvalget, at han kommer med denne tale.

Jeg fik mulighed for at tale med nogen, der har været involveret i Washington-politik som en slags insider i meget lang tid; og det var hans anskuelse, at han havde forventet, at noget i denne retning ville komme fra Trump-kampagnen, fra Donald Trump. Det kunne have været mere effektivt, hvis det var sket i september, men hvad enten han er opportunistisk, eller han reelt mener det alvorligt, så er det en kendsgerning, at spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall nu er blevet gen-indsprøjtet i præsidentvalget i en afgørende form for nedtælling til den 8. november. Og der er faktisk ingen ulemper forbundet med dette; uanset, hvad resultatet af valget bliver, så er Glass-Steagall et afgørende, politisk spørgsmål, der omgående må implementeres. Det er første skridt i hr. LaRouches Fire Hovedlove, udtrykkeligt baseret på de fire hovedrapporter til Kongressen, som Alexander Hamilton skrev, da han var finansminister. Vi søger altså tilbage til en politik, der har en mangeårig historie for beviselig succes. Donald Trump udbrød ikke bare lige pludselig, »Lad os få Glass-Steagall«. Ifølge beretninger fra mennesker, der fulgte denne tale på tæt hold nede i Charlotte, så var dette den mest gennemkomponerede og velorganiserede tale i hele hans præsidentkampagne. I et Tv-interview med Fox den næste morgen bekræftede Wilbur Ross, der tilhører en gruppe af »milliardærer«, som udgør Trumps økonomiske hovedrådgivere, den pointe, som Trump kom med dagen før i Charlotte. Her følger et kort uddrag af ordvekslingen mellem Fox News' Maria Bartolino og Wilbur Ross:

Bartolino: I går krævede Donald Trump en version for det 21. århundrede af Glass/Steagall-loven fra 1933, der kræver en opdeling mellem kommerciel bankvirksomhed og investeringsbankvirksomhed. Fortæl os om dette, for vi ved

alle, hvad Dodd/Frank-loven har gjort ved sektoren for finansielle tjenesteydelser; og det er blevet vanskeligere at låne penge. Det er blevet ét af spørgsmålene i denne økonomi. Fortæl mig om en Glass/Steagall-version for det 21. århundrede.

Ross var fuldstændig klar og på det rene med det, som Trump refererede til aftenen før. Han sagde:

Ross: Altså, bankerne. Det er ikke så meget det, at de er for store; det drejer sig om, at de er for komplekse. For komplekse, og for komplicerede internt. Tænk over, hvor meget storbankerne – man må kende alt til verdens geografi; man må kende hver eneste obskure form for produkt på derivatmarkedet. Det er en voldsomt stor menu for en person at absorbere. Vi mener, at det kunne være bedre for bankerne at holde sig til udlån, og, i stedet for at indføre flere restriktioner på pengeudlån, at gøre det lettere for dem at udstede lån. Tænk over det. Når man lægger sag an mod bankerne hver dag for de lån, de udstedte dagen før, så er det ikke måden at opmuntre dem til at udstede nye lån. De er i færd med at gøre bankerne pistol-sky.

Dernæst spørger hun, »Siger du, at der bør være mere opdeling?«

Ross: Jeg mener, at det, der er vigtigt, er fornuftig regulering frem for regulering for reguleringens skyld. Når man tænker efter, med alle disse bøder for subprime-udlån, kan du nævne en eneste person, der nogensinde er blevet sat ud af sit hus, som ikke rent faktisk havde et huslån, og som ikke var bagud med sine betalinger på lånet og fortjente at blive sat ud? Der er ikke et eneste tilfælde, hvor dette er blevet bevist, så det er altså strafferegulering, det er straffelovgivning snarere, end det er noget, der er fornuftigt.

Dette var helt klart ikke bare et slag ud i den tomme luft. Vi ved ikke, om dette er en seriøs forpligtelse til denne

politik. Men vi ved, at der er massiv folkelig opbakning til Glass-Steagall. Det er derfor, det endte i både det Demokratiske og det Republikanske partiprogram. Vi ved, at der fandt en intern kamp sted i Hillary Clintons kampagne, hvor flere af hendes hovedrådgivere indtrængende opfordrede hende til også offentligt at støtte Glass-Steagall, hvilket hun nægtede at gøre. Bernie Sanders' tilhængere, Elizabeth Warrens tilhængere, de, der er det Demokratiske Partis kernevælgere, er lige så ubøjelige mht. behovet for Glass-Steagall, som nogle på den Republikanske side.

Så spørgsmålet er, at dette nu er lagt direkte frem på bordet. Vi er i de sidste ti dage før præsidentvalget, og øjeblikket er derfor inde til at vinde dette spørgsmål, meget aggressivt, og til, at Kongressen tager dette spørgsmål op som sin første regulære forretningshandling, når den vender tilbage efter valget den 8. november, uanset udfaldet. Mandatet foreligger. Det er nu et fundamentalt spørgsmål i den præsidentielle debat i disse sidste dage. Igen, hvad enten Trump er seriøs om det her, eller det var et politisk stunt, så er spørgsmålet ikke desto mindre blevet særdeles markant indsprøjtet i denne præsidentkampagnes slutfase, og der er ingen bagside ved, at dette er sket.

Ogden: Hr. LaRouches ideer er meget magtfulde, og de står for sig selv. Hr. LaRouche responderede ikke på tidernes skiften. Han har i årevis været meget, meget klar mht. den *presserende* nødvendighed af Glass-Steagall og har forudsagt, at vi faktisk igen ville komme til dette punkt. Deutsche Bank er ved at nedsmelte. Det er værre end Lehman Brothers i 2008. Det faktum, at Glass-Steagall ikke blev genindført, som hr. LaRouche krævede, umiddelbart efter sammenbruddet i 2008, er det, der har bragt os til dette punkt. Kesha [Rogers] var involveret i en højt profileret kampagne til Senatet og flere højt profilerede kampagner til Repræsentanternes Hus. Andre medlemmer af LaRouchePAC Policy Committee stillede også op til valg til Kongressen for fire og seks år siden, på et

Glass/Steagall-valgprogram, og gjorde dette til det afgørende, nationale spørgsmål. I det omfang, hvor der har været nogen seriøse diskussioner i denne præsidentkampagne, så har det været omkring spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall. Det blev bragt på bane i den Demokratiske debat af to kandidater – Martin O'Malley, og også Bernie Sanders; Hillary Clinton sagde »Nej!«.

Dette er nu det *afgørende* spørgsmål. Og som du sagde, Jeff, så viser det, at der er en *overvældende* folkelig opbakning: og begge partiprogrammer. Vi har nu en situation, hvor genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall i bogstavelig forstand er fremherskende i hele verden. Det ville være tragisk, hvis Kongressen ikke omgående griber til handling for at genindføre loven – vent ikke på den officielle indsættelse [af den nye præsident] – omgående, ved Kongressens tilbagevenden til Washington. Glass-Steagall må ubetinget genindføres, for, hvis vi venter, og Deutsche Bank eller én af disse andre banker nedsmelter, så kan jeg garantere jer for, at vi befinder os i en langt værre situation end den, vi befandt os i, i sammenbruddet i 2008.

Så jeg mener, at det afgørende spørgsmål er lagt frem. Nødvendigheden af de dybtgående principper efter Hamilton – som hr. LaRouche har gjort meget klart – står for sig selv. Det er ikke et spørgsmål om, at nogen har erklæret Lyndon LaRouches [love for] gyldige; spørgsmålet er, at Lyndon LaRouches ideer står for sig selv, og har udgjort de afgørende spørgsmål, og nu har nået et punkt, hvor det er et indiskutabelt verdensledende spørgsmål – og det punkt, hvorfra det ikke er muligt at vende tilbage, kommer meget snart, med mindre man handler på disse ideer.

Hele webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, kan høres/læses her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=15628>

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](http://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.

ATT. Amerikanere: En global omorganisering er i gang. LaRouchePAC Internationale webcast, 21. oktober, 2016.

Dansk uddrag.

Uddrag af LaRouchePAC Internationale webcast, 21. oktober, 2016.

Efterfølgende kan udskrift af hele webcastet læses på engelsk.

Matthew Ogden: Vi vil begynde med en kort gennemgang af verdenssituationen; men vi har også et særligt 'traktement' til jer i dag, som er at give jer de redskaber, I behøver for at blive de aktivister, som I må være for at gå med i vores presserende mobilisering omkring LaRouches Fire Love.

Men til en start mener jeg, at vi kan bedømme vores situation som følger: Til trods for valggalskaben, som virkelig dominerer den gennemsnitlige amerikaners psyke lige nu, og, tror jeg, som forårsager en hel del psykologisk trauma, så er den virkelige, store historie den, at den globale omorganisering nu skrider frem. Vi ser noget, som er hidtil uset i nyere historisk tid. Denne globale omorganisering af historiske proportioner er åbenlys for alle at se. Den finder virkelig sted langs linjerne af det, som hr. og fr. LaRouche i årtier har ført kampagne for, omkring et nyt, økonomisk og strategisk paradigme for planeten. Dette sås i meget skarpe vendinger, som helt sikkert overraskede mange folk i Obama-administrationen, med den filippinske præsident Dutertes besøg i Kina; hvor han, i meget klare vendinger, meddelte, at han skiftede kurs, og skiftede Filippinernes kurs, hen imod det, han kaldte »Kinas ideologiske strømning«, og ligeledes Ruslands. Dette er blot det seneste i et mønster af lande, der engang ansås for at være solide og indiskutable, amerikanske allierede, og som skifter kurs og kommer på linje med BRIKS, det Nye Paradigme og perspektivet for den Nye Silkevej. Det skal siges, at dette ikke er et spørgsmål om, hvem, der bliver præsident om tre uger eller tre måneder; men det er i virkeligheden et spørgsmål om, hvem, der har været præsident i de seneste syv et halvt år.

Det er, på trods af alt det, Obama forsøger at gøre krav på, i form af hans store, økonomiske succeser osv., Obamas sande eftermæle på verdensscenen. Pointen er, at disse nationer, der ser den disintegration, som nu finder sted i Europa og i det transatlantiske system, samt spredningen af kaos og evindelige krige og terrorisme osv.; disse nationer har set, at der findes et alternativ derude, som nu er fremme på bordet; og det er et både økonomisk og strategisk levedygtigt alternativ, der er vokset frem. De er ved at beslutte at springe med om bord og opgive dette døde og døende system; og i stedet gå med i et nyt paradigme, som klart viser sig at være fremtidens bølge.

Det bør understreges, at dette på ingen måde er en ekskluderende, geopolitisk blok, og heller ikke er en slags forældet geopolitik i kynisk koldkrigs-stil. Som Xi Jinping gentagne gange har sagt, så er dette et fuldstændigt nyt paradigme for internationale relationer, og det er et »win-win«-paradigme; det er noget, som alle kan tilslutte sig, inklusive USA – som Xi Jinping udtrykkeligt har indbudt, under en fælles pressekonference med Obama for næsten to år siden. Obama afviste det; men det betyder ikke, at USA ikke kan gå med i dette nye paradigme.

Det er vores ansvar, og det er vores job at skabe præcis dette dramatiske skift i amerikansk politik. Det bringer os frem til denne afgørende kampagne omkring den mobilisering, som vi nu er engageret i, for at få LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love vedtaget og sat i kraft, og for at vende tilbage til Alexander Hamiltons principper, som det forklares i hans fire, banebrydende økonomiske rapporter til Kongressen. Vi vil foretage en ny gennemgang af substansen i disse rapporter; og vi vil også præsentere jer for en ny kampagneside på vores handlingscenter (på LaRouchePAC's hjemmeside), som vil give jer redskaberne til at gå med i denne mobilisering og til at opnå den form for fast baggrund, som I behøver til at aktivere jer selv omkring.

Men før vi kommer til det, så er der et par afgørende udviklinger, der er sket blot inden for de seneste par timer – 24 timer eller mindre – omkring LaRouche-bevægelsens aktiviteter, både her i USA og internationalt. For det første, så er de første rapporter om en begivenhed i Tyskland, der stadig er i gang, ved at løbe ind; et Schiller Institut-seminar, der finder sted lige nu i Essen. Et seminar med 80 deltagere; med folk, der deltager, og med en hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hvor hun understreger denne dramatiske omorganisering og nødvendigheden af, at Europa går med i den Nye Silkevej. Højtplacerede repræsentanter deltog i begivenheden. De navne, vi foreløbig har fået, er: en embedsperson fra den Kinesiske Ambassade i Berlin, Tyskland; en repræsentant fra en førende, kinesisk tænketank, Kinesisk Institut for Internationale Studier; en repræsentant fra Etiopien; og også nogle eksperter fra den teknologiske sektor – en ekspert i maglev-teknologi, en ekspert i laserfysik og flere andre personer af denne kaliber. Vi vil få flere rapporter om begivenheden, og en audio af begivenheden vil blive tilgængelig, forhåbentlig ved dagens slutning, som I kan lytte til.

Der har også fundet en meget spændende begivenhed sted, som foregik i går aftes i New York City; hvor Jason Ross, medlem af LaRouchePAC Videnskabsteam, var inviteret til at fremlægge en meget detaljeret gennemgang af dette Nye Paradigme, den Nye Silkevej, BRIKS-perspektivet og alle de store infrastrukturprojekter, der er i dette program, ved et møde i New York-afdelingen af det Amerikanske Civilingeniør-Selskab. Jason Ross var hovedtaler ved denne begivenhed, med en detaljeret præsentation, før middagen, af udviklingen med Suezkanalen i Egypten, og ligeledes en endnu mere detaljeret gennemgang, efter middagen, af hele perspektivet med den Nye Silkevej og dennes implikationer mht. en potentiel fremtid med Verdenslandbroen. Dette var et meget aktivt forum med nogle højt kvalificerede ingeniører, der var engageret i en meget livlig og aktiv dialog. Så videoen af denne begivenhed vil

forhåbentlig også blive tilgængelig på et tidspunkt; og vi vil også have en rapport om dette.

Jeg tror, dette giver jer en forsmag på præcis den form for aktiviteter, som vi hele tiden må være engageret i; og hold jer gevinsten for øje, som er det økonomiske program med LaRouches Fire Love efter Hamiltons principper. For, vi befinder os midt i en historisk omorganisering af globale proportioner, og som vil bestemme fremtiden for den kommende menneskehed.

Jeg tror, vi kan gå over til at diskutere disse ting, og så vil vi også, på et tidspunkt i udsendelsens forløb, præsentere denne nye kampagneside.

Engelsk udskrift:

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, October 21, 2016

**USE THE ACTION CENTER ON LAROCHEPAC.COM
TO MOBILIZE EVERYONE – EVEN YOURSELF!**

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's October 21, 2016.

My

name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly broadcast here on larouchepac.com on Friday evening for our weekly webcast. I'm joined in the studio by Benjamin Deniston

–

my colleague from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and via video by

two members of the Policy Committee: Bill Roberts from Detroit,

Michigan; and Diane Sare from New York City. We're going to begin with a brief overview of the world situation; but we also

have a special treat for you tonight, which is to give you the tools to become the activist that you need to be to join us in our urgent mobilization around LaRouche's Four Laws.

But just to begin, I think we can situate ourselves as

follows: Despite the election madness which is really dominating the psyche of the average American right now, and I think causing quite a bit of psychological trauma, the real story is the global re-alignment that is now in progress. We are looking at something which is unprecedented in recent historic memory. This global re-alignment of historic proportions is obvious for anyone to see. It really is right along the lines of what Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been campaigning for, for decades, around a new economic and strategic paradigm for the planet. This was seen in very stark terms and which certainly caught a lot of people in the Obama administration by surprise, with the recent trip by Philippine President Duterte to China; where he announced in very clear terms that he is re-aligning himself and re-aligning the Philippines with what he called the "ideological flow of China" and of Russia, too. I think this is just the latest in a pattern of countries which were once considered to be solid and unquestioning US allies, re-aligning themselves with the BRICS, the New Paradigm, the New Silk Road perspective. It has to be said that this is not a question of who is going to be President in three weeks or three months; but this is really a question of who has been President for the last seven and a half years.

This, despite everything that Obama is trying to claim in terms of his great economic successes and so forth, this is

really Obama's true legacy on the world stage. The point is that these nations, seeing the disintegration that's now happening in Europe and the trans-Atlantic system and the spread of chaos and perpetual war and terrorism and so forth, have seen that there is an alternative out there that's now on the table; and it's a viable alternative that's emerged, both economically and strategically. They are deciding to jump on board and abandon this dead and dying system; and rather, join a New Paradigm which is clearly demonstrating itself to be the wave of the future. This should be emphasized that this is in no way an exclusive geopolitical block, or some sort of old, cynical Cold War-style geopolitics. As Xi Jinping has repeatedly said, this is an entirely new paradigm of international relations, and it's a "win-win" paradigm; it's something which everybody can join, including the United States. Which Xi Jinping explicitly extended the invitation for, at a joint press conference with Obama almost two years ago. Obama rejected it; but that does not mean that the United States cannot join this New Paradigm.

That's our responsibility, and it's our job to generate precisely that dramatic change in US policy. That brings us to this crucial campaign around the mobilization that we are now engaged in to institute Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws, and to return to the principles of Alexander Hamilton, as was elaborated in his four watershed economic reports to Congress. We will be revisiting those in their substance; and we will also be presenting you with a new campaign page on our action

center,
which is designed to give you the tools to join that
mobilization
and to obtain the kind of substantive background that you need
to
activate yourself around that.

But before we get to that, there's a couple of very
crucial
developments that have occurred just in the last few hours –
24
hours and less – around the activities of the LaRouche
Movement
both here in the United States and internationally. First of
all, we are just now receiving the first reports of an event
which is still ongoing in Germany; a Schiller Institute
seminar
which is occurring right now in Essen. An eighty-person
seminar;
people who are participating in this with a keynote speech by
Helga Zepp-LaRouche, where she emphasized this dramatic
re-alignment and the necessity of Europe to join the New Silk
Road. There were very high-level representatives
participating
in this event. The names that we have so far, are: an
official
from the Chinese Embassy in Berlin, Germany; an official from
a
leading Chinese think tank, the Chinese Institute on
International Studies; a representative from Ethiopia; also
some
experts in terms of the technology sector – an expert in
maglev
technology, an expert in laser physics, and several other
people
of that caliber. We will be receiving more reports on that,
and
the audio of that event will be made available, hopefully by

the
end of the day today, for you to listen to.

Also, we had a very exciting event that happened just
last
night in New York City; where Jason Ross, a member of the
LaRouche PAC Science Team, was invited to present a very in-
depth
overview of this New Paradigm, the New Silk Road, the BRICS
perspective, and all of the great infrastructure projects that
are coming out of that program, to a meeting of the New York
division of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Jason
Ross
was the featured speaker at this event, with a pre-dinner
presentation in detail on the Suez Canal developments in
Egypt,
and also an after-dinner more in-depth overview of the entire
New
Silk Road perspective and what this implies in terms of a
potential future with the World Land-Bridge. This was a very
active forum, with some very highly qualified engineers
engaging
in a very excited and active dialogue. So hopefully, the
video
of that will also be available at a certain point; and we will
have a report on that.

But I think that just gives you a flavor of exactly
the kind
of activities that we need to keep engaged in; and keep our
eyes
on the prize around this Hamiltonian-LaRouche Four Laws
economic
program. Because we are in the midst of an historic re-
alignment
of global proportions, which will define the future of
humanity
to come.

So, I think we can have a little bit of a discussion

on

that, and then we will also present this new campaign page which

I mentioned, at a certain point during this broadcast. We're going to

begin with a brief overview of the world situation; but we also

have a special treat for you tonight, which is to give you the tools to become the activist that you need to be to join us in our urgent mobilization around LaRouche's Four Laws.

But just to begin, I think we can situate ourselves as follows: Despite the election madness which is really dominating

the psyche of the average American right now, and I think causing

quite a bit of psychological trauma, the real story is the global

re-alignment that is now in progress. We are looking at something which is unprecedented in recent historic memory.

This

global re-alignment of historic proportions is obvious for anyone

to see. It really is right along the lines of what Mr. and Mrs.

LaRouche have been campaigning for, for decades, around a new economic and strategic paradigm for the planet. This was seen in

very stark terms and which certainly caught a lot of people in the Obama administration by surprise, with the recent trip by Philippine President Duterte to China; where he announced in very

clear terms that he is re-aligning himself and re-aligning the Philippines with what he called the "ideological flow of China"

and of Russia, too. I think this is just the latest in a pattern

of countries which were once considered to be solid and

unquestioning US allies, re-aligning themselves with the BRICS, the New Paradigm, the New Silk Road perspective. It has to be said that this is not a question of who is going to be President in three weeks or three months; but this is really a question of who has been President for the last seven and a half years.

This, despite everything that Obama is trying to claim in terms of his great economic successes and so forth, this is really Obama's true legacy on the world stage. The point is that these nations, seeing the disintegration that's now happening in Europe and the trans-Atlantic system and the spread of chaos and perpetual war and terrorism and so forth, have seen that there is an alternative out there that's now on the table; and it's a viable alternative that's emerged, both economically and strategically. They are deciding to jump on board and abandon this dead and dying system; and rather, join a New Paradigm which is clearly demonstrating itself to be the wave of the future. This should be emphasized that this is in no way an exclusive geopolitical block, or some sort of old, cynical Cold War-style geopolitics. As Xi Jinping has repeatedly said, this is an entirely new paradigm of international relations, and it's a "win-win" paradigm; it's something which everybody can join, including the United States. Which Xi Jinping explicitly extended the invitation for, at a joint press conference with Obama almost two years ago. Obama rejected it; but that does not mean that the United States cannot join this New Paradigm.

That's our responsibility, and it's our job to

generate
precisely that dramatic change in US policy. That brings us
to
this crucial campaign around the mobilization that we are now
engaged in to institute Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws,
and
to return to the principles of Alexander Hamilton, as was
elaborated in his four watershed economic reports to Congress.
We will be revisiting those in their substance; and we will
also
be presenting you with a new campaign page on our action
center,
which is designed to give you the tools to join that
mobilization
and to obtain the kind of substantive background that you need
to
activate yourself around that.

But before we get to that, there's a couple of very
crucial
developments that have occurred just in the last few hours –
24
hours and less – around the activities of the LaRouche
Movement
both here in the United States and internationally. First of
all, we are just now receiving the first reports of an event
which is still ongoing in Germany; a Schiller Institute
seminar
which is occurring right now in Essen. An eighty-person
seminar;
people who are participating in this with a keynote speech by
Helga Zepp-LaRouche, where she emphasized this dramatic
re-alignment and the necessity of Europe to join the New Silk
Road. There were very high-level representatives
participating
in this event. The names that we have so far, are: an
official
from the Chinese Embassy in Berlin, Germany; an official from

a leading Chinese think tank, the Chinese Institute on International Studies; a representative from Ethiopia; also some experts in terms of the technology sector – an expert in maglev technology, an expert in laser physics, and several other people of that caliber. We will be receiving more reports on that, and the audio of that event will be made available, hopefully by the end of the day today, for you to listen to.

Also, we had a very exciting event that happened just last night in New York City; where Jason Ross, a member of the LaRouche PAC Science Team, was invited to present a very in-depth overview of this New Paradigm, the New Silk Road, the BRICS perspective, and all of the great infrastructure projects that are coming out of that program, to a meeting of the New York division of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Jason Ross was the featured speaker at this event, with a pre-dinner presentation in detail on the Suez Canal developments in Egypt, and also an after-dinner more in-depth overview of the entire New Silk Road perspective and what this implies in terms of a potential future with the World Land-Bridge. This was a very active forum, with some very highly qualified engineers engaging in a very excited and active dialogue. So hopefully, the video of that will also be available at a certain point; and we will have a report on that.

But I think that just gives you a flavor of exactly

the kind
of activities that we need to keep engaged in; and keep our
eyes
on the prize around this Hamiltonian-LaRouche Four Laws
economic
program. Because we are in the midst of an historic re-
alignment
of global proportions, which will define the future of
humanity
to come.

So, I think we can have a little bit of a discussion
on
that, and then we will also present this new campaign page
which
I mentioned, at a certain point during this broadcast.

DIANE SARE: Good. Well, I'll just add that what's
come out
in the last days is the question of the Obama administration's
obsession with Lyndon LaRouche, through various of the Hillary
Clinton emails that have recently been released. One,
LaRouche
is mentioned over 40 times in these emails; in particular
around
the question of Obamacare, which is just in its complete
meltdown
phase. I think they're trying to cover over the meltdown by
having doctors do 20 times more paperwork than they've already
been saddled with for their Medicare patients. The whole
thing
is insane; and what LaRouche had identified was that this was
a
program like Adolf Hitler's T4 program to target these so-
called
"useless eaters". Ezekiel Emmanuel, Rahm Emmanuel's brother,
who
was key in drafting the bill, in some of his writings made it

very clear that in his mind it was a real question; if a person could not become a fully participating member of society, if they were suffering dementia or other terminal illnesses, whether it really was worth trying to save them at all financially, from a dollar standpoint. What happened – I'll just say to the credit of the American people – is that in 2009, people may remember, everybody came out with their pitchforks to skewer their Congressmen; you had all of these completely raucous town hall meetings in which the Congressmen were calling the police to escort them home, because they were so afraid. You had a quality of fight.

We also saw again a certain quality of fight around the question of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act [JASTA], where the American people, led particularly by the LaRouche Movement and the 9/11 Families, made it very clear that there just are certain things that we are not willing to tolerate; namely, the cover-up of who was responsible for murdering Americans on that date, and the death toll in the aftermath. But I bring that up, because as Matt referenced early on, there is enormous frustration, fear, and anxiety about the fact that we have arguably the two worst candidates that we have ever had in the history of this country; and we've had some pretty bad ones. People are thinking, "Well, how is this going to work? This is a disaster."

I think people should also look at themselves, because: 1)

Had Bush been impeached when that was being discussed and was put on the floor by Kucinich, and Nancy Pelosi took it off the table.

Had Cheney and Bush been impeached for all of their crimes – the illegal wars, torturing people, and so on – you never would have had an Obama administration. The fact that Obama has not yet been thrown out of office, when every single Tuesday he is still holding meetings to decide who he is going to assassinate with drones; and somehow this is not considered grounds to throw him out and frankly put him in prison or put him in the criminal wing of a mental institution or something. In other words, that's the cause of this crisis, not the so-called people who are before us now in the elections.

What we've seen in Manhattan is a shift; I think it's dawning on people that perhaps if they want to change things, they should start by changing themselves and changing the level of their understanding and their thinking about what it means to be a citizen in the United States. We've started reading Alexander Hamilton's original papers, which are posted now on the website: "Report on Public Credit"; "Report on a National Bank"; "On the Constitutionality of a National Bank"; and "Report on the Subject of Manufactures". [We're doing this] as a way of qualifying ourselves to shape the policy of the nation. This is

very important, because the United States in this way is relatively unique; that is, the citizens of the United States do have an enormous amount of power, which is not the same as what you have in parliamentary systems. The citizens are able, if they are informed, to cause policy to be changed.

That's why Obama's and Hillary's advisors were so freaked out about Lyndon LaRouche. Because LaRouche has demonstrated a capacity through what he termed "the power of reason" to move the American people. We saw that with the concerts on September 11th in memory of the 9/11 attacks; and we're seeing that now. So, I think this is a very important factor not to be left out of the equation in terms of the shift which is occurring globally in the direction of the BRICS. Probably Bill or someone will something [to say] about the situation in the Philippines, which I think is remarkable in that regard, but we are absolutely I think in a pre-revolutionary situation in the United States; and it's up to us to put it in the proper domain.

BEN DENISTON: Because it's coming up now, I think it's really worth just emphasizing for our viewers, for our associates, for our activists that this issue around Mr. LaRouche's role in the Obama campaign is just typical of what makes Mr. LaRouche and our movement so unique. Mr. LaRouche acted in the future; he didn't respond, he didn't wait for the

kill lists to come out. He didn't wait for Obamacare to be fully demonstrated as it's being demonstrated now with people's rates going up; the care people are getting is collapsing. Even Bill Clinton, who's been completely shackled under the Hillary/Obama policy, came out saying this thing is insane and then backed down from that when he was asked about it; but it's on video, you can see it. [LaRouche] didn't wait for that; he came out right way and didn't just say it was going to be bad. He said, "This is a Hitler policy." He forced the issue {before} it came up. And the reason why we put the Obama administration on its heels from Day One, is because Mr. LaRouche took the lead; and didn't say, "Oh, well this is the first black President, so we have to be polite. He's a Democrat, so we have to be polite." He said, "No, we can see now, this guy's going to implement a killer policy, so we're going to call him out on the principle, on the hardest level of the reality of what he's doing. This is a Hitler healthcare policy. We're going to force the issue, and take the fight to him right up front." That's what makes our Movement effective. We act in the future, we don't wait for events to come, and respond to them. We act on what the future is going to be and what it needs to be.

I think that's a really important precedent for what we're

facing right now, again, in this insanity around the "election process," this Jerry Springer Show repeat of these "debates." We're not responding to that. We're responding to the future, to reality, what we're talking about with the world {shifting}, completely towards China's leadership on this New Paradigm, on the absolute necessity for LaRouche's Four Laws for this Hamiltonian program to save the United States.

Those are the issues that are going to shape the future, not responding to how ridiculous these debates are, who's saying what. [With] the level of insanity going on in the United States right now, it's worth instilling in people a sense of how you actually fight to change history. It's this kind of process. It's taking the lead, based on where history is moving, where society is moving, what are the actual underlying principles driving the process forward? – and acting on those, acting on the future, not responding.

Mr. LaRouche is mentioned in the Hillary Clinton emails. That's no surprise. He came out, right out front, and forced the issue, and drew the line, and that's been a critical factor in ensuring the Obama administration didn't go full-scale Hitler policy, even though they've gone that [way] to a very large scale across many domains – healthcare, foreign policy, etc. But that's leadership! That's what we're doing. That's why people need to drop everything and work with our Movement more closely and really get involved in our campaign, especially on this Hamiltonian program. Because that's what's going to matter. Not

who has the best commentary on what's happening today, or yesterday, or last week, but who's got an idea for where we need to go and how to make that happen.

OGDEN: The other thing that you can measure, in terms of what the Obama Presidency has been, is how much closer to World War III are we right now, than we were when Obama entered office. If you look at the progression of history since the overthrow and killing of [Libya's Muammar] Qaddafi, and the spread of that policy throughout North Africa and the Middle East, and the attempt to do the same thing in Syria and elsewhere, {how much closer we actually are}, right now, to an eruption of what would become, in a very short period of time, thermonuclear war. And this is being acknowledged by {everybody}, I mean [former President of the Soviet Union Mikhail] Gorbachov, Kissinger, people who you would not necessarily expect. It's a very dangerous prospect.

Americans should {resent} the fact that they're really being {set up} by this election campaign, where there is a new McCarthyism almost which is being instituted against the American people, where if you question the no-fly zone [proposal for Syria] or this Russia bashing propaganda or any of these policies, then you are automatically classified as "Oh well, you must be a Trump supporter," which is a ridiculous. Americans should {resent} that kind of situation, and should say, "No! Absolutely not. Not in our name. We do not accept being used and manipulated into this kind of new Cold War, but really World

War

III kind of program." It must be said that over the last 7-1/2 years, we have gotten perilously close to that threat. Again, Mr.

LaRouche was quite outspoken and quite explicit on that from the very beginning. As soon as the Libya invasion happened, and as soon as the death of Qaddafi occurred, Mr. LaRouche was on record saying this is taking us down the slippery slope towards World War III.

BILL ROBERTS: I would also emphasize that there have been important Presidential elections. There have been Presidential figures who were effective such as Franklin Roosevelt, largely because their Presidential campaigns were actually used to create a current of real leadership in the population to be ennobled and encouraged to fight. We haven't had an election like that for years. There hasn't been a figure like that running for President. Mr. LaRouche ran, literally, all of his [Presidential] campaigns in this way, to educate and build up a constituency for policies.

Obviously [the current] election process is the complete opposite. It's a psychological warfare operation on the population. But we have an opportunity to create and educate the kind of current of citizenry that can actually win the policy fight, despite how insane this election is. This should be one of the lessons of what Putin has effectively done, what Xi Jinping

[has done], this entire BRICS process. We have to actually build up a capacity within the population to respond, now, on the basis of knowing exactly what to do, to implement an economic solution.

That's the Fourth Branch of government. That is the sense in which Mr. LaRouche actually has been the Presidential figure during this period. These emails, the process that's been unleashed in the BRICS, has largely come out of Mr. LaRouche's and Helga's life's work to educate the world on the principles of economics, real economic development. Americans just have to be encouraged to locate their responsibility and their duty in something which is much, much higher than just voting in an election. That doesn't require any courage at all. The fight for ideas {does} require a little bit of courage, because we have to challenge people to face their fears and confront the crisis that requires specific qualities of ideas.

OGDEN: Along the lines of exactly that "quality of ideas," our last two webcasts, here, the previous two Fridays, have been focused around Mr. LaRouche's Four Economic Laws, and Alexander Hamilton's four economic reports. We've really encouraged you, as Diane said I think very correctly, "to qualify yourself as a leading citizen in this campaign." And the way that you can "qualify yourself" is to use that material to educate yourself and to also engage in a mass-education process of the rest of

the
American people.

The average American citizen of that time, who Benjamin Franklin proudly referred to as the "Latin farmer," was a very literate, classically educated individual, who understood the essential questions of the revolution, and prided themselves in that. Hamilton educated those Americans about his ideas. He used {The Federalist} letters. He used the media of his day – the print media and otherwise.

We're using the media of our day to do exactly the same thing. That's what the LaRouche PAC website has been. It's been a hub for that kind of self-education, and mass-education. The community coming together around that kind of process, nationally, is carried in the LaRouche PAC Action Center. On the Action Center, we are proud to announce the launch, today, of a new tool for you to use in that regard, and we're going to have a little bit of a guided tour led by Ben Deniston, of this new campaign page on our Action Center. This is on the LaRouche-Hamilton Four Laws. We're going to walk you through that here, but we also encourage you to immediately, on your own, get onto this website, to sign up, and to be an active participant in this new educational hub.

DENISTON: We should be able to pull up the webpage for people directly, so they can see it. What you'll see, if you're

newly visiting to the site, is right at the very top we have a banner, advertising this new campaign page Action Center. This could be, as Matt said, the hub, the mobilization center, to get

this policy through. If you don't see this banner, we will have

it featured in many other ways, including LaRouche's 4 Laws under

Our Policies. You can see this takes you immediately to a new page, which is the landing page for this new campaign. Right away, we're encouraging people – yourself, if you haven't done so already, but if you have, encourage your friends, your colleagues, your neighbors to do so – to sign up, to join the mobilization. If you know LaRouche PAC, we're not just a news service to throw things out to you; we're not just a commentary

service; we're a political {action} committee. We're putting the

emphasis on {action} in political action committee, and we're asking {you} to make sure you get involved.

We're doing stuff all around the country. Manhattan is a

major center of activity. We're leading the fight. But we also have activity from around the nation, getting congressmen, labor

unions, state legislators, whatever groups, farm groups, all kinds of organizations, on board in support of LaRouche's economic reform program. We're asking you to get involved in that

process. Help make it happen, take action yourself. And its starts here – on this page.

If you return to the page, we can see that, right away,

there are three main sub-pages to this main landing page. On the

far left we see What You Can Do. If you simply click on that, again, we're encouraging people to sign up, because the most

effective action activity is going to be in coordination with us, nationally and, really, internationally. Again, we're running a top-down coordinated campaign on this.

But there's a series of measures that are being taken around the country, and we're asking you to take also. There's a major push to get elected officials on board with this, obviously. There are bills to reinstate Glass-Steagall in both the House and the Senate. That is a very straight-forward and easy task that you can get your congressman to do – sign on to those bills, and then push them to go farther, to understand the whole Hamiltonian campaign. We'll get into that in a second. Intervene into local meetings. Write a "Letter to the Editor." Under Print and Distribute, we're going to feature, here, some leading material which you can print out and take to these meetings and organize with. So, these are some of the many things you can do.

If you return back to the landing page, on the right side, we're encouraging people to engage in a real social dialogue around your activities. So, Report Back. We're going to be having some breaking reports coming in, in just the coming days and week. We've got some of the activity that Jason Ross was involved in, which will be featured here, as was reported earlier. There's other activity from Kansas, on major support from the Kansas State Cattlemen's Association, in support of Glass-Steagall,

and

LaRouche's program. Which is just a good illustration. If you go out and organize these groups, people recognize that we need this kind of reform, and we can bring these kinds of organizations on board in support of this. So here is going to be our location to report back, to comment on reports, to engage in discussion about the campaign and the activity you are doing.

Essential to this whole thing is the relevant background and material you need to understand this campaign and to organize around it. So, as you'll see, linked all over this page and the sub-pages, including right here on the main landing page, the key document is Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws paper. If you haven't read this yet, this is a priority to read. You can access it directly from here. It is a relatively short, very dense, very well-composed presentation of the necessary program, in its entirety. And it's the source of these Four Laws, four components, but as Mr. LaRouche presents it. If you understand the necessity of this program, it's not four separate elements; it's one policy, rooted in one scientific understanding of economics. Something rooted in Hamilton's work and developed further by Mr. LaRouche in his work. This is obviously the central document to this entire campaign; and you can find it linked all over the page.

If you want more background, we have plenty of resources on

"Know the Full Story". Some background on the crisis; again, Mr.

LaRouche's Four Laws paper linked multiple times. And then relative background on each of the Four Laws. So, some of the background needed for Glass-Steagall, for example; information about the bills that currently exist in the House and the Senate.

Other resolutions and support for Glass-Steagall from all over the country and internationally; if you haven't seen that, it's

quite impressive – the whole level of support already. And other relevant background, including some of the Obama campaign's

lies about Glass-Steagall; their Wall Street lies that it has no

relevance to the crash. Something you've properly heard spread

throughout the media. We debunk these kinds of things. The fraud of the Dodd-Frank issue, etc. So again, relevant material

for people who are really organizing around this.

Regarding the second policy point of Mr. LaRouche's Four

Laws – a Hamiltonian national banking system, again, we have relevant background information for you here. Mr. LaRouche's own

writings on the subject of national banking and credit, here and

featured in other locations, we have Alexander Hamilton's own four reports to Congress; which as was mentioned by Diane and Matthew, are a major focus of educating the American people on the needed program today. So again, we encourage to go directly

and actually read these reports; study them. If you have questions, or you want to get more information, engage with us.

The point is, we need people to understand the real roots of

American economics as Hamilton developed it and presented it; as it was the founding core of our nation; and as Mr. LaRouche has developed it to further degrees in the present period. This is what's needed in its entirety today. Additional background on how this Hamiltonian program has been brought to bear at multiple points in the history of the United States: under John Quincy Adams; under Abraham Lincoln; in certain degrees, under Franklin Roosevelt operating under the constraints he could work in at the time. It's no secret to people who really know American history, that this policy has returned repeatedly in any period of economic recovery or upsurge. That's what's needed today.

Regarding the role of credit as Mr. LaRouche defined it, specifically for the increases in the productive powers of labor and the increases of energy flux density, we have some relevant background material to understanding Mr. LaRouche's science of physical economics and the role of credit in increasing these critical metrics of real human economic progress. So, understanding Mr. LaRouche's concept of energy flux density, understanding Mr. LaRouche's concept of the productive powers of labor, this information is all available here for you to study; some in video format, some in written form. I would even highlight Mr. LaRouche's own 1984 economics textbook, {So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?}; which is an excellent source to understand the real science of economics as it is needed to

be

understood today.

And the fourth point, Mr. LaRouche highlights a science driver program for fusion power and space exploration. Again, some background work from Mr. LaRouche directly on these subjects; relevant material on fusion power; the role of a fusion driver program for the economy – why this is critical. And similarly with space; why the space program is a critical component to driving the economy forward.

So, I would just restate that while we break down here relevant background material for each of these four laws, these four components, it is one program as Mr. LaRouche presented it.

What we're doing here is presenting you with secondary, tertiary

background material to understand all the elements. But the challenge we have before us is this Hamiltonian conception; we have to educate the American people on this Hamiltonian-LaRouche

conception of real economics. Most people probably know – especially viewers of our channel, our website – there is major

support for Glass-Steagall out there; it's massive. It's moving

forward; it's been moving forward, and that's critical. But that

along is not enough. Just Glass-Steagall alone is an absolutely

indispensable step, but it's only a step; it's a component of the

whole program. We need to cut off Wall Street; we need to separate speculation from the financial system; we need a stable,

regulated commercial bank system. But, we need to actually

utilize that with a Hamiltonian program, with a National Bank, with public credit to actually drive increases in the economy. If we don't do that, we're not going to make it as a nation. Glass-Steagall alone will not do that; it requires the understanding that Hamilton understood. We need to increase the productivity of the labor force; we need to increase the energy flux density of the economy as a whole; and people need to know the science underlying these policies.

I think we have a multi-faceted, but unified campaign here; leading with Glass-Steagall as the first step, but then building support among these people who support these reforms around a real science of what it's going to require to grow again. We need real growth; we need real leaps in the productivity, the value created by the US economy, by the US labor force. We have a wide-open opportunity to join with China, Russia, other nations, in collaborating around those kinds of programs; but it's going to require that shift in the United States to recognize that's where we need to go.

So, we have this new campaign page; it's an Action Center location, it's a place for you, the activist, the members of the LaRouche PAC to get involved in making this full Hamiltonian program known to the American people. Make it so you understand all the elements integrated in their totality yourself, and you can organize other leaders in your community – from regular citizens all the way up to Federal elected officials around this program.

Just to reference back to some of the discussion, we're acting in the future; this is what needs to happen in the future. This is what you need to take action on now to shape where this country goes; not responding to the insanity that's currently called the news cycle, but getting active in shaping the future of the country. That's what makes this movement unique; that's what gives us the chance to save this country at this late hour. We would encourage you to get on these pages, to share these pages; to get intimately connected to them and understand them. And to get more involved in this campaign.

OGDEN: To accomplish this, we need to create the qualified leadership. This is not something where you can depend on somebody else to do this; you can't depend on the "political class" – so-called – to accomplish this. We are going to need to create a citizens' intelligentsia; and there is work that needs to be done. As Ben just went through, all the tools are available to you. You can attend these Congressional town hall meetings; you can set up with your Congressional offices in the districts and in Washington. You can write letters to the editor; this is a very important institution in the United States. Share your ideas with a mass-based readership of your local newspaper, or national newspapers; and communicate the substance of these principles – the Four Laws and the Hamiltonian economic reports. You can set up house meetings to read Hamilton's papers in their entirety. We've already begun

that process in Manhattan; there are weekly meetings now, every Saturday, where some of the leading activists and leading citizens in Manhattan come together and read these Hamilton reports and discuss them, and discuss their implications for today. What's wonderful is that these are largely the same activists who were involved in the presentation of the Mozart {Requiem} on the anniversary of 9/11. We are witnessing the creation of this citizens' intelligentsia – a qualified leadership for this country who are going to take the intellectual responsibility to develop the knowledge they need to exert the kind of leadership that's necessary.

I might invite Diane to just say a little bit more about this process of these weekly readings in Manhattan, as a model for what can happen elsewhere in the country.

SARE: I know some people have discussed organizing such readings; and I think that would be absolutely appropriate, because that is in a sense, how the American Revolution was organized. In small circles of people discussing ideas; and it is how Alexander Hamilton organized the republic with his {Federalist Papers} with his collaborators John Jay and others.

I also just want to say, because part of the attempt to intimidate and demoralize the American people is this big promotion of this nonsense about Obama's great popularity and his brilliant legacy of – as he himself puts it – "the greatest economic recovery ever to happen in memorable recorded history of mankind and civilization in general". Which no one is experiencing whatsoever. And as far as his great surge in popularity, the override of his JASTA veto in the Senate was

97 –

1; I would not say that 1 out of 100 constitutes a great spike in popularity.

I do think this case of the Philippines, I want to bring it up because it's significant. The Philippines, as people may know, is not a particularly large or powerful nation. It's had a special relationship with the United States, which had been better when Douglas MacArthur was living. The President has just said to the US, "No, I am shifting our relationship to China. We're not going to have a special relationship with the US anymore; it's going to be with China, and with Russia." What can the United States do about this? Absolutely nothing; we have nothing to offer. All we have is a lunatic who is having his Vice President on his behalf and on behalf of the dying British Empire, make threats about covert cyber-war attacks on Russia. Of course, Ed Snowden asked the relevant question – maybe someone should explain what "covert" means to these idiots. I think Americans should really take heart. There is no reason for you to be suffering, except a decision to go along with this crap. As we inform and educate ourselves as to what the Founding Fathers actually intended with our republic, which is that knowledge which is the bedrock of Lyndon LaRouche's life's work; which he has taken to even higher levels in the realm of physical science and physical economy. That's our power; that's our strength.

And in these last two weeks before this dreaded election,

when it's clear to everybody that we are the best hope of the United States, we should just be organizing. I think that webpage looks fantastic; that is a great resource. So, we should make use of it; everyone watching should forward it to all your friends and neighbors. Take this material and get on the warpath a little bit. There's no need to sit back and take this. And by all means, you certainly don't have to vote for either one of these idiots. So, I think it's a great moment of opportunity; and the shift is being led right now by Putin and Xi Jinping and Lyndon LaRouche. We are the leaders of that in the United States; and that's really your role and our role right now.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, I think that's sufficient for today. Again, please become an active member of this new community that we've set up with its hub on the LaRouche PAC Action Center. There will be a free flow of ideas; report back, there's a field there where you can type in your reports. We want to share these with as many people as we can to just sort of inspire people as to what are the kinds of things that can be done. There's probably new ideas out there that haven't even been thought of yet, but there's a lot that can be done right now. All of the material is available; this is something that you can use to pull your friends into this orbit and lift people up out of the swamp of this psychological trauma of this election period. You can inspire people and say, "No. Don't become cynical; don't

become

demoralized." We have a lot that we can do. This is an historic

and potentially wonderful time in human history; it is a pre-revolutionary kind of situation on a world scale. This is your tool in order to become an active part of that.

So again, it's on the LaRouche PAC Action Center, there's a big banner right on the top of the larouchepac.com website right

now. You can access it right there. Please, sign up. You will

receive updates and become part of the network; you can join the

Thursday Fireside Chat activists' calls; share your ideas, ask questions to leading members of the LaRouche Political Action Committee. You can receive daily emails; you can receive the weekly updates from LaRouche PAC in your email inbox. You can subscribe to both the LaRouche PAC Live and the LaRouche PAC videos YouTube channel. Just get everything that you can, and become an active member. You can expect some reports, I think,

from this historic seminar that occurred today in Essen, Germany

that was sponsored by the Schiller Institute; so please stay tuned to the LaRouche PAC website for that, and for that numerous

other developments that we don't even know yet to have occurred.

But I'm sure that there will be a lot that will change over the

coming days and weeks.

Thank you very much for watching today. We look forward to

seeing you on the LaRouche PAC Action Center. Stay tuned to larouchepac.com, and good night.

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 Ehrlicke, 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 manufactories 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.

Glass-Steagall:

Det presserende første

skridt.

Af EIR's økonomiredaktør Paul Gallagher

Krakket har været i gang siden 1. januar, 2016. Det var den dato, da alle regler i Europa blev ændret således, at banker ikke kunne få en bailout (statslig bankredning). De skulle angiveligt reddes gennem en bail-in (ekspropriering af visse typer af bankindsud); det er blevet til at betyde, at indskyderne og obligationsindehaverne ville få eksproprieret deres penge for at skabe ny kapital til insolvente banker. Det har vist sig at være en total 'non-starter', komplet ubrugeligt; det fungerer ikke. Det blev afvist af Italien, og er grundlæggende set blevet opgivet og smidt i skraldespanden. Men de står ikke desto mindre over for, at der ikke er mulighed for bailout; især Deutsche Bank står på det seneste over for, at der ikke er nogen mulighed for bailout.

Da dette først skete, og oliepriserne faldt til omkring \$30-40 fra næsten 3,5 gange så meget, og alle de andre råvarepriser kollapsede, har dette, samt truslen om, at de ikke kunne få bailout, betydet, at ikke alene Deutsche Bank, men dusinvis af storbanker i de europæiske lande, i Det forenede Kongerige (U.K.), siden da har stået på kanten af afgrunden, med udsigt ned i dybet. De ventede simpelt hen på at se, hvor udløseren af faktisk tab af al likviditet i dette baksystem ville finde sted; om det ville blive i det tyske banksystem, i U.K.'s nationaliserede banker – som er i en meget dårlig forfatning.

Det er, hvor hele dette banksystem har stået siden 1. januar; enormt overgearet. Otte år; 7,5 år med kvantitativ lempelse, der har givet dem mulighed for at blive enormt overgearet; Deutsche Bank har en gearing-rate på 37:1 iflg. en rapport, der netop er udgivet af FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; USA's Statslige Indskudsgarantifond). Det er

værre end Lehman Brothers' gearing-rate, da den gik konkurs; ikke meget værre, men værre.

Samtidigt har de ligget og marineret i otte år i et miljø med 0 % 's rentesatser; hvilket betyder, at de ikke er profitable. De kan ikke på én og samme gang være forsigtigt kloge og solide, kommercielle banker, og så også være profitable. Så hvad har de gjort? De har generelt tilsidesat deres aktiviteter med at modtage indskud og udstede lån – deres kommercielle bank er fuldstændig gået over til den hjatank, der indeholder diverse former for spekulationer; med salg af kunstfærdige og komplekse instrumenter, som ingen forstår – inklusive dem, der sælger dem. De solgte dem til deres afdelingskunder, de solgte dem til kommuner og byer, de solgte dem til organisationer; og de forsøgte grundlæggende set at plyndre indskuddene i deres kommercielle bankenheder og bruge dem til deres spekulative operationer, fordi de ikke kan tjene penge ved kommerciel bankaktivitet, eftersom de har ligget marineret i 0 % 's rentesatser i otte år, med udsigten til, generelt, en ubegrænset fremtid med mere af samme slags. Så når man frem til krakket.

Det, der diskuteres omkring IMF-mødet, og jeg tror, vi kommer til dette, for vi har venner, som er dér; ud over dem af os, der udgiver *The Hamiltonian*, har vi andre venner omkring disse møder. Det, som diskuteres dér, er muligheden og frygten for et reelt likviditetskrak, som kunne blive udløst, hvad øjeblik, det skal være. Det, som ikke diskuteres dér, er de kriminelle handlinger, som disse banker begår som et resultat af deres spekulative kultur, og som et resultat af den tilstand, de befinder sig i, efter at have ligget i luge i disse 8 år. De forbrydelser, som de nu er i færd med at begå, fordrer absolut, både som et spørgsmål om juridisk retfærdighed og som et spørgsmål om fornuftig, sund bankpraksis, at bankerne omgående opdeles.

Vi behøver ikke se længere end til Wells Fargo, der skulle forestille at være den næststørste bank i USA, et mønster på

ikke-spekulativ, kommerciel bankvirksomhed. Se på, hvad de har bedrevet. Deres bankenheder for investering og værdipapirhandel har i bogstavelig forstand stjålet pengene fra deres indskydere i en skala af hundreder af tusinder (af indskydere), for at tjene gebyrer og profitter på kunstfærdige instrumenter (læs: makværk). Det er kriminelt. Vi husker nok Detroit og alle de andre byer i hele verden – i hvert fald i hele Europa og USA – som man solgte disse meget komplekse derivater og rente-swaps til. Hver gang, de ønskede at udstede en obligation og låne nogle penge til kommunen eller byen eller offentlige transportselskaber, hvad det nu var, solgte man disse produkter til dem. Det er stort set det samme som at sige, at de ikke anede, hvad det var, de fik; præcis ligesom indskyderne i Wells Fargo, som ikke var klar over, hvad det var for noget, man havde solgt til dem. Så uklar var forståelsen hos kommunens/byens finansdirektører, og hos finansdirektører for selskaberne for offentlige tjenesteydelser, af disse derivater, som bankerne fik dem til at købe, simpelt hen for at gøre lånet til en obligation med variabel rentesats, at man lige så godt kunne sige, at de solgte dem disse derivater uden, at finansdirektørerne overhovedet vidste, at de fik dem, indtil de opdagede, at de tabte millioner og atter millioner af dollars hvert år. Og forbløffende nok, i hvert eneste tilfælde i hver eneste by/kommune i hele verden, var den samme satsning gået galt på nøjagtig samme måde; og det løb op i – i nogle tilfælde med storbyer – i hundreder af millioner af dollars for bøder, gebyrer og tab, som de ikke kunne komme ud af. Denne kriminelle aktivitet kan kun afsluttes på én måde. Det er ved at sætte Glass/Steagall-loven i kraft igen. Hvis nogen prøver at fortælle dig, at, ved at tilføje endnu en specifik, lille regel til de andre tusinder, der findes i Dodd/Frank-loven, osv., at, så vil denne kriminelle aktivitet stoppe, så lægger de røgslør ud – de bedrager dig. Der findes kun én måde at standse det på. Uden Glass/Steagall-loven i en omtrentlig periode på de seneste 20 år, er hver eneste storbank blevet meget større, og er blevet til en båd, hvis midte er fuld af

indskydere med et stort antal – i visse tilfælde hundreder af tusinder af hajer, som udgøres af de spekulative afdelinger af dette enorme holdingselskab – alle disse hajer, der svømmer rundt omkring båden, der er fuld af indskydere, og som forsøger på den ene eller anden måde at få noget blod, få en arm eller et ben, få en hel krop, for at få blod ud af båden.

Den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan vende selv en sådan enkelt, enorm bank omkring og sige, give os en bank tilbage, der kan udøve kommerciel bankvirksomhed; som kan tage imod indsættelser/indskud og udstede lån og faktisk investere i industri og fremskridt; giv os det tilbage. Der findes kun én måde at gøre det på; og det er, at man tager sin harpuncanon og dræber disse hajer. Og måden at gøre dét på er at vedtage Glass/Steagall-loven; sæt den i kraft igen. Man rejser således, grundlæggende set, et sådant hegn op omkring indskuddene, at hajerne absolut ikke kan få nogen adgang, og man vi så se, at disse spekulative bankenheder – mange af dem – hurtigt vil gå bankerot. Det var meget velkomment i går at høre et forslag fra et parlamentsmedlem i Hamborg i Tyskland om, at man netop skulle gøre dét med Deutsche Bank. Hvis man kan gøre det med Deutsche Bank, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche foreslog for et par måneder siden, så kan man gøre det med alle storbanker i verden. Hvis man rent faktisk kan få en rigtig bank tilbage, en kommerciel bank, en udlånsbank, ud af den monstrøsitet, det roderi, som er Deutsche Bank i dag – i processen med en bankerot; så er den eneste måde at gøre det på lig med det forslag, som dette parlamentsmedlem kom med. Det samme forslag, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fremsatte for to måneder siden, kendt som Herrhausen-forslaget for Deutsche Bank. Dette parlamentsmedlem sagde, opdel og, på en lovmæssig måde, kød ned og fjern alle disse giftige, spekulative bankenheder. Så kan den kommercielle bank genkapitaliseres, endda af regeringen, på en sådan måde, at den nu begynder seriøst at investere i økonomien.

Så det er altså, hvad man ikke diskuterer; det er de

kriminelle handlinger, og hvordan man skal standse dem. Det er et langt mere fundamentalt spørgsmål end spørgsmålet om, hvilke af disse banker, der først går ned og udløser den generelle eksplosion af afviklinger. Vi må få Kongressen til at vende tilbage (til Washington). Hvad foretager de sig, når de forlader Washington i to måneder, efter at have sagt, at, nu vil de stramme skruen over for Wall Street i en række høringer om Wells Fargos kriminelle handlinger; for dernæst at forlade byen i to måneder. Holde pause for et totalt ubetydeligt valg, der ikke har noget valg at byde på, når de i stedet burde stramme skruen over for Wall Street; når de burde lovgive! Det er, hvad vi diskuterer her; den mobilisering, der nu er i gang, for at få dem til at komme tilbage til Washington og genindføre Glass-Steagall nu, og så fortsætter vi derfra.

Ovenstående er et uddrag af LaRouchePAC's webcast, 7. oktober, 2016. Hele webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, kan ses her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=15135>

**»Ét minut over midnat!
Få Kongressen tilbage til
Washington for at vedtage
Glass-Steagall nu!«
LaRouchePAC Internationale
fredags-webcast, 7. oktober,**

2016

Vi befinder os midt i en forhøjet mobilisering, og jeg kan sige, at netop, mens vi taler, bliver eksemplarer af det allerseneste nummer af avisen The Hamiltonian, den ugentlige avis fra LaRouchePAC, uddelt i New York City; men også på gaderne i Washington, D.C., uden for det årlige IMF-møde. Hovedoverskriften i The Hamiltonian i denne uge er meget klar; den har titlen »Ét minut over midnat, krakket er begyndt!« Og det kunne dårligt opsummere vores diskussion her i aften bedre. De andre artikler er også apropos; hvis I endnu ikke har læst dem, opfordrer jeg jer til at gøre det. Vi har »Økonomi handler ikke om penge« af Jason Ross; »Finanskrisen i oktober; Vedtag Glass-Steagall nu« af Rachel Brinkley; »Et lille skridt for Kongressen, Et kæmpespring for menneskeheden«, af Dennis Speed, om gennembruddet med underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet; og »Nero-Obamas sidste dage: Fremstød for atomkrigs-folkemord«, af Carl Osgood.

Så avisen uddeles nu, mens vi taler; og vi har allerede sidste-minut-rapporter fra uden for IMF-mødet, hvor personer responderer meget ivrigt, inklusive nogle tyske økonomer, der kendte Alfred Herrhausen personligt, inden han blev myrdet, og som responderer til Alexander Hamiltons stemme via de forslag eller det politiske perspektiv, som Lyndon LaRouche fremlægger netop nu.

Engelsk udskrift.

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast October 7, 2016

"ONE MINUTE AFTER MIDNIGHT!"

GET CONGRESS BACK IN WASHINGTON TO PASS GLASS-STEAGALL NOW!

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's October 7, 2016. My name

is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our Friday evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by a guest – Paul Gallagher from *Executive Intelligence Review* – and by two members of our Policy Committee via video; Bill Roberts joining us from Detroit, Michigan, and Kesha Rogers joining us from Houston, Texas.

We are in the midst of a heightened mobilization, and I can say that as we speak, copies of the very latest edition of the *Hamiltonian*, the weekly broadsheet from LaRouche PAC, are being distributed in New York City; but also on the streets of

Washington DC outside of the annual IMF meeting. The headline of the *Hamiltonian* this week is very clear; it's titled "One Minute after Midnight, the Crash Is On!" And I think that couldn't summarize our discussion any better here right now. The other articles are also apropos; and if you haven't read them yet, I'd encourage you to. We have "Economics Isn't About Money" by Jason Ross; "Financial Crisis in October; Pass Glass-Steagall Now" by Rachel Brinkley; "One Small Step for Congress, One Giant Leap for Mankind" by Dennis Speed, about the breakthrough with the JASTA veto override; and "Nero Obama Pushes Nuclear Genocide in Final Days" by Carl Osgood.

So, that is now being distributed as we speak; and we already have up-to-the-minute reports from outside of the IMF meeting, where individuals are responding very keenly, including some German economists who personally knew Alfred Herrhausen before his assassination and who are responding to the voice of Alexander Hamilton via the proposals or the policy perspective that is being laid out by Lyndon LaRouche right now.

What I want to begin with is a very quick brief overview of the crash as it stands, and as it is unfolding over the coming few days and few hours. We will also discuss a little bit of the mobilization that we're engaged in. But we're going to move very quickly from that discussion to an elaboration of what Mr. LaRouche wished to convey as he communicated during the discussion that we had with him a few

hours ago. But before we get to that, Paul, let me just ask you to give us a very quick overview of the crisis.

PAUL GALLAGHER: The crash has been on since January 1, 2016. That's when all the rules in Europe were changed so that banks could not be bailed out. Supposedly they were going to be bailed-in; that has turned into meaning the depositors and bondholders were going to have their money taken in order to make new capital for failing banks. That has turned out to be a complete non-starter; it isn't working. It was rejected by Italy, and has basically been thrown up into the air and into the trash basket. So, but nonetheless, they are facing no bail-out; especially Deutsche Bank recently has been facing no bail-out.

Once that occurred, and the price of oil fell into the thirties and around \$40 from nearly 3.5 times that and all the other commodity prices collapsed, that plus the threat of not being bailed out, has meant that not just Deutsche Bank, but dozens of major banks in the countries of Europe, in the United Kingdom, have been at the abyss looking down since then. Simply waiting to see where the trigger for actual loss of all liquidity in that banking system was going to occur; whether it would be in the

German banking system, in the Italian banking system, in the nationalized banks of the UK – which are in very bad shape.

That's where this entire banking system has sat since January 1st; tremendously over-leveraged. Eight years, 7.5 years of quantitative easing, which has given them the opportunity to be tremendously over-leveraged; Deutsche Bank is leverage 37:1,

according to a report that just came out from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. That is worse than the leverage ratio of Lehman when it failed; not much worse, but worse.

At the same time, they've been marinated for eight

years in an environment of 0% interest rates; which means they are not profitable. They cannot at the same time be prudent and sound commercial banks, and at the same time be profitable. So, what have they done? They have generally shoved aside their taking deposits and making loans – their commercial bank has gone wholly into the shark tank of various speculations; selling elaborate complex instruments which no one understands –

including the salesman. Selling them to their retail depositors, selling them to cities, selling them to towns, selling them to agencies; and essentially trying to loot the deposits in their commercial banking units into their speculative operations, because they can't make money by commercial banking, having been marinated in 0 % interest rates for eight years with essentially an indefinite future of the same stretching ahead of them. So, you reach the crash.

What's being discussed around the IMF meeting, and I think we'll get to it because friends of ours are there; in addition to those of us who are getting out the *Hamiltonian*, there are other friends of ours around these meetings. What's being

discussed there is the potential and the fear of a real liquidity crash being triggered at any moment. What's not being discussed is the crimes that these banks are committing as a result of their speculative culture and as a result of the condition that

they are in after this 8-year marination. The crimes that they are committing now absolutely demand, as a matter of justice as well as sound banking, that they be immediately broken up.

We don't have to look any further than Wells Fargo, which was supposedly the second-largest bank in the United States, which was supposedly the paragon of non-speculative commercial banking. Look at what they have been doing. Their investment banking and securities units have literally been stealing the money from their depositors by the hundreds of thousands in order to make fees and profits on elaborate instruments. It's criminal. We remember Detroit and all the

other cities around the world – around Europe and the United States anyway – which were also sold very complex derivatives, interest rate swaps. Every time they wanted to issue a bond and borrow some money for the city or the town or the transit agency, whatever it was, they were sold these products. It is as good as saying that they didn't know what they had; just like the depositors at Wells Fargo weren't aware of these things they had been sold. So dim was the understanding of the city treasurers and the agency treasurers of these derivatives that the banks were making them buy in order to simply float a bond, that you might just as well say that they sold them those derivatives without the treasurers even knowing that they had them, until they found that they were losing millions and millions of dollars every year. And amazingly, in every single case in every city around the world, the same bet had gone wrong in exactly the same way; and they were running into – in some cases with large cities – into the hundreds of millions of dollars of fines, fees, and losses that they couldn't get out of. This criminal activity can be ended in only one way. That is by enacting the Glass-Steagall Act. If anyone is telling you that by adding yet another specific little

regulation to the thousands of them that are in the Dodd-Frank Act and so forth, that this criminal activity will stop, they are blowing smoke. There is only one way to stop it. Without Glass-Steagall for the last nearly 20 years, you have had every major bank get much larger, and turn into a boat in the middle full of depositors with a large – in some cases hundreds and thousands of sharks, which are the speculative units of this

immense holding company – all those sharks swimming around the boat full of depositors, and trying in one way or another to get some blood, to get a limb, to get a whole body, to get blood out of there.

The only way you can return even in an individual huge bank like that, to say give us back a bank which can do commercial banking, which can take in deposits and make loans

and actually invest in industry and progress, give us that back. There's only one way to do it; and that is to get out your spear gun and kill

those sharks. The way to do that is enact the Glass-Steagall Act; put it back in effect. Essentially, you make such a fence around the deposits then that the sharks absolutely have no access, and you will find that those speculative units – many of them – will rapidly be bankrupt. We're very welcome to hear a proposal from a legislator in Hamburg in Germany yesterday, to do exactly that with Deutsche Bank. If it can be done with Deutsche Bank, as Lyndon and Helga LaRouche proposed a couple of months ago, then it can be done with any major bank in the world. If you can actually get back a real bank, a commercial bank, a lending bank out of that monstrosity, that mess which is Deutsche Bank today – in the process of failing; then the only way to do it was the proposal this legislator made. The same proposal, that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche had made two months ago known as the Herrhausen Proposal for Deutsche Bank. That legislator said, separate and in an orderly way, run down, eliminate all of these toxic, speculative units. Then the commercial bank may be capitalized, even by the government, in such a way that it begins to invest seriously in the economy.

So, that's what's not being discussed; is the crimes and how to stop them. That's a much more fundamental question than which of these banks is going to go first and be the trigger for the general liquidity explosion. We have to get the Congress to

return. What are they doing having left Washington for two months after saying they wanted to get tough with Wall Street in a series of hearings on Wells Fargo's crimes; then leave the city for two months. Go into recess for a completely meaningless

no-choice election, when instead they should be getting tough with Wall Street; legislating. That's what we're here to discuss, is that mobilization which is now on to get them to go back and restore Glass-Steagall now, and then we'll go on.

OGDEN: Well the smell of that 2008 crash is back in the air for sure; and I think people are beginning to recognize what time it is, as demonstrated in this. This is a headline from the *New York Times* yesterday: "Deutsche Bank as the Next Lehman Brothers". They say, "far-fetched, but not unthinkable"; but remember, that 2008 crash happened exactly during this campaign season, and the Congress came back into emergency session. And at first, voted down the bail-out and then voted the bail-out up. It's that kind of environment; this is what we're seeing. This is an October crisis; this is not something which is going to wait until after the elections. This is not something that's going to wait until the lame duck; and that's the lead on the LaRouche PAC website today. "Send Congress Back To Enact Glass-Steagall Law; Lame Duck Is Too Late".

I don't know Bill, if you want to say a little bit about what the status of that mobilization is, and what people have to be thinking about.

BILL ROBERTS: Sure, Matt. I can confirm that it was my experience when confronting two Congressmen yesterday here in Michigan, and I think some of our super activists have reported a very similar experience. While these Congressmen are paying lip service and while their lips say "Yes, I'm for Glass-Steagall"; their actions say "No." Because as Paul just pointed out, if they were in reality about the fact that Glass-Steagall is something that must be put in place preemptively, then they would be rushing back to Washington to pass it. The vote to override Obama's veto of the JASTA bill is quite fortuitous, because really if you think about all of the excuses that these members of Congress have: you can't get the two parties together; you can't take on these high-powered lobbyists. In both of those cases, the defeat of JASTA – the justice for the families of the victims – the way that this happened, proves that in fact, it is possible.

This mobilization has got to be accelerated and

continued. What our activists are doing—and we are building up a full-scale mobilization on this—is to confront these Congressmen on the full reality of what Glass-Steagall actually is. As Mr. LaRouche pointed out today, Glass-Steagall is just the first of four steps. I think that while many well-meaning people say they support Glass-Steagall, in fact their unwillingness to take leadership on this so far, reflects a lack of understanding of the reality of the situation, how dire it is, and, frankly, a lack of a sense of what Glass-Steagall is, in the sense that this was a real historical bill that was signed into law by Franklin Roosevelt.

When you hear some of these Congressmen, or Bernie Sanders talk about Glass-Steagall, it's just "break up the banks," and that's it. And then they start talking about the abuses of the pharmaceutical industry, as if it's just this sort of gimmick.

But, as Mr. LaRouche has pointed out, this is a strategy, frankly, for victory against genocide. With JASTA, Obama was confronted on his taking the side of an imperial authority to have arbitrary power over people's lives. This is the same exact question. It is even more deadly.

I think it's on that sort of level that this mobilization has to upshift to, to get out of the domain of just a question of "Are you for, or are you against Glass-Steagall?" but "What is your commitment, now, Mr. Congressman to ensuring that the government intervenes to save the American people, as Franklin Roosevelt did?"

OGDEN: Absolutely! Thank you very much. That, I think, brings us directly to the subject that we discussed with Mr. LaRouche earlier, and this is the subject of our "institutional question," which I'm just going to read. It says, "Mr. LaRouche, you have said that it is absolutely urgent that Glass-Steagall

is implemented immediately, and that this is the first step towards a whole series of actions that must be taken to save the economy. Can you please elaborate what the other steps are?" So, that's the question.

Paul, I'm going to let you elaborate a little bit, and then we can also get to the Four Laws, as Mr. LaRouche specifically identifies them.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Well, maybe we'll get to them very quickly, because it brings us really to the question of these two extremely well-known, very fundamentally important figures in history, extremely controversial and very little understood, namely, Alexander Hamilton and Lyndon LaRouche. Certainly the recent efforts to lampoon Hamilton on the stage in New York have not aided at all in people understanding what he really contributed to the human race, to this nation, how he built this nation, in an indispensable way.

We were talking to Lyn LaRouche and Helga LaRouche earlier today about this subject. What Lyndon LaRouche said, repeatedly, actually, was that when he introduced what he called his "Four Cardinal Laws for the Economy" in 2014, he was modelling them directly on the Reports of Alexander Hamilton to the Congress of the United States. Here is where those reports are found, in this book, *The Reports of Alexander Hamilton*, [edited by Jacob Ernest Cooke, II] which gives the four Reports that Hamilton made to the Congress, through which he established the legislative actions— but they were really broad government actions, based on crucial legislation in each case — which made it possible for this country to survive the extreme bankruptcy which it came into during the course of the Revolution, and to rapidly, from that point on, expand and become the leading industrial and technological power in the world.

What LaRouche was looking at, was four laws and obviously not meaning four traffic laws—four broad actions that must be taken in order to revive the economy from its

present zero growth, zero productivity growth state, and nearly zero infrastructure investment, no infrastructure mission. To revive it from that state there are four broad actions which have to be taken, which can be represented and made possible, authorized by legislation, but are really very fundamental.

Glass-Steagall is the first, and must be done *right now*, but it just opens the door. It's like taking out the garbage, as we say. It opens the door to the other actions, and it

corresponds very much to Hamilton's establishment on this continent—initially even *before* the Constitution was adopted, and *before* any of his Reports to the Congress were made and the institution of a commercial bank and something whose *only* purpose was to, as he put it, "gather the savings of the country, and place them in the hands of those who could make the most productive use of them."

That idea of a "commercial bank," in the Bank of New York, which he founded; and, obviously, in the Bank of the United States, which he founded, was unique. Before that, you had merchant banks in Europe, which essentially took partnerships in trade ventures and financed trade; and then you had banks which were formed in order to lend to the government, and get control of government finances. The Hamiltonian bank had absolutely neither of those purposes, but rather the purpose which we'll get into, I think, in the course of this.

OGDEN: Let me just display on the screen, right now, the first slide. This [Slide #1] is the title screen: "The Four Laws, by Lyndon LaRouche." On the next slide [Slide #2] you'll see the link to the actual document which was published by Mr. LaRouche

on June 8, 2014, which we encourage you to read in full. It's titled "The Four New Laws to Save the USA Now! Not an Option: an Immediate Necessity." [<https://larouchepac.com/four-laws>] That's the website you can go to, to read the document in

full, and that will also be included in the description to this video, so you'll have access to that as the broadcast continues.

On the next slide [Slide #3] you'll see a very short quote which I've taken from the introduction to that document, in which Mr. LaRouche says the following: "The only location for the immediately necessary action which could prevent such an

immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S. Government's now immediate decision *to institute four specific, cardinal measures: measures which must be fully consistent with the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution...*"

On the next slide [Slide #4] you'll see "*No. 1: the immediate re-enactment of the Glass-Steagall law instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without modification, as to principle of action. No. 2: A return to a system of top-down, and*

thoroughly defined as National Banking. The actually tested, successful model to be authorized is that which had been instituted, under the direction of the policies of national banking which had been actually, successfully installed under President Abraham Lincoln's superseding authority of a currency created by the Presidency of the United States (e.g., 'Greenbacks'), as conducted as *a national banking-and-credit-system placed under the supervision of the Office of the Treasury Secretary of the United States*". Mr. LaRouche elaborates after that, that this was the system that

Alexander Hamilton created. "No. 3: The purpose of the use of a Federal Credit-system, is to generate high-productivity trends in improvements of employment, with the accompanying intention, to increase the physical-economic productivity, and the standard of living of the persons and 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 assured, this time, once more, as was done successfully under President Franklin D.

Roosevelt, or by like standards of Federal practice..." Next slide [Slide No. 5] "...used to create a general economic recovery of the nation, {per capita}, and for the rate of net effects in productivity, and by reliance on the essential human principle, which distinguishes the human personality from the systemic characteristics of the lower forms of life: the net rate of increase of the energy-flux density of effective practice. This means intrinsically, a thoroughly scientific, rather than a merely mathematical one, and by the related increase of the effective energy-flux density *per capita*, and for the human population when considered as each and all as a whole." Following this, Mr. LaRouche said, "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 achievement of the nation and the individual."

And then "No. 4." Next Slide. [Slide No. 6] "'Adopt a Fusion-Driver 'Crash Program.' The essential distinction of man from all lower forms of life, hence, in practice, is that it presents the means for the perfection of the specifically affirmative aims and needs of human individual and social life. Therefore: the subject of man in the process of creation, as an affirmative identification of an affirmative statement of an absolute state of nature, is a permitted form of expression.

Principles of nature are either only affirmations, or they could not be affirmatively stated among civilized human minds."

Following this, Mr. LaRouche elaborates the concept of Vladimir Vernadsky's idea of the noosphere, in which he places man as specifically distinct, and in a hierarchy, above other forms of life; and then elaborates the concept of "physical chemistry," as the only yardstick in the science of economics.

So, again, that document, in full, is available to you at <https://larouchepac.com/four-laws>. The link is available in

the description to this video. We encourage to read that and study that, in full, along with these Four Reports that Paul mentioned—the Four Reports by Alexander Hamilton to the United States Congress. With that said, I think we can open up, especially this fourth point, that I just named here, and I invite Kesha to say a little bit on this subject.

KESHA ROGERS: Okay. Thank you Matt. I think we really have to start with the unstated-but-consuming principle that exists in all four of those Laws. Mr. LaRouche really captured this in recent discussions: that mankind has to re-discover the meaning of "mankind," and what is the purpose by which we, as the human species, exist? What is our purpose, in terms of promoting the power of the creative potential that lies only in the human species, unlike any other species.

When you think about the Fourth Law, people start to say, "Ah, Okay. Well, you know, LaRouche is promoting nuclear power and fusion power, and so forth." It's not just about that. It's a subsuming principle of *all Four*, that starts with, what I would define as the principle of Agapé. How do you develop Glass-Steagall? How do you develop the credit system, in the way that Hamilton understood, in the way that LaRouche understands? It comes from the understanding of the benefit to all mankind, which exists in advancing the creative potential for all mankind.

If you really look at how that has influenced our nation, under Presidents George Washington, and particularly in Roosevelt and John F Kennedy. These Presidents didn't just look at Hamilton's conception of national credit, Hamilton's conception of development of economics from the standpoint of just the law. It started with the understanding of a unique principle in the United States to advance the productive and creative powers of every living being in this nation and on this planet. One thing

that we talk about is what you saw under President Franklin Roosevelt, who was a devout student of Alexander Hamilton, and really what expanded from the period of Franklin Roosevelt through the period of John F Kennedy, was what named as the Golden Age of Productivity. I think that what we need right now is a Golden Age of Productivity for the world.

Where is the opposition coming to this? Well, if you look at what has happened with the attacks on our US space program, which would be the defining principle, the defining process which would bring together new scientific discoveries for mankind;

revolutionizing science in the way that we should be doing, which is our human potential. That's what Obama rejects. When Obama said that we don't need any fancy fusion, and now you've seen not only the shutdown of our manned space program; but now the potential for advancements in new creative breakthroughs of

scientific and technological advancements that exist through programs such as the fusion research centers and development programs at MIT and Princeton. That's being shut down because we didn't go with Glass-Steagall; we didn't go with the Hamiltonian credit system to actually put the necessary credit into these great scientific endeavors and large scale infrastructure projects. This isn't just happening because somebody thinks the money should go elsewhere. It's happening because of a rejection to this truly human identity that it is our human nature to advance to provide for the future; to bring about the creating of a future. So, when you think about what we're up against here, when people say "Oh yeah, we need to break up the big banks and we need Glass-Steagall"; we need Glass-Steagall, we need to break up the big banks, but we need it on Hamilton's terms. We need it on LaRouche's terms from the standpoint of a higher conception.

We have to stop the death rate; we have to stop the mass killing in the United States and around the world. The way we're going to do this, is that these programs have to be

implemented from the standpoint of a higher definition and conception of what it means to be human.

I think that gets us to a fundamental point of why you look at what China is doing with the development of their space program – and LaRouche has really emphasized this very emphatically – that China has to be a model from the standpoint of the space program. Not just because of a singularity of a program they're taking up, because China's now going to the far side of the Moon, unlike any other nation; doing something that no one else has yet to do. What does this mean? This is a breakthrough in a revolution in science; this is a breakthrough in the benefit and the potential progress to all mankind. I think that is where LaRouche's Four Laws have to start from; and what China is doing right now is what we in the United States, the foundation and the principle of this United States was founded on.

What our great visionaries and scientists understood was the unique principle of mankind that defies this oligarchy's rejection of that identity; and why we became a nation committed to this principle of the creative, productive powers of the human species. If you think about these visionaries from the standpoint of what China and nations around the world are doing to advance this creative potential, it can really be stated and defined in what the great space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke again outlined as what our true extra-terrestrial imperative as a human species is. One thing I wanted to point is – again, I've stated this on a number of occasions – we brought up Krafft Ehrlicke's three laws of astronautics and what this really represents to promoting that potential. But I want to focus in very quickly on the third law, which is not always stated as clearly as it could be; but I think it really captures this idea that he says, "By expanding through the universe, man fulfills his destiny as an

element of life; endowed with the power of reason and the wisdom of the moral law within himself." I guess the point is, where does this power of reason come from? Where does this moral law and nature within the existence of mankind lie? And it lies in

mankind's creative potential, the discovery that exists only in the human species to be able to introduce new scientific principles; to introduce new laws that no other animal species can do. This is what we're losing sight of right now.

But the thing is, if we allow for the human population to be killed off en masse, we take away that potential. Look at what's happening right now: the death rates; what's happening with the drug overdoses, the suicides. What's happening with the fact that nations are dying because we don't have the scientific and technological advances to deal with threats that occur in terms of threats that come with natural disasters, that we could be saving lives. Look at the numbers of people that are going to die in Haiti right now. All of this could be stopped if we actually had a program in place immediately; a global Glass-Steagall. So we can actually stop the death rate and organize people around saving human lives so that we can advance for the future; so that we can put forth a new meaning of what mankind and the future of mankind must be. That's where the Four Laws lie; that's where we have to get Congress, as you said, back in Washington DC right now. Because they have a responsibility to this nation and a responsibility to mankind. The fact that Obama rejected the offer by China for cooperation, rejected the offer by China to be a member of the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank and to be a part of the New Silk Road Development Plan, already tells you – once again – his commitment is not to the advancement of the people of this nation and the people of the world. It is to this financial oligarchy, to this empire, and to the purpose of death that he has been promoting for far too long and cannot continue to get away with.

OGDEN: Yeah, I'm actually glad you brought up the AIIB, the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, because one of the other elements that Mr. LaRouche raised in the discussion that we had with him this afternoon, was the necessity for international development bank banking types of activities. That there has to be a commitment on the level of agreements among nations for these vast development projects, and a Hamiltonian banking system which will allow these to take place. We see the emergence of this with what China is doing and some of the other collaborative programs around the development of the New Silk Road. This is the kind of vast surge in productivity and increased standards of living that we see in places of the world that have suffered almost no development. The interior of Eurasia and elsewhere.

But it's something that the United States had originated over 200 years ago with what Hamilton conceived; and it's something which the United States is in no way participating in today. In fact, it's rejecting and attempting to shut down – as you said Kesha. So, that's something that Mr. LaRouche also introduced into the discussion. Maybe it's something that we can also discuss a little bit more of.

GALLAGHER: At this IMF meeting, the IMF introduced a report on the world economy, and they said the big problems are: no growth, most especially including in the United States and of course in Europe; in Obama's recovery, no growth at all; and too much debt. What did they propose as a solution? To cut back credit all over the globe, and especially to insist that China and India – which are the only two engines of real economic and industrial growth in the world – should cut back their issuance of credit. That tells you that there is functional insanity at the top of the IMF; they are completely unaware of the relationship between credit and debt. It is in fact the case that what Alexander Hamilton did â; The United States now needs a

national investment bank; it needs a national infrastructure bank, whatever you want to call it, it needs a national bank with that purpose. What Alexander Hamilton created, as LaRouche in the second of his Four Laws, was essentially a bank which he said was needed in order to be the liaison between the government and the private banks. In the process, again remember that characterization of gathering the savings of the country and placing them in the hands of those who could make the most

productive use of them. So that Hamilton was able to actually reorganize the debt of the United States and the states – which was largely unpayable at that time; provide a means of extinguishing it over a long period of time and redirect that reorganized debt through a bank into new credit, the purpose of which was to go into the key areas of the development of the productivity of the new American labor force. It could have been coming to the third action LaRouche is talking about, Hamilton

was most controversial there, because the bank that he created to reorganize the unpayable debt of the United States and the states and make it into credit; that bank could have been a land bank, that was what was being done in Europe. Alexander Hamilton had studied all those experiments of Turgot and all the other national land banks which had been set up, which had the effect of perpetuating agriculture as really the only economic activity in the country, and of enriching farmers. But of course, it tended to enrich the monopolists who got control of the production of farmers. It also potentially that effect.

Hamilton said, no, that is not what we want to be as a nation. We don't want a national bank to finance unchanged farming practices all the way to the Pacific Ocean; which is what Jefferson wanted, and other. Rather, we want the farms to become the market for truly creative new manufacturing and industrial development – craftsmen, artisans, the founders of manufacturing businesses. This is what our national bank, said Hamilton, has to bring about; not just the endless

extension of farming, the basis of the government finances on a national land bank.

What LaRouche specified – and again, as he was saying, he was thinking of Hamilton's Four Reports to the Congress in his Four Laws; what he specified is then the national bank's credit must be invested in truly productive infrastructure investment.

We're not going to get productive by investing in endless fields of solar mirrors out in the desert, or making a desert out of what was previously just a plain. We're going to become more productive by investing in the most advanced infrastructure investments and missions that the country could possibly have.

That brings us directly to Kesha's conceptual overview, particularly of the fourth critical action; what LaRouche called the Fourth Cardinal Law, that there are frontiers of science. We know that the exploration of deep space, reviving that with everything that goes with in terms of the human experience and also in terms of developing new means of studying, measuring, and changing potentially, the laws of the universe; Einsteinian action in exploration of deep space. That requires that we have a major effort such as that which collapsed in the late 1960s when NASA's budget essentially, virtually disappeared overnight just as we were landing on the Moon. There was not a Hamiltonian credit institution backing that space exploration, that Apollo project, up; and its budget suddenly disappeared.

We need, according to LaRouche's outline of these actions that have to be taken, to put that on the basis that we are going to go fully at the frontiers of science. Go with China to the other side of the Moon, from which the universe can be studied

and observed in a way that it never has been before. Take the Moon's long view of the universe and bring it back and share it with all the nations of the Earth; which is what the Chinese space administrator at the conference in Mexico last

week was

committing China to. So, we also have to make this international, as LaRouche specified. It is a crime that whereas China has created the institutions of credit – the New Silk Road Fund, the AIIB that Kesha raised – the so-called policy banks which make trillions of dollars in infrastructure at home and abroad. Where it has created, one hand reached out for an actually international credit and sound banking system, the United States has not responded. It has no national banking institution; does not have, for the most part, sound and prudent banking going on in the private commercial banking system either.

Germany – the other critical economy in the trans-Atlantic region – same thing; no such national institution. The Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau which they built up after the war, has practically been eliminated; and therefore, no hands coming from the trans-Atlantic side, from the European economies join with that initiative of China, either in the exploration of space, or in the creation of the credit for it. Therefore, this terrible predicament that our friends reported and are experiencing who are at the IMF meeting; that they are somehow trying to reduce the runaway indebtedness of the world by cutting off the new credit which could actually – if directed as Hamilton and LaRouche say – if directed into the frontiers of science and technology, could actually make that debt manageable; both by being written off and also by being made whole in the long term.

This is where Glass-Steagall is intended to lead, is into these kinds of actions. By first putting an end to the crime syndicate which has taken the place of major banks, and breaking it up and making the rest of these crucial actions possible.

But, as Bill said, we have a lot of members of Congress – why not name a few? Maxine Waters, who in the hearing on Wells Fargo said, "I'm introducing legislation to break this bank up; and if it breaks the other banks up, so be it." She's not

a sponsor of the legislation which would break that bank up in the way that would actually make for sound banking. A whole bunch of Senators at the Democratic Convention, who were interviewed on the floor in a television video, and said they were absolutely for restoring Glass-Steagall; but haven't sponsored the legislation: Senator Stabenow; Senator Booker of New Jersey; Rep. Sherman of California. There are so many members of Congress, who are not putting their sponsorship and their action where their – they're like on Facebook. They "like" Glass-Steagall, but that is the end of it; they haven't done what they have to do.

So, get like-minded friends of yours and associates, people you know who, like you, support Glass-Steagall, and ambush these Congressmen with bunches of calls all at once to their offices demanding this. Ambush them as Bill was talking about, at the many town meetings and public appearances that they'll make.

We've got to get them to go back to Washington and take the action against Wall Street before this crash wipes us out.

ROBERTS: Let me make one more point, too, which is that Glass-Steagall has enjoyed popular support for years; it's in both party platforms. Why hasn't there been a hearing on Glass-Steagall when you have 130 members of Congress that support

it? Well, it's simple – because of Obama. It's the same reason that Obama has sabotaged Glass-Steagall is the same reason that Obama sabotaged the space program. Because the space program is the one area, as Kesha was developing, where it's completely transparent that the real nature of the human species and the

real nature of economics is the Hamiltonian conception of the increase of productive powers of labor and of real physical economic growth that's generated through the discovery of new principles. You can't have a space program without that; you can't send human beings out into space and conquer the Moon

and other domains. There's no pie to divide up; space is infinite. It just becomes utterly clear; it's like this experience that's been related by so many astronauts that go up to the Space Station. They look down at the bright blue Earth, and they say, "Well, I don't see any borders. I see these little land masses." And it becomes very clear to them that we are one unified humanity; and that is something that Obama had to kill. So, just as in the case of the JASTA vote, Obama has to be confronted; there's no nice way about this. He's the reason why this has not happened. I just wanted to make that point clear.

OGDEN: Absolutely! He was rendered impotent over this historic defeat of his veto of the JASTA bill. All of the so-called practical political arguments that people presented to you over years and years – "Oh, we're for Glass-Steagall, but it's just not – we can't politically make it happen." All of those crumbled with this historic victory, secured by the activation of the American people to create the conditions in which Congress had no choice but to override Obama's veto. All of these arguments against the immediate re-enactment of Glass-Steagall have crumbled. There's no better opportunity than in the wake of that victory with the restoration of the confidence of the American people that in fact, you can force this kind of historic political change to happen through this kind of mass-based activation. Coming off of that victory, it's the time to create the political climate in this country in which if Congress does not return to Washington to immediately re-enact Glass-Steagall; that that's a toxic environment. And the American people know how to make that happen; we can do that, we can lead that. It's the kind of climate in which if you were clear as to how close we are to a total disintegration of this trans-Atlantic system, you wouldn't think twice about doing that.

And any Congressman who's trying to escape from the reality of what it would mean for Deutsche Bank with all of the derivatives counterparties to go through the floor; that this

would be far, far worse than the Hell that was experienced in 2008. That would be a collapse from which you could not recover; you can't bail your way out of that kind of crisis.

So, it's only through the immediate re-enactment of Glass-Steagall – but also, as you made the point, Bill, I think very clearly – knowing that Franklin Roosevelt created Glass-Steagall in the context of the entire program that he instituted with his Presidency. The full weight of the FDR program has got to be present with the first step that's taken with re-enacting Glass-Steagall.

ROGERS: It's important to bring out what we put out as a standard in the report we published – which people should go back to – "The United States Joins the New Silk Road; a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance" – because I think that captures the essence of what we have to seek to bring about. Not just an economic recovery, not just putting a few people back to work; but we need a whole, complete breakthrough. A revolutionizing of science in the way that LaRouche is calling

for; a revolutionizing in the conception of the nature of mankind; what it means to be human; what we are as a species. And then how we bring together the conception of mankind for the benefit of all from the standpoint that we are now going to

advance and share in the greatest potentials for mankind that ever existed. That's found in, as Krafft Ehrlicke said, "leaving the confines of one small planet" and going out into conquering and development of space. I thought that Bill just said it well;

that that exists not from the standpoint of borders, or from the standpoint of competing for resources. This is not about competing for resources or existence of borders; but it's that we have a unique potential as a species to come together and to act to create this economic renaissance as it's never been defined before.

I think that is really what we have to get the

emotional quality around, as we saw an emotional drive around this JASTA fight. It wasn't just about the families of 9/11; but this was the question of the fight for human beings. The fight that existed really took place in people starting to sing together. When people sang together, the power that they found within themselves with the development of what took place with the

Living Memorial concerts as one; but the principle that people started to really sing together and to realize that they had more power against this enemy than they ever thought existed. And they acted on that power. We have to do the same right now to realize that this evil can be and must be defeated.

OGDEN: Wonderful. So, I think that with the title of this week's *Hamiltonian* – "One Minute After Midnight" – we can proceed with the correct sense of urgency; and everything that has been said today defines exactly what the mission is. So, again, if you can read the full document – LaRouche's Four Laws – which is provided in the link in the description to this video, that's available. And secondly, the Four Reports by Alexander Hamilton; this is available as a book. Jacob Cook is the editor of this version; it can be made available as well. And please read these in conjunction, and maybe that can be the subject of your Congressman's next town hall meeting.

So, thank you very much for joining us. And I would like to thank both Kesha and Bill, as well as Paul.

Please stay tuned at larouchepac.com, and Good Night.

Einstein-standarden – Menneskehedens fremtid i rummet.

**Del I af LPAC-webcast, 30.
sept. 2016**

Lyndon LaRouche: »Det vigtigste spørgsmål, der konfronterer menneskeheden, er, hvilke er de eksisterende potentialer, på hvilke menneskehedens fremtid er beroende? Hvilke er de videnskabelige opdagelser, der må gøres af den unikt kreative art, som er mennesket, og på hvilke vi kan skabe en sand og vedvarende fremtid for den menneskelige art?«

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Hvilket eksisterende
potentiale må vi have
udviklet, hvis vi skal give
menneskeheden en fremtid?**

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast, 30. sept. 2016

LaRouche: »Det vigtigste spørgsmål, som mennesket står overfor, er, hvilke er de eksisterende potentialer, på hvilke menneskets fremtid beror? Hvilke er de videnskabelige opdagelser, der må gøres af den unikt kreative art, som er menneskeheden, og på basis af hvilke vi kan skabe en sand og vedvarende fremtid for den menneskelige art?«

Engelsk udskrift:

WHAT ARE THE EXISTING POTENTIALS WHICH MUST BE DEVELOPED IF WE ARE TO GIVE MANKIND A FUTURE?

LaRouche PAC International Webcast

September 30, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon! It is September 30, 2016.

My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us here for our weekly LaRouche PAC webcast on Friday evening. I'm joined in the

studio by Jason Ross and Benjamin Deniston of the LaRouche PAC science team, and via video by Diane Sare and Michael Steger, both of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

We spoke with Lyndon LaRouche just a short time ago, and Mr.

LaRouche's opening remarks are as follows: He says, "The most important question facing mankind is what are the existing potentials on which mankind's future depends? What are the scientific discoveries that must be made by the uniquely creative

species that is mankind on which we can create a true and sustainable future for the human species?" Not a practical question, but a truly scientific question in a truly

scientific

sense. Now Mr. LaRouche's remarks come right in the wake of the absolutely victory, the deafening defeat that we have delivered to Barack Obama with the resounding override in both Houses of the United States Congress – both the Senate and the House – of Obama's veto of the JASTA bill. It's widely acknowledged that the LaRouche Movement, those of you who are watching this broadcast here today, played a central role in that victory alongside the 9/11 families. I think it's clear that the courageous and consistent and sustained leadership of Mr. LaRouche himself on this, has delivered this historic defeat of Obama.

Now we know, as Obama's disgustingly arrogant response to this override that was handed to him demonstrates very clearly, where he said, "This is the most embarrassing moment in the history of the United States Senate," and so forth; you're dealing with a narcissist here. And a narcissist, when delivered this kind of defeat, is very dangerous. And we're seeing the danger of the escalation to the point of nuclear war of Obama's personal desire to confront both Russia and China; the refusal to allow the peace process in Syria to work. And also the total breakdown of Deutsche Bank, number one, and the entire rest of the financial system. It's been said that this is a zombie bank walking which is creating a zombie economy; this is way worse than the Lehman process. So, the next step is obviously the immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall.

However, as Mr. LaRouche was emphatic today – and we

are

going to have his remarks written up and circulated widely for you to read verbatim – the solution to this is not a practical question. We need to throw in the garbage can all the failed ways of thinking; and we need to create an entirely new outlook

on mankind's relationship to the Universe. So, we're going to have a somewhat in-depth presentation and discussion on some of

those questions here today. We thank you for joining that discussion, and hope to have full participation. So, I'm going

to hand it over to Ben to get that discussion started.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think Mr. LaRouche definitely raised

the bar in our discussion with him this morning; and I think it's

a very apt and useful intervention into the way many people are

thinking about the situation, because as you said, we've had a huge victory with Obama being just slammed on his attempted treasonous veto of the JASTA bill and protection of the Saudis.

So, this is a major victory, but coming out of the discussion with Mr. LaRouche, I think it's a victory for our cause as a movement that Mr. LaRouche has uniquely created; and our mission

as a movement, which is to move mankind forward from the highest

level. This is not just a victory in terms of DC politics; it's

not just a victory in terms of party debates and the normal terms

of politics people think of in the United States today. It's a

victory in terms of our mission as an organization to go from

the
highest historical, scientific level, understanding what the
heck
is mankind on this planet. What are we trying to do; what is
our
mission as a species here? That's what we're fighting on; we
have to deal with these kinds of issues, and we have to defeat
these terrible forces that are holding mankind back – Obama is
exemplary, the Saudis are exemplary. But victories against
these
evils are victories for the cause of real progress; real
economic
progress as Mr. LaRouche understands it.

As he said earlier today, real economics as he
understands
it, is very different than what normal people think about
economics. It's not just about money issues, or even
production
or products or something like that; but if you're talking
about
economics, you're talking about the human species. You're
talking about how do we progress; how do we move mankind
forward?
Progress for mankind has always been, and will always continue
to
be if we continue to exist, fundamental creative revolutions
in
what the human species really is. It's not about how much you
produce, the productivity of your labor force, how much credit
you're spending, how much money you're putting in. Those are
components, but if you're talking about real, fundamental
human
progress, economic progress, the core goes to how is that
mankind
uniquely completely changes the nature of his existence on
this
planet in this Universe more generally? That's something

mankind

does; the entire history of mankind, when we haven't been held back by empires, oligarchical systems, degenerate ideologies as

we have largely dominating today. Mankind's nature is complete

revolutions where in effect, it's as if we really create the human species anew on a higher level. So, that's our mission as

mankind today; that's what the fight is today.

From the discussion and Mr. LaRouche's emphasis, he is emphasizing that this has to be upfront and center. That's what

we're fighting for; that's our mission on this planet. That means science; that means real science. That means going into space; that means what China is doing with their lunar program.

Bringing mankind into the Solar System as a real creative force

in the Solar System in the way mankind has never done. What China's doing with their lunar program, their current focus on the lunar far side; a completely mysterious area in many degrees.

A region that is absolutely unique in the immediate vicinity around the Earth; that will give us completely new insights into

the Universe more broadly. These are the kinds of pursuits that

enable mankind to come to these new, higher levels.

One thing I wanted to put on the table today, a subject

that's been a longstanding discussion with Mr. LaRouche and our

science team, is this issue of the Galaxy, the galactic system.

This defines a new frontier, the new domains of scientific revolution that are the substance of what mankind does to

completely transform his existence. I think it's apt in the context of this victory to assess what these new future discoveries can be; what we should be looking towards. Because as he said earlier today, it's not just about repeating something you've done before; it's always something fundamentally new. And the Galaxy is something fundamentally new, really. We don't understand how the Galaxy works, and we know coming to a higher understanding of that – a real scientific understanding of that – is the kind of thing that will transform what mankind is in the most fundamental sense in this Universe.

So, we're living in this galactic system; and again, this determines more about our lives here on Earth than people tend to realize. This is still a very slow realization; only a handful of the population – small layers in the scientific community – are really pursuing and presenting that. The conditions here on Earth that we live in and experience are not Earth conditions; they're not even Solar System conditions. They're galactic conditions. Just to highlight one example we've discussed before, we're living in a galactic climate. If you look at the Earth as it exists today, the largest scales of climate change that occur, are a function of our relationship to our galactic system, for example. We're used to the Earth as it is today. For much of modern civilization, the Earth has been relatively similar to how it is today; but the conditions that we experience now are a function, to a very large degree, of our current galactic relationship.

For example, we've cited that on very long timescales, the motion of our Solar System into and out of the Galaxy's spiral arms, for example, determines some of the largest variations we see in the climate record. The reason why we have ice-caps at all, for example; you look at a map, you see Antarctica, it's covered in ice. You ever see it not covered in ice? You ever gone to the islands of Antarctica and visited lakes there, fished on Antarctica and seen the wildlife there? No, no human being has ever experienced that; it used to be like that. It used to just be a land-exposed continent like the other continents. Why is it not like that now? Because of a function of our galactic position, we're in a large-scale glacial period that the Earth periodically goes through as a function of our galactic relationship currently. So, the conditions that we experience, that we're used to, that we see on Earth, are largely a function of these larger processes; that being just one example.

We had discussed on one of the New Paradigm shows recently, a new paper that came out that demonstrated this in a new way. Demonstrating more clearly that the conditions of the atmosphere, the water cycle, the cloud systems – which play a huge role in climate – are being hour-to-hour, day-to-day affected by this galactic influence. Even just a one-day perturbation of that galactic influence, you can immediately measure the effects. So when the Sun gets more active and shields the Earth from this galactic radiation effect for just the course of a couple days,

within days after that, you can measure changes in the cloud cover, changes in the water cycle of the atmosphere. So, this galactic input, this radiation, this effect of what we call the atmospheric system of the Galaxy, is a continuous input that determines the conditions we experience here on Earth.

That's just an opening example to start to get people to think about the fact that we're part of this much larger system.

We're not living on Earth and there's some galaxy out there; we're living in the galaxy. The galaxy is what we're a part of.

It's a larger system, but the point is, it's a larger system we don't yet understand. To draw an analogy, it's like looking at

the Solar System before the time of Kepler. The Earth was part

of the Solar System, but it was not understood; we did not understand the principle of the Solar System. It took a real creative revolution, a creative discovery to understand that.

We

have not yet done that for this larger galactic system. We have

not yet gone through the type of creative discovery that really

elevates mankind to a new level of fundamental relationship to the universe by understanding these higher order principles of the galactic system.

A lot can be said, but just to point to another example, we

have some sense of the Solar System's orbiting through the galaxy, moving through the galaxy. We have some sense, according

to the records, that that determines climate change; potentially

evolution, the development of life are also things that have been related to the relation of our Solar System to the galaxy. Those are large topics I'm just citing; a lot could be said on this. We have a sense of these records, and the relation of these records; but the actual fundamental basic principle governing the orbit of our Solar System around the galaxy, or any star around the galaxy is not understood. We don't even understand the basic principles of the orbital relations of stars in the galaxy. This has been cited as a reason to invoke this whole investigation of so-called "dark matter"; it's another subject that would take some time to get into. But the point is, we can't even explain the orbital periods of stars around galaxies with our current understandings of the way galaxy are organized and the principles governing galactic systems.

Not to be too linear about it, I think it's worth drawing a direct relation to science and astronomy before the time of Kepler. Where, for example, you had the attempt to extrapolate from prior conceptions, prior knowledge, a certain way of modelling the Solar System and explaining certain observations. You had models of the Solar System done by Ptolemy, done by Tycho Brahe, done by Copernicus – something people may be more familiar with. But in a sense, all of those attempts to explain the motions of the planets, to explain the Solar System at

those

times, were extrapolations from a certain assumed method of thinking the way the universe functioned.

What Kepler did was fundamentally different, by actually making a discovery. He didn't just extrapolate, extend further, prior conceptions of how the solar system worked – how they thought it worked, how they assumed it worked, based on certain assumptions. He introduced a discovery, something that {he} generated, uniquely, as a creative thought, and that was what allowed mankind to know the solar system, not an extrapolation from observation, not an extrapolation from data, but an actual {discovery}.

I think that really goes to the core of what Mr. LaRouche has spent decades trying to address, which is that issue of {real creative discovery}, as opposed to {description}, as opposed to what gets discussed often as science today, which is much more empirical descriptions of observation, maybe coming up with certain formulas or certain descriptive relations that describe phenomena, {versus} the idea that there is something fundamentally {different} about what the human mind can generate as a completely new idea, which does not come from the observations, {per se}. Kepler is a very good example of that. Einstein is a very good example of that.

That's the kind of thinking that we need, if we're going to move the human species forward. I think that's Mr. LaRouche's point. We're at a point now, where, if we're going to move mankind in his natural, creative, human direction, it requires

these kinds of revolutionary discoveries of the very fundamental organization of the universe. That does not come from the type of so-called "science" that's often taught today, which, I think, is why Mr. LaRouche is highlighting Einstein as such a {critical} figure at this point, one of the last people who really had an insight into this fundamental difference between real human creative discovery and mere description, mere observation. A lot can be said about that.

I just want to cite one more example, before getting into maybe some discussion about this. Recently we just got, I think, a very interesting new, initial, preliminary of many of the stars surrounding us in our galaxy. This comes from the so-called Gaia satellite. What that Gaia satellite is doing now, is mapping very precisely the positions and the motions of a billion stars surrounding us. We'll have to wait a few years for the full map to be created. But this is a very exciting, very interesting mission that's going on right now. We're going to have a map of the motions – direct observations of the motions and the directions – of a billion stars surrounding us. This is going to give us the best observational data we've ever had about how our galaxy functions, how any galaxy functions, really. We're going to have direct measurements of a substantial – still small, but

substantial – sections of our galactic system as a whole. We will then be able to measure, with more accuracy than ever, how things are moving, where things are moving, what structures are there, how different structures are moving.

But, if we don't then continue to then put the emphasis on the issue of actual creative discovery, that's not going to do the trick. That's going to take us one step. I think the most apt comparison is Tycho Brahe had made the most accurate observations of the motions of the planets up to his time. But when he tried to explain the solar system, and how the planets moved, he just had another iteration, based on the same assumptions as his predecessors, as Copernicus, as Ptolemy. Even though he had the data, he didn't make the "discovery," to put it in very simple terms. Kepler did. Kepler was able to use that same data to actually make a discovery. He needed the data to do it, but it was something that {he} was able to generate in his own mind, that was the discovery, that was what allowed mankind to really change the way he exists in the universe, by moving to an understanding of the {principles} organizing the galactic system.

I think these are the kind of examples and reference points that we can look to today, for the kind of challenge we are facing now. We're part of this galaxy. This galaxy represents higher-order principles of organization of the universe as we understand it – the universe that we're a part of. Mankind, uniquely, can discover these things, but only when we recognize

that it's not just coming from observations or descriptions, but it is the issue of something unique about the human mind and creativity, that is the real substance of science.

I'm certainly no expert on Einstein, but Mr. LaRouche has put a large emphasis on the importance of Einstein's work. As far as I understand it, [Einstein is] one of the last – if not the last – leading scientist who really waged a fight on this issue, who really had some insight into the fact that there is something remarkable about the fact that the human mind can come to know the fundamental, unseen, organizing principles of the universe. I haven't seen Einstein reflect on his own work in this way, but I think it's rather interesting to just look at his work and the implication of his work on Relativity, where he shows that your basic ideas of space, of time, are not the way the universe is organized. To take it maybe closer to Mr. LaRouche's work, your sense-perceptual interpretation of the universe does not give you a direct understanding for how the universe is actually organized.

But there is something within mankind that's not from sense-perception, that's not just from observation, that's not just from descriptions of data, some potential that mankind has, to come to know the causes, the principles, that are not accessible to sense-perception. At the very heart of it, that is the substance of what enables mankind to be a unique species on

this planet. We talk about economics and growth and progress. It is those kinds of revolutions, not economic growth, [but] complete revolutions in what mankind is and what mankind can do on this planet, [that] fundamentally transforms the nature of our existence.

If you look at what level of society existed 1000 years ago, 2000 years ago, 10,000 years ago, to today; that's not just an incremental process of finding and exploiting new wealth, or something. That [progression] is a function of complete revolutions in the very fundamental way mankind relates to the universe. That is our mission today. That's something that's been attacked and written out of science, written out of education, largely, today: this critical issue of actual creative discovery.

Again, I think Mr. LaRouche has defined this and illustrated this better than anyone else I've ever seen: the intimate relation between {that} process and what really moves society forward, what really moves mankind forward.

The challenge that Mr. LaRouche put to us today, I think, is that we're at an historical moment. This is an historical victory. It's not completed, it's not over. There's still a {major} fight going on. But this opens up the potential to actually have some positive solutions. But those positive solutions are not what people normally think about, in terms of "positive solutions", in society today. It's not just about taking on the banks and giving some of their money to other people and redistributing the wealth. We're fighting on a much higher level. It's about how do we actually move human society forward, and what does that mean? That means these kinds of

issues: the genius of Einstein, the genius of Kepler; looking to the new areas – the galaxy, the far side of the Moon.

I know that's a very brief and general coverage of a lot of stuff. But I think that's some of the framework that we should discuss, because I think that's the real challenge we have, uniquely, as this organization – the LaRouche organization – to fight on that level. I'm sure that other people have some thoughts, but I think Mr. LaRouche definitely intervened with a very provocative and challenging focus today, and I think this is maybe a way to open it up and get the discussion going.

DIANE SARE: I just wanted to take a couple examples, because it is very provocative. In Einstein's letters, he makes the point. He said, of course there's a place for empirical evidence in science, but the more important the discovery, the smaller the role of empirical evidence is. When you think about, for example, Kepler, or his conception of the universe – which is a real challenge to think about what each one of us is, potentially, as a human being, and a great deal of faith in Reason, or what it means to be created in the image of the Creator – Kepler had an idea in his mind of a view of the solar system from the vantage point of standing on the Sun, as if you were on the Sun at the center, or slightly off-center, since we don't have circular orbits of the solar system.

Now think about, in his day, what that looked like.

Not only

had we never gone to the Moon, we didn't even have an automobile!

I mean, you're talking about the 1600's. So, how is it that Kepler has a conception of the solar system, as if perceived from

the Sun? And then his ability, in his own mind, to develop a conception of what that would mean, in terms of the relationships

among the planets, which Cusa, who was even earlier and did not

have the benefit of Tycho Brahe's observations, yet Cusa had a certain very clear hypothesis, simply through Reason, about the

way that the solar system could be ordered or had to be ordered,

just based on his ability to try and think as if he were the Creator. How might the Creator of the universe think about what

this is?

Similarly with Einstein, we had a discussion on one of the

Thursday night Fireside Chats. The caller clearly had read Einstein, and he said this seems more like an essay or a philosophical discussion, than what he would typically think of

as "hard science," because, similarly, Einstein was dealing with

Reason. In other words, we have not, so far, had a train that goes anywhere near the speed of light, and if one did, I'm not really sure how well you could see it, if you were standing on a

bank, trying to watch what was going on in such a train.

But Einstein was able to construct "experiments" {in his mind}, which may have been provoked by something was observed or

a phenomena that was not explained. The other thing that he said, which I found very provocative; he was writing a letter to a friend of his who was, I think, a physicist, and he said, "You know, I really admire the work that you do, because the best you can get, in scientific experiments, is 'Maybe.' That is, you can get an outright 'No,' like you have a hypothesis, you try to construct it, you try to demonstrate it, and the thing flops, and then you know that the universe definitely doesn't work {that} way. But, you could construct an experiment, and then you get the result that you're hypothesizing, and then you say, Okay, well it seems that, perhaps, the universe does work {this} way." And Einstein then, of course, says that "The best you get is a 'Maybe,' which always will ultimately will become a 'No," because, as science advances, then, ultimately, you will discover that what seemed to be true in your initial hypothesis, actually is not the whole truth at all."

Therefore, Mr. LaRouche's challenge to us today about developing new types of science. In other words, there are principles which, even to conceive of them, would require a leap beyond, and then the ability, almost, to look back on ourselves, as if from above, or as if from some future point, to determine what should be the next step.

JASON ROSS: I really liked what you had brought up from Einstein about how discoveries will rely less on empirical

data;

you had brought that up as something that he was saying, because

it's a great example. None of the things, many of the things he

predicted, it's not that things had been observed and no explanation was available, which he then came up with an explanation for. He did some of that. But the other thing he did was to forecast events occurring, forecast scientific experiments that could be performed that had never been seen before. People couldn't explain why Mercury's orbit moved the way that it did until Einstein; that was already a problem. But

nobody had seen light bend around the Sun and wondered why it occurred. Nobody had noticed that the kind of light emitted changed depending on the gravitational field it was emitted in.

These weren't problems that needed a solution; they were things

that Einstein – from very simple principles – realized would have to come about.

I think another thing that's very important about him is

that he was active in many other fields. In other words, he had

a very pervading sense of justice and of honesty, a disdain for

authority in the sense that he should come to his own conclusions

about things and then stick with them once he came to them.

This

is what made it possible for to do things like discard the notions of space and time that people had. This wasn't an easy

thing; it was a difficult concept to get, it was shocking to Einstein as well. But he realized that it had to be the case.

He also was very adamant in his day – see, people alive and

maybe some of our viewers can recall this; during Einstein's life, he was known as an outspoken political figure. He made commentary on political events all the time, and as far as the coverage that he got in newspapers, a lot of it was about what he

did with science; but a lot of it was about his stands on things.

For example, he said that academics should just refuse to testify

at the McCarthy hearings. He said, "Don't use the 5th Amendment

as an excuse, use the 1st! You should be able to say what you think and discuss ideas without being called to account by the government for it. What is this, Nazi Germany?" He saw the anti-Communist crusades being conducted as being very similar to

something he saw in Germany; where the Nazis began by taking out

the Communists.

OGDEN: It earned him a very extensive FBI file.

ROSS: Yes, an 1800-page FBI file, full of mostly crap.

Well, if you're trying to make someone good look bad, you're going to have to fill your file with a bunch of crap. It was astonishingly incompetent by the FBI, although maybe it's par for

the course for them.

The other thing, take racism, for example. This is something that he spoke frequently about; that he made an exception to his general tendency not to go to ceremonies at colleges to get honorary degrees. He had had enough; he found the ceremonies sort of obnoxious. But he made an exception to go

to what billed itself as the first institute for higher learning

for blacks in the United States – Lincoln University. He went there to get his honorary degree and lecture on relativity and on racism. So, he was a committed overall person, who also had his standards – I'll bring up one more topic – in music and culture. His use of the violin is famous; his affection for music is well-known. He played his violin at events, benefit concerts. Once when he was asked to give a speech, he said, "You know, I'm going to play my violin instead; I don't really have anything to add to what the other speakers said." So, he pulled it out and performed.

He lived at a time – think about this – the early 1900s, the first half of the 20th Century. This is a period that Lyndon LaRouche has identified as a willful destruction of culture – both in science with the replacement of science by mathematics, and culturally after the death of Brahms by a changing basis of what it would mean to be culture or to be music. Where anything goes, and Stravinsky's "Rite of Spring", which invites the audience to join him in a murder of a virgin to satisfy the gods, is considered to be art in just the same way that Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the {Ode to Joy}, the sense that all men are brothers, is art. So, a rejection of reason in the domain of culture; a rejection of reason in the domain of science.

I'll just end with one example on that, which is the field of quantum study; where Einstein, although really pioneering the field of quantum physics, towards the end of his life was seen

as
an outcast because he held to the notion that fundamentally
the
universe is real and that it's reasonable. Those concepts
were
rejected in what became prevalent quantum mechanics, by his
friend Nils Bohr, for example; who said that because of what
seems to be a lack of determination or of cause when we look
at
processes in the very small, we would have to abandon that
concept. We would have to abandon the concept that there is a
real world independent of our observations. In a very crude
way,
what becomes science, is going right back to what Ben had
mentioned about Tyco Brahe; science is set back to the idea
that
what can we say about things that we observe. That was the
view
of Heisenberg, for example. What can we say about
observations
we might make? And throw away the idea that there's something
real underneath it; something real that's susceptible to human
reason and that should make sense to us as a human-like idea;
the
same way that was attacked in culture. So, I think those are
several other reasons that Einstein absolutely stands out as a
scientific genius and as an incredibly moral person, who
allowed
his convictions and his honesty to guide in other fields as
well.
Who didn't limit himself to being a scientist, but in fact
used
the notoriety he received from what he had done in that field
to
advance other causes that he thought the world needed to take
on.

MICHAEL STEGER: Yeah, I think you'd be hard pressed to find someone, if they're a scientific genius, if they're not of a higher moral quality. The discussion so far I think has been very relevant, because over the course of the last 30 days, we have clearly gone into a different period. We are at a point that mankind has never been before. That's not simply from the standpoint of a timeline perspective; we are at a qualitative — these last 30 days have seen a qualitative transformation in the condition of mankind. But that cannot be measured from past events; it can't be measured based on anything mankind has ever experienced before. It has to be measured on where we're now going to take this new condition of mankind. What is going to be the direction? What is the scope or perspective of mankind's actions in the universe? What new discoveries, what new principles will be discovered that create the conditions for mankind to substantiate and develop an entirely new human species? The level of coordination on this planet now among nations is of an extraordinary level; one that's unprecedented. That major nations on the planet today have a capability of coordinating the most broad and in-depth scientific and technological revolution that mankind has ever seen, among billions of human beings. That is something that is beyond unprecedented; it is a fundamental shift in the universe itself. This recent expression of humanity within the US Congress only typifies what more is possible; because we are now in a condition. What China has established with its space program, and the capability that you have within the major nations; you see endeavors by India, by Russia, by nations of South America,

Africa, Europe. And really a revival of the United States towards this question of what is mankind in the universe. These bigger questions ultimately, in the pursuit of discoveries as we've seen with Kepler and Einstein, ultimately have to shape the policies themselves that coordinate the development of our nation and of mankind as a whole.

This New Silk Road perspective is now becoming an entrenched factor for a growing majority of the population on the planet. Over 4 billion people are already encompassed by the policy. This will likely take another billion people out of poverty over the course of the next 20 years; and that would be at a slow pace. If the United States immediately moves under these kinds of financial breakdown circumstances that are ongoing now; this system – as Mr. LaRouche said yesterday – the crash is on. It's coming; it's here. It's not something you have to argue; it's not something you have to look for indications. It's practically right in front of your face; that's partly why most people can't see it. There is that quality of shift, and under these kinds of circumstances, the question does come up. We are looking at, that what we know of mankind thus far is insufficient; we have to call upon the creative scientists and artists of our society and of the world to participate in a re-conceiving of mankind's new future. I think this is really the endeavor; if you look at individuals like Brunelleschi or Cusa.

We had a discussion with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche a few weeks

ago. This question of, it almost seems as if it comes out of the blue; a new quality of human identity emerges. Something that no one had ever even conceived of before, and yet once it's introduced and takes hold, it seems as if it's the most natural characteristic. Yet, it's a fundamental leap. The characteristic of mankind since the Italian Renaissance, the level of population growth, the potential density of mankind on this planet and in the universe fundamentally changed; it's an undeniable empirical fact that that had happened. Yet, the cause of it was the unleashing of mankind's new creative potential. I think that's the responsibility that we have as a nation and as a species for the future of mankind; to unfold that characteristic of mankind. I think what Ben raised on the galaxy ultimately captures it; because as the Solar System did for Kepler, the galaxy today presents that next unfolding of the universe in its discovery for us. We are at a new era of mankind; and we must move so rapidly to consolidate that potential, because it's something that requires constant creative input and discovery. It will never rest on its own. It will require from this day forward, a higher quality of creative thought than mankind has thus far been capable of generating.

I think as we probably all agree, Mr. LaRouche has been the key figure in initiating this potential and this possibility. But it's something that really lies upon all of us to continue

and to advance. So, I'll leave my comments there; perhaps there are some other thoughts.

OGDEN: One of the things that Jason mentioned, the role that music played as an integral part of Einstein's identity, is something that can't be overestimated. I think it's often very underestimated, even though it's a well-known fact among some circles. I think the other thing that cannot be underestimated is the role that the music program that's been initiated by Mr. LaRouche and others who are on this discussion here today, has played in changing the United States. One thing that's very clear, is that nobody really expected this great victory that occurred this week to happen; it kind of came out of the blue. I don't think that the Obama White House really expected that Congress was going to grow a spine and stand up to him and deliver this kind of rebuke. I don't think the Saudis were expecting that they were going to have to pull out \$5 million and all the stops and try to intimidate Congress at the very last minute. Where did it come from? I think it's an ingredient that people might not understand when they have their heads in the practical world of politics. And it's very much what happened two weeks ago up in New York City. A series of concerts of the Mozart {Requiem} and four African-American spirituals that were performed by the Schiller Institute chorus; and performed in memory of the victims of 9/11, but also for the cause of justice.

To remoralize those people who, for the last 15 years, have been so beaten down by the Bush-Obama paradigm; to remoralize them and to create that surge of optimism for victory that was required to secure what happened this week. We know that Terry Strada herself was involved in and was personally present at one of those concerts, and gave a very impassioned speech beforehand on the necessity for securing all-out victory on the fight for JASTA against Obama. But we were told by some of the members of the 9/11 Families this week, that the sound of those concerts was still ringing in their ears; and I think that is something that has had an effect in New York City and a radiating effect across the entirety of the United States. Which is compounded by the victory that occurred this week, but it's inseparable; those two elements. I know, Diane, tonight in New York, John Sigerson – who was the conductor of that series of concerts – is going to be giving a presentation on the scientific rigor, the scientific principles underlying truthful musical performance with the unique Verdi tuning that those performances were presented at. I think this is going to be a sort of continual echo back and forth; the political victories and the musical accomplishments that have occurred and will continue to occur, emanating out of the Manhattan Project.

SARE: I think a part of the power of the music is like making a scientific discovery. When you participate in

something

which is actually beautiful in the most scientific sense of beauty, you are reminded of your identity as a human being.

When

we remind ourselves of that principle of what it actually means

to be human, there are certain forms of injustice which simply are not tolerable. Things that would make us scared on a lower

level if you think of yourself as an animal, or you think of your

life's value being dependent on how much money you earn, or what

your status is in society, or what kind of clothing you can wear;

then you have a lot to be fearful about. But, if you are reminded that what makes us human, what is actually lasting is a

quality which is invisible; which is both in the domain of science as Einstein understood it, and in classical composition;

then these other things seem trivial, and there are higher principles which become far more important. I think that's why

music was such an integral part of the civil rights movement, for

example; where people had extraordinary courage in the face of extreme violence and torture. Music, explicitly Beethoven, was

crucial in the freedom movements of 1989 when the Berlin Wall came down. I think it is going to be crucial today for the United States to come into embodying what our nation was actually

intended to be by the Founding Fathers. Because we are, after all, a revolutionary republic. You might not think that if you

look at the last two administrations, but the intent of our

republic actually was completely revolutionary; the idea of a nation which is not based particularly on a land area or a religion or some other construct, but on the idea of human creativity as being the generator of so-called wealth. So, I think that's true. Tonight we'll see what occurs, but John is very creative; and I think it's very useful that we're going to develop this process of our musical collaborators not only appreciating the work that we've done, but beginning to get insights as to why a group of political organizers would be able to pull off what is seen by many as a very high quality and unique quality of performance; which has to do with this kind of approach to the music, as opposed to the typical, lower level technical or whatever idea. So, I think this will be quite interesting, and will further advance the work.

OGDEN: Well, I think that embodies and typifies exactly what the question that's been opened up today is. I know some of the work that Ben was presenting was to be a little bit more elaborated and something that you're working on writing, and I know will be explored further in some of these upcoming shows that we'll be doing on this channel. So, this is meant to open up a lot of questions, and to engage your mind in this process; not to have the answers to all the questions, but to ask them. And make these kinds of breakthroughs in terms of the discoveries that are yet to occur. So, as Mr. LaRouche said, "The most important question facing mankind at this moment is: What are the existing potentials which must be developed if we are to give mankind a future?"

So, with that said, I think we can celebrate our victories,
but we can anticipate even greater victories in the future. I would like to thank all of you for joining us here today. Thank you to Jason and Ben, and to both Michael and Diane. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and good night.

Lyndon LaRouche: »Dette er en dødsens alvorlig sag. Få denne tilsidesættelse af Obamas veto mod JASTA i hus!« Uddrag af LPAC Fredags- webcast, 23/9 2016

... hvis Obama fører sit veto ud i livet, så bør han omgående afsættes ved en rigsretssag. Dette er i den grad en handling med åbenlyst og vidende forræderi imod ikke alene 11. september-familierne, men imod De forenede Stater som helhed.

»Det er forkasteligt, at én mand kan stå imellem retfærdighed for mordet på 3000 mennesker, og så denne lovs ikrafttræden«. Kristen Brightweiser, 11. september-enke.

Matthew Ogden: God eftermiddag! Det er den 23. sept., 2016.

Jeg er Matthew Ogden, og jeg vil gerne byde jer alle velkommen til en særlig udsendelse her fra LaRouchePAC.com her fredag *eftermiddag*. Vi udsender *tidligere* end vi plejer; kl. er 4:00 Eastern Time (1:00 Pacific Time), fordi vi befinder os midt i et opgør i Washington, D.C., hvor hvert minut tæller.

Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Jeff Steinberg fra *Executive Intelligence Review*; og via video har vi med os Elliot Greenspan, koordinator for LaRouchePAC-aktiviteter i New York City.

Som I alle ved, så befinder vi os netop nu i en nedtælling til »sandhedens time«. Fra og med kl. 1:00-2:00 her i eftermiddag, under Det hvide Hus' pressebriefing, står det klart, at [præsident] Obama vil nedlægge veto mod JASTA-loven (Senatslov 2040). Vi vil straks skrive telefonnummeret på skærmen, så I kan ringe til Kongressen og komme i kontakt med senatorerne og kongresmedlemmerne (i Repræsentanternes Hus, *-red.*) fra jeres stat, så I kan være mobiliserede *under vores udsendelse*. I skal slet ikke udsætte det. Ring. Sørg for, at jeres stemme bliver hørt. Sig til hvert enkelt kongresmedlem, at han/hun skal være stærk i sin forpligtelse over for at gøre Obamas veto ugyldigt. [Capitols omstillingsbord: 202-224-3131]

Trods *utroligt* pres, trusler, løgne, penge, intimidering fra den saudiske lobby-maskine og fra Det hvide Hus direkte, så står Kongressen, under den sidste optælling på Capitol Hill, stadig til at gøre Loven for Retsforfølgelse af Sponsorere af Terrorisme (den såkaldte JASTA) ugyldig og levere en særdeles historisk første tilsidesættelse af et veto i hele Obamas præsidentskab. Tidligere på dagen havde *New York Times* en artikel, »Obama er på kanten til at få en skarp irttesættelse, han længe har undgået – en tilsidesættelse af sit veto«.

Det, som dækningen har tydeliggjort, er, at dette har været en total kamp bag scenen. Jeg vil gerne meget, meget hurtigt læse blot lige indledningen til en *NYT*-artikel, der udkom onsdag

den 21. sept., med overskriften, »Kamp mellem saudier og 11. september-familier eskaleres i Washington«. Jeg synes, det giver et dramatisk overblik over nøjagtigt, hvad det er, der er foregået bag scenen, og i offentlighedens lys, i løbet af blot disse par dage i denne uge. Artiklen starter således:

»Mandag indkaldte en samling lobbyister for Saudi-Arabien, der har brugt mere end \$5 million i det forgangne år på at købe indflydelse i Washington, til et krisemøde, for at forsøge at standse en lovgivning, der vil gøre det muligt for familierne til ofre for 11. september-angrebene at sagsøge den saudiske regering for enhver rolle, den måtte have spillet i den forbryderiske plan.

Tirsdag demonstrerede 11. september-familierne, hvis sagsanlæg til mange milliarder dollars varetages af advokater inkl. Jack Quinn, en forhenværende rådgiver til Det hvide Hus, for at lægge pres på præsident Obama om ikke at nedlægge veto mod loven, som han har lovet at gøre.

Onsdag kom disse to magtfulde kræfter, den ene, der operer i skyggerne, og den anden mere åbent, sammen på Capitol Hill til kulminationen af en af de største og mest følelsesladede lobby-stridigheder i hele året. Kampen reflekterer 11. september-familiernes vedvarende dominans i Washington, og den skrumpende indflydelse her af Saudi-Arabien, der engang uhindret promoverede sin dagsorden i Vestfløjen og i korridorerne af Kongressen.«

Jeg mener, at det er meget tydeligt, at der er sket det, at 11. september-familierne – men også andre borgere, inklusive de af jer, der ser med i dag på denne udsendelse – har spillet en central rolle i at bære ved til dette opgør. Dette opgør er, trods \$5 mio. i saudiske lobby- penge, blevet næret af aktivismen hos borgere som jer selv. Og derfor er det, at vi beder jer om lige nu, hvis I ikke allerede har ringet jeres repræsentant i Kongressen op, at ringe lige med det samme – 202-224-3121 – for at sige: »Tilsidesæt det veto af JASTA-

loven, som Obama truer med.«

Dette kunne ikke være tydeligere end under de demonstrationer, der fandt sted foran Det hvide Hus tirsdag morgen, og foran USA's Senat senere på dagen, med medlemmerne af 11. september-familierne og andre. Vi har nogle videoklip fra **pressekonferencen**, der fandt sted på Senats-siden af Capitol tirsdag eftermiddag, hvor Terry Strada, Kaitlin Strada og Alison Crowther – alle tre medlemmer af 11. september-familierne – og ligeledes senator [Richard] Blumenthal totalt smadrede og pillede ned de løgne, der kom ud af Obama-administrationen og den saudiske lobby-maskine.

Men, før vi kommer til det, vil jeg bede Jeff Steinberg om, ganske kort, at fortælle os, hvad LaRouches marchordre for dette øjeblik er, stedt over for Obamas forestående trussel om et veto af JASTA-loven. Dernæst vil vi afspille klippet fra pressekonferencen. Jeg vil give ordet til Jeff til en sammenfatning af hr. LaRouches kommentarer tidligere på dagen:

Jeff Steinberg: Det er temmelig lige ud ad landevejen. Han sagde simpelt hen, at, hvis Obama fører sit veto ud i livet, så bør han omgående afsættes ved en rigsretssag. Dette er i den grad en handling med åbenlyst og vidende forræderi imod ikke alene 11. september-familierne, men imod De forenede Stater som helhed.

En af nyhedshistorierne i dag sagde, at, hvis Obama fører dette veto ud i livet, så tager han, atter engang, terroristernes side imod USA's interesser.

I Forordet til USA's Forfatning er ét af præsidentens fremmeste ansvar, at forsvare De forenede Staters nationale sikkerhed: »at sikre det fælles forsvar«, og at »fremme det almene vel«, og hvis præsident Obama ikke kan se, hvorfor det er i alle amerikaneres og alle menneskers overhængende interesse, i hele verden, som rent faktisk ønsker at nedkæmpe denne terroristsvøbe, der udgår fra saudisk wahhabisme og fra

den saudiske kongefamilie, ja, så må de hellere tænke over, hvad implikationerne af dette er.

Så hr. LaRouches »marchordrer« er ganske enkle: Få denne tilsidesættelse af Obamas veto i hus. Mobilisér jeres senator; mobilisér jeres repræsentant i Kongressen. Men oven i dette bør enhver, der ikke er sikker på, hvad implikationerne af et Obama-veto er, tænke længe og hårdt, og bør gå med i det kor, der omgående må kræve hans afsættelse fra embedet gennem en rigsretssag. Dette er en dødsens alvorlig sag, og dette er det skridt, der må tages.

Hele webcastet, inkl. engelsk udskrift, kan ses her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14887>

»Det er forkasteligt, at én mand kan stå imellem retfærdighed for mordet på 3000 mennesker, og så denne lovs ikrafttræden«.
Kristen Brightweiser, 11. september-enke.
LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast, 23. sept. 2016.

Som I alle ved, så befinder vi os netop nu i en nedtælling til »sandhedens time«. Fra og med kl. 1:00-2:00 her i eftermiddag, under Det hvide Hus' pressebriefing, står det klart, at [præsident] Obama vil nedlægge veto mod JASTA-loven (Senatslov 2040). Vi vil straks skrive telefonnummeret på skærmen, så I kan ringe til Kongressen og komme i kontakt med senatorerne og kongresmedlemmerne (i Repræsentanternes Hus, -red.) fra jeres stat, så I kan være mobiliserede under vores udsendelse. I skal slet ikke udsætte det. Ring. Sørg for, at jeres stemme bliver hørt. Sig til hvert enkelt kongresmedlem, at han/hun skal være stærk i sin forpligtelse over for at gøre Obamas veto ugyldigt. [Capitols omstillingsbord: 202-224-3131]

Et længere, dansk uddrag vil blive udlagt på hjemmesiden senere i dag.

Engelsk udskrift:

"IT IS REPREHENSIBLE THAT ONE MAN IS STANDING BETWEEN JUSTICE FOR THE MURDER OF 3000 PEOPLE AND THIS LEGISLATION BECOMING LAW."

—

Kristen Brightweiser, 9/11 widow

LaRouche PAC International Webcast Sept. 23, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon! It's September 23rd, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to welcome all of you to a special broadcast here from LaRouchepac.com on Friday {afternoon}. We are broadcasting {early} our regularly scheduled webcast this week at 4:00 Eastern Time (1:00 pm Pacific Time)

because we are in the midst of a showdown in Washington, D.C., where every minute counts.

I'm joined in the studio by Jeff Steinberg, from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and we're joined via video by Elliot Greenspan, coordinator for LaRouche PAC activities in New York City.

As all of you know, we're in the countdown to the "moment of truth" right now. As of 1:00-2:00 this afternoon, during the White House press briefing, it remains clear that [President] Obama is committed to vetoing the JASTA Bill (Senate Bill 2040).

We're going to put, right now, the phone number on the screen for

you to call in to Congress in order to contact the Senators and

Representatives from your State, in order for you to be mobilized

{during the show}. Don't even delay. Call in. Make sure that your

voice is heard. Tell every single Member of Congress to remain strong in their commitment to override Obama's veto. [Capitol Switchboard: 202-224-3131]

This Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (or JASTA,

so-called), despite {unbelievable} pressure, threats, lies, money, intimidation coming from the Saudi lobbying machine and from the White House directly, at last reading on Capitol Hill,

Congress is still set to override this veto, delivering a very historic first veto override of Obama's entire Presidency.

There's a {New York Times} article just earlier today, "Obama is

on the cusp of a rebuke he has long avoided – a veto override."

What's become clear from the coverage, is that this

has been
an all-out battle behind the scenes. Very, very quickly I'd
like
to read just the beginning of a {New York Times} that came out
on
Wednesday, September 21st, which was headlined "Fight Between
Saudis and 9/11 Families Escalates in Washington." I think
this
gives a dramatic overview of exactly what has gone down behind
the scenes, and in public view, during the course of just the
few
days that have occurred this week. It reads, in the beginning:

"On Monday, a constellation of lobbyists for Saudi
Arabia,
which has spent more than \$5 million this past year to buy
influence in Washington, called a crisis meeting to try to
stop
legislation allowing the families of victims of the Sept. 11
attacks to sue the Saudi government for any role in the plot.

"On Tuesday, the 9/11 families, represented in their
multibillion-dollar lawsuits by lawyers including Jack Quinn,
a
former White House counsel with deep relationships in
Washington,
demonstrated outside the White House to pressure President
Obama
not to veto the legislation, as he has vowed to do.

"On Wednesday, these two powerful forces, one
operating in
the shadows and the other more in the open, converged on
Capitol
Hill in the culmination of one of the biggest and most
emotional
lobbying fights of the year. The battle is a reflection of the
enduring dominance in Washington of the 9/11 families and the
diminishing clout here of Saudi Arabia, which once advanced

its

agenda unencumbered in the West Wing and corridors of Congress."

Now, I think it's very clear that what has happened, is the central role that the 9/11 families – but also other citizens, including those of you who are watching this broadcast here today – have played in fueling this showdown. This showdown has been fueled, despite \$5 million in Saudi lobbying money, by the activism of citizens like you. And that's why we're asking you, {right now}, if you haven't called in to your Congressmen, to call right now – 202-224-3121 – to say "Override Obama's threatened veto of JASTA."

This couldn't have been made more clear than during the rallies that occurred in front of the White House on Tuesday morning, and later in the day in front of the United States Senate, by members of the 9/11 families and others. We do have some clips from the press conference that occurred on the Senate side of the Capitol on Tuesday afternoon, where Terry Strada, Kaitlyn Strada, Alison Crowther – all three members of the 9/11 families – and also Sen. [Richard] Blumenthal absolutely demolished and debunked the lies that were coming out of the Obama Administration and the Saudi lobbying machine.

But before we get to that, I'd like to just very briefly ask Jeff Steinberg to say, in brief, what Mr. LaRouche's marching orders for this moment were, in the face of Obama's upcoming threatened veto of the JASTA Bill. And then we will play this press conference clip. So, Jeff, I'm going to let you just summarize what Mr. LaRouche's comments were today.

JEFF STEINBERG: It's pretty straight forward. He just simply

said that if Obama goes ahead with this veto, then he should be immediately impeached. This is such an act of overt and witting treason against not just the 9/11 families, but against the United States as a whole.

One of the news accounts today said that if Obama goes ahead with his veto, then once again he's siding with the terrorists, against the interests of the United States.

In the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution, one of the first responsibilities of the President is to defend the national security of the United States: to "provide for the common defense, and to "promote the general Welfare," and if President Obama cannot see why it is in the urgent interests of all Americans, and of anyone around the world, who wants to actually fight against this terrorist scourge emanating from Saudi Wahhabism and from the Saudi Royal Family, then they basically better think about what the implications of this are.

So, Mr. LaRouche's "marching orders" are very simple: Get the veto override. Mobilize your Senator, mobilize your Representative. But, on top of that, anyone who is unclear about the strategic implications of an Obama veto, should think long and hard and should join in the chorus that must immediately demand his impeachment from office. This is a dead serious matter, and that's the step that must be taken.

OGDEN: Great! We're going to elaborate a little bit more on the context of that a little bit later. Also, with the developments that are occurring internationally. But right

now, I want to play a very short excerpt from the speeches of Terry Strada, Kaitlyn Strada, Alison Crowther, and Sen. Blumenthal, where they debunk every single media propaganda line that you're going to hear coming from the White House and the Saudi lobbying machine on the subject of the JASTA Bill. So, here's that excerpt:

TERRY STRADA: In our quest for the truth, accountability, and justice for the murder of my husband and the thousands of other innocent souls lost and injured, my colleagues and I have worked tirelessly with Congress for over four years advocating for the 9/11 families in support of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA).

I am frustrated, angry, and tired of the mis-truths being carelessly spewed about this legislation, and I am here today to set the record straight. The President's rationales to veto JASTA hold no weight. They are 100% wrong. The issues the White House and [unclear: 0:08:35.4] are raising now, concerns of reciprocal laws or lawsuits, have all been considered, repeatedly, and addressed.

This issue about the possibility of threats of reciprocal laws and lawsuits is a kneejerk reaction, raised by all novices looking at the Bill, until they actually read the text and consider the policies. Then, only those who would favor Saudi

interests seem to cling to the mis-truths. Those who favor sound, anti-terror-financing policies, support JASTA.

The most recent statement from the White House Press Secretary, Josh Earnest, last Monday, when he told the White House press corps that there were concerns about judges all over the country designating terror organizations for U.S. sanctions, is nonsensical. No judge overseeing a civil jury trial for injuries would ever be imposing U.S. sanctions. That is simply outlandish.

To be crystal clear: JASTA does not and cannot have anything to do with suing our diplomats. That issue is controlled by something entirely different from JASTA – the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. And, if {I} know it, I suspect the White House knows this, too.

Very importantly, JASTA has nothing to do with whether a private citizen, or even a private company, can be sued for alleged wrong-doing. JASTA deals with immunity of foreign States.

So, the White House's press comments that enacting JASTA will threaten suits against the U.S. – which Mr. Earnest emphasized as a risk of JASTA – are categorically untrue. I am sure the White House knows that, too.

And most importantly, our military is not at risk for being sued if JASTA is enacted. The narrow text of JASTA, like our legal history, specifically distinguishes between acts of war and acts of terrorism. The text of the Bill, for anyone who cares to read it – and it is surprisingly short – specifically excludes

acts of war. I'm sure the White House knows that, too.

No one who seriously opposes terrorism disagrees with a bill that at its core, accuses no one. All JASTA does, is simply ask those accused of sponsoring terrorist attacks on U.S. soil, to answer on the merits and to stand account for those accusations.

For us, the 9/11 families and survivors, all we're asking for is an opportunity to have our case heard in a courtroom. Denying us justice is un-American. In our case, the existing and still growing mountain of evidence against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, demands that they address those accusations, if for nothing else, to normalize our relations with a nation that claims to be our ally.

I would suggest, that if the Kingdom had no part in the horrific attacks of 9/11, they should welcome the opportunity to address the allegations head-on, and fix our relationship. Instead, they have hired dozens of highly-paid lobbyists, who roam the halls of Congress, intimidating our Members of Congress, and trying to strong-arm our legislative process. This, too, is un-American.

We, the 9/11 community, have suffered far too long at the hands of far too many that would prevent us from seeking accountability before a jury of our peers. Neither the President, nor Congress, nor the lobbyists for foreign kingdoms should be permitted to make us wait another day to pass JASTA.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: The basic objective here is to hold accountable wrong-doers and law-breakers and evil-doers. Because that is the rule of law. Behind that over-arching, seemingly abstract ideal, is a loop-hole in the law. And it's a modest loop-hole. The loop-hole is that a foreign actor or agent can commit an atrocity in this country, but be immune from any kind of legal accountability if the aiding and abetting is done outside our boundaries. That's basically what may well be shown in a court of law about the Saudi agents or operatives who aided and abetted the 9/11 terrorists. There's a basic principle here. If a foreign agent or actor gives a bag of money or a ton of explosives to someone who then does harm in our country, and it happens outside the country, there still should be legal accountability. That's a loop-hole that Congress never intended.

Take an analogy: If another country launched a missile from [within] its borders, from its soil, that blew up an American citizen, nobody would say, "Well, that's okay, because they did it within their own borders." And the same principle applies here. A foreign government that aids and abets an act of terror that does harm in our country, should be held accountable, even if those actions occurred outside our borders.

I want to deal with the reasons given to oppose this measure. And I want to say, with great respect to the President of the United States, that he has a different perspective. He

conducts our nation's diplomacy. I respect him and his office and his reasons for opposing this measure. But I disagree. Strongly, and powerfully, with those reasons.

If the Saudi Government is innocent, it has nothing to fear from a day in court. If it is culpable, it should be held accountable. And there is mounting evidence, revealed in the 28 pages, kept secret for so long, about potential Saudi complicity.

So, I'm urging the President, as I did in a letter with my colleague Sen. [Chuck] Schumer about ten days ago, to sign this measure, and I believe that there are now, and there will be, well more than the necessary votes to override this veto. It was unanimously passed, and I believe it will be overwhelmingly approved again, if need be.

KAITLYN STRADA: After hearing our cries for justice, our US Senate and House of Representatives unanimously passed legislation called the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act – JASTA. This bill would give me and thousands of other children who lost their parents on 9/11, the opportunity to see some degree of accountability. JASTA does not determine whether the accused foreign state is actually responsible; the accused just wouldn't get a free pass on accountability. Under existing law, a foreign state alleged to be responsible for a car wreck has no free pass and must face the music; the same should be for

terrorist attacks that kill or cause injury to Americans on US soil. It is the right thing.

So, I am imploring Congress to override the President's impending veto, and help my family and all the 9/11 families and survivors seek the justice we deserve. Fifteen years is far too long for us to have to wait already. The veto should be overridden at [the] first opportunity, and we should not be forced to wait a day longer. Please show that you, our elected officials, stand on {our} side; that of the American citizens. Do not yield to the pressure of powerful foreign influences looking to escape accountability. It's past time to enact JASTA.

ALISON CROWTHER: I've come here today along with many other 9/11 families and victims in support of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. The purpose of this act is to hold accountable individuals in nations that fund terrorist activities in our country. JASTA, if passed, will open pathways to choke off foreign sources of funding and bankrupt terrorism. We first and foremost exhort President Obama to approve JASTA. We are engaged in an insidious war of hearts and minds; an epic battle for the soul of humanity. To quote President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "The only thing we have to fear, is fear itself." If we allow fear of potential consequences to rule over right action, the bad guys will win. JASTA is a weapon in our nonviolent arsenal to

fight against those who would intentionally target and
perpetrate
heinous crimes against innocent men, women, children, and the
unborn. If President Obama decides to veto JASTA, we trust
that
the Senate and House, who represent the will of the 9/11
families
and the citizens of our great country, will stand by their
unanimous convictions and override a Presidential veto of
JASTA
without delay. Thank you very much.

OGDEN: Now while you were watching that video, we
received a
breaking news announcement; and I'm going to let Jeff announce
to
you what has just developed.

STEINBERG: At 4:27 this afternoon, President Obama
signed
the veto of JASTA. Which now means that the onus is on all of
you
and on the members of the US Senate and then the US House of
Representatives to deliver a unanimous rebuke to a President
who
puts his future business dealings with Saudi Arabia and his
commitment to cover up the crimes of 9/11, ahead of the
interests
of the American people. This is a shameful moment for the
institution of the Presidency; and I hope all of you will take
that absolutely seriously and do your part as citizens. As Mr.
LaRouche said, "This is an unconscionable act by President
Obama
that deserves his immediate impeachment. But first and
foremost,
he's got to be delivered a brutal message by the Congress, by
the

Senate; but first by you, the American people that this is thoroughly unacceptable. He will go down in infamy for this hideous act on his part."

I just want to amplify a little bit what the stakes are in this fight. We all know that 2,997 people perished on 9/11; but the death and destruction from that event continues to this day. I want to read you a news item that I wrote earlier this afternoon, just before coming to the studio; and I think you'll understand why this is an appropriate thing to be reading to you right now.

"On the weekend of the 15th anniversary of the September 11, 2001 attacks earlier this month, {Newsweek} magazine published an extensive report on the tens of thousands of New Yorkers and other first responders who are suffering severe medical conditions as the result of their heroics following the 9/11 attacks. The {Newsweek} story was graphically headlined, '9/11's Second Wave; Cancer and Other Diseases Linked to the 2001 Attacks Are Surging'. While much of the article was devoted to heartbreaking case studies of the first responders who are now either dead or are suffering serious illnesses as the result of their efforts, the statistics provided in the article are harrowing, and reveal the extent to which the consequences of the 9/11 attacks continue to take lives."

This is a quote from {Newsweek}: "'Doctors with the World Trade Center Health Program, which the Federal government

created

in the aftermath of the attacks, have linked nearly 70 types of

cancer to Ground Zero. Many people have fallen victim to cancers

their doctors are rare, aggressive, and particularly hard to treat.' More than 411 emergency rescue workers died in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center;

and that number has reached 1064 as of July 2016, according to data that {Newsweek} obtained from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and OSHA. But the full account is staggering: 'As many as 400,000 people are estimated to be affected by diseases such as cancers and mental illnesses linked

to September 11th.' 400,000. That figure includes those who lived

and worked within a mile and a half of Ground Zero in Manhattan

and Brooklyn. The vast majority of whom still don't know they're

at risk. Mark Farfel, director of the World Trade Center Health

Registry, which tracks the health of more than 71,000 rescue workers and survivors, says 'Many people don't connect the symptoms they have today to September 11th.'

"Dr. Michael Crane, director of a clinic at Mount Sinai

Hospital which treats 22,000 rescue and recovery workers from 9/11, told {Newsweek} that of the 75,000 people enrolled in the

World Trade Center's Health Program, 5,441 have been diagnosed with 9/11 cancers. {Newsweek} reported that 'Today, 15 years after the attacks, doctors are starting to understand why people

are still dying. When the towers came down, they say, they released a massive plume of carcinogens; turning lower

Manhattan

into a cesspool of cancer and deadly disease.'

"A National Resources Defense Council report issued soon

after the 9/11 attacks estimated that the North Tower alone released 400 tons of asbestos into the atmosphere, along with lead, mercury, volatile organic compounds, and deadly poisons.

Among New York City firefighters, the cancer rate after 9/11 increased by between 19% and 30% over pre-9/11 rates. The Environmental Protection Agency, however, issued a report one week after the 9/11 attacks, declaring that the air within a 16-acre area around Ground Zero was safe to breathe. An EPA Inspector General's report in 2003 found that there was no basis

for EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman making that statement. The IG report concluded, 'The White House Council on

Environmental Quality influenced, through the collaborative process, the information that the EPA communicated to the public

through its early press releases when it convinced the EPA to add

reassuring statements and delete cautionary ones.' So far, at least 1140 people who lived and worked in the immediate vicinity

of Ground Zero, have died from diseases brought on by the attack;

and that number is incomplete. An unknown number of first responders and those who were in the immediate area of Ground Zero, are suffering from mental illnesses similar to the PTSD suffered by returning Iraq and Afghan war veterans."

So, the body count is continuing, and therefore, the magnitude of the President's crime in failing to sign JASTA into

law, is that much greater.

OGDEN: Now, we had a memorial series of concerts that

was

sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture,

and members of the Schiller Institute chorus participated in these two weeks ago. This was the context in which Terry Strada

made some very prescient remarks in the prelude to the Monday concert that occurred in Morristown, New Jersey; at which she said Obama is nothing but a spokesman for the Saudi regime.

And

despite overwhelming pressure from the entire Congress, from the

American people, Obama and a lot of the other members of the Saudi lobbying machine have acted on orders from Riyadh and from

London to shut down the JASTA bill. The threats have been immense. The kinds of blackmail and intimidation – including the

European Union entering this discussion and saying that this would be a systemic crisis; the European Union said, "harm to the

international order, if the JASTA bill were to take effect."

So, as you can see, the activities of the LaRouche Movement

in collaboration with the 9/11 Families and other citizen activists have really, really changed the course of history and

have put the entire Obama-Saudi-London establishment on the rails.

STEINBERG: I want to say something about this EU issue,

because people may remember that President Obama was in London prior to the Brexit vote that took place in June, and intervened

into the internal political affairs of Britain; by basically threatening that if Brexit passed, then Britain's role as a

critical ally of the United States within the European Union would be diminished. It was considered to be a crass and really impolitic intervention. The idea that the White House clearly solicited this comment from the European Union, I hope will have a backlash effect on legislators and all of you out there, and that the message will be that this kind of foreign interference is a slap at the sovereignty of the United States and it should assure that the overwhelming vote of both Houses of Congress goes to overriding President Obama's shameful veto.

Yesterday, at hearings on Capitol Hill, Defense Secretary Ash Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Joseph Dunford lied through their teeth shamelessly; and claimed that the passage of JASTA would jeopardize the security of American soldiers overseas. As you heard from Senator Blumenthal, these arguments are preposterous; they're the height of sophistry, and they reflect the actual morality of this administration. This is disgusting.

OGDEN: I'm going to hand it over to Elliott right now in New York City. The activity on the ground is intense, both in terms of forcing an override on this JASTA veto; but also activity on ushering in a New Paradigm, a new international economic order, which is now on the table for discussion at the United Nations General Assembly meeting. So, I'm going to let Elliott say a

little more about the situation there.

ELLIOTT GREENSPAN: Thank you, Matt. Let me begin by picking up on what you indicated. Four concerts – this is now two weeks ago – four concerts; a living memorial to the 3000 who perished on 9/11, to the first responders, to the survivors, to the families, to the millions of victims in regime-change wars caused by the Bush and Obama administrations. A living memorial. We had upwards of 3000 New Yorkers at these concerts; we had reached at least 100,000, probably hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers in the run-up to this, for the purpose of focussing the city, the metropolitan area, the nation, on 9/11; on the implication of the declassification of the 28 pages, on the potential of a breakthrough with JASTA. So, this goes back a couple of weeks. Then, we come to the UN General Assembly.

Among other events at the General Assembly, is the intervention by the Saudi government spokesman [inaud; 30:49] before the General Assembly – that is, before the world – saying that JASTA was an affront to the sovereignty of Saudi Arabia. At the same time, you have the {Wall Street Journal} in New York editorializing against JASTA; you have the {New York Post} with a Congressional op-ed supporting JASTA; you have two {New York Times} major articles in the last two days. This is super-charged. In that context, we released – twice this week – the {Hamiltonian} editions 5 and 6 of the LaRouche newspaper {Hamiltonian}; which people can see on this website. Which had

headlines "Traitor Obama Stalls on JASTA; Impeachment Is Nigh",
and "Obama's Doomsday: First JASTA; Next Glass-Steagall". Insofar
as Obama has perpetuated the Bush-Cheney policy, the British-Saudi policy of regime-change war, of international terrorism, we took the gloves off in Manhattan over these last days, targetting Obama. We had banners at our rallies throughout
especially the East Side near the UN, midtown, Upper West Side:
"LaRouche: Cameron Is Out; Make Obama Next!"; "Good-bye Cameron:
Take the Pig with You", which had a picture of a pig with Obama's
face on the pig; "Duterte Was Right! Obama is a Son-of-a-B****";
"Obama's Legacy – 5 Wars, 60 Million Refugees"; "Obama Backs ISIS in Syria"; and it goes on like this. That is, we hammered away at this.

Let me, however, locate this in the broader context of the
UN General Assembly. You have a revolution to finish off the British Empire on the 4th and 5th of September at the Hangzhou summit of the Group of 20; led by the Chinese under the direction
of President Xi Jinping. You have the creation of a new financial
architecture, of an international governance agency – the G20 –
which is committed to a new economic order; the New Silk Road, a
World Land-Bridge, which ideas were put forward in 1975 by Lyndon
LaRouche. And brought by LaRouche's allies, in particular Ambassador Fred Wills, to the United Nations General Assembly for

the first time 40 years ago this week. Without going through this history, those ideas, which we've organized for day by day over 40 years, have now created such a new economic foundation based on scientific and technological progress, great projects of infrastructure. This occurs at a moment when Deutsche Bank, the Italian banks, the London and Wall Street banks are facing their demise; far beyond the 2008 explosion.

In that context, you have the creation of this new system.

The Chinese government, under Premier Li Qeqiang, over the last several days, has brought the breakthrough, the commitment of the Group of 20 summit to the United Nations General Assembly. What he has done, is to address on the sidelines of the General Assembly, 16 international organizations; and he put forward the conception of the UN Sustainable Development 2030 Agenda, which is a commitment adopted a year ago by the UN General Assembly to eliminate poverty by the year 2030. Except much of the trans-Atlantic leadership, the Obama leadership, much of the Western European leadership, the London-Wall Street oligarchy posed sustainable development in terms of an orientation toward global genocide. What the Chinese have done, is to emphasize the development part of sustainable development; and they've enlisted the United Nations Development Program in a first Memorandum

of

Understanding between the UNDP and the Chinese government that there is a transformation building as a result of the leadership

of President Xi with President Putin, with the BRICS nations as a

unit, which has taken the several summits – the G20 of early September – into the General Assembly and from here into the BRICS summit in mid-October in India. You have the unfolding of

this new economic potential for humanity. The Chinese have standing on the matter. As President Xi put it at Hangzhou, they

have eliminated for 700 million Chinese; they will eliminate poverty for 57 million more by 2020. They're spreading this through the New Silk Road already to at least 70 nations, and soon 100.

The great question is, what is the United States doing in

response? What is Western Europe doing? In a discussion with Mr.

and Mrs. LaRouche this morning, Mrs. LaRouche emphasized that China is the stellar nation fighting for this perspective; but you do not have any such thing coming from the US or from Western

Europe yet, and therefore, the treason of Obama. Obama, who beyond aiding and abetting ISIS, al-Qaeda, al-Nusra, international terrorism – the irony at the UN this week of Obama

convening a summit on the refugee crisis; well, Obama created the

refugee crisis. What we have created with an international alliance under President Putin's leadership, and an international

development orientation into Syria and Iraq and the entire region, is that we've created the solution to the refugee crisis.

So, finally in this regard, in our work on the streets of Manhattan this week, you had a super-charged environment. You had a battleground there. There was, for example, a demonstration heavily funded by George Soros and the neo-cons attacking the Presidency of Rouhani of Iran; about 500 demonstrators attacking Rouhani. Joe Lieberman becomes the spokesman of that demonstration; and Joe Lieberman announces that it's Iran that is responsible – he says – for the mass murder of Syrians. Daniel Burke, LaRouche PAC leading organizer in the city, happens upon this demonstration; and he yells out, "Lieberman, you're lying! Obama, the Saudis are responsible for the mass murder in Syria." And there's a short dialogue and Lieberman at some point seems to agree with Daniel Burke. Then there was a demonstration organized by the Syrian-American Forum, large numbers of Syrian-Americans and others there, and Lynne Speed – leading LaRouche organizer in New York – takes the microphone and she outlines what we have done to create the potential for this transformation in Syria. One of the Syrians there said, "What about Senator Richard Black?" And Lynne said, "Yes, he just spoke at a Schiller Institute conference which was addressed by Jeff Steinberg, by Helga LaRouche, by Ambassador Jafari of Syria." And Lynne develops the potential to end this regime-change policy by virtue of the G20 agenda, of the Chinese and Russian agenda. To crush terrorism militarily, and to develop, to reconstruct that region.

Daniel was interviewed at the same time by ABC Television in New York, who said, "Well, President Obama is giving his final UN address. What do you anticipate?" And Daniel said, "It's going to be treason; it's going to be a disaster. Obama has created the refugee crisis," and he spelled out the alternative policy which is what we now have on the table.

Let me conclude this way. A few hours ago, in our midtown New York organizing with the new {Hamiltonian} – and I should emphasize that the lead report in the {Hamiltonian}, the banner headline is "Appeal to the UN General Assembly: A New Paradigm for the Common Aims of Mankind". Helga LaRouche penned this appeal explicitly to build upon the G20 breakthrough; the G20 revolution. And the challenge that she posed to the governments of the world, many of whom are receiving this {Hamiltonian}; we've gotten out about 4000 {Hamiltonian}s in several days. We will intensify this over the weekend and into next week, with that LaRouche PAC – Schiller Institute appeal. The idea is the challenge to the governments of the world to join China and Russia and India and the BRICS; to join LaRouche under LaRouche's leadership. What happened this morning as we were distributing this and organizing, a Chinese businessman came to our table, and he said, "If the US and China work together, we can solve all the problems of the world. Drugs; terrorism; war. But the US doesn't want to do it. India and China are doing things; in the US, it's just talk and fighting. If you want to be rich, build a road.

It makes everyone richer. If more Americans were like you," he said to our organizers, "we could solve all problems." I think that's a useful microcosm. The LaRouche Movement, the new Presidency, which LaRouche is creating, centered in New York with the {Hamiltonian}; working with China with the BRICS countries. That's my report.

OGDEN: Thank you very much Elliott. As can be made no more clear, the lever of history is in our hands in terms of every single element. I think if you're inspired by that kind of intensity of organizing, as many members of the LaRouche PAC New York City chapter, activists with the New York City were engaged in on Tuesday; they took the bus down to Washington DC to be involved in these JASTA rallies. That made a huge difference in the White House rally and the Senate rally. These are people who have the physical means to do that. You, right now, can pick up the telephone and call Congress. We still have a few more minutes on the East Coast before Congress leaves for the weekend. Call them now! That's why we're recording at this early time; we're going to display again the phone number on the screen. This is the Capitol switchboard; you can call both of your Senators, and you can call your House of Representatives member, and tell them now is the time to override Obama's veto.

Jeff, I know you want to follow up on that report from Elliott. I think some of these developments over the weekend

also
in terms of the situation in Syria on the ground, underscore
even
more how critically important it is right now that Obama is
receiving this sort of rebuke from inside Washington DC.

STEINBERG: I want to say two things. Number one, I
think for
those citizens out there who've not engaged in this kind of
level
of political mobilization, let me be very clear. If you walk
into
any office on Capitol Hill, the first thing you encounter are
several young people, usually they're new employees – fresh
out
of college – sometimes they're even interns. They're there
taking phone calls. And they are instructed by every member of
Congress, to take detailed notes on every constituent call
that
comes in there. Those members of Congress – and of course,
we're
two months away from elections in which every member of the
House
and one-third of the Senate are up for re-election. They want
to
know what issues are on their constituents' minds. When
Congress
was considering whether to give President Obama the authority
to
bomb Syria back in September of 2013, the switchboards were
ringing off the hook on Capitol Hill. Every office received
massive numbers of phone calls, emails, letters; and they were
running 100 to 1 against any kind of new wars in the Middle
East
involving the United States. So, you do make a difference.

I think the other thing that needs to be remembered in
the

context of what Elliott just reported, is that one of the things

that is going on, on both sides of the Atlantic, is that the entire financial system is crumbling at an accelerating rate.

If

anything, we are also at a moment where not only is it necessary

to pass JASTA and to get this treacherous President out of office

– not wait 'til January, not wait 'til the November elections

–

but now! After what he's just done, it should be clear as day.

But the other thing that's got to be done immediately, is

Congress must take up the Glass-Steagall Act. There are bills in

both Houses of Congress to reinstate Glass-Steagall; which means

breaking up the too-big-to-fail banks.

Now, the FDIC, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

which insures your deposits in the Federal commercial banks across the United States, has issued a report in the last few days in which they reported in great detail and with great alarm,

that the major banks of Europe and the United States have once again built up such a mountain of leveraged debt that they could

blow at any moment. The bank that stands out above all others is

Deutsche Bank, which is notionally a German bank but really is headquartered in London and is the largest bank in the world in

terms of derivatives exposure. But Societe Generale of France, Credit Suisse, the Union Bank of Switzerland, Goldman-Sachs, and

a number of the other major European banks – Banco Santander of

Spain; the leverage that these banks have built up criminally, is worse than where things stood at the time that Lehman Brothers blew out. The leverage of debt to reserves of Deutsche Bank is over 37 to 1; and all the other banks that we're talking about here have leverage ratios of 25 to 1, 30 to 1. So, this whole system is about to blow; and once again, the Obama administration, in the same way it's opposed to JASTA, is opposed to reinstating Glass-Steagall. Congress has to really stand up; and you've got to be the spine that pushes that issue forward. As well as what we've been talking about in the first part of this show; about the urgency of a veto override of JASTA and moves to bring this President down all together.

OGDEN: I could foresee Glass-Steagall being the second veto override of Obama's administration.

STEINBERG: Right; exactly. And it's got to happen in September; we can't wait 'til after November for this, it's too risky.

OGDEN: Absolutely. I want to leave you with a quote from Kristen Brightweiser, who's one of the widows of 9/11; her husband was killed in the 9/11 attacks. She said – and I think this is right to the point: "It is reprehensible that one man is standing between justice for the murder of 3000 people and this legislation becoming law. The President and the Congress should

be listening to American citizens, not a bunch of lobbyists who represent a foreign nation."

So, I think it couldn't be more clear at this point that this is the most dramatic development of recent history. The degree to which the Obama administration has been forced to put itself out there, to show its true colors in the face of unanimous opposition from both parties of the United States Congress; we never could have reached this point without the concerted action of citizens of the United States under the leadership of LaRouche PAC and allied forces. It is a testament to the fact that the kind of focussed deployment of our operations into New York City and elsewhere across the country, have had a substantial historical effect. We do have our finger on the lever of history; not only in terms of what's happening now at this very moment with JASTA and the showdown there with the Obama White House. But also what's happening on the world stage, with what's occurring now in the United Nations General Assembly; the transition into a completely New Paradigm, a new international economic world order. Which is what has been on the table for 40 years plus, coming out of the leadership of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, and the development of the entire New Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge. This is the future of the United States. If we are able to take our government back, to take our Constitutional republic back into the hands of the American citizens and out of the hands of this Obama-London-Riyadh triangle; and if we are able to force through the Glass-Steagall Act in a timely and urgent manner, we can immediately become

participants in the New Paradigm, as has been so clearly illustrated by what is happening in China, what's happening with China's alliances with the other BRICS nations, and what I'm sure will be the number one issue on the table this weekend at the United Nations General Assembly summit.

So, that appeal that Elliott referenced from Helga Zepp-LaRouche, which is now going into the hands of UN ambassadors and others as we speak, this is critical; at the same time that I know that over the course of this weekend, everything will be dominated by this fight over the JASTA veto override. Congress will be in session at the beginning of next week; and as much pressure as can be brought right now before they leave their offices for Friday evening, and everything that can be done in the districts. The district offices, high-profile appearances, op-eds, call into radio shows; everything that you can do over the next 24-48 hours, will determine what happens on Monday morning when Congress comes back into session.

So again, the number is on the screen – 202 224-3121 – you can call into your Congressional office; you still have a few moments left to do so. Circulate this broadcast as widely as you can. That video excerpt that we showed you with Terry Strada, the other 9/11 families, and Senator Blumenthal; that's available on the LaRouche PAC website. You can circulate that, too. That debunks all of the lies that are coming from the Obama White House and the Saudi political lobbying machine; you can use that to inform your own activism over the course of this week.

So, I'd like to thank Jeff Steinberg for joining us here today. Elliott, do you have any final words from New York that you want to tag onto the end of this show here?

GREENSPAN: Insofar as Lyndon LaRouche's objective with the creation of the {Hamiltonian} newspaper was to launch a new Presidency of the United States, a new institution of the Presidency independent of these hated candidates, independent of Obama, this is a fascinating and decisive moment; where Obama, for the first time in his entire Presidency, is about to be overridden. Where Obama can be brought down. Jeff emphasized LaRouche's point about impeachment; we will now take the {Hamiltonian} onto the streets in a heightened way tomorrow morning and Sunday and into next week, to build both this process of override, potential impeachment, Glass-Steagall, and the new Presidency. And you ought to come to the New York town meeting tomorrow, the dialogue with LaRouche.

OGDEN: Right; and that will broadcast live also on the LaRouche PAC website. So, thank you very much. This is a revolutionary moment; I'm glad that we were able to join you live today as this news broke. We hope that you will be very active over the coming 24 hours. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and good night.

Opgør med Obama over JASTA- loven og Glass-Steagall. LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 16. sept. 2016

Med indgangen til denne weekend har vi set en dramatisk række udviklinger, inklusive det faktum, at netop på tærsklen til 15-års dagen for 11. september, vedtog Repræsentanternes Hus JASTA-loven, Loven om retsforfølgelse af sponsorer af terrorisme. Dette sker kort tid efter, at Senatet ligeledes vedtog loven for et par måneder siden. Men det blev fra Obamas Hvide Hus gjort meget klart, at han agtede at nedlægge veto imod loven. I sammenhæng med denne dramatiske optrapning af kampen, deltog Schiller Instituttet i en række meget, meget historiske koncerter, sponsoreret af Fonden for Genoplivelse af Klassisk Kultur i New York City-området og New Jersey: Fire koncertopførelser efter hinanden af Mozarts *Rekviem* – koncerter med stor deltagelse af publikum, inklusive en koncert, der fandt sted i sammenhæng med en messe, som biskop [Nicholas] DiMarzio fra Brooklyn-bispedømmet holdt i fælleskatedralen St. Joseph i søndags, den 11. september.

Engelsk udskrift.

Showdown with Obama over JASTA & Glass-Steagall

IS CONGRESS MORE COWARDLY AND GUTLESS THAN
THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS?

LaRouche PAC International Webcast
September 16, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Hello! Today is September 16th, 2016.

My name

is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly broadcast

here on Friday evening with the LaRouche PAC webcast. I'm joined

in the studio today by Jeff Steinberg, from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and via video, by Diane Sare, member of the

LaRouche PAC Policy Committee, and coordinator of activities up

in New York City.

We're meeting here in the immediate aftermath – really in

the midst – of the further developments that came out of this past weekend. Going into this weekend we had a dramatic series of

developments, including the fact that right on the eve of the 15th Anniversary of 9/11, the House of Representatives unanimously passed the JASTA Bill, the Justice Against Sponsors

of Terrorism Act. This is on the heels of the Senate doing the same thing a few months ago. But it was made very clear from the

Obama White House that he was going to veto this Bill. In the context of that dramatic escalation on this battle, the Schiller

Institute participated in a series of very, very historic concerts sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival for Classical Culture in the New York City area and in New Jersey: four concerts in a row of the Mozart *Requiem* – very, very well-attended concerts, including one that happened in the context of a mass celebrated by Bishop [Nicholas] DiMarzio of the

Brooklyn Diocese at the Co-Cathedral of St. Joseph on Sunday, September 11th.

We're going to begin our broadcast tonight with a very

short

set of remarks that were delivered Terry Strada, the widow of Tom

Strada, and leader of the 9/11 Families Against State Sponsors of

Terrorism, who attended the concert in Morristown, New Jersey on

Monday, September 12th, at which she endorsed the concert and was

invited to the stage to express her views about the crime of 9/11. You'll see what Terry Strada had to say, which was delivered before the music began, during that Monday concert.

I'd

like to just begin with a quick excerpt of Terry Strada's remarks.

LYN YEN (pre-recorded): At this point I would like to introduce somebody very special to all of you. Many of you probably know of her. Her name is Terry Strada. She is the national chairwoman of the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism. She and her organization were instrumental in

the release of the 28 pages of the congressional report on 9/11.

Without further ado, I'm going to turn the mic over to her.

[applause]

TERRY STRADA (pre-recorded): Thank you! Thank you very much!

My name is Terry Strada, and I lost my husband on September 11th,

2001. Tom was 41 years old when he went to work that day, and never came home again. We have three children. At the time, they

were 7 years old, 4 years old, and our youngest was only 4 days old.

On September 12th, 2001 I woke up – well, I probably didn't sleep that night – so when the sun came up, the questions were,

"Who did this? Why would they do this?", and "How could they possibly do this? How could they attack our country like this, and how could they kill so many innocent people in one day?"

Because I wanted to know the answers, I started to ask the questions more and more. And so did more and more 9/11 families.

United to Bankrupt Terrorism was our first title, and now we're

United Together for Justice Against Terrorism. Of course it was

the 28 pages that we focused on in the beginning that needed to

be released. And when they were released, there were two key things that we learned. One is that Saudi Arabia has never been

fully investigated for the role that they played in 9/11; and two, that it is indisputable that the Saudis played a very important role in 9/11.

The second piece of legislation that I've been working on

for over four years now is called the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. This bill is intended to fix a minor problem in

our current Foreign Sovereignty Immunity Act of 1976. So, it's a

40-year-old law that has stood for 40 years, until we looked further into the Saudi's role in 9/11, found the evidence, and tried to hold them accountable.

What happened next was that the courts decided to misinterpret the law and dismiss them on sovereign immunity. Make

no mistake. No country, no entity, no individual is entitled

to
immunity – sovereign immunity, any type of immunity – in the
case of a terrorist act. This bill is intended to hold {any
nation} accountable for a terrorist attack on U.S. soil that
kills United States citizens.

We've chosen this path because it's a peaceful way to
fight
terrorism. We don't want to see more bloodshed; we don't ever
want to see more people die over 9/11. And we also want to
protect our borders; we want to protect our country; we want
to
protect {you}; I want to protect my children. And the way that
we
do this, is by holding the nations accountable that fund known
terrorist organizations, like al-Qaeda, ISIS, Boko Haram.

People say, "You can't fight the lone wolf." I say,
"Yes, we
can!" If we cut off the funding, and we destroy their
capabilities to recruit and incite, and bring on more terror
and
to brainwash people, we can eliminate ISIS. And that is our
long-term goal. The short-term goal, right now, is to get
Saudi
Arabia off of this crazy [situation] that they're not held
accountable.

In May, the Senate passed unanimously this Bill, and
on
Friday, September 9th, it went to the U.S. House of
Representatives. I was in the gallery and was honored and
proud
to see each and every one of our 435 Members in the House vote
"Yes" for JASTA. [applause] Thank you, thank you. I don't
really
know how many times this has ever happened on our history,
that
we have both Chambers of Congress voting "Yes" unanimously.
What

this means for the President: as of 4:00 today, he was still threatening to veto the Bill. The Bill will be sent over to his

office for signature later on tonight, at the latest tomorrow. We're doing everything we can to convince him to not do this.

You probably hear things in the news – and I'll kind of wrap this up, because I want to hear the music as badly as you do

– but you may hear in the news, things about the Bill. They're simply not true, if they're coming from the Administration. Unfortunately, they are the mouthpiece for the Saudis at this point. We just need to point out to them how important this is, to hold them accountable – any nation, going forward – would be held accountable, and how important it is for our country to have that type of security net.

If the President does decide to veto this Bill, it will be our last hurdle; it may be our biggest. But we plan to overcome it, and override the veto. Hopefully the Senate and the House will fall into line and do that for us.

If there's anything that you'd like to do to help, going forward, it's passtjasta.org. That's our website. It's updated as often as I can get to a computer and update it. There are usually just simple instructions of how you can reach out to the White House, your Representative, or a co-sponsor of the bill. This is very important legislation. I thank you very much for taking the time to listen to me, and now I'm so honored to have these

wonderful musicians. I have heard them practice. You are in for a treat. This is going to be a very wonderful time now for us to just transcend ourselves from the evil, to a higher place – to a place where Good is. I believe Good will win, and I thank you for coming. [applause]

OGDEN: So, as you can see, we're right in the midst of a {very} active battle on the JASTA front, as Terry Strada had to say, right there. It's all dependent on action that is taken in the next coming days and hours, in order to create the conditions where Obama is boxed in, and to create the kind of upsurge that is necessary around this. I know there are actions being planned to be taken in Washington, D.C. in the coming days. I'll let Jeff talk about some of that, and also mention some of the activities that {you} were involved in, Jeff, up in New York City, at the same time, this past weekend, as these events were taking place.
So...

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Yes, there will be a series of demonstrations on Tuesday in Washington, D.C., which is when the House and the Senate will be back in town. There'll be a demonstration in front of the White House. And then, also, another demonstration, I

believe, on the Senate side of the Capitol grounds.

The point is very obvious. I think Mr. LaRouche put it succinctly: everything that Obama has done as President has been

a reflection of the fact that he's an agent of the British System, the British Monarchy. Therefore, it should be presumed that, even though he will make himself an avowed enemy of the American people – and especially the 9/11 families – if he does

go ahead with this veto, we should assume that that's exactly what he will do, because that's what the British want him to do.

They don't care about justice for the 2,997 people who perished

on 9/11, or the perhaps-by-now tens of thousands of people – first responders, others who were at the scene at the World Trade

towers, at the Pentagon, in Pennsylvania – who suffered tremendously, and have developed diseases, illnesses related to

9/11. There's one estimate that 40,000 people have been afflicted

with serious illnesses because of their heroic actions immediately following the 9/11 attacks.

Obama is on the other side. These are impeachable crimes.

Being an agent of a foreign power, while serving in the Executive

Branch of the U.S. government – I mean, that is treachery. The fact of the matter is that Obama can be *forced* by an enormous amount of public mobilization, to go forward and actually sign the Bill into law, or simply let it pass into law without his signature. But that's going to be only on the basis that he is convinced that there will be an overwhelming, bipartisan, near-unanimous voice vote, if he attempts to veto the Bill.

This is an existential issue, not just for the Saudis, but

for the British as well. Remember, a month or so back, at the height of the mobilization after the Senate unanimously passed JASTA, a British Tory Member of Parliament wrote in the {Daily Telegraph} that if the Saudis can be sued by the families, then

the British can be sued also. Now, he claimed it was because of

failure to crack down on the jihadist networks that were given safe haven in Britain, but we know that the reality is, that Prince Bandar was the central figure organizing the support for

the 9/11 hijackers. We know it through the 28 pages, and that barely scratches the surface of the evidence. Bandar's another British agent. Bandar and Margaret Thatcher, in 1985, created the

Al-Yamamah program, and it was funds from that Al-Yamamah program

that were probably going into the hands of the 9/11 hijackers.

So this is a {very big deal}. And it's going to come down to

a head-to-head political battle. Everyone listening to this broadcast should contact your senators, contact your representatives. Deliver a very blunt message to the White House,

that this will be considered an act of treachery, perhaps an act

of treason, on the part of President Obama, if he fails to sign

JASTA into law and allow the 9/11 families, at last, their day in

court. No matter where the evidence goes, no matter what's proven

or not proven, they have every right under our Constitutional system to take appropriate legal action in a court against the Saudis, and the JASTA Bill removes what in this case was an illegitimate sovereign immunity.

So, I think that's where we stand.

This past weekend of 9/11 in New York, the Schiller Institute had an extraordinary event. And the full video of that is up on this website; and I would urge everybody to watch it. There was another event that took place at the historic Cooper Union campus in lower Manhattan; and I was honored to speak on a panel on the 28 pages at that conference. There were a number of other speakers: Judge Imposimato from Italy, who was the judge who went after the Gladio apparatus around the strategy of tension attempted coups in Italy in the 1970s and '80s, the Moro assassination. He was one of the keynote speakers. Dan Sheehan, the lawyer who broke open the Iran/Contra affair spoke. But everybody was laser focused on the implications of the 28 pages and JASTA; and the importance now of making sure – as Senator Bob Graham said at a recent event in Washington, DC, the release of the 28 pages just simply pops the cork. Now we go after the full content of the bottle. There are millions of pages of classified material that are yet to come out that deal with Sarasota, Florida, San Diego, California, Paterson, New Jersey, Herndon, Virginia, and other locations unknown. And of course in Europe, Hamburg, Germany. The point I made both at the Schiller Institute event and at the Cooper Union event, is that there is no statute of limitation on the truth; and we've got to drive that point forward.

OGDEN: At the Schiller Institute event in New York on Saturday, September 10th, not only did Jeff speak, not only

did

Virginia State Senator Dick Black deliver a very dramatic and sharp speech. But also, the Ambassador from Syria to the United

Nations was the featured guest, and delivered a very strong speech in which he denounced the Obama administration and the Bush administration campaign of regime change that has taken place in the region over the course of the last 15 years since 9/11. Starting with Saddam Hussein, then with Qaddafi, and then

with the attempted regime change against Assad in Syria. I think

that the developments of this week, with the lower house of the

UK Parliament where they delivered a very strong rebuke to David

Cameron in terms of the grounds on which the Libyan invasion was

launched; which led to Cameron's resignation. This also applies

just as much to the case of Obama; and this is something which Obama is continuing to push during his time in office. So, I think all of these are coming together in the context of Obama's

rejection on his trip to Asia, during the ASEAN and G20 summits.

He is being boxed in; and his true colors are very clear as he sides with the Saudis against the American people. I don't think

it can be taken for granted that the conjunction of all of these

events up in New York City over the weekend has set up the most

dramatic political showdown of Obama's entire career, as we go into the coming days here in Washington.

So Diane, you probably want to give a little bit more of a

context to that.

DIANE SARE: I think what we're talking about is a certain profound question of justice; not retribution, but the ability for mankind to actually move forward. What distinguishes Asia and Russia under Vladimir Putin from the United States and the trans-Atlantic system is that these nations are actually committed to a world in which the future is brighter than the present or the past. That is, the leaders of these nations are saying, my children, my grandchildren, my great-grandchildren are going to live in a world in which their standard of living is higher, their educational level is superior, the number of diseases they're subjected to is fewer; the way that Americans used to think not so long ago. Part of the significance of the work of the chorus, which is here directed by John Sigerson and myself, is to remind the American people what is actually a human standard; as opposed to a bestial standard. I have to say in that regard, I found Senator Richard Black's comments and particularly his passion and his anguish when he was describing what was being done in Syria by these so-called "moderate" Syrian rebels who the US is funding; the people we are funding who are beheading children that they're kidnapping out of hospitals, or the rebels we are funding who are carting women around in cages. Where our own State Department spokesman says, "Well, how can we stop funding them? We're not going to judge what they do on one single

incident of beheading. Other than the fact that they behead children, they might be wonderful." It is so evil! And the idea

that Americans have lost the capacity to feel outrage when you are confronted with this kind of evil; where it's all kind of numb, and people say, "Well, there's nothing you can do."

I think the process of the election of Hillary Clinton, who

may be suffering some serious illness, we don't know; who was destroyed by her capitulation to Barack Obama. And Donald Trump,

who's just a pure FBI thug lunatic. What's happening is that the

population is putting up a kind of teflon veneer where they are

trying not to think about anything. Of course, that's death; we

have to think. What you have in the rest of the world is a break-out of the human spirit, of this quality of creativity.

So, what happened this weekend, the involvement of our chorus in this series of concerts sponsored by the Foundation for

the Revival of Classical Culture, is that you got a glimmer of the power – I think both the fact that JASTA had passed the Senate and then the House on that Friday going into the weekend;

and then what we were presenting musically from the African-American spirituals to the Mozart to the Handel, in terms

of what it actually means for us to be human. And a certain quality of human life which we hold sacred; and which is not in

our physical being. And perhaps this was most powerfully sensed

at the Catholic mass which was dedicated to the firefighters and

those who had died on September 11th. The Bishop made the

point

that these are people who are giving their lives not simply for

their brothers or for their friends, but for complete strangers.

At the end of the Mass, it's not typical that people applaud and

give standing ovations; but when the Mass closed, the standing ovation of the crowd – it was very clear it was not simply for the musicians; but it really was in deep and profound appreciation of what these people had done.

I have a sense that we really are in a moment in the United

States like Germany in 1989. Maybe we're in May of '89 and not October yet; but there's a kind of awakening of the better spirit

of the American population. People are not prepared to sit back

and tolerate criminal injustice. If we will act with courage, since about two-thirds of the world is already on the other side

of this; and China, for example, the idea of talking about legalizing drugs? They would think you are completely insane; being addicted to drugs, distributing drugs is not tolerated. There's certainly a harsh crackdown on drug trafficking in the Philippines which we're seeing now; and I don't think Duterte appreciates Obama's accusations of human rights violations for someone who's trying to shut down the drug trade. In other words,

there's a whole different standard in the world which, when we find our courage and stand up, is going to resonate. There's no

reason for people to believe that what happens in this country is

going to be determined by the fraud of what's call the elections.

I would just say that what Jeff, you were saying earlier about

Obama; we have to really stick to this. There's no point in talking about the candidates unless Obama, who is the evil who is occupying the seat of leadership of this country right now, is removed from office and prosecuted in a criminal court.

STEINBERG: I just wanted to add something; a footnote on what Matt mentioned earlier, about the actions by the British House of Commons this week. The Foreign Affairs Committee produced a report, which was a damning indictment of Cameron, Sarkozy, and Obama over the disastrous consequences of the overthrow and assassination of Qaddafi in Libya. On a certain level, the British House of Commons – with everything that we know; with all the caveats about the power of the British monarchy and all of that – the House of Commons puts the US Congress to shame. They forced Cameron out of office; they forced his resignation from the House of Commons on the grounds of his role in the Libya disaster. Above all else, the United States, Britain, and France lied to the world – they also lied directly to Russia and China – when they promised at the outset that there would be no regime change in Libya; but it was strictly a humanitarian intervention.

Well, it turns out that the House of Commons report is, if anything, an even more stunning indictment of Obama than of Cameron. The report makes very clear that Cameron and Sarkozy were the drivers behind the need to intervene to prevent the humanitarian disaster in Benghazi. In fact, they were protecting British-created terrorist networks that were back in Libya from

having fought the wars in Afghanistan; the same wars that created al-Qaeda. But what was made clear is that it was President Obama who insisted that a no-fly zone was insufficient; a no-fly zone failed in Iraq, it failed in Bosnia, and it would fail in Libya. Therefore, the UN resolution had to have much more teeth; it had to be a "no-drive" zone. It had to give a carte blanche to defend the so-called victims of Qaddafi forces by all out military action.

On the one hand, everybody swore up and down to Russia and China that it was not about regime change. As a result, Russia and China abstained from the vote when the Security Council resolution was passed to create the no-fly zone and the no-drive zone; and to use all forms of military force that were deemed necessary to "save" the civilization population of Benghazi. Well, the report makes clear that after the first 24 hours, they were safe; there was no threat to them anymore. From that moment on, the whole exercise was all about regime change. There was one exchange where one of the ministers in the Cameron government at the time, Liam Fox, lied and said no, this was never about regime change; we didn't have any agenda. The questioner pointed out that on April 14, 2011, the *New York Times* published a signed op-ed by Barack Obama, David Cameron, and Sarkozy; in which the three of them said, "Qaddafi must go, and go for good." So,

they

were lying openly; and if anything, Obama did more heavy lifting

to create this disaster than either Sarkozy or Cameron. It included a conscious decision to assassinate a foreign leader.

So, the British House of Commons has delivered a new bill of

impeachment against President Obama; and I hope that Congress will take that seriously. Needless to say, the US media has blacked out the story totally up to this point.

OGDEN: In a very real way, this is like a Chilcot Report 2.0

in the case of Libya and Obama's role in that. Honestly, that's

exactly what you called for, Diane, in the petition that you were

circulating about a month or a month and a half ago. Look at what's developed since the publication of that petition: We've won the fight on the release of the 28 pages; although there are

tens of thousands of other pages that need to be released. JASTA

has gone through – this was your point, too – JASTA has gone through both the Senate and the House; and despite the fact that

Obama is still threatening to veto, as it stands, it could be overridden in the first veto override of the Obama administration. Although he's trying to delay it, and deploying

Saudi agents crawling Capitol Hill right now. We have reports that the Saudi Foreign Minister is personally going to Capitol Hill and meeting with members of the Senate; threatening that you

have to withdraw your support for this JASTA bill. But that is a

fight which is active; this Chilcot Report type of approach,

as

you called for in your petition, Diane, this is what we now see

coming out of the UK House of Commons. Also, the overarching question of cooperation between the United States and Russia to actually defeat terrorism worldwide.

I thought it was very important that this was one of the themes around these concerts with the image of the 9/11 Teardrop

Memorial in Bayonne, New Jersey; which was contributed by Russia

in support of the world's struggle against terrorism after 9/11.

And also, during this Schiller Institute seminar in New York City

on Saturday, Senator Dick Black pointed out that we're right in

the midst of this ceasefire negotiation between Kerry and Lavrov.

And according to reports, Kerry has really isolated himself from

the Obama administration; or at least there's a faction which is

trying to actively undermine these efforts to work with Lavrov.

So, these are ongoing battles; and it's all around the question

of the type of leadership that was exhibited in that petition that you put out about a month and a half ago, Diane. Obviously,

we're now preparing for the convening of the United Nations General Assembly this week and next week in New York City. I think these events that were happening at the Schiller Institute

conference with the Syrian ambassador and so forth, should be

seen as preparing the way for what will be the defining questions

– hopefully – put on the table at the UN General Assembly.

Both

that and the question of the new international financial architecture, coming out of the G20 meetings; we have a big responsibility on that as it comes to the question of Glass-Steagall, which is something that I'd like to get to in a moment.

But maybe, Diane, you want to say a little bit more about

the events leading up to this UN General Assembly meeting.

SARE: Sure. Actually, I'm thinking, I don't know what the

conspiracy is this time. Last year, as followers of our website

know, President Putin had gone to China for the V-J Day parade and then come to the UN and proposed his coalition to wipe out ISIS; and created that to great effectiveness. Now, the UN General Assembly comes in the wake of the G20 meeting, the ASEAN

meeting, the Vladivostok conference, where all of these nations

which have been represented, signed more and more agreements with

each other on various economic projects and so on. And, I think

it's significant that, going into the G20, Xinhua ran that interview with the Russian representative; who said that Beijing

and Moscow must work with Washington. We have to bring Washington

in on this; and Washington is a complex and unpredictable

partner, I think were the words that were used. So, clearly,

I'm sure that they're not coming into this General Assembly with no plans. I don't know what plans they have; I think it'll be very interesting as it unfolds. I think it's very important for Americans to do our part to make the United States less full of complexes; I'll put it that way, and less unpredictable by addressing this Obama criminality problem. I think what Jeff said about Cameron – it really is something. Tony Blair first with the Chilcot Inquiry; now you have this whole report on Libya. Any American, any member of Congress can get their hands on this; and it is absolutely damning in terms of Obama's role. I think that would be an important contribution for the United States, because the truth of the matter is, we should be part of the Belt and Road; we should be part of the New Paradigm. The American people are suffering horrifically, horrendously with this economic collapse; and I guess that brings us to the point that you were talking about, which is the Glass-Steagall moment.

OGDEN: Right; exactly. On that subject, let me just read the text of the institutional question we got for this week. I know Mr. LaRouche had a direct response to this. It reads: "Mr. LaRouche, Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren is marking the 8th anniversary of Lehman Brothers' bankruptcy with a new push to investigate and potentially jail more than two dozen individuals

and corporations who were referred to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution in 2011 by the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, a government-appointed group that investigated the roots of the 2008 financial crisis. None was ever prosecuted. In a letter to the Justice Department's Inspector General, Warren calls the lack of prosecutions 'outrageous and baffling', and asks the Inspector General, Michael Horowitz, to investigate why no charges were brought. 'The DoJ record of action on these individuals nearly six years after DoJ received the referrals, is abysmal,' she writes.

"In your view, is Senator Elizabeth Warren's new push to investigate and potentially jail nearly two dozen individuals and corporations who were referred to the Justice Department for possible criminal prosecution a step in the right direction; and will it help the prospects of Glass-Steagall's passage?"

So, Jeff, maybe you want to say what Mr. LaRouche's response was on this.

STEINBERG: I think the point is, again, we're looking at the irresponsible behavior of leading government elected officials. The fact is, that in 1933, you had the Pecora Commission, which was a Senate investigation into the crimes of the too-big-to-fail banks of the Depression era; and bankers did go to jail. They were called to testify under oath before Congress; they were forced to produce their tax records; and there was a climate

that

was created through that process that led to the passage of Glass-Steagall and a number of other critical legislative initiatives in the first 100 days of the FDR Presidency. Where we

are today is in the midst of a financial crisis that's much larger, that's much more global in its scope than what we were dealing with in 1933. Yet, there's been virtually no significant

action by either the Justice Department or by Congress against these criminal swindlers who are CEOs of major banks. Just an illustration: The woman who was the head of the division of Wells

Fargo that was caught basically creating phony accounts for their

own customers in order to charge fees so that employees of the bank could get special bonuses; that person resigned from the bank, but received a \$125 million golden parachute on her way out

the door. It's night and day. So, Mr. LaRouche's comment on Glass-Steagall was, {"Do it!} It's needed right now; we can't wait another minute."

Today, Deutsche Bank was given a \$14 billion fine by the

Justice Department for their involvement in mortgage-backed securities fraud in the run-up to 2008 and beyond. Yet, no official of Deutsche Bank has gone to jail. In fact, Deutsche Bank's \$14 billion fine virtually bankrupts it; the entire bank

capitalization, market capitalization of the bank is \$19 billion.

Were they to pay the fine out of their own deposits, they'd be out of business tomorrow morning. So, we're at a moment where this is all deadly serious. Yes, of course, these bankers should

be put in jail; but why is Elizabeth Warren not doing more to push Glass-Steagall? Why is Elizabeth Warren instead tiptoeing

around the issue because she's basically been anointed by Hillary

Clinton as the attack dog against Donald Trump? Again, hold it up

to the gold standard of Franklin Roosevelt, the Pecora Commission, and you'll see that once again – as we just discussed with the British House of Commons actions compared to

the complete inaction on impeaching Obama or taking other measures to deal with these problems – it's shameful; and it's all part of a recurring pattern.

As Diane just said, there may only be four or five months

left in the Obama Presidency, but every day that he remains in office is a threat to the survival of this country and the survival of humanity. Libya was all about starting the process of

war provocations against Russia and China. Lyndon LaRouche warned

about that the day that Qaddafi was assassinated back in 2011; and we're still in that trajectory towards war. So, yes, we urgently need Glass-Steagall; it should be taken up immediately.

There are bills in both Houses. Yes, the Justice Department should reverse its policy of no jail time for too-big-to-fail bankers; throw them all in the slammer – they all deserve it. All of the top executives of all of the big eight US commercial

banks – they're all involved in multiple crimes, whether it's mortgage-backed securities fraud, LIBOR fraud; the crimes are manifest and the actions have been pathetic.

OGDEN: As you referred to, there is a major problem with the

Democrats right now being compromised because of their defense of

Obama and Hillary; both of whom are avowed – as it stands

right

now – opponents of the restoration of Glass-Steagall. As Terry Strada said, right now the Obama White House is a spokesman for the Saudi regime; but in the exact same way, it's a spokesman for Wall Street. You have Glass-Steagall in both party platforms; you have the biggest mobilization in years from some of the trade union movements – the AFL-CIO – other activist layers around Glass-Steagall. Getting this to a vote – preferably {before} the elections take place, if not sooner – but the problem is, you have an intention from the top to suppress this from within the ranks of the Obama faction of the Democratic Party, which Hillary Clinton finds herself in right now.

I would say that there is also a broader, a little bit of a deeper agenda here; and this came up in the discussion we had yesterday with Lyn and Helga. Helga pointed out that there's a recent report that has now been put out by the Club of Rome, which has been around for 40 years now – an avowedly neo-Malthusian movement to reduce population; that's been their agenda – and the title of the report in German is "One Percent Is Enough"; explicitly saying that the kind of dramatic growth percentages that you see year on year on year, coming out of China and other countries that are now part of this New Silk Road dynamic, is somehow dangerous to the planet. And that we must enforce a zero-growth or at least very low growth agenda; which is what is coming out of the British monarchy and is coming out of a lot of these trans-Atlantic circles. That is really the

foundation around which this fight between the new international economic order, this New Paradigm that you see coming out of China, the BRICS, and the Silk Road countries, versus the Obama, trans-Atlantic regime that's taking place. It's a longstanding, deeply rooted, ideological opposition to the idea of the no limits to growth, perpetual increases in productivity kind of idea of mankind; which Mr. LaRouche has made a career out of defending and deepening with his approach to physical economics.

So, you have this as a deeper agenda which, again, Obama has found himself as a spokesman for, and has made it very explicit on multiple occasions. Remember his trip to Africa, where he said you guys aren't allowed to have access to modern technology such as electricity; because if you do, the planet will boil over. And on other occasions, he said, we don't need any fancy stuff like fusion power or anything like that.

So again, I think it comes down to this much deeper idea of what is your conception of man; and what is your scientific idea of this perpetual progress; or the conception that there is no limit to creative discovery, there are no limits to growth. That's the deeper agenda that we now see also bubbling to the surface.

STEINBERG: These guys are genocidal lunatics; they've been that way for 40 years. The LaRouche Movement was in a certain sense, launched as a war against the Club of Rome when they

came

out with their 1972 report, "Limits to Growth". The whole history

has been a battle between those led by Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche, who represent the principle of real human creativity;

versus people who work for an oligarchical system that is consciously out to suppress it. You've got Prince Philip, the British royal consort, calling for the population reduction of this planet by 80%. If the Club of Rome report, 1% cap on growth,

were to be put into effect, this would represent mass genocide on

an unprecedented scale in human history; and it would happen right away.

OGDEN: Right. As was made very clear in these concerts over the

weekend, there's an element of inspiration which, when it is unleashed in the American population, it is overwhelming. The

kind of turn-out that we saw at these concerts in New York – full to capacity audiences in almost every single venue;

including downtown Manhattan, the cathedral in Brooklyn, a concert that happened in Morristown, one that happened in Lehman

College in the Bronx; there's an undercurrent of desire for this

kind of beautiful celebration of the nature of mankind. I thought

it was really significant to place Mozart's *Requiem*, which is an incredibly profound and has a resonance which goes deep in the

American population; including the fact that the last time it was

celebrated as part of a Mass was 50 years ago at the request of

Jackie Kennedy, at a memorial service for the slain President,

John F Kennedy, at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross in Boston. That was the last time this was presented in the context of the mass itself. But the conjunction of that, together with these four African-American spirituals, which is this call for justice, for freedom, and for the dignity of the human being; putting these together in the counterpoint between the two, it really did awaken something very profound and very deeply rooted in the people who participated in this community chorus which is growing in an exponential way, but also in the people who participated as members of the audience. So Diane was the conductor of the first part of these concerts, of the African-American spirituals, and I would personally say, I think you were channeling the spirit of Sylvia Olden Lee and her collaborators. It was very moving, and I think it's part of something that we're going to see continue to grow; in not just the desire for justice, but the desire for human dignity and creativity among the American people.

So, maybe you want to say a little bit about what the plans are for the community chorus in that context, Diane.

SARE: I hope it's going to grow, and there are a lot of plans. But my parting words to our audience would be: One, that people should join the actions in front of the White House on Tuesday in support of the JASTA bill and against Obama's veto; and a challenge to the American people and the members of the

US

Congress. Which is, are you more cowardly and gutless than the British House of Commons? If they can throw out Cameron and expose the crimes against humanity that he has participated in, and if they are already naming Obama; what is holding you back?

OGDEN: Good. Well, those events in front of the White House are scheduled currently for 12:30pm on Tuesday, and apparently there may be another rally in front of the Senate at 2pm the same afternoon. So, if you are in the area, or you can make it into DC, that's something to participate in. There will probably be more information on the passJASTA.org website that Terry Strada mentioned at the beginning of this broadcast in her remarks at that Morrystown concert. And please, circulate tonight's webcast as widely as you can so that Terry Strada's very emphatic statement that she made at that concert can be heard more widely. I think this is something that needs to be heard by the American people; and that's something that you have a responsibility to assist in.

So, I'd like to thank both Diane and Jeff for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we will have coverage of this rally next Tuesday, and you can join us for our regularly programming as well. So thank you very much, and good night.

Mennesket er bestemt til at være en kreativ art.

Uddrag af international webcast, med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Og så selvfølgelig, at de valgte Ode til Glæden, Schillers smukke digt sat til musik af Beethoven; hvor teksten et sted siger, »Alle mennesker forbrødres« (»Alle Menschen werden Brüder«), som er det poetiske udtryk for »win-win«-perspektivet; at menneskeheden har et højere mål. At de valgte dette til at være gallaens højdepunkt, viser virkelig, at de har forstået noget meget fundamentalt. De sagde, »Teksten er skrevet af Friedrich Schiller«, så mange mennesker ville selvfølgelig have tænkt på Schiller Instituttet; og vi har brugt Ode til Glæden mange gange for at udtrykke den samme idé.

Så jeg mener, at vi virkelig kan være stolte; for, vi gjorde ikke det hele, men vi havde en meget god andel i at frembringe dette smukke resultat.

Mennesket er bestemt til at være en kreativ art, der fuldt ud elsker hinanden: Derfor er Oden til Glæden, der blev spillet ved G20-gallashowet i Kina, virkelig en vision for fremtiden.

Første del af LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 8. september

2016: Et nyt paradigme giver nu liv til verden.

*Se hele webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14599>*

Jason Ross: God aften. Det er torsdag, den 8. september 2016, og dette er vores ugentlige LaRouchePAC-webcast. Vi optager udsendelsen en dag tidligere i denne uge, pga. nogle begivenheder i den kommende weekend, som vi vil diskutere senere i udsendelsen. Jeg er Jason Ross, vært for i aften, og jeg har to gæster med mig i dag – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der er med os fra Tyskland, og Diane Sare, der er med os fra LaRouche Manhattan-projekt i New York-området.

Verden har gennemgået en dramatisk ændring i løbet af de seneste par uger. Der har især været flere store, internationale konferencer, der repræsenterer en konsolidering af et nyt paradigme og en ny anskuelse blandt verdens nationer. Disse konferencer var det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Rusland; G20-mødet, der sluttede i Hangzhou, Kina; og dernæst de Sydøstasiatiske Nationers (ASEAN) møde med Kina, der fandt sted i Laos.

Under alle disse konferencer, under alle disse tre møder, har spørgsmålet drejet sig om at skabe en særlig synsmåde mht. økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde, og ikke at respondere til kriser, ikke det Sydkinesiske Hav; det har været et langsigtet syn på, hvad fremtiden bliver. Jeg vil gerne oplæse et par citater fra nogle præsentationer på disse konferencer.

Under B20-mødet, mødet mellem erhvervsledere forud for G20-mødet i Kina, erklærede præsident Xi Jinping, at

»Mennesker er økonomiens grundlag. Vi må være orienteret mod disse menneskers behov og hæve deres levestandard og livskvalitet. Vi vil løfte over 57 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, og fattigdommen vil blive mindsket i alle fattige lande frem til år 2020. Dette er et højtideligt løfte til det kinesiske folk. Vi har løftet over 70 % af den kinesiske

befolkning ud af fattigdom. Vi vil gøre denne kage større, og vi vil fortsætte den globale kamp mod fattigdom.»

Ved G20-konferencen, som omfattede en meget smuk åbningsceremoni med værker af Beethoven og Schiller, med *Ode til Glæden* sat til musik, og en flot forestilling, kom lederne dér til en konklusion i deres slutkommuniké fra konferencen, der omfattende følgende:

»Vi kan ikke længere alene forlade os på finanspolitik og monetær politik til at løse krisen. Vi forestiller os en fremgangsmåde, der omfatter alle dimensioner, alle lag og er vidtrækkende mht. innovation, der drives frem af innovation inden for videnskab og teknologi og går videre endnu og dækker udviklingsfilosofi, institutionelle mekanismer og forretningsmodeller således, at frugterne af innovation bliver fælles for alle.»

I mellemtiden var det eneste, Obama havde at sige til nogen, noget ævl om »menneskerettigheder« og diskussion om handelsaftalen Trans-Pacific Partnerskab (TPP), der absolut ingen chance har for at blive vedtaget i Kongressen; den er død.

Ved ASEAN-mødet så Obama, hvad han troede var en chance for at sætte på dagsordenen og gøre et spørgsmål ud af, voldgiftsafgørelsen om det Sydkinesiske Hav, der gik Kina imod; han ønskede at sætte det på dagsordenen, gøre det til et spørgsmål, og i stedet var det slet ikke en del af diskussionen.

Det, der i stedet blev diskuteret, var økonomisk samarbejde, den Maritime Silkevej og det kinesiske 'Ét bælte, én vej'-projekt. Og med hensyn til Filippinerne i særdeleshed, som havde lanceret en voldgiftssag imod Kina mht. det Sydkinesiske Hav, sagde den nye filippinske præsident, [Rodrigo] Duterte faktisk, da han blev spurgt om Obamas planer om at belære ham om krænkelser af menneskerettigheder mht. Filippinernes krig

mod narkotika:

»Jeg er præsident for en suveræn stat, og vi er for længst ophørt at være en koloni. Jeg har ingen anden herre end det filippinske folk; ingen, absolut ingen. De skal ikke stille spørgsmål, Putang ina« (der betyder »søn af en hore«), »Jeg vil bande ad Dem under dét forum«, sagde han til Obama. »Jeg ønsker ikke at gå ind i et skænderi med Obama, men jeg knæler ikke for nogen, undtagen det filippinske folk.«

I hele dette forløb har Obama absolut stået udenfor. Han har intet at tilbyde verden. *Forbes-magasinet* har erkendt dette i sin dækning, for eksempel, hvor bladet siger, at, alt imens Obama taler om menneskerettigheder og TPP, som aldrig vil ske, så har Kina været i færd med »hurtigt at opbygge sine regionale akkreditiver med et stærkt fokus på økonomien i Sydøstasien ... Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ, der forbinder Asien med Europa økonomisk, ville gøre det muligt for Beijing og dele af Sydøstasien at bygge et stort transportnetværk plus industrielle samarbejdsprojekter. Beijing opererer tilfældigvis også Kina-ASEAN Investerings-Samarbejdsfonden, der finansierer projekter for vækstfremmende infrastruktur, energi og naturlige ressourcer i Sydøstasien.«

Jeg mener, at kontrasten mellem Obama, der intet har, og så det, som Kina og Rusland, og BRIKS-nationerne – men i særdeleshed Kina og Rusland – har tilbudt verden, strategisk og økonomisk – at kontrasten ikke kunne være tydeligere. Med også G77-ledernes deltagelse i disse konferencer er verden som helhed i færd med at vedtage dette som politik.

Lad os få Helga Zepp-LaRouche ind i diskussionen her. Helga deltog i T20-mødet, som var et møde mellem tænketanke, et »Tænk20«-møde, der blev afholdt i Kina som forberedelse til G20-topmødet for statsledere, der netop har fundet sted. Lad mig spørge dig om dette, Helga. Hvordan har verden, efter din mening, ændret sig i løbet af de seneste par uger, med alle disse begivenheder?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg mener, at dette er en ændring af verdenshistoriske dimensioner. For det, der er sket mellem Vladivostok Østlige Økonomiske Forum, G20 og dernæst ASEAN-konferencen, er en enorm ændring mht., hvor verdens magtcentrum befinder sig. Lad mig blot meget hurtigt opsummere, hvilken betydning, hver af disse forskellige konferencer har haft.

I Vladivostok havde vi integrationen af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union med Kinas initiativ for Silkevejen/Bæltet-og-Vejen. Dette er meget vigtigt, fordi også premierminister Abe fra Japan og præsident Park fra Sydkorea deltog, og der blev indgået aftaler om langfristede investeringer inden for udvikling af Ruslands fjernøstlige områder, af Sibirien, inden for enorme investeringer i energisektoren, samt integration af alle disse økonomier (nationer) i Asien.

Dette efterfulgtes af G20-topmødet, som jeg mener, var et absolut gennembrud. For det første havde Kina lagt en enorm indsats i forberedelsen til dette møde, ved at sammenkalde til mange, mange indledende konferencer, der begyndte allerede for et år siden, på mange, mange niveauer: ministre, tænketanke, institutioner og organisationer. Kinas plan var den at transformere G20 fra at være en mekanisme, der blot responderer til kriser, som den i 2008 – Lehman Brothers' finanskrak – og til at være en organisation, der vil skabe en alliance af lande, der vil danne en mekanisme til global styrelse, og som vil have til formål at finde problemløsninger. Xi Jinping sagde flere gange, at han ønsker at transformere G20 fra at være en »diskussionsklub« og til at være en gruppe af nationer, der handler sammen. Når man ser på det, så blev dette opnået på flere måder.

De vestlige medier forsøger hysterisk og desperat at bagatellisere resultatet af konferencen ved at sige, »der var alle disse spørgsmål«, men de eneste, der tog disse såkaldte »spørgsmål« op, såsom konflikten over det Sydkinesiske Hav og Voldgiftsretten i Haag, og alle de øvrige spørgsmål, der

skiller meningene, var faktisk Vesten.

Det, der skete, var, at det overvældende antal nationer går i retning af at vedtage den kinesiske model for økonomi. Det gør de særdeles ret i, for Kina har bevist, at det var i stand til at skabe et økonomisk mirakel af sådanne dimensioner, sagde Xi Jinping, at det har transformeret et land med 1,4 mia. mennesker, og som aldrig før er gennemført i historien, og den kendsgerning, at Kina kunne løfte 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom og til en meget anstændig levestandard, er ligeledes uden fortilfælde. Et af resultaterne af topmødet var vedtagelse af en plan for at eliminere al fattigdom i hele Kina frem til år 2020, dvs., kun fire år fra i dag.

Det lykkedes Kina at sætte den kinesiske model, som den attraktive model for alle for at deltage i, i et »win-win«-perspektiv, på dagsordenen. Mange lande må jo sige, »Ja, vi kan få den samme økonomiske udvikling som Kina; det er langt mere favorabelt end at gå sammen med USA eller NATO eller europæerne i en konfrontation af geopolitisk natur.«

Dette topmødes succes er virkelig utrolig. Det har ændret situationen i verden, til det bedre, skulle jeg mene; for den unipolære verden eksisterer bestemt ikke mere. Som du nævnte, så havde *Forbes-magasinet* og *Time-magasinet* nogle helt hysteriske artikler, der sagde, at Obamas politik med »Asia Pivot« (Omdrejningspunkt Asien) er en total fiasko; dette var hans sidste chance for at gøre kur til landene i området, men det mislykkedes totalt, og Obamas »Asia Pivot« er totalt død; den mislykkedes.

G77, den Alliancefri Bevægelse, ASEAN-landene – de bevæger sig nu alle i en totalt anden retning, og især den kendsgerning, at Sydkorea og Japan deltog, sammen med Rusland og Kina i denne Vladivostok-konference, beviser, at disse lande, der tilsyneladende er allierede med USA, ikke længere ønsker en konfrontation vendt mod Rusland og Kina.

Så dette er ekstremt vigtigt. Og det betyder først og fremmest, at de lande i verden, der ikke er en del af det gamle regime med Verdensbanken og IMF – den såkaldte »Washington-konsensus«, de såkaldte Bretton Woods-institutioner – de havde ingen stemme, og nu har de en stemme.

Jeg mener, at det virkelig er meget vigtigt, at Kina udtrykkeligt tog udviklingslandene og de fremvoksende økonomier med. For det første inviterede de dem alle – eller en meget stor repræsentation af dem – til at deltage i G20. Kina udtrykte sin absolutte forpligtelse til, at enhver frugt af teknologisk innovation ville blive delt med disse lande for ikke at forsinke deres udvikling. Se, dette er en meget smuk idé, der første gang blev udtrykt af den tyske tænker, Nikolaus Cusanus [Nikolaus von Kues] i det 15. århundrede, og som allerede dengang sagde, at videnskab og teknologi er så vigtig for menneskehedens udvikling, at, hver gang, der foreligger en ny opfindelse, bør den lægges i en international pulje – for nu at bruge moderne udtryk – og at alle lande dernæst skal have adgang til den, for at deres udvikling ikke skal blive forhalet.

Det er en utrolig forandring, for det betyder, at, for første gang blev en idé [taget op], som min mand udtrykte i 1975, da han foreslog en plan for udvikling af den Tredje Verden, og han kaldte det den Internationale Udviklingsbank [IDB]. Denne idé præsenterede han både i Bonn, Tyskland, dengang, og i Milano, Italien. Han ønskede dengang at få en \$400 mia. stor teknologioverførsel om året til udviklingssektoren fra de avancerede (udviklede) lande, for at opbygge infrastruktur, for at opbygge industrialisering og landbrug i den Tredje Verden.

Han (LaRouche) gav en meget konkret form til et krav fra den Alliancefri Bevægelse, der, i 1976, under en konference for den Alliancefri Bevægelse i Colombo, Sri Lanka, havde vedtaget en resolution, der krævede en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden. 90 % af ordlyden i denne, den Alliancefri

Bevægelses resolution, kom fra IDB. Men I ved, hvad der skete dengang, og det var, at alle lederne fra de lande, der havde taget initiativ til at kæmpe for dette – såsom fr. Gandhi fra Indien, fr. Bandaranaike fra Sri Lanka, Bhutto fra Pakistan – alle disse ledere blev enten dræbt eller destabiliseret; og hele denne indsats blev sat enormt tilbage og fungerede ikke.

Som I sandsynligvis ved, som nogle af vore lyttere ved, så har vi i LaRouche-bevægelsen kæmpet for virkeliggørelsen af IDB, eller en tilsvarende plan som IDB, for den Tredje Verden; men i alle disse år har Verdensbanken og IMF (Den internationale Valutafond) gjort det stik modsatte. IMF's politik med betingelser (dvs. krav om nedskæringspolitik, for at opnå lån, -red.) umuliggjorde enhver form for udvikling, ved at stille betingelser, der tvang udviklingslande til at betale af på gæld, i stedet for at investere i infrastruktur. De skabte endda en gældsfulde for at gøre det umuligt for udviklingslande at udvikle sig. Så den elendige tilstand i Afrika, og i mange andre lande i Asien og Mellemøsten og nogle lande i Sydamerika, er resultatet af den bevidste politik for undertrykkelse af udvikling.

Se, efter krisen i Asien [i 1997-98] indså de asiatiske lande selvfølgelig, at de var nødt til at gøre noget for at beskytte sig imod George Soros' spekulation dengang, så en proces med skabelse af nye institutioner udviklede sig. Et sådant initiativ var Chiang Mai; men så her for nylig – for omkring tre år siden – tog Kina lederskab, sammen med andre BRIKS-lande [Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina, Sydafrika], for at skabe en række radikalt alternative bankinstitutioner: Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB); BRIKS' Ny Udviklingsbank (NDB); den Ny Silkevejsfond; den Maritime Silkevejsfond; Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisations-Banken. Men har altså nu et fuldstændigt alternativt system for bankpraksis, som *ikke* er hasardspil, kasino; men som udelukkende kun udsteder kredit til investering i reel infrastruktur og realøkonomien.

Hvad er det så, der nu finder sted? Jeg mener, at folk må få en forståelse af, at det, der fandt sted ved G20-mødet, udgør en sejr i en kamp, der har varet i mindst 40 år; at gøre det muligt for mennesker i Afrika, i den såkaldte udviklingssektor, at få en mulighed for at have en fremtid. En sådan magtfuld koalition er nu vokset frem – den strategiske alliance mellem Kina og Rusland; Putin var æresgæst ved dette G20-møde – så verden har virkelig ændret sig. Det er meget vigtigt at sige, at disse artikler i magasinerne *Forbes* og *Time* slet ikke har fattet det. Det er ikke anti-amerikansk; det er ikke anti-europæisk. Xi Jinping og de andre ledere har mange gange sagt, at de ønsker, at USA og Europa skal gå med i dette »win-win«-perspektiv.

Det, der er på bordet nu med G20-mødet, er for første gang et strategisk initiativ, der ikke er geopolitisk; for det tilbyder et fornuftsplan, hvor man samarbejder internationalt om menneskehedens fælles mål. Jeg mener, at dette er et enormt historisk gennembrud, som vi virkelig må sørge for, at det amerikanske folk virkelig får kendskab til, hvad drejer sig om, og ikke bliver vildledt af middelmådige journalister, der simpelt hen ikke kan tænke i andre baner end geopolitik. Det er ligesom en person, der er ond, og som, når han/hun taler med et andet menneske, ikke kan forestille sig, at dette andet menneske ikke også er ondt! Så det, man læser i de vestlige medier, er ikke andet end en projicering af mediernes degenererede tankegang; men det er ikke, hvad der fandt sted på dette topmøde. Så lad os sørge for, at folk virkelig forstår den historiske betydning af denne ændring.

Jason Ross: Fantastisk! Jeg vil mene, at det, du netop gennemgik, mht. historien om din involvering, om din mand Lyndon LaRouches involvering, om LaRouche-bevægelsens involvering i løbet af de seneste fire årtier, i skabelsen af sejren for den politik, der nu bliver annonceret ved disse konferencer, virkelig er en demonstration af, hvor magtfuld en idé er. At over kynisme, eller over det, der syntes at være

tingenes struktur og kontrol over tingene, kan en god idé, og en succesrig og vedvarende mobilisering for den, virkelig få ting til at ske.

Jeg vil spørge dig, om du vil sige mere om historien om LaRouche-bevægelsens involvering i alt dette; eller også, om du har noget at sige om, hvordan vi skal få USA til at tilslutte sig denne udvikling, i stedet for at være imod den?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg vil for det første gerne kort kommentere ASEAN-konferencen, for dette fulgte i G20-mødets fodspor; og nu er disse uoverensstemmelser bilagt. For ASEAN-landene, sammen med Kina, har alle sammen aftalt, at alle uoverensstemmelser vil blive bilagt gennem fredelig forhandling og dialog; de vil, frem til midten af næste år, udarbejde et adfærdskodeks med dette for øje, og i fællesskab bekæmpe trusler mod sikkerheden, såsom terrorisme, og andre trusler. De vil agere på grundlag af FN's Havretskonvention, eller UNCLOS; og det betyder, at alle disse forsøg på at oppiske en konflikt mellem Filippinerne og Kina, med Voldgiftsretten i Haag, ikke er lykkedes. Dette var et forsøg på at skabe uenighed, men denne ASEAN-konference sagde, »Nej, vi ønsker fælles, økonomisk udvikling. Vi vil genoplive den regionale organisation for økonomisk udvikling.«

Så dette demonstrerer, at Kinas udenrigspolitik – og ikke alene ved G20-mødet – ændrede dagsordenen totalt; men også mht. regionale konflikter, nemlig, at hvis man har et »win-win«-perspektiv, hvor man tager hensyn til den andens interesser, så kan man finde løsninger.

Så det, der blev tilbage for Obama, som nogle aviser skrev, var gennemførelsen af TPP; men, som du allerede har nævnt, så har både Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet, og også de to præsidentkandidater, sagt, at TPP er ude. Formændene for de to Kongreshuse har sagt, at det ikke kommer til afstemning i år; hvilket vil sige, ikke i Obamas tid som præsident. Så TPP er dødt; TTIP – det er den europæiske version af samme sag – er

ligeledes dødt. Så jeg mener, at verden virkelig har ændret sig; unipolære krav og den idé, at man kan afstikke reglerne på vegne af et enkelt land, eksisterer ikke mere. Vi er gået ind i en fuldstændig ny æra med respekt for et andet lands suverænitet, og med en alliance af overvejende republikker, til fordel for det overordnede gode ('det almene vel') for alle.

Det er selvfølgelig en virkelig betydningsfuld udvikling. Det betyder ikke alene, at USA har muligheden for at vende tilbage til præsident John Quincy Adams' (1825-1829) udenrigspolitik – for det var præcis, hvad han havde skitseret, at USA skulle gøre – men det betyder også, at systemet med fuldstændigt suveræne nationalstater, der samarbejder om en fælles udvikling – hvilket er, hvad vi har promoveret, hvad især hr. LaRouche naturligvis har promoveret, i mere end 50 år – nu er i færd med at blive til virkelighed.

Så jeg mener, vi har grund til at være meget glade for dette, for LaRouche-bevægelsen har, i de seneste 40 år, men især særlig i de seneste 25 år, sammenkaldt til bogstavelig talt hundredevis af konferencer i hele verden; i alle de store amerikanske og europæiske byer, i Rio de Janeiro, i São Paulo i Brasilien, i Mexico, Beijing, New Delhi og Moskva. Endda mange i Australien, i Egypten og i andre afrikanske lande; vi har afholdt seminarer og konferencer. Jeg mener, at vi nu har en renæssancebevægelse og en verdensbevægelse for udvikling.

Eftersom du nævnte den smukke gallakonzert, som åbnede G20-topmødet, så var dette på en vis måde lig det, som vi gør med dialogen om klassisk kultur; for det begyndte med en række meget smukke kinesiske folkesange, og dernæst kom der scener fra balletten Svanesøen – der blev danset i en sø – så danserne ligesom skabte små springvand ved hvert trin, fordi de dansede i vandet. Det skabte en utrolig effekt. Og så selvfølgelig, at de valgte *Ode til Glæden*, Schillers smukke digt sat til musik af Beethoven; hvor teksten et sted siger, »Alle mennesker forbrødres« (»Alle Menschen werden Brüder«),

som er det poetiske udtryk for »win-win«-perspektivet; at menneskeheden har et højere mål. At de valgte dette til at være gallaens højdepunkt, viser virkelig, at de har forstået noget meget fundamentalt. De sagde, »Teksten er skrevet af Friedrich Schiller«, så mange mennesker ville selvfølgelig have tænkt på Schiller Instituttet; og vi har brugt *Ode til Glæden* mange gange for at udtrykke den samme idé.

Så jeg mener, at vi virkelig kan være stolte; for, vi gjorde ikke det hele, men vi havde en meget god andel i at frembringe dette smukke resultat.

Foto: Fra Schiller Instituttets koropførelse af Mozarts Reviem i New York sept. 2016, i anledning af 15-års milehøjtideligheden for terrorangrebene den 11. september, 2001.

Et nyt paradigme giver nu liv til verden.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 8. september 2016

Verden har gennemgået en dramatisk ændring i løbet af de seneste par uger. Der har især været flere store, internationale konferencer, der repræsenterer en konsolidering af et nyt paradigme og en ny anskuelse blandt verdens nationer. Disse konferencer var det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Rusland; G20-mødet, der sluttede i Hangzhou, Kina; og dernæst de Sydøstasiatiske Nationers (ASEAN) møde med Kina, der fandt sted i Laos.

Under alle disse konferencer, under alle disse tre møder, har

spørgsmålet drejet sig om at skabe en særlig synsmåde mht. økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde, og ikke om at respondere til kriser, ikke det Sydkinesiske Hav; det har været et langsigtet syn på, hvad fremtiden bliver.

Engelsk udskrift:

LaRouchePAC Friday Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

A New Paradigm is Animating the World

The new paradigm animating the world was on full display over the past few weeks, in meetings of the Eastern Economic Forum in Vladivostock, the G20 in Hangzhou, and the ASEAN / China meeting in Laos. While President Obama doddered around with nothing to offer, an increasing portion of the world is adopting policies of economic integration and development, including such science frontiers as the Chinese space program. This paradigm is not new – the LaRouches and the LaRouche movement have been organizing for the policies now becoming dominant, for over 40 years. Meanwhile, as the fifteenth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks approaches, a "living memorial" is offered in a series of concerts featuring the participation of the Schiller Institute New York Community Chorus.

Jason Ross hosts a discussion with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, a participant in the T20 meeting leading into the G20 summit, and Diane Sare, founding director of the Schiller Institute Chorus, on the changes sweeping the world, and how to inspire the US to join, rather than oppose, this new paradigm.

TRANSCRIPT

JASON ROSS: Hello! This is Thursday, Sept. 8th, 2016. You're watching our weekly LaRouche PAC webcast. This week we're recording the show a day early, because of some events coming up this weekend, which we'll be discussing a little bit later on. I'm Jason Ross, I'm the host today, and I'm going to be joined on the show today by two guests – by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, joining us from Germany; and by Diane Sare, joining

us from the LaRouche Manhattan Project in the New York area.

Over the past few weeks, the world has changed dramatically. In particular, there have been several major international conferences that represent a solidification of a new paradigm and a new outlook among nations in the world. These conferences have been the Eastern Economic Forum in Vladivostok, Russia; the G20 meeting, which concluded in Hangzhou, China; and then the Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) meeting with China, which has been taking place in Laos.

In all three of these conferences, in all three of these meetings, the issue on the table has been creating a specific outlook for economic development and cooperation, not responding to crises, not the South China Sea; it's been a long-term outlook on what will the future be. I'd like to read a few quotes from presentations made at these conferences.

At the B20 meeting, the meeting of business leaders in advance of the G20 meeting in China, President Xi Jinping stated that "People are the foundation of the economy. We have to be oriented to the needs of the people, and raise their living standards and the quality of their lives. We will lift over 57 million people out of poverty, and poverty will be alleviated in all poor counties by 2020. This is a solemn promise to the Chinese people. We have lifted over 70% of the Chinese population out of poverty. We will make the pie bigger and we will continue the global fight against poverty."

At the G20 conference, which included a very beautiful opening ceremony, featuring the work of Beethoven and Schiller with the *Ode to Joy* set to music, and quite a spectacle, the leaders there came to a conclusion in their final communiqué from the conference, which included, "We can no longer rely on fiscal and monetary policy alone to deal with the crisis. We envision an all-dimensional, multi-tiered, wide-ranging approach to innovation, which is driven by innovation in science and technology, and goes beyond it, to cover development-

philosophy, institutional mechanisms, and business models, so that the benefits of innovation will be shared by all."

Meanwhile, at the G20 conference, the most Obama had to say to anybody, was some blubbering about "human rights," and discussion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which has absolutely no chance of possibly being passed through the Congress; it's dead.

At the ASEAN meeting, Obama saw what he thought was an opportunity to put on the agenda and make an issue of the South China Sea arbitration ruling that went against China; he wanted to put that on the agenda, make that an issue, and instead, that was not part of the discussion at all.

What was instead discussed was economic cooperation, the Maritime Silk Road, the Chinese One Belt, One Road project. And, as a matter of fact, on the Philippines in particular, which had launched the arbitration case against China regarding the South China Sea, the new President of the Philippines, [Rodrigo] Duterte, when he was asked about Obama's plans to lecture him on violations of human rights in the Philippines' war on drugs, President Duterte said "I am a President of a sovereign state, and we have long ceased to be a colony. I do not have any master except the Filipino people; nobody but nobody. You must be respectful. Do not just throw questions. *Putang ina*," which which translates to "son of a whore") "I will swear at you in that forum," he said to Obama. "I do not want to pick a quarrel with Obama, but I don't kneel down to anybody, except the Filipino people."

In all of this Obama has absolutely been the odd man out. He has nothing to offer the world. *Forbes* magazine has recognized this in its coverage, for example, where it states that while Obama is talking about human rights and the TPP that will never occur, China has been "quickly building its regional credentials with a heavy focus on the economy of Southeast Asia... China's Belt and Road initiative connecting Asia to

Europe economically would let Beijing and parts of Southeast Asia build a major transportation network plus industrial cooperation projects. Beijing also happens to manage the China-ASEAN Investment Cooperation Fund, which bankrolls growth-linked infrastructure, energy and natural resources projects in Southeast Asia."

I think the contrast between Obama, who has nothing, with what China and Russia, and the BRICS nations – very specifically China and Russia, in particular – have been offering the world, strategically and economically, the contrast couldn't be clearer. With the participation of the G77 leader as well in these conferences, the world as a whole is adopting these as policies.

Let's bring on Helga Zepp-LaRouche now. Helga was a participant in the T20 meeting, which was a meeting with think tanks, a "Think20" meeting held in China in preparation for the G20 heads of state summit which just occurred. Helga, let me ask you about this. In your view, how has the world changed over the past couple of weeks, with these events?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think it is a change of world-historical dimensions. Because what has occurred between the Vladivostok Eastern Economic Forum, the G20, and then the ASEAN conference, is a tremendous change, in terms of where is the power center of the world. Let me just go through very quickly what the significance each of these of these different conferences was.

In Vladivostok, you had the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union with the Silk Road/Belt and Road initiative of China. That is very important because also Prime Minister Abe of Japan and President Park of South Korea participated, and there were agreements of long-term investments in development of the Far East of Russia, of Siberia, of huge energy investments, and integration of all of these economies of Asia.

This was followed by the G20 Summit, which I think was really an absolute breakthrough. First of all, China had put an enormous amount of effort into the preparation, by convening many, many pre-conferences, starting already a year ago, on many, many levels: ministers, think-tanks, institutions, and organizations. The intention of China was to transform the G20 from a mechanism which only responds to crises like 2008 – the financial crash of Lehman Brothers – into an organization which would form an alliance of countries to form a global governance mechanism which is problem-solving. Xi Jinping said repeatedly he wants to transform the G20 from a "talk shop," into a group of nations which *act* together. Looking at it, this was accomplished in many ways.

The Western media are hysterically and desperately trying to belittle this outcome of the conference, by saying "there were all these issues," but the only people who raised these so-called "issues," like the South China Sea conflict, and the issue of the Arbitration Court in The Hague,, and all other divisive issues, was really the West.

What happened is that the overwhelming number of nations are moving to adopt the Chinese model of economy. They are very right to do so, because China has proven an economic miracle of such dimensions, Xi Jinping said, to transform a country of 1.4 billion people has never been undertaken in history, and the fact that China could uplift 700 million people out of poverty into a very decent living standard, is also unprecedented. One of the outcomes of the summit was the adoption of a plan to eliminate poverty all over China by 2020, that is, only four years from now.

China succeeded to put the Chinese economic model as the attractive model for everybody to join, in a "win-win" perspective, on the agenda. Many countries must say, "Yeah, we can have the same economic development like China; that is much more favorable, than to join the United States or NATO or the Europeans in confrontation of a geopolitical nature."

The success of this summit is really unbelievable. It has changed the situation in the world, I think for the good; because the unipolar world, for sure, does not exist any more. As a matter of fact, as you mentioned, *Forbes* magazine and *Time* magazine had quite hysterical articles saying that Obama's "Asia pivot" policy has completely failed; this was the last opportunity to woo the countries of the region, but this completely failed, and the "Asia pivot" of Obama is completely dead; it failed.

The G77, the Non-Aligned Movement, the ASEAN countries – they are all are now moving in a completely different direction, and especially the fact that South Korea and Japan participated, with Russia and China in this Vladivostok conference, proves that these countries who are obviously allied with the United States, but do not want confrontation against Russia and China any more.

So this is extremely important. And it means primarily that those countries of the world which are not of the old regime of the World Bank, the IMF – the so-called "Washington Consensus," the so-called Bretton Woods institutions – they had no voice, and they now have a voice.

I think it is really very important that China explicitly adopted developing nations and emerging economies. First of all, they invited all of them – or a very large representation of them – to participate in the G20. China expressed the absolute commitment that every fruit of technological innovation would be shared with these countries, in order not to hold up their development. Now, this is a beautiful idea, which the first time was expressed by the German thinker Nikolaus of Cusa in the 15th Century, who already then had said that science and technology are so important for the development of mankind, that every time there is a new invention, it should be put in an international pool – to use modern words to say it – and that every country should have, then, access to it, not to be slowed down in their

development.

It's an incredible change, because it means that, for the first time, an idea which was expressed by my husband Lyndon LaRouche in 1975, when he proposed a plan to develop the Third World, and he called it the International Development Bank [idb]. This was the idea which he presented both in Bonn, Germany at the time, and in Milan. He at that time wanted to have a \$400 billion technology transfer per year to the developing sector from the advanced countries, in order to build up infrastructure, to build up industrialization and agriculture in the Third World.

He gave a very concrete form to a demand of the Non-Aligned Movement, which in 1976 at the Non-Aligned Movement in Colombo, Sri Lanka, had adopted a resolution demanding a just New World Economic Order. That Non-Aligned Movement resolution 90% of the words were those of the IDB. But you know what happened at that time was, all the leaders of the countries who had taken the initiative to fight for this – like Mrs. Gandhi from India, Mrs. Bandaranaike from Sri Lanka, Bhutto from Pakistan – all these leaders were either killed or destabilized; and this whole effort had a tremendous setback and it did not function.

Now as you probably know, and some of our viewers may know, we have been fighting in the LaRouche Movement ever since that time – it's now 40 years we have been fighting for the realization of the IDB or an IDB-like plan for the Third World; but the World Bank and the IMF, for all these years have done the exact opposite. The IMF conditionalities would completely deny any kind of development by having conditions which would force developing countries to pay debt instead of investing in infrastructure. They created the debt trap even, to make it impossible for countries to develop. So, the miserable condition of Africa, and many other countries in Asia and the Middle East and some countries in South America, is the result of the conscious policy to suppress development.

Now, after the Asia crisis [in 1997-98] the Asian countries obviously realized that they had to do something to protect themselves against speculation of George Soros at the time, so a process of creating new institutions developed. One was the Chiang Mai Initiative; but then recently – about three years ago – China took the leadership together with other BRICS countries, to create a completely alternative set of banking institutions. The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB); the New Development Bank of the BRICS; the New Silk Road Fund; the Maritime Silk Road Fund; the Shanghai Cooperation Organization Bank. So, you have now a completely alternate system of banking which is *not* casino; but only gives credit for investment in real infrastructure in the real economy.

So, what is happening now? I think people have to appreciate that, that what happened at the G20 meeting is the victory of a struggle of 40 years at least; to make it possible for human beings in Africa, in the so-called developing sector, to have a chance for the future. Such a powerful coalition has now emerged – the strategic alliance between China and Russia; Putin was the guest of honor at this G20 meeting – so the world really has changed. It's very important to say that these articles in *Forbes* magazine and *Time* magazine really don't get it. It's not anti-American; it's not anti-European. Xi Jinping and the other leaders have expressed many times that they want the United States and Europe to join in a "win-win" perspective.

So what is on the table now with the G20 meeting is for the first time a strategic initiative which is not geopolitical; because it offers a level of reason to cooperate internationally for the common aims of mankind. I think this is a tremendous historical breakthrough, which we really must make sure that the American people find out about what it is, and not be misled by mediocre journalists, who just can't think differently than geopolitics. It's like somebody who is evil, cannot imagine when he talks to a really good person,

that the other person is not also evil. So what you read in the Western media is just the projection of the degenerate thinking of the media; but it's not what happened at this summit. So, let's make sure people really understand the historic significance of this change.

ROSS: Great! I think what you went through in terms of the history of your involvement, of your husband Lyndon LaRouche's involvement, of the LaRouche Movement's involvement over the past four decades in creating the victory for the policy that's being announced at these conferences, really goes to show the power of an idea. That over cynicism or over what seemed to be the structures and control of things, a good idea and successful and intense and ongoing organizing for it, really can make things happen.

I was going to ask if you wanted to say more about the history of the LaRouche Movement's involvement in this; or also if you have anything to say about how we're going to get the U.S. to join in this development instead of being opposed to it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, first of all, I would like to make a short comment on the ASEAN conference, because that was in the footsteps, or following the G20 meeting; and that dispute is now settled. Because the ASEAN countries together with China, all agreed that all the disputes will be solved through peaceful negotiation and dialogue; they will work out a Code of Conduct until the middle of next year to this effect, and jointly fight threats to security like terrorism and other threats. They will act on the basis of the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea, or UNCLOS; and that means all these efforts to hype up the conflict between the Philippines and China with The Hague Arbitration Court has not succeeded. This was an effort to cause disunity, but this ASEAN conference said, "No, we want to have joint economic development. We will revive the regional economic development organization."

So, it shows that the foreign policy of China – not only at

the G20 – was changing the agenda completely; but also in terms of regional conflict, that if you have a "win-win" perspective where you take into account the interests of the other, you can find solutions.

So then what is left for Obama, some papers were writing, was the implementation of the TPP; but as you already mentioned, both the House and the Senate and the two Presidential candidates all have said the TPP is out. The Speakers of the two Houses have said it will not get on the agenda this year; which means not during the time of Obama. So, the TPP is dead; the TTIP – it's the European version of the same thing – is also dead. So, I think the world really has changed; unipolar demands and the idea that you can decide rules on behalf of one country is no longer in existence. We have entered a completely new era of respect for the sovereignty of the other country, and an alliance of essentially republics for a greater good.

This is obviously a really important development. Not only does it mean that the United States has the chance to go back to the foreign policy of John Quincy Adams – because that is exactly what he had outlined for the United States to do; but it also means that the kind of system of perfectly sovereign nation-states working together for a joint development – which we have pushed, especially naturally Mr. LaRouche has pushed, for over 50 years – this is now becoming a reality.

So, I think that we can be very happy about that, because the LaRouche Movement for the last 40 years, but especially the last 25 years, convened literally hundreds of conferences around the world; in every major U.S. and European city, in Rio de Janeiro, in São Paulo, Brasilia, Mexico, Beijing, New Delhi, Moscow. Many even in Australia, in Egypt, in other African countries; we had seminars, conferences. I think we have now a renaissance movement and a world movement for development.

Since you mentioned the beautiful gala concert which preceded the G20, this was, in a certain sense, similar to what we are doing with the dialogue of Classical culture; because it started with a very beautiful series of Chinese folk songs, then it had scenes of the ballet of *Swan Lake* – danced in a lake – so the dancers would make sort of little fountains by each step, because they would step into the water. It gave it an unbelievable effect. And naturally, the fact that they chose the *Ode to Joy*, the beautiful poem by Schiller composed by Beethoven; where the text at one point says, "All men become brethren." "*Alles Menschen werden Brüder*", which is the poetical expression of the "win-win" perspective; that there is a higher goal of mankind. And that they choose that to be the high point of the gala, really shows that they have understood something very fundamental. They said, "Text written by Friedrich Schiller" so naturally many people would have thought about the Schiller Institute; and we have used the *Ode to Joy* many times to express the same idea.

So, I think that we can be really proud; because we did not do everything, but we had a very good part in producing this beautiful result.

ROSS: Wonderful! I'd like to return to get more thoughts from you, but I'd like to bring in Diane Sare at this point to discuss one of the opportunities for changing the United States. Which is that this weekend, this Sunday, is the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks from 2001. Diane – who is the founder and managing director of the Schiller Institute New York City Community Chorus, as well as a member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee – has been very engaged in a process that Mr. LaRouche has called a "Living Memorial" for 9/11; which is a series of concerts that are taking place this weekend.

I'd like to ask Diane about that, and first mention something about the context; which is that over the past month we've had the release of the 28 pages. The 28 classified pages of the

Congressional Joint Inquiry into 9/11; and we've got scheduled for a vote in Congress tomorrow the JASTA bill – the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act – which would make it possible for the family members, for victims of 9/11 to sue Saudi Arabia directly in U.S. courts for having aided in the commission of an attack on U.S. soil. This has the potential to really transform 9/11 from an opportunity for those pushing a policy of conflict and war, to really get justice on this, by redefining American strategic policy.

Let me ask you, Diane, you've been very involved in this, of course. Could you talk to us about the conception of a Living Memorial? What's happening this weekend? How are we putting that into practice?

DIANE SARE: I'll situate it in a question you asked earlier of Helga. The question is, how can the U.S. join this New Paradigm? What is holding us back? One very important aspect is not simply the idea of a unipolar world; but a unipolar world which is based on fantasy, and lies, and delusion. Which we have seen in particular – I wouldn't say it began with the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 – but after that, what did you have, since the truth was not told? You referenced the 28 pages being released, and the potential for JASTA to be passed this week. What happened? We had an attack which was , and instead we invaded Iraq. Then, we invaded Libya. Now, we have an insane President Obama who wants to overthrow Assad.

The actions of the United States on behalf of this British-Saudi Empire have explicitly created an increase in terror attacks around the world; an increase in war; an increase in the death rate. I was reading this morning that as many as 400,000 people in the New York metropolitan area have been affected by the attack on the World Trade Center, because of all of the toxic debris that was blowing through the air. You have over 1,100 people who have contracted rare forms of terminal cancer; and we run into them all the time here in New Jersey, people who were first responders, who were security,

who were police who worked in the area.

So, you've had a great injustice; and because the injustice has been allowed to continue, the crime has only grown in magnitude. The number of people who have died as a result of this has been expanding. ... what potential to remedy that situation; to bring justice, which would in a sense, clear the conscience of the American people to make us morally capable and morally fit to join with the rest of the world in this New Paradigm?

What Mr. LaRouche said explicitly when the question came up at one of the Saturday town hall meetings, on the idea of what can we do for these people who died on September 11? He said, a Living Memorial. So when I think of a Living Memorial, I think of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg and his words that: the dead have already consecrated this ground; but it is up to us, the living, to make sure that they have not died in vain. Therefore, what we are seeking to do here, by doing something which is a completely beautiful and noble thing, is to enable the American people to address this; and to insist that our nation become something different than what it was. It is not a coincidence that this is occurring at the same time that we have these extraordinary breakthroughs.

ROSS: You could say more. I know that over the weekend we've got the Schiller Institute chorus is going to be participating in a series of concerts of the Mozart *Requiem*, of spirituals and other pieces, on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Could you tell us how the participation in these kinds of events shows a potential to change people? What kind of responses have you been getting from musicians, from politicians, from others involved in these events? What significance does this show you it having already?

SARE: Well, I think perhaps the most exciting thing that's occurred, is the growth of the chorus; because the people who participate in the chorus are the ones who in a sense will be

the most transformed by these events. We began the chorus almost two years ago, in December of 2014, in the wake of the choking death of an African-American man who was strangled by the police in Staten Island, and the grand jury determined that there was no wrongdoing on the part of the police. There was a great deal of anger which was threatening to rip apart the city. And we said why not do something beautiful, dedicated to the sanctity of human life or the question of the brotherhood of man? Let's not let ourselves be divided; let's not have fits of rage. And the police officers who also have been put in a bind, because they're trying to protect our cities, our poorest populations which have been destroyed and made insane by the drug epidemic which is funded and run out of Wall Street.

So, what occurred is, we had about 100 people show up to sing; one of whom suggested that we form a community chorus, which I did. We went from week upon week where we had 3 people, 5 people, 12 people; finally a core of about 40. I can say at the performance of the Mozart *Requiem* that we will be doing in Manhattan on Saturday, there will be about 160 people in this chorus. They are themselves telling others that they're profoundly affected. We know that members of the Fire Department in Brooklyn – the brigade where every single one of them was killed on September 11th – they hold a special Mass every year. This year, our chorus is going to be involved in singing the Mozart *Requiem* as part of the Mass; and members of the Fire Department there were very moved that someone had thought to do something on this level to honor those people who made the ultimate sacrifice in the aftermath of that.

So, it's opening up and inspiring many people. Instead of just saying, "We're going to swallow this, we're going to take it. We're not going to talk about this. We're going to act like nothing happened, and we're going to presume we can never get justice." There's a sense now that "No, we don't have to go along with this any more. We *can* get justice." I would just say

that my point earlier, that in this way, the United States could be transformed to make it possible that we would no longer act as a cat's paw for the British Empire; but be capable of joining with China and Russia. And I'll further say that the beauty of this potential development has absolutely nothing to do with the stupid elections and the idiotic candidates that we have; but is from a much higher standpoint.

ROSS: Good. Diane, did you have anything else you'd like to say on that topic? I'd like to ask Helga a question. Do you have anything else, Diane?

SARE: Go ahead; that's fine.

ROSS: OK. Well, I wanted to ask Helga, let's paint for our viewers an idea of a future, if we could. With the U.S. dropping this zero-sum game, geopolitical approach, with the U.S. and Europe adopting the proposals that you're putting forward, what could the world be like in 5 or 10 years? Is this an endless, perpetual fight? Or what does victory look like? What could the world be like?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I think things can change very quickly if the United States and Europe would adopt the Glass-Steagall banking separation law; which is, as you know, in bills in Congress in the Senate, and I was quite happily reacting when I saw that Black Lives Matter is now demanding from Hillary Clinton that she should adopt Glass-Steagall. Because you can only fight racism if you fight the injustice caused by Wall Street; I thought this was an irony. So, if the United States and Europe – which is bankrupt; let me just spend one sentence on that.

China has growth rates anywhere from 6.7%, they want to have now 7% again; India had even 8% growth rates. Other Asian countries are going in the same direction. And what is the growth rate in Europe? The new statistics of the Eurozone just came out – 0.3%; and in France, Italy, and Finland – 0%. Then

naturally, all the parameters are really alarmist; the headlines today are Draghi, the head of the European Central Bank, has no more options. He's running out of options because of negative interest rates, quantitative easing, helicopter money; all of these are signs of a dying system. And then naturally, you have Deutsche Bank, which is having all the parameters like Lehman Brothers in 2008; the credit default swap costs are now exactly like for Lehman Brothers just before it blew up. If that happens, you could have the next 2008 crisis this September or October.

So, the fight for Glass-Steagall is super-urgent; and naturally, as Lyndon LaRouche has stressed very emphatically with his Four Laws, this is not enough. Then you need to have a credit system, and you need to issue credit for real investment.

Now, if these changes can be done quickly – this year – even before the U.S. election occurs, then there is no reason why the world cannot enter a completely New Paradigm; stop geopolitical confrontation. The danger of war is not yet eliminated; I don't want to make a false security when it's not there. But at least with the new alliance between Russia, Turkey, Iran, the Syria question can be solved. With the 28 pages and the JASTA bill, maybe the Saudi support for terrorism can also be brought to an end. Then, even the German Economic Development Minister from the CSU – the Christian Social Union – made a speech yesterday in the Parliament, demanding a Marshall Plan for Africa. He said, this present global system is a failure; it has created forms of early capitalism in many parts of the world. This cannot continue. In the next 30 years, 2 billion babies will be born alone in Africa; they need many jobs, many teachers, real investment. He demanded that the WTO [World Trade Organization] be transformed from a free trade into a fair trade mechanism. So, this is a conservative politician from Germany of the Merkel government; and he's the only one who so far has the courage

and the vision to say these things. But that's actually true.

With the new alliance I described earlier in the context of the G20, now Japan is starting to invest massively in Africa; and this was welcomed by China. China said we are not in Africa for competitive reasons, but the need for development is so big, we are happy if India and Japan are all investing; and naturally, Europe should invest. The United States should have to overcome the poverty and build up the Middle East; rebuild the war-torn region – Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Libya, all of Africa. If all of these countries would be developed with the extension of the New Silk Road program and all countries would work together, poverty could be eliminated in a very short period of time; maybe in two years.

Gerd Müller, the Development Minister, pointed out that 80% of Africans still do not have access to electricity. Now that could be very, very quickly changed; we have developed in our program of the World Land-Bridge, a comprehensive development plan for Africa. Infrastructure, bridges, ports, fast train systems, roads, the development of agriculture and industry, the creation of large amounts of freshwater to fight the desert through peaceful nuclear energy, desalination of ocean water, the ionization of moisture in the atmosphere. In a few years, Africa and those parts of the world which are still in poverty could look like beautiful gardens, forests, agriculture, new cities. People studying to become scientists, to become musicians, to become artists.

The human potential for creativity has just been scratched on. So far, we have only outstanding geniuses like once a century. You had Plato, Cusa, Kepler, Leibniz, Beethoven, Einstein, a couple of more people I am not naming here; and these were relatively rare phenomena. If we go in the road now on the horizon, and every child on this planet can have access to universal education, because there is enough to eat, there is enough housing so that the child can study and is not distracted by poverty or by Pokémon Go, or some other idiotic

thing. But the child can learn Classical music, *bel cantos* singing, learn geography, learn astronomy, learn the history of the Universe, the history of mankind, universal culture. Love other cultures by knowing the beauty of Chinese painting, of Indian drama, of poetry from Persia.

Once you know these cultures, you cannot help but say this is actually enrichment; all racism would go, all xenophobia would go. The world community would just be working together for the common aims of mankind.

Developing breakthroughs like thermonuclear fusion power in the short term; space colonization in the short and medium term; and discover new breakthroughs we have not even an inkling of to ask the right question. We are not an Earth-bound system; by no means. The ecologists are always talking about finding solutions within Earth-bound systems; this is complete nonsense. Mankind is a species which naturally can develop the planet with infrastructure and open up landlocked areas on Earth; but the continuation of this infrastructure will be in close space. The Moon being the first target; and other objects, asteroids will be studied. Eventually, we will have the means to take longer space flights to Mars and other bodies in space. We will become a human species where the beautiful idea of Vladimir Vernadsky that the noosphere will take over the biosphere more and more; what he meant by that is that human discoveries, human scientific and technological innovation, will be what will rule and dominates the world more and more.

From that standpoint, the fact that China decided to put the innovation in the center of their efforts, is really the right step in the right direction. I can see, and I hope to see this in my lifetime, that the relations among nations will completely change; that you no longer are looking full of mistrust and xenophobia against everything which is foreign, but that people will become much more educated. There will be much more patriots and citizens of the world; world citizens,

which must not be a contradiction with what was said by Friedrich Schiller 200 years ago. And that we will basically give up all those stupid habits which prevent our creative potential from unfolding. People will have intelligent discussions; they will have loving relations among themselves by furthering the interest of the other.

So, I think we are at the verge of becoming adult; I think right now the human race behaves like little uneducated, spoiled two-year-olds who kick against the knee of your colleague, and they scream and say, "This is my toy!" That's about the mental level of geopolitics.

I think that is not worthy of man; I think man is meant to be a creative species, fully loving each other. Therefore, the *Ode to Joy* that was played at the gala evening in Hangzhou is really the vision of the future.

ROSS: Wonderful! I just want to add one thing on that, which is that you had mentioned how China had put technology as a major factor in their outlook on things. And when that's coming from China, it really means something. China is the nation that has gone and had a landing for the first time in decades. It's China that in two years, plans to have the first-ever landing on the far side of the Moon. And it's China which in that process, is offering for international use, the use of a communications relay satellite that they'll have with the Moon; that they plan to make available to other nations who want to do work there.

That, their fusion program; it really shows the potential on the highest level of economy. Your husband has pointed out for decades that infrastructure provides a platform for meeting the productive needs of society. As you said, children being able to have enough food to be able to concentrate on education; on learning about the great cultures of the world, of their past cultures, to be able to contribute to it in the future. We're not citizens of the world; we can be citizens of

the Solar System, and we've really got a very broad potential outlook for ourselves. On that highest level, it's driving mankind as a species forward; which we can do through collaboration on science. That really lets us collaborate on the highest possible level.

Let me ask, are there any final words from either of you? Do you have any concluding remarks?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yeah, I would like people to – I'm aware of the fact that what I'm saying is not the mainstream opinion about China, about all these countries. I would ask the audience to not just dismiss, if you disagree with what I said, but please take the effort to look into it yourself. Look at the speeches of Xi Jinping and the other leaders. Look at what China is doing. Study Confucius, and you will find out that there *is* indeed a completely different philosophy; and that philosophy is much, much closer to what the United States was when it was founded, than most people would imagine. Both in terms of economics, but also in terms that the government should be there for the common good; this is an idea which almost has been lost in the last decades.

I think people should just not dismiss it. Once you are convinced that what I have said is true, help us to get the United States onboard. The United States needs a Silk Road. China has a plan to have 50,000 km of fast train system by 2020; and we have developed an extension of the Silk Road for the United States, also having a huge system of fast trains connecting the East and the West Coasts, the North and the South. Build a couple of new cities in places in the United States which make sense. And there is no reason why the United States cannot be part of this. It's not anti-American; America should become part of it, and you should help to do this.

ROSS: Wonderful. Well, thank you both very much for joining us. Thank you to our viewers for joining us. If you're in the New York area, definitely become involved in this process over

the weekend. You can find out more at the Schiller Institute New York City Chorus website. Stay tuned to LaRouche PAC; subscribe so you don't miss our shows, and we'll see you next time.

Vi må vække samme lidenskab i befolkningen, som udtrykkes gennem Mozarts Rekviem og Benjamin Franklins »En Republik, hvis De kan bevare den.«

Uddrag af LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast 2. sept. 2016.

Matthew Ogden: ... På hjemmefronten har vi en meget intens kampagne, der nu optrappes, for at genindføre Glass-Steagall; og for at styre kræfterne til at gennemtvinge en vedtagelse af dette lovforslag, før præsidentvalget finder sted (8. nov.). Dernæst har vi indsatsen for at genåbne en fuld undersøgelse af terrorangrebene den 11. september (2001); med frigivelsen af de 28 sider må dette nu fortsætte med at forfølge de ti tusinder af andre sider, der fortsat tilbageholdes. På denne front befinder vi os én uge fra 15-års dagen for disse forfærdelige angreb den 11. september; og vi vil se en række koncerter, der vil finde sted i New York City – det kan Diane

(Sare) fortælle os mere om – med en opførelse af Mozarts *Rekviem*, der vil blive opført i katedralen i Brooklyn, en stor kirke i Manhattan og andre steder, for at mindes ofrene for disse angreb, og for at bringe retfærdighed ...

Ogden: Diane, du er lige nu selvfølgelig midt i at arrangere 15-års mindehøjtideligheden og seminaret, og med at lede aktivistbegivenhederne i New York City. Så, kan du tage den herfra?

Diane Sare: Jeg vil faktisk gerne lige træde et skridt tilbage; for én af de ting, som senator Graham sagde om, hvorfor, det var så vigtigt (for senator Grahams indlæg om retfærdighed for ofrene for 11. september, se fredags-webcast, med engelsk udskrift, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14486>).

Han sagde, at der var tre grunde: én var spørgsmålet om juridisk retfærdighed for familierne til de mennesker, der blev dræbt; To, et temmeligt indlysende spørgsmål, som er spørgsmålet om sikkerhed. Hvis vi ikke udrydder disse netværk, er de der, for at blive brugt igen. Og tre, som jeg mener, er virkelig vigtigt og ikke kan overdrives, og det er spørgsmålet, om folk stoler på deres regering. For, når USA's befolkning først kommer dertil, hvor de ikke længere stoler på regeringen, hvilket er, hvor vi næsten er nu, så mister man republikken. Vores republik, der går helt tilbage til Nicolaus Cusanus' ideer og *Concordantia Catholica*[1], hviler på dette spørgsmål om de regeredes tilsagn (konsensus). Hvis man ikke stoler på sin regering, vil man ikke give sit tilsagn til, at den repræsenterer én. Det, som hr. LaRouche har sagt de seneste dage, er, hvad vi har set mellem det gennembrud, der fandt sted med vores arbejde som drivkraft, og så kongresmedlemmerne Jones og Lynch, der bogstavelig talt truede – ikke helt med disse ord – men som sagde, vi ved, at vi er immune, hvis vi læser dette (de 28, hemmeligholdte sider) ind i Kongressens protokol; og så det, der sker med Glass-Steagall mht. partiernes valgplatforme, er, at disse kongresmedlemmer

begynder at blive tvunget til at repræsentere deres befolkning.

Jeg sætter dette i en international sammenhæng, med det, der nu er forestående med møderne i Vladivostok, der finder sted netop nu (2. – 3. september), og G20-topmødet (3. – 4. september); og det transatlantiske system er totalt bankerot. Der er intet, som Obama og den nuværende opstilling, den Europæiske Centralbank; hvad har de at tilbyde verden? Negative rentesatser? Lad dine penge stå hos os, og vi vil få dig til at betale for det! Med andre ord, de kan intet gøre; men hvad har vi med Rusland og Kina? Kinas arbejde – som folk, der følger os på vores hjemmeside, vil have set på vores onsdags-udsendelse; det Nye Paradigme-show om spørgsmålet om Månens bagside, eller udsendelsen torsdag aften (Manhattan-projektet). Der er et helt univers, der åbner sig for os – vi begynder med Solsystemet – med dette samarbejde, som Asien kan tilbyde. Kineserne er vært for G20, og de har gjort præsident Putin til æresgæst. Dernæst er [den egyptiske] præsident al-Sisi endnu en æresperson ved dette møde. Hvad er Obamas respons? Han tror, at han dér vil gennemtvinge [handelsaftalen] Trans Pacific Partnerskab, som er dømt til at blive et totalt flop, en fuser. Russerne gjorde, i et interview i *Xinhua* før dette møde, det ganske klart, at Moskva og Beijing behøver Washington som partner. Det gjorde mig glad som amerikaner, for jeg mener, at USA bør være en partner i dette her. Og, paradoksalt nok, sagde den person, der blev interviewet, at Washington kan være en kompleks og uforudsigelig partner.

Så jeg vil sige, at vores job som amerikanere er – vi har på en måde fået en mission, at andre, meget betydningsfulde ledere siger, at USA ønskes som en skattet partner i dette Nye Paradigme. Det er vores opgave at yde dette partnerskab, ved at stille dette kriminelle [amerikanske] regime, vi har, stolen for døren. Noget af det, vi så med 11. september, er, at mørklægningen er fortsat igennem to regeringer; at Obama

har været ikke alene medskyldig i dette, men med sin politik i regionen har bidraget til ISIS' vækst, al-Qaedas vækst, og deres mulighed for at rekruttere. Vi har i løbet af disse seneste år mistet næsten 4500 soldater i Irak, som man nu ved, var en total løgn og et bedrageri; det var konklusionen af Chilcot-undersøgelsen. Med hensyn til spørgsmålet om 11. september, så er spørgsmålet: Vil vi se retfærdigheden ske fyldest? Og retfærdighed betyder ikke hævn eller gengældelse; det betyder, vil vi genrejse vores nation til at blive til noget, hvor folk vil ønske at give deres tilsagn til at blive regeret af denne regering?

Når man ser på spørgsmålet om Mozart, og hans *Rekviem*, som vil blive opført, og som vores (Schiller Instituttets) kor vil deltage i og arbejder med; Mozarts engagement var dette. Han var en tilhænger af den Amerikanske Revolution; han var tilhænger af ideerne om at skabe en republik, og han blev myrdet. Hans arbejde blev fjernet; hans bidrag; det, han kunne have gjort, hvis han havde levet længere. Dette musikstykke har levet videre, fordi det har en udødelig egenskab; som faktisk legemliggør spørgsmålet om menneskelig kreativitet. Vi ser her en respons fra de mennesker, der er engageret i denne opførelse, med, at de udvikler en form for lidenskab, der nok altid fandtes i dem. Men, fordi de har mulighed for at deltage i noget, der vil blive så intenst og så smukt, og som har en mission i den virkelige verden, så bliver de igen lidenskabelige; hvilket er noget, jeg mener, har manglet. Alle kan komme i tanke om samtaler, de har haft med venner og naboer, om det forestående valg, eller noget andet; og befolkningen er blevet lidenskabsløs, hvilket er grunden til, at folk ikke handler, når de burde, eller når de kan.

Jeg har en fornemmelse af, at vi virkelig står over for et betydningsfuldt gennembrud, som USA vil blive en del af; selv om mange mennesker i USA ikke fuldt ud forstår, hvorfor det er her, og hvordan de blev engageret i det.

Ogden: Absolut! Jeg vil blot følge dig i det, du netop sagde,

Diane. I sin tale i Press Club citerede senator Graham den ofte citerede anekdote af Benjamin Franklin under Forfatningskonventet i Philadelphia; da en kvinde spurgte, »Hvad har De givet os?«, svarede han, »En republik, hvis De kan bevare den«. Den lidenskab, som senator Graham har udvist omkring dette, hvor han har bevaret sin rolle og sin kamp igennem 15 år for frigivelsen af disse dokumenter; hvor kommer denne lidenskab fra? Selv om FBI forsøgte at intimidere ham personligt og gav ham besked på at trække sig, fordi han ser dette – som det også skal ses – som et eksistentielt spørgsmål for den Amerikanske Republik. Ikke kun ud fra et juridisk standpunkt og et standpunkt om national sikkerhed, men som selve vores nations overlevelse som en republikansk form for regering. Jeg vil hævde, at vi ser på præcis den samme form for eksistentielt spørgsmål, når det kommer til genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall. Selve omfanget af det transatlantiske systems implosion, som vi står overfor – hvis dette her kommer ned over os, uden det nødvendige lederskab på plads omkring genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall og lignende, for at beskytte det amerikanske folk fra konsekvenserne af denne form for finanskrise – så ville denne republik ikke overleve.

Muligheden er umiddelbart forhånden, for at gå med i den nye, finansielle arkitektur, og for at skabe de produktive vækstbølger, som denne nation aldrig før har set; som ville overgå selv det, vi så under FDR's New Deal, hvis vi tilsluttede os den Nye Silkevej, der netop nu ledes af Kina og andre. Så det er den samme form for lidenskab, der også må anvendes til dette spørgsmål.

*Hele fredags-webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, kan ses her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14486>*

*Et dansk uddrag af webcastet, omhandlende spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagalls betydning, kan ses her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14506>*

[1] Se: Specialrapport: »En dialog mellem kulturer: En hyldest til Nicolaus af Cusa«, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14486>

USA og Europa: Det er Glass-Steagall versus en finansiell nedsmeltning af de transatlantiske økonomier, med massedød i befolkningen til følge

Hr. LaRouche ...»Hvis man ikke gennemtvinger Glass-Steagall, som udgangspunkt for en sådan total omstrukturering af hele USA's finansielle og monetære system«, og selvfølgelig også udstrækker det til Europa; »så vil et enormt antal mennesker dø. Det er den enkle kendsgerning.«

Uddrag af LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast, den 2. september 2016. Hele webcastet inkl. engelsk udskrift kan ses her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14486>

Matthew Ogden: God aften. Det er den 2. september 2016, og dette er vores ugentlige fredags-webcast på larouchepac.com. Med mig i studiet i aften har jeg Jeffrey Steinberg fra *EIR*, og via video to medlemmer af LaRouchePAC Politiske Komite:

Dave Christie fra Seattle, Washington, og Diane Sare fra New York City-området. Velkommen til jer begge to.

Vi havde en diskussion med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche for et par timer siden. Det er helt klart, at vi står ved et punkt, hvor tre, meget afgørende initiativer, som LaRouche-bevægelsen har stået i centrum for i flere år, nu kulminerer. For det første står vi umiddelbart foran G20-topmødet; topmødet i Vladivostok er i gang; og to uger efter disse begivenheder træder FN's Generalforsamling sammen. Det er helt åbenlyst, at man tager initiativerne til at skabe en ny, finansiel arkitektur for planeten omkring udviklingen af den Nye Silkevej. Jeg vil blot ganske kort nævne, at, hvis man ikke har set den endnu, så har vi en fremragende, ny, 20 minutter lang video (på larouchepac.com – se den danske hjemmeside, inkl. udskrift: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14429>) »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. Den går i dybden med meget af indholdet i *EIR's* rapport af samme navn. Den må I bestemt se, hvis I ikke allerede har.

På hjemmefronten har vi en meget intens kampagne, der nu optrappes, for at genindføre Glass-Steagall; og for at styre kræfterne til at gennemtvinge denne vedtagelse, før præsidentvalget finder sted. Dernæst har vi kampagnen for at genåbne en fuld undersøgelse af angrebene den 11. september (2001); med frigivelsen af de 28 sider må man nu gå videre med at forfølge [frigivelsen] af de ti tusinder af sider, der fortsat tilbageholdes. På denne front befinder vi os nu én uge fra 15-års dagen for disse forfærdelige angreb den 11. september, og vi vil se en række koncerter, der vil finde sted i New York City – det kan Diane fortælle meget mere om – med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem, som vil blive opført i Brooklyns katedral, i en stor kirke i Manhattan og andre steder, for at holde en mindehøjtid for ofrene for disse angreb, og for at bringe retfærdighed [for dem]. Dette vil finde sted samtidig med et strategisk seminar, der sponsoreres i New York City om samme emne. Og samtidig foregår der et

kraftigt initiativ for at gennemtvinge en afstemning i Repræsentanternes Hus – forhåbentlig i næste uge, før mindedagen – om JASTA-lovforslaget (Justice against State Sponsors of Terrorism Act; Loven om Retsforfølgelse af statslige sponsorer af Terrorhandlinger). Kongressen vender tilbage fra ferie i næste uge.

Som en del af dette fremstød var tidligere senator Bob Graham i Washington D.C. i forgårs, hvor han deltog i en betydningsfuld pressekonference, som han holdt i National Press Club. Både Jeff Steinberg og jeg selv havde mulighed for at deltage i konferencen, og vi vil fremlægge nogle uddrag af denne pressekonference som en del af vores udsendelse i aften.

Men før vi kommer til det, vil jeg gerne begynde med den diskussion, vi havde med hr. LaRouche for blot et par timer siden; især om nødvendigheden af at lancere en omgående mobilisering omkring genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall. Så for at introducere dette spørgsmål, vil jeg læse det spørgsmål, vi har fået fra institutionelt hold til i dag, og som blev forelagt hr. LaRouche. Jeg vil bede Jeff Steinberg om at uddybe det, som hr. LaRouche sagde som respons til dette spørgsmål. Det lyder:

»Hr. LaRouche, De har advaret om, at, med mindre USA's Kongres handler – og handler her i september – for at genindføre Glass-Steagall som det første skridt i en langt større omskabelse af den økonomiske og monetære politik, så har hele det transatlantiske system kurs mod en nedsmeltning. Vil De venligst uddybe vigtigheden af at vedtage Glass-Steagall under den næste Kongressamling, umiddelbart efter Labor Day (mandag, den 5. september)?«

Jeffrey Steinberg: Hr. LaRouche var meget ligefrem; han sagde: »Hvis man ikke gennemtvinger Glass-Steagall, som udgangspunkt for en sådan total omstrukturering af hele USA's finansielle og monetære system«, og selvfølgelig også udstrækker det til Europa; »så vil et enormt antal mennesker dø. Det er den enkle

kendsgerning.« De europæiske storbanker, der er fuldstændig viklet ind i de store Wall Street-banker, har en beholdning til nominelt billioner, hvis ikke hundreder af billioner af dollars, af derivater og insolvente lån og anden hasardspilsgæld, så vil man ikke have nogen som helst mulighed for på nogen som helst måde at omstøde den situation, vi har i USA's økonomi lige nu; og det samme er tilfældet for Europa. Nemlig [den situation], at der er et sammenbrud i produktiviteten; tro ikke på tallene for jobskabelse, for virkeligheden er den, at 93,5 millioner jobkvalificerede amerikanere i den arbejdsføre alder står uden arbejde. For de har opgivet at finde et job; og de er derfor aldrig blevet talt med i arbejdsstyrken i det hele taget. Hertil kommer, at et voksende antal mennesker nu finder, at de er henvist til at arbejde deltids; undertiden et par timer om dagen i flere forskellige jobs, fordi der ikke er nogen fuldtidsjobs inden for produktion til rådighed i økonomien. Der er en masse parasit-jobs; der er en masse andre jobs, der, i en sund, voksende økonomi, ville være nødvendige og nyttige. Men, når man har et sammenbrud i produktion, som vi har i USA og Europa, og når man oven i dette lægger denne form for massive bankkrise – en finansboble, der overgår den i 2008; så har man en perfekt storm for noget, der vil resultere i massedødsfald.

Glass-Steagall er det første skridt; det er på ingen måde totaliteten af det, der må gøres. Hr. LaRouche har fremlagt de Fire Nødvendige Love, fire hovedinitiativer, der må tages for at genrejse produktiviteten; for at skabe ægte, produktive jobs. Men udgangspunktet må være at opbryde og udskille de legitime, kommercielle bankfunktioner fra de spekulative aktiviteter, der fuldstændigt har plyndret de kommercielle bankers indskyder-grundlag, siden Glass-Steagall blev ophævet (1999). Begge de politiske partier (Demokrater og Republikanere) har i deres valgplatforme støttet en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall; dette var ikke bare en rutineting. Der var en kamp under Republikanernes konvent mellem folkene i Platform-komiteen; der var et aggressivt

fremstød for at gennemtvinge en vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall. Så begge partier har taget stilling. Der er lovforslag fremsat i begge Kongreshuse, og man skal og må vedtage det; ikke efter præsidentvalget, og ikke under 'lame duck'-sessionen, men i løbet af den kommende 2-3 uger lange periode, der starter på tirsdag, den 6. september, den aften, hvor Kongressen vender tilbage. Onsdag bliver den første, hele dag, hvor Kongressen har sammentræde. Dette må være én af denne Kongressamlings allerførste handlinger i løbet af denne overgangs-samling; og det vil ikke ske, med mindre der finder en total mobilisering af det amerikanske folk sted. Der er betydningsfulde institutioner, fra AFL-CIO (USA's største fagforening) og til diverse borgerrettighedsgrupper, der er med os i dette spørgsmål om Glass-Steagall. Men det kræver en absolut fokuseret og hård og laserlignende intervention. Og der er nok ikke noget, der opsummerer dette mere klart end det, som hr. LaRouche gentagne gange har sagt i løbet af de seneste dage: Nemlig, at, hvis man ikke vedtager Glass-Steagall; hvis man ikke intervenserer for at sikre, at Kongressen gør det, så kan man dø som følge af det.

**Vi kan ændre historiens gang:
Handling nu for at
gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall.
LaRouchePAC Internationale**

Fredags-webcast, 2. sept. 2016

Matthew Ogden: Vi havde en diskussion med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche for et par timer siden. Det er helt klart, at vi står ved et punkt, hvor tre, meget afgørende initiativer, som LaRouche-bevægelsen har stået i centrum for i flere år, nu kulminerer. For det første står vi umiddelbart foran G20-topmødet; topmødet i Vladivostok er i gang; og to uger efter disse begivenheder træder FN's Generalforsamling sammen. Det er helt åbenlyst, at man tager initiativerne til at skabe en ny, finansiel arkitektur for planeten omkring udviklingen af den Nye Silkevej. Jeg vil blot nævnte ganske kort, at, hvis man ikke har set den endnu, så har vi en fremragende, ny, 20 minutter lang video (på larouchepac.com – se den danske hjemmeside, [inkl. udskrift: http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14429](http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14429)) »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. Den går i dybden med meget af indholdet i EIR's rapport af samme navn. Den må I bestemt se, hvis I ikke allerede har.

Engelsk udskrift.

You Can Change History: Act Now to Force a Vote on Glass-Steagall

"A REPUBLIC, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT."

International LaRouche PAC webcast, Saturday, September 3, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's September 2, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here on Friday evening with larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence

Review}, and via video by two members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee. We have Dave Christie joining us from Seattle, Washington; welcome, Dave. And we have Diane Sare joining us from the greater New York City area.

I'll just say to start off, we did have a discussion with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche just a few hours ago. It's very clear that we are at the intersection point of the culmination of three very crucial initiatives that the LaRouche Movement has been right in the center of leading for several years. Number one, we're on the eve of the G20 summit; we have the Vladivostok summit which is occurring; and in two weeks following that, we have the United Nations General Assembly. It's very apparent that the initiatives are being taken to create a new financial architecture for the planet, around the development of the New Silk Road. I'll just say very quickly here, if you haven't seen it yet, there's an excellent new 20-minute video feature on the larouchepac.com website which is about "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge". It elaborates a lot of the {Executive Intelligence Review} publication by that same title. I would say to definitely watch that if you haven't yet.

On the domestic front, we have a very intense campaign which is now being escalated to reinstate Glass-Steagall; and marshalling the forces to force that to a vote before the Presidential elections take place. Then we have the push to reopen a full investigation into the attacks on 9/11; with the declassification of the 28 pages that happened, you have to

further that with the pursuit of the tens of thousands of more pages which continue to be withheld. On that front, we are one week away from the 15th anniversary of those horrific attacks on 9/11; and we will be seeing a series of concerts which will take place in New York City – Diane can tell us a lot more about that – of Mozart's {Requiem} that will be performed in the cathedral in Brooklyn, a major church in Manhattan and elsewhere to commemorate the victims of those attacks and to bring justice. This is happening in conjunction with a strategic seminar which is being sponsored in New York City on the same subject. And at the same time, there's a powerful push to force a vote in the House of Representatives – hopefully next week, before the anniversary happens – on the JASTA bill (Justice against State Sponsors of Terrorism Act). Congress is returning next week.

As part of that push, former Senator Bob Graham was in Washington DC the day before yesterday, at a major press conference which he held at the National Press Club. Both Jeff and I had the opportunity to attend that conference, and we will be featuring some excerpts from that press conference as part of our broadcast tonight.

But before I get to that, I do want to start with the discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche just a few hours ago; particularly on the necessity of launching an immediate mobilization around the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. So, in order to introduce that subject, I'm going to read the institutional question which we received today, which was presented to Mr. LaRouche. I'm going to ask Jeff to elaborate a

bit on what Mr. LaRouche's comments were in response to this question. It reads: "Mr. LaRouche, you have warned that unless the United States Congress acts – and now in September – to reinstate Glass-Steagall as the first step in a much larger overhaul in economic and monetary policy, then the entire trans-Atlantic system is headed for blow-out. Would you please elaborate on the importance of the passage of Glass-Steagall in the next session of Congress immediately after Labor Day?"

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Mr. LaRouche was very blunt; he said, "If you don't implement Glass-Steagall as the starting point for such a total overhaul of the entire US financial and monetary system," and extending that obviously into Europe as well; "then an enormous number of people are going to die. It comes down to that." The major European banks, which are completely co-mingled with the big Wall Street banks, are carrying trillions – perhaps hundreds of trillions – of dollars in derivatives and non-performing debt of all other kinds as well. They're hopelessly bankrupt, and unless you implement Glass-Steagall and separate out and just simply write off all of that derivatives and other gambling debt, you have no chance whatsoever for any kind of turnaround in the situation that we have in the US economy right now; and similarly in Europe. Namely, that there is a collapse of productivity; don't believe the numbers about job creation, because the reality is that 93.5 million eligible, working age Americans have no work. Because they've given up trying to find a job, or they've never found a job; and therefore

have never been counted in the working force to begin with. On top of that, a growing percentage of people are finding themselves relegated to working part-time; sometimes a few hours a day on several different jobs, because there are no full-time productive jobs available in the economy. You've got a lot of parasitic jobs; you've got a lot of other jobs that in a healthy, growing economy would be necessary and useful. But when you've got a collapse of production as we have in the United States and Europe, and you put on top of that a kind of massive banking crisis – financial bubble bigger than 2008; then you've got a perfect storm for something that will result in mass deaths.

Now, Glass-Steagall is the first step; it's by no means the totality of what must be done. Mr. LaRouche has laid out the four cardinal laws, four major initiatives that must be taken to restore productivity; to create genuinely productive jobs. But the starting point has to be to break up and separate out the legitimate commercial banking functions from the speculative activities that have completely looted the depositor base of commercial banks since the repeal of Glass-Steagall. Both political parties, in their platforms, have endorsed reinstating Glass-Steagall; and this was not just simply a perfunctory thing.

There was a fight at the Republican convention among the Platform Committee people; there was an aggressive push to force Glass-Steagall's adoption. The same thing happened on the Democratic side. Hillary Clinton has not publicly called for reinstating Glass-Steagall. So, you've got both parties poised.

You have bills in both houses of Congress and a vote can and

must
be taken; not after the elections, not during the lame duck
session, but during this next 2-3 week period starting
Tuesday,
the 6th of September, when Congress returns that evening.
Wednesday will be the first full day that Congress is in
session.
This must be one of the very first acts of this Congress
during
this interim session; and it's not going to happen unless
there
is a full-blown mobilization of the American people. There are
major institutions from the AFL-CIO to various civil rights
groups that are with us on this question of Glass-Steagall.
But
what's required, is an absolutely focussed and tough and
laser-like intervention. And I think nothing sums that up more
clearly than what Mr. LaRouche has said repeatedly over the
last
few days: Namely, if you don't pass Glass-Steagall; if you
don't
intervene to make sure that Congress does it, then you may die
as
a result of that.

OGDEN: Well, I want to use as an example of the kind
of
strategic leverage that is going to be required to force
through
this passage of Glass-Steagall, I want to use as an example
what
the LaRouche Movement was able to do by marshalling forces
across
the country to force the declassification of the 28 pages.
Because it's a very similar example of the kind of widespread
upsurge in activism across the country led with this kind of
laser focus, that's going to be required right now in the

coming

weeks to force the Glass-Steagall vote. So, on that note, I'd like to introduce a short 7-minute video clip which is excerpts

from the blockbuster press conference that former Senator Bob Graham held at the National Press Club this past Wednesday. We can invite you to watch the full press conference, which is available on the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel. For right now, I'd

like to introduce that, and then use that to open up a broader discussion here.

FORMER SEN. BOB GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Burr; and thank you for the opportunity to come back to the National Press Club.

As has been said, on July 15th, after some 14 years, the chapter of 28 pages from the final Report of the Congressional Joint Inquiry into 9/11 was released. This was removing the cork from the bottle; but there is a significant amount of information which, like the 28 pages, has been withheld. It was necessary to get this first block of material to the public in order to build the support that will be necessary for the balance of the material to flow.

Now that the bottle is open, what is likely to pour forth?

I think there are three tasks in which the liquid will flow.

One is, the 28 pages were written in the Fall of 2002, but were not – in a number of instances – completed. We were under a mandate to submit our final report before the end of that

session

of Congress; which meant by the end of December of 2002. There were some issues that have not been taken fully to ground. As an

example, the role of Prince Bandar, the long Saudi ambassador to

the United States. In the 28 pages, it is disclosed that in the

book of Abu Zabadeh[ph], one of Osama bin Laden's closest operatives, were the telephone numbers – which were otherwise unavailable – to Bandar's mansion in Aspen, and to his bodyguard

here in Washington. There was also information about the fact that both he and his wife had been involved in money transfers which appeared to go to the mentors and protectors of the three

hijackers in San Diego. Was that where that money flow ended; or

did it end up supporting the hijackers? That's the kind of questions which were raised in the 28 pages; but I hope that we

will now get information to close those loopsâ!.

?: Senator Graham, thanks and congratulations for what

you're doing in insisting that the facts on 9/11 come out. As you

pointed out, and as the media pointed out, the 28 pages and credible media reporting that there were meetings, there were facts here; not just myths and wonderings, but facts. In San Diego, the meetings by the Saudi Director of Religious Affairs with at least three of the hijackers; and 15 of the 19 hijackers

were from Saudi Arabia. There was money paid from Prince Bandar's

account. Those are the facts; but it just seems that the American

policy is to hide and to obfuscate. Why? Is it a matter of Democrats and Republicans alike just want to pander to Saudi Arabia? What I don't understand is the reason why we don't just take the facts and move from there; because these are the facts.

GRAHAM: No, this is not a partisan issue. In fact, in the House, the effort to pass this JASTA legislation that will modify the sovereign immunity defense, and prior to that, a resolution urging the President to release the 28 pages, was led by a Republican, Walter Jones from North Carolina, and a Democrat, Stephen Lynch from Massachusetts. This has had strong bipartisan support. If anything, it's more of an Executive Branch versus the people of America; it's been the Executive Branch through not only Justice and State, but Treasury and the intelligence agencies, that have largely been the barrier to allowing this information to be known by the American people. And let the American people then form a judgment. What do they think we ought to be doing in this relationship with Saudi Arabia?

STEINBERG: Jeff Steinberg; {Executive Intelligence Review}. Senator, former Navy Secretary John Lehman, who was a commissioner on the 9/11 Commission, told "60 Minutes" back in April that there really never was a complete investigation by the 9/11 Commission; and you've already said that the Joint Inquiry was limited by time and resources. Now, 15 years later, we have

the 28 pages. As you just indicated, there's lots of facts in there. There was a 47-page report written at the beginning of the 9/11 Commission by the two people on your staff who were following up on the Saudi leads. They listed 22 Saudi officials who had direct contacts with just the San Diego hijackers. What do you envision as the next step? Can there be a new investigation without the time restrictions and other problems? Do you support that? How would you envision moving forward from here in addition to the lawsuit which we do hope will be reinstated against the Saudis for discovery?

GRAHAM: In addition to the request to the National Archives, who are the custodians of the 9/11 papers, to release those sections of its report which have been withheld which relate to following up to the leads which are in the 28 pages. So, we could ask, in those pages, is there a chapter about Prince Bandar that pursues the leads that were outlined in the 28 pages? Second, will have to be more Freedom of Information Act with the FBI and the CIA. Another thing would be the President; I can understand why George Bush acted the way he did. I cannot understand why Barack Obama is acting the way he has. This information is going to be known; whether it's in 2016, or 2026, or '36, or '46, it will – like the Pentagon Papers and all these other old scandals – eventually it's going to come out. I think the legacy of

Barack Obama is going to be stained when the people recognize how much information was under his control, that he made the executive decision to continue to restrict from the American people. So, those are, I think, the principal levers; they all eventually come to the American people. The American people care about knowing what their government did in this particularly egregious action; and if so, will they put enough political pressure? The most immediate thing is to contact your member of Congress and urge he or she to vote for JASTA. That bill has had a roller coaster existence over the last four or five years; it seems to be closer to reaching its destination today than at any time during that long period. The key is going to be, will the House take it up? That's where the pressure needs to be until that important task is accomplished.

What I think are the most likely three directions after the 28 pages are: One, following up on the leads that were in the 28 pages; such as the role of the then-Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar. Second, there's been information developed since the 28 pages were written in the Fall of 2002; such as the existence of this relationship between a prominent Saudi family, Mohammed Atta and two of his compatriots in Sarasota, Florida. Then third, the litigation that is being frustrated by the sovereign immunity defense; which the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has been raising. Those are, I think, the three major channels in which we will get additional information on the relationship between Saudi Arabia and the 19 hijackers. The

report, I think, made a case that an investigator reading what Prince Bandar had done, would say, "I want to pursue this further." The question is, were those leads pursued? And if so, to what end? I hope what we'll find is that yes, they were pursued; and here are investigative reports that carry this case to its conclusion.

OGDEN: So, as you could see, yours truly Jeff Steinberg was on hand to ask Senator Graham a question; and Senator Graham's emphasis, which he repeatedly came back to, was to open up the file on Prince Bandar, the Saudi ambassador. So Jeff, maybe you want to elaborate a little bit more on where this investigation needs to go.

STEINBERG: Well, I think Senator Graham was very clear that there are 80,000 pages of documents that the FBI has acknowledged belatedly and begrudgingly exist in Sarasota, Florida. I'm sure that that was a small fraction of the documents down there, as Senator Graham said, 13 of the 19 hijackers, at one point or another, were based in Florida before the attack. Paterson, New Jersey was another center where the hijackers were living and training for a period of time. Falls Church, Virginia was both a place where a number of them were present for a while, but it was a convergence point; a kind of a staging area. There was a confirmed report that a high-ranking Saudi minister was at the same hotel in Falls Church, Virginia as a group of the

hijackers

the night before the hijacking. So, there are many leads.

Undoubtedly, between the FBI, the CIA, the National Security Agency, there's an alphabet soup of 16 intelligence agencies that

undoubtedly have millions and millions of pages of undisclosed material.

I think one of the most crucial things – and again, Senator

Graham was very clear on this – the most aggressive and effective form of forcing out new information on what really happened is by having the Saudi monarchy reinstated in the lawsuit. Meaning that the JASTA bill has to pass the House; it has to pass by a veto-proof majority. Once again, we're back to

the same question: Are you, the American people, going to stand

up and fight for something that's urgently needed? Or, are you going to treat democracy as a spectator sport? If you choose the

latter, then the consequences are going to be more of the same and worse. I think that the fact that Senator Graham focussed on

further disclosure – as he said, the bottle is uncorked; but the

contents have been barely trickled out. There's an enormous amount more that has to be done; and of course, next weekend is

the 15th anniversary of the initial 9/11 attacks. Let's not forget, it's the fourth anniversary of the second 9/11 attack in

Benghazi in 2012. That's not only a very relevant issue in terms

of the consequences of the original cover-up of the Saudi involvement, but it's a very immediate and intensive issue related to the Presidential elections in the US. We've got to be

fairly blunt about that. The cover-up of Benghazi is part of the continuation of the cover-up of the Saudi role in the original 9/11 attack.

OGDEN: Well, Diane, you're right in the middle obviously of putting together the commemorative anniversary celebrations and the seminar, and just leading the activism there in New York City. So, maybe you can just pick up from here.

DIANE SARE: Well, I'd like to actually take a step back; because one of the things that Senator Graham brought up about why this was so important. He said there were three reasons: One is the question of justice for the family members of the people who were killed; Two, a somewhat obvious question, which is the question of security. If we don't root out these networks, they're there to be used repeatedly. And three, which I think is really important and cannot be overstated, which is the question of whether people trust their government. Because once the population of the United States no longer trusts the government, which is almost where we are right now, then you lose the republic. Our republic, going back to the conception of Nicholas of Cusa and {Concordantia Catholica}, depends on this question of the consent of the governed. If you don't trust your government, you will not consent to have it representing you. What Mr. LaRouche said in the last days, is what we've seen between the

breakthrough that was driven by our work, and then Congressmen Jones and Lynch virtually threatening – not exactly in those words – but saying we know that we are immune if we read this into the record; and what's moving on Glass-Steagall in terms of the party platforms, is that these Congressmen are beginning to be forced to represent their populations.

I would put this in an international context, because what you have coming up with the Vladivostok meetings going on right now, and the G20; the trans-Atlantic system is completely bankrupt. There is nothing Obama and the current configuration, the European Central Bank, what are they offering to the world?

Negative interest rates? Keep your money with us, and we'll make

you pay! In other words, there is nothing that they can do; but

what you have with Russia and China. China's work – which people

who are following our website will have seen the show on Wednesday; the New Paradigm show on the question of the far side

of the Moon, or the talk Thursday night. There is an entire universe – we'll start with the Solar System – which is opening

up, which this collaboration in Asia has to offer. What the Chinese have done is, they're hosting the G20 meeting, and they're making President Putin the guest of honor. Then they're

having President al-Sisi as another honored figure at this meeting. What is Obama's response? He thinks he's going to go there and somehow push the Trans-Pacific Partnership; which is bound to be a complete flop, a non-starter. The Russians made

very clear in an interview in Xinhua going into this meeting, that Moscow and Beijing need Washington as a partner. I found that somewhat – it made me happy as an American, because I think the US should be a partner in this. Also, paradoxical. Then the person who was interviewed, said Washington can be a complex and unpredictable partner.

So, I would say that our job as Americans – in a sense – we've been given a mission that other very important leaders are saying that the United States is wanted as a valued partner in this New Paradigm. It is for us to deliver that by straightening out this criminal regime that we have. Part of what we saw with 9/11 is that the cover-up has gone on through two administrations; that Obama has been not only complicit in this, but with his policies in the region, has contributed to the growth of ISIS, the growth of al-Qaeda, their ability to recruit. We've lost over these last years, almost 4500 soldiers in Iraq, which is now known to be a complete lie and a fraud; that's what came out of the Chilcot Inquiry. The question of 9/11, therefore, becomes will we get justice? And justice doesn't mean revenge or retribution; it means will we restore our nation to something which someone would want to give their consent to be governed by this government?

I think when you look at the question of Mozart, which

is
the {Requiem} which will be performed, which our chorus is
participating in and working on; Mozart's commitment was that.
He
was a supporter of the American Revolution; he was a supporter
of
the ideas of creating a republic, and he was murdered. His
work
was eliminated; his contribution, what he could have done had
he
lived longer. The piece has lived on because it has a quality
which is immortal; which actually embodies the question of
human
creativity. What we're seeing here in response is that the
people
who are engaged in this are developing a certain kind of
passion
which probably was always in them. But because they have a
chance
to participate in something which is going to be so profound
and
so beautiful, and it has a mission in the real world, they are
becoming passionate again; which is I think is something
that's
been very lacking. Everyone can think of conversations that
you've had with your friends and neighbors about the upcoming
election or almost anything; and the population has become
passionless, which is why people don't act when they should or
when they can.

So, I have a sense that we really are on the brink of
a
major breakthrough that the United States will be a part of;
even
if many people in the United States don't fully appreciate why
it
is here and how they came to be involved in it.

OGDEN: Absolutely! I would just echo exactly what you just said, Diane. In his speech at the Press Club, Senator Graham quoted the often-quoted anecdote from Ben Franklin at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention; when the woman asked, "What have you given us?" And he said, "A republic, if you can keep it." The passion that Senator Graham has exhibited around this, sustaining his role and his fight for 15 years for the declassification of these documents; where does this passion come from? Even though the FBI tried to intimidate him personally, and told him to back down; basically "Get a life!" they said. Senator Graham has refused to back down, because he sees this – as well it should be seen – as an existential question for the survival of the American republic. Not only from justice and the standpoint of national security, but the very survival of our nation as a republican form of government. I would assert that we're looking at exactly the same kind of existential question when it comes to the restoration of Glass-Steagall. The magnitude of the implosion of the trans-Atlantic system that we are about to see – if this thing came down without the necessary leadership in place around the restoration of Glass-Steagall and otherwise, to protect the American people from the fall-out from that kind of financial crisis – this republic would not survive.

The opportunity is there at our fingertips to join the new financial architecture and to create the kinds of productive surges in growth that this nation has never before seen; that

would surpass even what we achieved during FDR's New Deal, if we were to join the New Silk Road which is being led right now by China and others. So, it's that same kind of passion which needs to be applied to that question as well.

DAVE CHRISTIE: Just to add, because I think the other side of this is what Mr. LaRouche has identified that we're at a point now where the old concept of sovereignty from the standpoint of geopolitics; that the moves that are being made in the world by the leadership of Russia, China, and India, are obviously the echo of what Mr. LaRouche and his wife Helga have put on the table for over a 40-year period. The discussion of the new financial architecture really began when Mr. LaRouche proposed the International Development Bank; his proposals for a New Bretton Woods conference, starting in the '90s. That was picked up by Nestor Kirchner of Argentina. Putin was actually discussing this concept as well, of the new financial architecture, in the early 2000s. So clearly, the role of the LaRouches is at the forefront of this New Paradigm and the potential for that to come into existence. What Mr. LaRouche has stressed is that we're going to move beyond the old nation-state system. That doesn't mean we're going to cease to have nations; but rather, the first and foremost thought will be of mankind viewing itself from the common aims of mankind. That humanity will be thought of first. I think that's what we're seeing with the implications of the New

Silk Road policy and the new financial architecture; it is just simply to facilitate the expansion of this concept.

In that light, I think it's important that {The Hindu} just had an interview with Helga Zepp-LaRouche; and in the coverage of that article, they cite the question of the Bering Strait, which is the tunnel underneath the Bering Strait to link Eurasia with North America. I think that's relevant to the ongoing discussion in Vladivostok; because clearly the ability for Japan, for Korea, for China and Russia to come together in this part of the world, represents an amazing potential. Just think of the scientific and technological potentials of those nations: China's space program; Russia's space capabilities; the high-tech capabilities of Japan and Korea. It really represents a very profound potential; and when you begin discussing the development of the Siberia region, the Far East region, you're building up that economic potential right up to the doorstep of the Bering Strait. So, I think that's obviously reflected in this {Hindu} article which interviews Helga Zepp-LaRouche and her call to make the New Silk Road become the World Land-Bridge; which is actually the title of that article.

So, I think the importance of what Diane referenced – this

idea of the consent of the governed – in a sense, these discussions that are going on this weekend with the Vladivostok conference, the G20 conference, that is what is actually being discussed. As the Europeans are complaining about Obama, they're trying to ram the TTIP and the TPP down the throats of the Europeans; where prominent leadership of Germany and France are saying, "Wait a second. Aren't we going to be involved in any kind of discussion about this? Is this a democratic process?" But of course, for Obama and the imperial interests that control him, there's no discussion; no democratic process. I think that's actually what is on the table. Just to come back to it, there's no other place than space, which is perhaps the greatest reflection of the end of the idea of the old system of nation-state. There are no nation-states in space.

We were discussing earlier the fact that this SpaceX rocket just blew up; the great privatized space program that we're now going to have after Obama dismantled NASA. It turns out that its payload was a satellite launched by Facebook to run broad band in Africa. This is the level of technology that we have in the United States, or that we're concerned about. Whereas, if you look at what China's doing with the far side of the Moon, look at this collaborative effort; that can be the way to bring Asians on this planet together to actually realize the common aims of mankind.

OGDEN: If you go back to the inaugural speech that John F Kennedy made in 1961, when he was elected President; that was obviously the focus of a previous generation of this country. He said, we must move beyond the age of war; because all-out war is not conceivable anymore in the age of nuclear weapons. This would lead to the extermination of not just one country or another, but the entirety of the human race. Instead, what we must do, is move beyond the age of war to an age where nations are collaborating to achieve the common aims of mankind. He said, our mission must be to explore the stars, to conquer the deserts, to cure poverty and disease, and to bring an end to the age of war itself.

When you look back one year at the speeches that Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping made at the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York, that was exactly what the subject matter was. It was the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, and the framework that was put together by Franklin Roosevelt after that war before he died, was intended to be a framework of international relations based on bringing the New Deal, bringing the awesome achievements that the United States had accomplished under the American System to the rest of the world. And, bringing an end to imperialism and colonialism once and for all. So,

they harkened back to that framework in which the United Nations was originally conceived, and said this must be the foundation of the paradigm going forward. Immediately after those speeches at the United Nations General Assembly, Helga LaRouche issued a call for a new security architecture for the planet. If you look at how much has changed just over the past one year, in terms of what now exists in actuality in those terms; that new security architecture, the new economic architecture, this new international order has now begun to coalesce.

As Diane was saying, it's incumbent on the American people to impress upon yourself how rapidly the situation in this country could change, if the necessary steps are taken in order to bring the United States into that new framework. If you bring yourself outwards by a couple of months or one year from the present date, and look at how much has changed since that previous United Nations General Assembly meeting; you can see how rapidly things could change for the better. I know that's been Helga's assertion over and over again. The future is so close; it's at your fingertips. It would be so easy to achieve. But there are bold actions that must be taken in the United States; and absolutely that starts in the month of September with the convening of an immediate vote on Glass-Steagall, and ramming that through the United States Congress.

STEINBERG: I think that Mr. LaRouche has emphasized repeatedly that winning this fight in the United States, basically restoring the United States to its historical

tradition

– which was an anti-colonial, anti-imperial, specifically anti-British Empire nation that came into existence through a struggle against all those principles of empire that have been gradually more and more adopted by the last two administrations;

by the Bush 43 administration and equally so if not even more so

by Obama. The fact of the matter is, that we can at this point

–

as the 28 pages fight indicated, as the momentum for Glass-Steagall indicates – we can win this fight in the United States; but it's got to be done now, and it's got to be done in a

timely fashion where people realize that there are critical flanking battles that must be fought. Many other things are merely irrelevant or distractions; and should just be ignored.

We

win the fight on Glass-Steagall; we win the fight on the full exposure of the Saudi 9/11, because that is really a British-Saudi story that goes deep into our own national security

structures. So, these are the things that are going to be measured in the next immediate days and weeks ahead. It has virtually nothing to do with the election show that's going to be

more and more of a dominant factor.

We've got to win this fight for Glass-Steagall; we've got to

win the JASTA fight. Those things can be won in the Congress in

the immediate several weeks ahead of us. That's going to take an

enormous mobilization, a focussed mobilization of the American people. It means a lot of institutions that can be dragged in many different directions, have to have the same kind of laser focus that Mr. LaRouche is calling for and demanding of our

own

forces. AFL-CIO actively involved in Glass-Steagall. Now is the

moment to pull out all of the stops and force the issue; because

Glass-Steagall is merely the starting point. It begs the issue of

a national system of credit; of national banking; of establishing

priority projects. Including, first and foremost, reviving NASA;

reviving our government-backed space program. Because these are

the things that are the only way that you're going to revive real

productivity in the US economy, given how far down it's sunk already.

OGDEN: I would just say one thing. Those two subjects – the forcing of the reopening of the 9/11 investigation and the immediate mobilization around Glass-Steagall – these are featured in this week's edition of {The Hamiltonian}; which is hitting the streets today. That is a direct focus in terms of activism that everybody needs to be involved in, is the saturation of New York City, specifically with this weekly publication that is now coming out – {The Hamiltonian}. So, maybe before we conclude this broadcast, Diane, you can give us a

quick update on how that's changing the situation on the ground

in New York; and what people have to do between now and next weekend in order to maximize the effect of the events that are coming up in a week.

SARE: I would say that people should certainly contact the

Manhattan Project office about coming to our meeting tomorrow

in

Manhattan; where people can pick up copies of {The Hamiltonian}

and can join us on the distributions. We've been getting them out

all over the city and in the neighboring boroughs, and getting a

very favorable response. It's amazing; this one we're printing now is only the fourth issue, but we already clearly have a following of people saying, "Do you have the next one?" I think

it's also shaping the perception of what people are willing to say. It may have been a coincidence, I don't know, that we ran our first issue on Hillary Clinton as a stooge for Obama's wars

and Wall Street; and that week, Maureen Dowd came out with her column on Hillary Clinton as the pro-war perfect replacement for

Dick Cheney was the idea. As we've seen in the past, there are certain things that we take the point on, and we change what people are allowed to discuss. Like when Mr. LaRouche, years ago

during Cheney and Bush, talked about Leo Strauss; and we produced

a series of reports – ultimately a book – on this policy of lying and ramming it down people's throats as a way of terrorizing the population to go along with fascism. The next thing you knew, the {New York Times} was running this big article about Leo Strauss, who I'm sure most people had never heard of until we did this.

If you go back to what happened with the 28 pages, Obama had

absolutely no intention to ever release those pages. We created a

situation where he could not not release them; he had to do it.

Therefore, people should take heart in a certain way, that

what

you used to consider as the powers that be, or the things that are unmovable, or what can't be changed; that is no longer the case. Now is really the moment to pick up – Jeff said it clearly

– the American Constitution, Alexander Hamilton; what our nation

is actually supposed to represent in the world. Now is the moment

for Americans to find their guts and stand up on their hind legs

and demand that nothing lower than that standard is going to be

tolerated by us at this point.

OGDEN: Absolutely. So, I would encourage everybody to please

contact the New York office if you're in the area, or if you can

travel there. There's going to be a series of events that you can

participate in over the next week; and it's very significant. If

you have not yet, please subscribe to our YouTube channel, but also, watch the two latest features that have been posted on the

LaRouche PAC YouTube channel and the LaRouche PAC website. As I

mentioned, the full press conference that Bob Graham delivered at

the National Press Club is available; the short address of that

is lpac.co/graham-press-club. We'll put that in the description

of this video here today. Also, the 20-minute video called "The

New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge: a Tour"; which is

very well-composed overview of exactly what the New Paradigm and the new economic architecture looks like. Again, we'll put the URL of that video in the description as well.

So, thank you very much for joining us here today. I think this was a very important discussion. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Thank you very much; good night.

Hvordan menneskehedens produktivitet udløses: En ny økonomisk orden. LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast, 26. august 2016.

Matthew Ogden: I aften har vi en særlig gæst med os, Paul Gallagher, økonomisk redaktør for *EIR*, og som vil præsentere for os det klare og presserende nødvendige valg, som amerikanere må træffe for at opgive den forfejlede økonomi, som er Obamas politik med nær-nul-vækst, og beslutsomt må tilslutte sig den nye, økonomiske orden, som Kina har indledt. Med det forestående G20-topmøde, der skal finde sted om en uge, har Kinas præsident udtrykkeligt gjort det klart, at det er hans hensigt, at dette topmøde skal bruges til at fremme skabelsen af en »ny international finansiel arkitektur« i samarbejde med Rusland og andre betydningsfulde magter, baseret på videnskabelig og teknologisk innovation og vækst. I mellemtiden konfronteres USA og Europa med det transatlantiske systems fremstormende implosion, der ikke alene skyldes den

enorme akkumulering af gældsbobler og eksponering til derivater, men i endnu højere grad årtiers fravær af enhver reel vækst i økonomisk produktivitet. Kinas program for udforskning af Månen tjener til at illustrere kilden til ægte, økonomisk værdi. Kun gennem en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og en gældseftergivelse for at afskrive den kolossale boble af fiktive værdier kan USA blive en del af denne nye, økonomiske orden og tage del i udløsningen af menneskets kreative evner.

TRANSCRIPT

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It is August 26th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from LaRouchepac.com. As you can see, I'm joined in the studio tonight by Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and by Paul Gallagher, a special guest today, Economics Editor for *Executive Intelligence Review*; and we also joined, via video, by Kesha Rogers, member of our Policy Committee, joining us from Houston, Texas. Hi, Kesha!

We are meeting here at the day that the 3rd edition of the LaRouche PAC publication *The Hamiltonian* is hitting the streets of New York City. This is Edition

3, the August 26th edition, as you might be able to see from this very small edition copy. The very large headline is "Obama is a Failure. The World Needs a New Financial Architecture, Now." That encapsulates the framework of our show today.

I think, as we've said recently over the last couple of weeks, we are highly anticipating the upcoming G-20 Summit, which is going to be held in China, hosted by China, hosted by Chinese President Xi Jinping, on September 4th and 5th – a little bit over a week from now. What's happening in the lead-up to that G-20 Summit is the consolidation of really what is becoming

the framework for a new international financial and economic architecture. You have a consolidation of cooperation among countries of Eurasia – mainly China, Russia, and India, but many other countries besides – including moving forward with the development of the [international] North-South Transportation Corridor [instc], and many other economic bilateral and multi-lateral relationships among the countries of that region.

But, what is being stated explicitly by the leadership of China and of Russia is that this framework, this paradigm, must replace the failed paradigm which is now bringing the trans-Atlantic system down with it, and must become the framework for a new international, global economic order. I think it was said, very clearly, by a spokesman for the Russian International Affairs Council, who said in an interview this week, "Russia and China should work together, within the G-20 framework, to secure a new international financial architecture." That's Andrey Kortunov, [Director General at the Russian International Affairs Council]. And then, just yesterday, a spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Minister, said, "What will happen during the G-20 Summit, is a major change in the world economic landscape."

Now, what we've discussed, including in a discussion today with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, is that it can be seen very clearly that China and Russia absolutely "know what time it is," as Mr. LaRouche has been warning all of you: that we are on the verge, if not in the midst, of a complete implosion of the trans-Atlantic financial-economic-social-political system as a whole. And this is not just because of the debt exposure of the largest banks, or the derivatives exposure, or anything like that, but it is – and I think this is what Paul will get into in much more detail – it is because we have neglected any real economic growth, any real concept of economic value in this trans-Atlantic system for at least the last 30-50 years, and in fact have rejected the very idea of the necessity of

productivity and economic progress.

We're going to be discussing that, but also from the standpoint which will be filled out in a little bit more detail in the second half of our show of what is the concept of real economic value, and how indeed are China and Russia leading mankind toward a revolution in economic productivity, which is centered very prominently around their dedication to a space program, especially around lunar development and lunar exploration. With that said, I'd like to invite Paul to open up the discussion.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thank you! Let me start by saying we have to relate the American people, American policy-makers, American elected officials emphatically to the September 3rd, 4th G-20 Summit being hosted by China, because just as there was a necessity about a year and a half ago for the United States to become part of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank [aiib] and the other global institutions of new credit for infrastructure which China was initiating, one will remember that at that time, instead, the Obama Administration set its teeth against the AIIB bank, tried in vain to sabotage it and prevent countries from joining it as members. One need only say that as of now, there are 60 nation-members of the AIIB, and of next year it's expected that there will be 90 nations trying to participate in the generation of high technology infrastructure credits in the grand task of the New Silk Road, (or the Eurasian Land-Bridges), across Eurasia, through the Mideast, into Africa – communication, power, transportation being revolutionized in this way. The Obama Administration took the United States to the sidelines, and worst, to the adversarial position, to try to sabotage that.

We have to do differently, in this case, because our economy is completely failing. We have the condition of an imminent second 2008 bank panic, not because of this or that particular deal, or even this or that particular bubble, but because the economies of the United States and Europe have sunk so far in

the non-recovery of the 2008 collapse, that even the biggest banks themselves have been destroying their hosts and shrinking, their stocks collapsing, their collapse as a whole emerging from that cause, of the absolute inability to make profits in economies which they have done so much to ruin.

What China is proposing – and remember China has said, that the leading other nation-guest at that G-20 Summit is President Vladimir Putin of Russia – what they are proposing is a "new financial architecture." Now "financial architecture" basically means how do nations regulate their banks, and perhaps in the other order – how do nations create credit for purposes of progress: economic, technological, scientific progress, and direct that credit where it should go. Secondly, how do nations regulate their banks; and thirdly, how do *international* institutions – particularly international credit institutions, lending institutions – how do they function, in order to make this progress possible for all the nations involved, and in particular allow less-developed nations access to both the credit that they need, the technological development, and the self-development of the skills which are necessary for this kind of progress. That's what a "new financial architecture" means. Clearly, the financial architecture since 1971, when we went to the floating interest rate, and, particularly since the Presidencies of Bush and Obama, this financial architecture has been a complete failure.

So, they are saying, this is not just a two-day summit, but a collaborative process which has to continue among the G-20 nations until a new financial architecture is accomplished. I'll get to what that would mean, particularly on the part of the United States and Europe. But, let me read one thing that a leading scholar in China said, about this September 3rd and 4th G-20. He said, "This is a very important summit for all the countries in the world." This is Su Xiaohui, Deputy Director of Strategic Studies at the China Institute of

International Studies. Many scholars of his type might have said this. "China is hosting this summit because it is what other countries wanted. It is the other countries that wanted China to host this event, this growth and innovation summit. In recent years, there have been plenty of problems in the world economy, and all the countries in the world, including G-20 members, are eager to find solutions. Other countries know China can be a leader in addressing the world's economic problems."

What he is saying, in diplomatic terms, is many countries to take the lead in a summit whose purpose is an all-out drive to restore growth and productivity in the world economy, because China has been the driver of growth and productivity in the world economy for the last ten years, joined now by India, and despite crippling sanctions, with some very striking accomplishments by Russia. For example, that Russia has become, as of right now, the world's leading wheat exporter. It has become self-sufficient in many categories of food, in which it was 50% dependent on imports when these sanctions were put on. So, although its economy, under these financial and economic sanctions, is not growing, nonetheless it has successfully grown in ways which prevented literal starvation of its economy and its population, by these sanctions. That's why they have to lead it.

This puts a challenge to China, obviously, to really hold their determination to make this summit a real accomplishment, in terms of growth and progress. Only a couple months ago the Chinese Finance Minister, Lou Jiwei, and the [Minister of Commerce (formerly known as the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation), Gao Hucheng,] made public statements, particularly when the finance ministers of the G-20 met, saying the condition of the world economy is grim. World trade, in un-inflated terms, has essentially stagnated for the last 5-6 years. No growth at all. There are many nations in the world with no growth, they said. It's a grim situation

which must be reversed by the G-20. Again, diplomatically, they weren't naming the zero-growth nations. But I will, very shortly.

China, on the other hand, is continuing to put large volumes of combined public and private credit issuance, something on the order of \$250 billion a year equivalent, into investments, both within China, across the New Silk Road economic belt, and further afield as well. In comparison to that, you have the United States. Obama. We say he's a failure. No question. One of the things he fails at, is arrogantly bragging that "the United States sets the rules," and China has to follow them; that China is merely a raw-materials-producing and cheap-goods-producing economy, and has to grow up and join the advanced economies of the world. This is one of the sports, in which Obama is a failure, is trying to brag and shine over China. Let's look at it.

U.S. economic growth in the eight years of Obama's Presidency has not equalled U.S. economic growth in the first year of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency, nor in the second year of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency. In both of those years, by the way this growth is calculated today, in recovery from the Great Depression, under the impulse of Roosevelt's policies, the growth in the United States was on the order of 10%-11% a year, in '33 and '34, and again in '35.

BEN DENISTON: Each individual year?

GALLAGHER: Each individual year. The total growth of the U.S. economy, by GDP measures, during Obama's entire Presidency, has been 1.1% a year; 8.4% over his entire [tenure]. So, he hasn't *equalled*, in 8 years of recovery from the Great Recession, the growth of each of Franklin Roosevelt's first 3 years in the recovery from the Great Depression.

Now, the reasons for this are more fundamental than the measures of growth, which include a lot of things, but suffice

to say, that Europe whose annual growth per year during the same years that Obama has been President, has been an average of 0.6% per year. China's growth during that same 8-year period has been on average 8.1% per year. So, it's been very similar to the rate of growth which was generated under the impulse of Roosevelt's policies; and not accidentally, because the policies of credit-generation, infrastructure investment, high-technology innovation – in this context particularly space exploration, fusion technology development. In these areas, they have been very similar in the 21st Century context to what Roosevelt did when he became President; and getting similar results and exporting those results to a significant degree to the benefit of other countries.

What lies underneath this, as Lyndon LaRouche has really stressed to the satisfaction of everyone who has listened to him, and should go and look into this; is the loss of productivity – the collapse in the growth of productivity in the United States and European economies during that same period of time. There is a crude measure of productivity which one often reads about in the financial press and in reports from the Commerce Department and so forth. By that measure, which is simply gross domestic product divided by the number of hours worked of the labor force, by that measure, productivity growth during the term of Obama in the White House, has been approximately 0.8% per year. And actually, you can see if you look at the progression, that that growth took place in 2010, 2011, 2012, and part of 2013. Since then, we have seen no productivity change whatsoever; in fact, three of the last four quarters of the year reported by the Labor Department, have seen productivity in the United States go down, not up. So that productivity in the last 12 months of this economy has gone down. I won't go into the European figures.

This is crucial, even though it's a very crude measure, because it indicates that the productivity of labor is not

increasing in such a way that labor can get higher wages; so wages stagnate when this is the case. New capital investments by business are not taking place; the rate of new capital investments by business is extraordinarily low. If this is now on the screen [Fig. ?], this shows a more fundamental measure of productivity growth known as technological productivity growth, or total factor productivity growth. Before giving you a narrow definition, let me read a report which was done by the National Bureau of Economic Research about the growth in the 1930s of this total factor productivity in the United States economy; which you can see is the highest of those bars. What the National Bureau of Economic Research said much later in a report written in this century, is that "The extraordinary growth of this technological productivity in the Roosevelt New Deal era, was due to the very strong growth in electric power generation and distribution, in transportation, in communications, in civil and structural engineering for bridges, tunnels, dams, highways, railroads, and transmission systems, and in private research and development." In other words, what happened during that period of time which made it an even greater burst of productivity than we saw during the World War II mobilization which followed it, what happened during that period of time is that the tremendous demands on the economy of the great infrastructure projects of Roosevelt – including the development of nuclear power and the development of all of the huge hydroelectric power sources; was that everything involved in engineering power, in engineering roads, in engineering tunnels, in engineering great civil works of all kinds, was technologically revolutionized. The companies involved and the agencies involved made breakthroughs in research and development in order to do these things more powerfully and more efficiently; and really to conduct projects on a scale that had never been done before, in such a way that there was very rapid technological progress under the impulse of this pursuit. And scientific progress as well, if you think what underlay the development of the nuclear power piles, it was the beginning

of particle physics, the beginning of nuclear biophysics, the beginning of plasma physics, and the basis for the attempt to develop fusion energy today. There were tremendous developments going on underneath these great works of the Roosevelt era.

So, if we go back to the slide for a minute, you see that by far the highest rate of yearly growth in this technological productivity; that rate of growth is almost 3.5% a year. That rate of growth is in the 1930s; followed by the 1940s, including the war mobilization when it is about 2.7% per year. And after rather a slump in the Eisenhower 1950s, back up in Kennedy's Apollo project 1960s to 2.7% growth per year in technological productivity; and then look what happened. If I could take you off through the '70s, '80s, '90s, the first decade of this century with the Bush Presidency, 1% per year growth or less. And if I could take you off the end of that graph to the Obama years, it would be 0.53% growth per year, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research. So, you see there the under-girdings of the collapse of an economy in the complete loss of real productivity in that economy; and therefore, the ability to launch growth and sustain growth which this represented.

Again, it's very important that this was recovered so rapidly in the 1960s when Kennedy again put great expenditures and great projects at the very frontiers of science in the Apollo project to reach the Moon, but in the broader plans which were then being made and developed for the further exploration of space, which we'll get to. This made a tremendous difference. I should point out that, according to a recent study by the Harvard School of Business of this same factor, in China over the last decade, it has grown at a rate of 3.08% annually; somewhat higher or equal to the highest that the US has achieved, namely that under the Roosevelt period. So that when you have this collapse in productivity in the US and European economies, you have at the same time, de-industrialization of

those economies accelerating; with the result of on the one hand, a real destruction of the labor force – the people. We've talked about this, it isn't necessary to go through it again; but we've talked about the connection between this process and the increasing propensity of Americans who were previously productive, to commit suicide in one way or another – by drinking, or drugging, or in other ways themselves to death. The data just keep coming, the studies just keep coming out on this; each one more depressing than the last. That has been the result of this real collapse; and it has even begun – as I indicated at the beginning – to shrink and undermine the biggest banks who have done so much to cause it. So that even the derivatives markets have, in the last few years, have shrunk; and so have the biggest banks, which became even bigger by swallowing other banks in 2008. They have shrunk; they are parasitizing a host which is dying.

The best way to conclude, I think, would be to quote something that Helga Zepp-LaRouche said this morning, which I think is absolutely correct: "If the United States and Europe are to cooperate in 10 days with the purposes of this growth and innovation summit of the G-20, they must do two things, otherwise they're not cooperating. The first thing is they must implement and enforce Glass-Steagall regulation of their banks. And I should point out that China is the only major economy in the world which has a currently enforced efficient Glass-Steagall bank separation law; passed in 1993. It has been much debated since then, but kept intact and enforced. They must pass Glass-Steagall and enforce it; and secondly, they must write off – not just write down, but write off – the nominal values given to the still \$500-700 trillion worth of derivatives on the books of their banks. In order that those banks can again, under Glass-Steagall become vehicles for the transmission of productive credit and progress. If the United States and Europe are willing to do that, then the real work can begin, of restoring growth and scientific progress to the world economy. If they're not, then they are effectively to be

accounted saboteurs of this noble effort that is being led now by China." So, I'll stop with that.

OGDEN: I do want to add just one quick thing before we get into what Kesha and Ben have to present. I would say, Helga and Lyndon LaRouche are not merely peripherally involved in this process which is now coming out of China; but actually centrally involved, both now and historically. I think it should be remembered that just a few weeks ago, Helga LaRouche was one of the prominent speakers at an event called the T-20, which was a gathering of international think tanks and other persons of that type in the lead-up to the G-20 summit in China. Helga LaRouche was involved in that. Helga has travelled to China I think half a dozen times in the recent several years now; and is a prominent personality in the public discourse there. One other thing that is notable is that the G-20 was developed as the G-22 in 1997-98 at the time that Bill Clinton was making a speech at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City; where he called for a new international economic architecture. That was the framework in which the G-22 was formed. That was exactly the same time that people probably remember the recent webcast where we showed the video clip of Lyndon LaRouche speaking in Washington DC about the development of the New Silk Road, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and the cooperation between Russia, China, and India in creating a new economic framework for Eurasia. That has now converged; the new international economic architecture and the New Silk Road Eurasian Land-Bridge is one thrust that's coming out of China and Russia. Historically, even rewinding back before that, Mr. LaRouche's proposal – which Bill Clinton did pick up on in a certain way in 1997-98 – was for a New Bretton Woods; a reorganization of the world economic system, which is something which he has been on the record centrally leading for 40 years if not more, going all the way back to some of the discussion among leadership of the Non-Aligned Movement for a New International Economic Order by that name. And also Mr. LaRouche's idea for international development banks, which

is exactly what the AIIB or the BRICS new development bank now are echoes of.

So, historically, this is something that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have led from a central position and continue to play a very central role in shaping. And I would just emphasize Paul's point that it is now incumbent upon the United States to take very bold and dramatic decisions to communicate, "Yes, we are no longer going to be Obama failures. We are no longer going to reject these overtures that are coming very explicitly from China for participation in this new system; but we're going to join it, and we're going to show not only our good will, but our intention to do so. By restoring Glass-Steagall immediately and freeing ourselves from the bondage of this dying system which is dragging the entire trans-Atlantic down with it. So, that's an action point that needs to be taken in the days ahead.

GALLAGHER: That's very well added, and I think Lyn and Helga have given the kind of laser focus to this impulse for development, which China, Russia, other countries, India, have shown. That it had to be focussed around not only the frontiers of science, but the frontiers of travel so to speak; of passenger and freight travel, and of crossing the Eurasian continent, which had never been done before. But now, in addition, and particularly recently, Helga has, through a whole series of major conferences, put an additional focus on bringing that development, that Silk Road, through the Mideast; as the only way in which the cauldron of the Middle East could possibly be made into a peaceful and developing area, is through that same New Silk Road process. There's been a great response to that in countries like Yemen, Egypt, other countries of the Mideast.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to take up from there. I think the question at hand is, what is it that fosters this impulse for development that you spoke of, Paul; and what fosters the rapid increase of rate of growth in a society? Mr. LaRouche,

over the years, has defined this as the creative development of the human mind and the productive powers of labor of a society to make new breakthroughs and scientific and technological progress that actually improves not just the conditions of mankind on the planet; but improves mankind's ability to actually go out into the far reaches of our galaxy, to develop the resources of our Solar System. This is exactly the discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche – some of the Policy Committee members and our Basement Team – just recently. His response to the rapid developments of China's leadership in developing the Moon and their plans for going to the far side of the Moon by 2018, that what we're looking at here is not just going to the Moon for the sake of going to the Moon, or finding another landing spot on the Moon. This is critical in a commitment toward international cooperation and a science driver essential for cooperation and development throughout the planet and beyond. Mr. LaRouche recently called for and made the point that we have to have a complete mapping and development of our Moon's surface. He called for the mapping of the Moon's surface being something that we do not and have not fully come to understand. A lot of people will say, "Well, we've already been there, done that." A lot of nations have landed various rovers on the Moon, or satellites on the Moon; or we've had orbiters taking pictures of the Moon. But one thing we have not done, is to go to the far side of the Moon; and recognize the potential that is set to be unleashed from this new feat and endeavor that only China – being the first nation – would be out to present and create.

So, I think when we think about what it is that fosters economic progress, again, we have to look at what China is representing as a leader of the world right now in terms of what they've unleashed in the rapid development of their momentum towards space exploration; and particularly development of the lunar surface. There is so much that we have yet to accomplish right now. We've only touched at a very small surface area of the Moon. It's important to see that the

opening of the far side of the Moon represents a vast potential to give us new insights into human growth.

So, we were just a moment ago talking about the negative growth rates under the insane policies of the Obama administration. Well, what has this been caused by? What has this been a result of? This has been a result of Obama's continued murderous policy and spitting on the legacy of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and John F Kennedy, and the visionary legacy embodied by the great German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke. What he has done, not just to dismantle the space program, but to dismantle the commitment towards human development and human progress. What has he done in place [of that]? He's actually shut down our Constellation program; the program that had slated us in the trajectory in the United States to be in cooperation with nations around the planet around the commitment to return to the Moon, and eventually to the far side of the Moon. What did Obama replace this policy with? He replaced it with an insane policy of capturing an asteroid, cutting our fusion development program, and continuing to bail out the Wall Street speculators who represent no commitment to human progress and growth.

The American people have to ask themselves how much longer will we put up with this atrocity, this tragedy that has taken hold of our nation? Right now, you look at what was offered to Obama by the Chinese, by the Russians, in terms of "win-win" cooperation; the "win-win" cooperation exemplified by the offer of President Xi Jinping of China to not only work for the common aims of mankind in the development of the Silk Road development plan and projects that were going to benefit the growth of all mankind. To work in collaboration on the exploration of space, which is absolutely crucial to this intention. Obama has refused that. The American people and members of Congress have sat by and done nothing about it.

So, you look at the fact of, this is the reason why we face a negative growth rate in the society right now represented by

the United States and the trans-Atlantic financial system. There are a lot of nations right now that are starting to get knocked over the head and recognize that if they don't join with the progress and the New Paradigm being set forth by China and Russia for international cooperation in space development and economic growth, they will be, as the head of NASA in the United States said about the US not cooperating and collaborating with China in space exploration, on the outside looking in. That's where we're going to be if we do not actually take up this full commitment to not just the exploration of space, but truly to what that means. It really can be defined by looking at the vision that was laid out by Krafft Ehrlicke as a great associate and friend of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche before he passed away. What Krafft Ehrlicke identified in terms of the importance of lunar exploration in a writing that he provided prior to his death, earlier in his life, called "Lunar Industrialization and Settlement". I want to read from that just briefly, to give you a sense of what it is that is the priority for the development of the lunar surface in the way that Krafft Ehrlicke envisioned it. It must be taken up as a national and international mission again. So, Krafft says that: "The most important aspect of lunar development lies in the human sector. It bears repeating that technological progress and environmental expansion are no substitutes for human growth and maturity; but they can help the human reach higher maturity and wisdom. He goes on to say that "Human growth is contingent not only on the absence of war, or overcoming war, poverty, and social injustice. But also on the presence of over-arching elevating goals and their associated perspectives. Expanding into space means to be understood and approached as world development. As a positive, peaceful, growth-oriented, macro-sociological project, whose growth is to ultimately release humanity from its present, parasitic, embryonic bondage in the biospheric womb of one planet. This will demand immense human creativity, courage, and maturity."

So, that's what we're discussing here. How do you actually free mankind from this adolescent stage? From the understanding that we are confined to one small planet with limited resources, to the bondage of a biospheric womb on the planet that keeps mankind at states of limited development in a fetal position. When is it that human beings are going to decide to grow up and to leave the nest? That is what is represented by the mapping of the lunar surface; that is what is represented by mankind's reaching out and growing up and going out into the exploration of space. That is the creative process that we must take up right now, which is being denied to us by the attacks on our space program. This is not just the space program as a fun, side project or a hobby; but what is essential to the creative progress of mankind as Mr. LaRouche has clearly understood and has made clear in his development of the Four Laws to Save the United States. The essential aspect of those Four Laws, as was stated by Paul earlier, starting with the Glass-Steagall banking reorganization, going into the progress of re-establishing a credit system, to invest in long-term development projects, has to be centered around a science driver fusion program. This can only be fully developed and fully realized when we realize and bring about our full potential in the exploration of space and everything that represents; including the development of helium-3 on the Moon.

So, as I've said; as Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. LaRouche understands, and as the Chinese and others who are cooperating with them understand, that the most important aspect that we're dealing with right now is the defense of human creative progress. So, I'll just stop right there.

BEN DENISTON: I think that's well said. Maybe the point to be taken through all of this, the focus on the issue of productivity in the beginning, this discussion of the space program, what we really need to push in this context is the realization that this program Kesha's laying out, returning to

Krafft Ehrlicke's vision for lunar development and expansion into space; this is necessary. This is a necessary program, this isn't a cost. These are the kinds of things that actually are the substance of increasing the net total value accessible to mankind as a whole; increasing the productive powers of labor as we're discussing. You hear all this silly talk still about jobs; creating jobs, when we have a net collapse in the productivity of the economy, as we saw with what Paul went through, what Kesha's talking about. This is what actually creates the type of activity that increases the ability for society to sustain itself at a higher standard of living increasingly with less labor input required to maintain the requirements of society. Maybe in the context of Mr. LaRouche's emphasis in the recent weeks, that's also the importance of his focus on Einstein. That also goes to a deeper level of what are the fundamental changes that mankind only uniquely can make that allow us to have these kinds of transformations. We certainly have a clear program before us with what China and Russia are leading.

Just for our viewers, next Wednesday, we're going to be discussing some of this lunar program in a little more detail. So, I would definitely highlight that as a coming episode; we're going to focus a little bit more on this lunar far side program. What China is doing; what's so unique about the far side of the Moon. We just have a clear march from these nations leading in this direction – fusion and space together. This is the driver that's absolutely needed; it's not a cost, it's not an expense. It's a necessary requirement for mankind; especially for the United States in our state right now. That should also be seen as driving to the process of pushing real fundamental breakthroughs in science such as we haven't had since Einstein. I know Jason Ross has elaborated this in recent days to good effect.

With the imminent breakdown of this financial system and the importance of this G-20 focus coming up right now in the

context of clear recognition that we're right on the verge of something worse than a repeat of 2008; I think this being the clear message and marching orders for where we need to go, is absolutely critical at this point. It's not enough just to address and reorganize the financial system; that's absolutely required, but to what effect? To actually drive the kind of growth that China's leading; Kesha's leading a revival of that in Texas to get that going in the United States again.

OGDEN: Along those lines, this entire process that I laid out in terms of Mr. LaRouche's advocacy for a new international financial architecture, was never separate from his insistence that it had to be based on fundamental scientific revolutions; the discovery and incorporation of new physical principles into the economy at large. Not let's rearrange just the bureaucracy of how banks work, or something like that. And it was not even just what other people turned it into, which was that we need equal representation for the developing countries; or the Third World is not having the proper voice at the bargaining table at the World Bank or something like that. It was never something at that level; it was always at the level of why did Mr. LaRouche found the Fusion Energy Foundation, for example. Can you imagine what kind of productivity would be unleashed by the development of commercial, controllable fusion power? That would be unequalled by anything that has come heretofore; it would make what FDR achieved look like hardly anything. Mr. LaRouche's emphasis with the Strategic Defense Initiative was always that we need a breakthrough in terms of physical principles; it was hand-in-hand with fusion energy development, but it was also bringing that into the realm of space exploration and harnessing principles which were beyond what man even understood at that point. In the same exact period, he was also discussing how are we going to have lunar colonization and colonies on Mars. This was LaRouche's emphasis all through that time.

So, the new economic architecture is not separate from a fundamental revolution in science on the caliber of what Einstein achieved; and that is what drives economic productivity. Nothing less than that.

GALLAGHER: I wonder if you can get the third graph on the screen. This gives an idea of how – this goes from 1958 over to 2012, and it's the NASA budget. This gives an idea of how rapidly leaderships of the United States abandoned the actual frontiers of space exploration before we had even gotten to the Moon for the first time. Because by the time we did, that tremendous drop was already underway; and it goes all the way to the present day. The same thing could be shown for the United States effort in research on fusion. They just were abandoned in the face of the extraordinarily powerful visions of human future powers that pioneers like Krafft Ehrlicke had, in terms of covering the Moon's surface with a new human habitation and industrialization as a jumping off point for the rest of the Solar System. All of that – he called it the Seventh Continent – all of that was abandoned along with the tremendous power resources and capacities involved in the fusion technology. Today you can barely find a laser cutting process anywhere in US industry; these things have just been abandoned. If what you see in that graph were reversed very suddenly under the impulse of a desire and a decision that gets rid of Obama and his leadership, and a decision that says we will be part of a team of space-faring nations which in this endeavor would be led by China; maybe in others by us, in others by India, in others by Russia. We'll be part of that overall exploration and this will reverse; this would have a tremendous impact on the entire not only productivity, but the condition of society. This is really the condition of the individual human being, who has these creative possibilities is what LaRouche is always, always talking about; that this is what makes such possibilities of an individual becoming a genius and the fruitfulness of that genius. This expands it to the greatest degree, if leadership will make these kinds of

decisions. This decision is right in front of us with this upcoming G-20 summit; and again, I repeat what Helga said. If the US doesn't put Glass-Steagall into law – it's now been adopted by both parties in their platforms; it ought to be law by no later than the end of this year. If the US doesn't put Glass-Steagall into law immediately, and enforce it right off the collapsing derivatives bubbles; then it's sabotaging this process which has to go forward. Then we will see more loss of our population, more suicide, more drug addiction, more hopelessness among the population unless we make this 180 degree turn.

OGDEN: One thing Helga has also repeatedly said upon her return from these trips to China, is that – and I think other people just pick up on this, too – is that the optimism is pervasive; you can sense it among the population. The 3.8% growth rate in productivity, the 8% growth rate, is just a reflection of an attitude that says, "Our job is to create a future. We will give our children a future. Our lives have meaning because we are involved in creating a future which has not, prior to this point, existed." If you contrast that with an increasing pessimism, cynicism, rage – which is clearly reflected in this election process in the United States population – all of those are symptomatic of exactly what is being addressed in this discussion.

One other thing that Krafft Ehrlicke said which I thought was just well put; he said, "If God had intended us to be a space-faring species, he would have given us a Moon." Well, he did; and that's the launching-off point for mankind to move into the Solar System and beyond. So, if that's not an optimistic idea of the capabilities of the human species, I don't know what is. I know that that's one of the elements that is also being incorporated into the Manhattan Project process.

One more thing I wanted to mention before we close the show today, is the accompanying articles in this week's *Hamiltonian* are: 1) a short article by Jason Ross on

the true genius of Einstein. It's called "Discovering Humanity's True Nature; the Case of Einstein". But then, the back side of the broad sheet is a discussion of 1) an article by Diane Sare, called "2016: America's Moment of Decision, *in which she discusses some of the legacy of the optimism surrounding the tradition of Classical music within the United States and the fight to revive that tendency among people who were close friends with Lyndon LaRouche when they were alive: Bill Warfield; Sylvia Olden Lee; Robert McFerrin; and others. And then there's a very short excerpt of an interview with the national music director of the Schiller Institute, John Sigerson, in which he's discussing the significance of the upcoming series of four concerts of Mozart's Requiem over the weekend of September 11th, in the interests of justice and in dedication to the victims of those attacks and everything that has happened since. So, that's another very crucial element in terms of the ability to uplift a population and to give them a sense that a future is possible; and that these kinds of very dramatic changes in policy could happen in a very short amount of time. If we were able to force the declassification of the 28 pages, which we did; nobody can deny the very significant central role that we played in doing that. People might have said, "This is a hopeless cause." If we were able to do that, then yes, we also can force the passage and enforcement of Glass-Steagall and a radical, dramatic change in policy of the United States in the direction of this new economic architecture which is being led by China and Russia among others.*

With that taken as the final word, I'm going to thank everybody for joining me – Paul Gallagher, Ben Deniston, Kesha Rogers; and thank you all for joining us here today. I know we continue to gain new subscribers of the LaRouche PAC live YouTube channel; so I encourage you, if you have not done so yet, to subscribe to this channel. You will get the opportunity to have a notification of this discussion that Ben mentioned next Wednesday, on the further implications of the

Chinese lunar program. Thank you for joining us and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Hvorfor har vi alt for længe tilladt et Imperium at dominere vores eksistens? LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 19. august 2016

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Engelsk udskrift.

WHY HAVE WE ALLOWED AN EMPIRE TO DOMINATE OUR EXISTENCE FOR FAR TOO LONG?

International LaRouche PAC Webcast , Aug. 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's August 19th, 2016.

My name

is Matthew Ogden. You're joining us for our weekly broadcast here

on Friday evenings of our LaRouche PAC webcast. I'll be your host

tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined, via video, by Kesha

Rogers and Michael Steger, both leading members of the LaRouche

PAC Policy Committee.

As we broadcast this show here tonight, the second edition

– newest copy – of the weekly publication, {The Hamiltonian} is

going to press. This is going to be flooding into the streets of

New York City close on the heels of the first edition, which came

out two weeks ago. Both Kesha Rogers and Michael Steger have articles that are on the front page of this week's copy of {The

Hamiltonian}. Michael Steger wrote an article called "LaRouche Was Right. End Wall Street, Now", and Kesha Rogers wrote a very

profound and beautiful article called "A Truly Human Culture – an Expression of the Creative Human Mind."

What Kesha addresses in this article is the inner relationship between the minds of Lyndon LaRouche, Albert Einstein, and Krafft Ehrlicke, and their conception of what a truly human culture is.

Joining us here today is Jason Ross, who has actually prepared a condensed presentation on the subject of some of the

unique discoveries of Albert Einstein, which will add to our discussion here today.

But before we get to that, we've agreed to begin today's broadcast with a sort of travel back into time. Now that we are on the verge of a total consolidation of this new Eurasian system, which is based around the original idea of the Russia-India-China Strategic Triangle, which was championed by Lyndon LaRouche and also championed by Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov of Russia in the 1990s, we are finding ourselves in a completely unprecedented situation. It's, I think, very clear, as we approach the G-20 Summit, the Vladivostok Economic Forum, and also the United Nations General Assembly, that the entire strategic geometry of the planet has shifted and has realigned.

As is rightly pointed out in the lead of today's LaRouche PAC website, this is not just a "practical" realignment of nations, but, since we are talking about Einstein here today, this is almost the "gravitational effect" of an idea which was introduced almost 20 years ago by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

The video that you're about to see is a very short excerpt of a speech that Mr. LaRouche made at a forum in Washington, DC in 1997 in conjunction with the release of the {Executive Intelligence Review} {first} edition of the special report on the subject of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was a presentation that was made as part of a series of so-called "development conferences" that were held in Washington during those couple of years – 1996, 1997, 1998 – and I think what you'll see in this video is the fact that it was Lyndon LaRouche's "marching orders." It was sort of his creative vision of what the role

that

China, with the New Silk Road, and also the role that Russia would play in completely reshaping the strategic geometry of the world.

So, this is a short excerpt of that speech from 1997:

LYNDON LAROUCHE: There are only two nations which are respectable left on this planet, that is, nations of respectable power: that is the United States, particularly the United States not as represented by the Congress, but by the President. It is the {identity} of the United States which is a political power, not some concatenation of its parts. The United States is represented today only by its President, as a political institution. The Congress does not represent the United States; they're not quite sure who they do represent, these days, [laughter] since they haven't visited their voters recently.

The President is, institutionally, the embodiment of the United States in international relations. The State Department can't do that; the Justice Department can't do it; no other Department can do it; only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can represent the United States as an entity – its entire personality, its true interest, its whole people.

Now, there's only one other power on this planet which can be so insolent as that toward other powers, and that's the Republic of China. China is engaged, presently, in a great infrastructure-building project, in which my wife and others have had an ongoing engagement over some years. There's a great reform

in China, which is a "trouble reform." They're trying to solve a problem. That doesn't mean there is no problem. But they're trying to solve it.

Therefore, if the United States, or the President of the United States, and China, participate in fostering {that} project, sometimes called the Silk Road Project, sometimes the Land-Bridge Project, if that project of developing development corridors across Eurasia into Africa, into North America, is extended, that project is enough work to put this whole planet into an economic revival. I'll get into just a bit of that, to make it more sensuously concrete.

China has had cooperation with the government of Iran for some time. Iran has actually been completing a number of rail links which are an extension of China's Land-Bridge program (or Silk Road project). More recently, we've had, on the side of India, from Indian leadership which has met with the representatives of China, to engage in an initial route, among the land routes, for the Land-Bridge program. One goes into Kunming in China. I was in that area, in Mishana, during part of World War II. Out of Mishana we had planes flying into Kunming, "over The Hump," as they used to say in those days. I'm quite familiar with that area.

But if you have water connections, canal connections, and rail connections from Kunming through Mishana – that area – across Bangladesh into India, through Pakistan into Iran, up to the area just above Tehran, south of the Caspian – you have linked to the Middle East; you have linked to Central Asia; you have linked to Turkey; you have linked to Europe.

Then you have a northern route, which is pretty much the route of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built under American influence and American advice, by Russia. You have a middle route, which is being developed, in Central Asia, with China and Iran.

India is working on a plan which involves only a few hundreds of kilometers of rail to be added – there were a lot of other improvements along the right-of-way – which would link the area north of Tehran through Pakistan, through India, through Bangladesh, through Myanmar, into Kunming, into Thailand, into Vietnam, down through Malaysia and Singapore, across the Straits by a great bridge, into Indonesia.

There's a plan, also, for the development of a rail link through what was northern Siberia, across the Bering Strait into Alaska, and down into the United States. There's a Middle East link – several links – from Europe, as well as from China, but from China a Middle East link into Egypt, into all of Africa.

So, what we have here, is a set of projects which are not just transportation projects, like the trans-Continental railroads in the United States, which was the precedent for this idea, back in the late 1860s and 1870s. You have "development corridors," where you develop, on an area of 50-70 km on either side of your rail link, your pipeline, and so forth. You develop this area with industry, with mining, with all these kinds of things. Which is the way you {pay} for a transportation link. Because of all the rich economic activity. Every few kilometers

of distance along this link, there's something going on, some economic activity. People working, people building things, people doing things.

To transform this planet, in great projects of infrastructure-building, which will give you the great industries, the new industries, the new agriculture, and the other things we desperately need. {There is no need for anybody on this planet, who is able to work, to be out of work.} That simple. And that project is the means.

If the nations which agree with China – which now includes Russia, Iran, India, other nations – if they engage in a commitment to that project which they're building every day; if the United States – that is, the President of the United States, Clinton – continues to support that effort, as he's been doing, at least politically, then what do you have? You have the United States and China and a bunch of other countries ganged up together, against the greatest power on this planet, which is the British Empire, called the British Commonwealth. That's the enemy!

If on one bright day, say a Sunday morning, after a weekend meeting, the President of the United States, the President of China, and a few other people say, "We have determined this weekend, that based on our advisors and the facts, that the international financial and monetary system is hopelessly bankrupt, and we in our responsibility as heads of state, must put these bankrupt institutions into bankruptcy reorganization, in the public interest. And it is in our interest to cooperate

as

nations in doing this, to avoid creating chaos on this planet."

The result, then, is that such an announcement, on a bright Sunday morning, will certainly spin the "talking heads" on Washington TV. [laughter] But otherwise it means that the entire system, as of that moment, has been put through the guillotine, and the head is rolling down the street. Alan Greenspan's head, perhaps.

That means we have at that point the impetus for building, immediately, a new financial and monetary system. Now, in putting a corporation which is bankrupt, into viable form, what do you do? You've got to find the business that it's going to do, which is the basis for creating the new credit to get that firm going again.

The Land-Bridge program, with its implications on a global scale, is the great project which spins off directly and indirectly enough business, so to speak, for every part of this world, to get this world back on a sound basis again.

OGDEN: As you can see, this is a very prescient speech, and in fact it was Lyndon LaRouche's active intervention, travelling to Russia, his wife travelling to China in this period, the publication of {EIR} Special Report about the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has shaped the current situation we find ourselves in. One thing that's interesting to point out, is

those maps that you were seeing. At that time many of those rail routes and other pipeline routes were merely proposals, but now many of them are actually in the process of being built.

I think it's clear, 20 years on, this is the emergent dominant system on the planet. At the same time, the trans-Atlantic system is in completely blowout mode. You have an oncoming implosion of trillions of dollars of non-performing debt and derivatives exposures, which are being projected into every major bank across the trans-Atlantic system.

In the meantime, in the build-up to the G-20 Summit and into the United Nations General Assembly, you've got the role that especially President Putin is playing, in consolidating a series of alliances, mainly between Russia, China, and India; but also this emerging alliance between Russia and Turkey; and, very significantly, the very strengthened alliance between Russia and Iran, where Russia is now using bases in Iran as a point of departure for fighter jets to go in and fight against ISIS in Syria.

Putin, who is being honored as the Number One guest at the upcoming G-20 Summit in China, is certainly at the center of all of this. His career and Mr. LaRouche's career, over the past twenty years since that speech was delivered in Washington, have very closely paralleled each other.

I think we can open up the discussion with that as a

basis.

KESHA ROGERS: Did you want to start, Jason?

JASON ROSS: You can go ahead Kesha, or Michael.

ROGERS: Okay. I think Michael might be having some technical difficulties, so I will go ahead and get started.

When we look at Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, first of all, going back to this video that you just showed, it's extremely important to look at this video as a characteristic of who Mr. LaRouche is, and his 40- to 50-year track record in economic development, and what he has been organizing around, from the standpoint of the center of economics being based on the human intervention, the human creative process. And what actually distinguishes him from all of the other so-called "economists" out there, because as you just said Matt, what we're dealing with right now is a breakdown crisis in the society that Mr. LaRouche has recognized going back to his first forecast of the late 1960s, 1970s. What were these forecasts based on? They were based on the fact that if you went along with a mathematical idea about how society should function, then you were completely misunderstanding – or should I say wrong in your understanding of what actually fosters progress in society. What fosters progress in society is not money per se; and this has been Mr. LaRouche's focus on the role of Alexander Hamilton. [That's] why right now as many people have seen, we've already put out one edition of a new newsletter that you just showed Matt, called {The Hamiltonian}. This is extremely important because now we're putting out the second edition of {The Hamiltonian}, which is having reverberating effects, particularly throughout

Manhattan;

which is the center of the fight for the nation. That is the fight where Alexander Hamilton led the fight for the development

of our US Constitution against the British criminals like Aaron

Burr, and against those who wanted to destroy what the United States actually represented.

But it goes deeper than that; because I think what we've

discussed a lot around Mr. LaRouche's current fight in Manhattan

and what we're doing with this {Hamiltonian} is what has defined

the mission for bringing about the new Presidency. Michael wrote

an article last week on the question of the new Presidency fostered by Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws and the bringing in of those

Four Laws. The article that's in this week's {Hamiltonian} is by

Michael around LaRouche's track record in economics and why Wall

Street has to be brought down now. It is followed by the article

that I wrote on the human creative process. I think we'll get more into that, but when we bring up this question of a New Paradigm for mankind and the identity of a renaissance, some of

it becomes in most people's minds because of the society and culture we live in, a little superficial. It is based on this idea that a renaissance has a different meaning to it. When we

speak of the idea of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, first

and foremost, it is the idea of creating something that has not

yet existed; something that the human creative mind has to bring into existence. When you go back and you start to look at the idea of what the conception of the Italian Renaissance was based on historically, it was the idea of putting mankind and the human creative process at the center of the Universe.

I think it's important that we'll get into this; that this is what has shaped the identity of Mr. LaRouche around his emphasis on the unique creative role of Albert Einstein and the unique creative of others such as was mentioned earlier – Krafft Ehricke. I think it's important for people to look at this, because the question now is that with the collapse of the society that we're seeing right now, the detrimental collapse of the culture, what we're seeing in terms of what's taken over the thinking of the population. The population is not capable of actually making decisions as human beings; they're making decisions based on what somebody tells them is possible or is not possible. I think this is a problem we're running into. How can you actually say that you have the ability to make decisions as a free citizen when you're making your decisions based on what you think is already possible and has been determined as precedents set and possibilities that are already a determining factor of what can and cannot happen.

So, I think that's important to look at as people are thinking about this insane election process. Instead of thinking

about what is going to shape your future; is it going to be something that happens to you? Or something that you actually bring into existence? That's what Mr. LaRouche has been completely focussed on. The population has to have a sense that

you're responsible for your future; you must bring that which does not exist into existence, based on your understanding that

human beings are not animals. We don't have to go along with the

insanity of what we're told we have to accept.

So, I'll start with those remarks for now, and let you guys go on with more.

OGDEN: Well, we just got Michael back, so maybe we should hear him.

MICHAEL STEGER: Hi.

OGDEN: Great! Welcome back. We were just discussing some of the implications of going back and looking back at that video of Mr. LaRouche's speech in 1997. I think you actually had something to point out about the timing of that speech and what happened just immediately afterwards.

STEGER: Yeah, and part of the dynamic in organizing some of the layers of China at that time was that it was not clear to many in China at that time, or in Asia, that the western trans-Atlantic system had major failings and weaknesses. It was just two months after that speech was made that the Asian financial crisis erupted; dominating Southeast Asia and Japan

–
the so-called "Asian tigers". It really made it very clear that the entire financial system could go. It was just a year later that the whole LCTM crisis happened. So when Mr. LaRouche is referencing the bankruptcy of the financial system, that was very apparent in just months to come to almost everyone on the planet; as apparent as it was in 2008 when the financial system blew again. As we point out in the article in the new {Hamiltonian}, the level of insanity that now dominates 20 years later, creates what is clearly the largest financial breakdown in modern history. This is a kind of financial bankruptcy only comparable to perhaps the blow-out in Italy in the 1300s; which brought a Dark Age to Europe.

But what is remarkable is how much these nations like China – it's just striking; and maybe this has already been stated – but the context of China and India collaborating on major routes is an ongoing diplomatic process today. Far more engaged, far more serious than anyone can probably imagine; let alone the integrations of countries like Iran, Turkey. Everything that Mr. LaRouche laid out about 20 years ago, is now on a far greater active collaborative effort among these nations. It is somewhat a testament to the power of ideas and how that can shape history at crisis moments; as we saw in '97 and what we see today.

OGDEN: I think one thing that is very clear from just looking

at

Mr. LaRouche's role in the middle of this, is his emphasis on the

mission that has to bring nations together. In other words, this

is not just geopolitics in a cynical sense. This based around a

concept of what is the human species? What is real profit?

How

do we create a future for a growing population; and how do we establish the kind of optimism that mankind has a future towards

which the current generations can work? It's pointed out, I think a lot of what we're seeing right now is not just a projection of the past into the present. This is a reflection of

a future intention. You can look at what China is doing, for example, in terms of their space program. The fact that two years from now, you're going to have a Chinese probe going to where no man has gone before; to the far side of the Moon, to discover things that perhaps we don't even know are questions yet, in terms of man's relationship to the Universe.

When we were discussing some of these questions with Mr.

LaRouche yesterday, he had one thing to say which I just would like to quote verbatim from him which I think can provide the basis for a furthering of this discussion. What Mr. LaRouche said was the following: "Mankind is not based on the limitations

of individual human behavior; but, in fact, man as a species is

based on the individual powers of the human mind to go beyond what mankind had conceived of prior. Giving mankind a power over

the Universe greater than anything achieved heretofore."

We've

been putting a lot of emphasis on the personality of Albert

Einstein, but for what reason? For the very reason that Albert Einstein is paradigmatic of exactly that sort of individual, revolutionary characteristic of genius. That the genius takes what was believed prior to that point and calls it into question, and overturns major aspects of what mankind had believed and had put into practice up to that point; and revolutionizes mankind's understanding of the Universe and of himself. So, I think that's sort of a window into why the emphasis on Albert Einstein right now.

JASON ROSS: It's difficult to speak for LaRouche; and he's got opportunities to speak for himself on this site, too, which he'll continue doing. But the example of Einstein as a real {mensch} you might say, a real human being, what it is to be a person is essential for a couple of reasons. One, if you think about the role of LaRouche in history and the economic breakthroughs he made several decades ago now, you look at the courage that he had to stick with what he knew was right despite whatever opposition might come his way; despite what was effectively a life sentence in prison, to not compromise in the face of that. An economic forecasting record that's unparalleled and proposals for polices that are now – as you heard in that video, and as is taking place right now with China's One Belt, One Road taking the world. So, in terms of how Einstein fits into that, I want to take up something that Kesha had brought

up

about popular opinion. Because where do you get a freedom in your thoughts from? How are you able to be a free thinking citizen; or how are you able to come to conclusions that are your

own, as opposed to having a basis in their popularity. Or whether you think other people might think them, or whether you

think you ought to look like you think them to get ahead somehow.

Is there an actual standard for whether something is true or not?

Yes, there is; and unfortunately and deliberately, that's really

not part of our culture or our education right now.

So, LaRouche has emphasized that the general understanding

of Einstein is false; it's wrong. Most people's images of who Einstein is as a person, his work to some degree, it's just not

true. And we've got to clean that up in order to make a case about what his approach was to the Universe, to mankind, to life;

and how that was important, it made it possible for him to make

the scientific breakthroughs that he did. But he was a whole person; he was an entire human being, including the role of his

violin – something that LaRouche has referred to a number of times.

So today, I want to go through a few things – somewhat briefly. We're going to have a "New Paradigm for Mankind"

Wednesday show this coming week on Wednesday after a hiatus of some period. So, we'll be able to get into this in a bit more detail than, but I want to take up three things. First is briefly, some thoughts from Einstein; quotes from Einstein.

How

did he think about things beyond his scientific work also. Second, I want to talk about his most famous discovery – relativity; and what that implies. And then third, talk about quantum mechanics as an example of Einstein's courage against popular opinion; which is something that he had from a very young age. Then we'll see how that plays into these other concepts.

When he was 67, Einstein was asked to write down a sort of an autobiography; which he felt was like writing an obituary before he had passed. He was a nice guy, so he still did it. I'm going to read some quotes from this; it's called his "Autobiographical Notes". He starts off very early; he says, "Even when I was a fairly precocious young man, the nothingness of the hopes and strivings which chases most people restlessly through life, came to my consciousness with considerable vitality. Moreover, I soon discovered the cruelty of that chase; which in those years was much more carefully covered up by hypocrisy and glittering words than is the case today." So, the vain chase for success, this isn't a real identity. He says, "It was possible to satisfy the stomach by such participation, but not a human being insofar as he is a thinking and feeling being. Thus, I came – despite the fact that I was the son of entirely irreligious Jewish parents – to a deep religiosity; which, however, found an abrupt ending at the age of 12. Through the reading of popular scientific books, I soon reached the conviction that much of the stories in the Bible could not be true. The consequence was a positively fanatical free thinking, coupled with the impression that youth is intentionally being deceived by the state through lies. It was a crushing impression. Suspicion of every kind of authority grew out of

this experience. A skeptical attitude towards the convictions which were alive in any specific social environment; an attitude

which has never left me." It's not some popular opinion.

He wrote that, "The contemplation of the huge world, the vast riddle of the Universe around us," this to him was the proper goal of life. And that by considering it, you could be really liberated from things that are merely personal or insignificant. He wrote: "Similarly motivated thinkers of the present and the past, as well as the insights which they had achieved, were friends that could not be lost. The road to this paradise of knowledge was not as comfortable and alluring as the road to the religious paradise; but it has proved itself as trustworthy, and I have never regretted having chosen it."

In his thinking process, Einstein – who was a musician with a deep love of Mozart in particular – didn't believe that thinking required words. He wrote: "For me, it is not dubious that our thinking goes on for the most part without the use of signs or words. And beyond that, to a considerable degree, it takes place unconsciously." He writes that "Through our experiences as we understand conflicts between our thought of how the world works and experiences which counter that, we develop a sense of wonder," which he says is the key to the development of new thoughts. So, how can that be developed? How can that be fostered? Well, he complained about the school in his day; he said there was too much testing and not enough freedom or actual thought for the students. I can hardly imagine what he would say about schools now. He wrote then that "It is, in fact,

nothing

short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry. For this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly

in need of freedom. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and of searching can be promoted by means of coercion and a sense of duty."

On the kinds of thoughts that make true discoveries, he said that there are two requirements for such a theory. One, it can't be contradicted by observations; and second, he said it has to have an inner perfection. About that, he wrote – sounding very much like Johannes Kepler, the first modern astronomer – Einstein wrote: "We prize a value more highly if it is not the result of an arbitrary choice among theories which – among themselves – are of equal value and analogously constructed." That is, to be right, an idea also has to be necessary; not just in keeping with observations.

In his life, he was a courageous man; he stood up against World War I; even when many great scientists like Max Planck had written a letter supporting the war, supporting Germany's cause in it. Einstein didn't; he wrote a letter opposing it, and even got Max Planck to rescind his support for the war. He stood up against racism in the US in many famous cases such as Marian Anderson, who when she went to perform in Princeton, wasn't

able

to actually spend the night anywhere; she was turned away by hotels. So, she stayed at Albert Einstein's house, which is where she'd stay whenever she visited that town. And his opposition to the FBI and the thought policing it was doing. When he was coming to the US, they had a list of questions for him; they wanted to do an interview, find out what kind of thoughts Einstein had. He said, I'm not going to answer these.

If this is the condition for coming to the US, I'm not going to come; forget it. They gave in. So, I'll let those brief words from Einstein stand for themselves.

Let's take a look at the second part, which is a few thoughts about his famous discovery of relativity. As far as the context for this, ever since the general hegemony of Newton's outlook – which didn't have to happen, but it did – according to Newton, when we make observations, when we do science, things take place in a space that is indifferent to those things; it's just there. It existed before anything was in the Universe. According to Newton, space existed before God created everything; it was just the primordial space. Newton also believed that there was a time; a single time, a universal time that flowed on of its own accord, had no particular characteristics and was not dependent on or related to anything that actually took place over time. So, according to Newton, there was an absolute space, an absolute time; and objects in that space at various times. Now,

this had already been shown to be wrong by Gottfried Leibniz, who in a debate with Newton, demonstrated that requiring an absolute space and then saying that God created everything somewhere in that space, as opposed to somewhere else; would be a decision without any good reason. And that God couldn't do something like that; everything in the Universe had a reason for it, and that therefore there couldn't have been this space in the first place. Newton used the same example to say that shows you how powerful God is, because He could do whatever He felt like. So, He put the Universe somewhere. Anyway, Leibniz had already shown that this Newtonian idea was wrong; but Newton gained hegemony. So, it has the result that people think of facts, of things taking place in locations at certain times. But Einstein showed that this actually isn't true; that there is no time that any event takes place. That the time an event occurs, depends on who is looking at it. Not in the way of uncertainties or anything like that; but the time itself doesn't exist as one thing that's independent of who's doing the looking, or of their location. What he did was, he created a new concept that resolved the contradiction between two concepts that were actually mutually contradictory. So, these two concepts were, first off, relativity; which existed before Einstein as a concept or equivalence. Leibniz believed this, for example; which was that no matter where you are, or how you're moving – any of those kinds of particular conditions – mind is universal. Mind is everywhere; mind is everywhere in the Universe; mind doesn't have a speed or motion or anything like that. Concepts that govern

how the Universe unfolds – true physical principles – are independent of how you look at any particular fact or observation that's occurring. So, you can't change mind by moving something physically – more on that in a minute.

The second concept was that the speed of light is the same for any observer; and that's not something that was immediately apparent. This was definitely debated. To contrast that, imagine that you're driving on a road and there's a car next to you that's moving at a similar speed. To you, it looks like the car isn't really moving; to a pedestrian, the car is moving at whatever speed you're driving. Light is different than a car moving, where you can catch up with its speed and make it look like it's still. For light, no matter how you're moving, light beams to you all appear to move at the speed of light. So, you can't put those two concepts together; you can't have relativity and a constant speed of light if you have one time and one space.

Instead, what Einstein said was that the time between events or the distance between locations can actually differ based on how you're looking at them. So that simply being in motion – it's not perceptible except at very high speeds – but simply being in motion changes the lengths of everything around you, the time between events that take place.

I'll just briefly outline one example of this – we can get

into it with some pictures and things on Wednesday. He shows a lot of examples of thought experiments using trains moving through train stations or embankments. He gives one example which is, let's say that as a train is moving, someone on the ground sees flashes of lightning hit both sides of the train at the same time. For them to say "at the same time", what it means is if you're standing in the middle, the light from both of those flashes reaches you at the same time. You say, "I'm in the middle between these two points, therefore they must have happened at the same time and then it took the light a little bit of time for me to see it." But you'd also recognize that if someone on the train was to see those same two lightning bolts, which to you occur simultaneously, as the train is moving this way and you picture light moving at a constant speed from your viewpoint, the light that was at the front of the train is going to be observed first by somebody standing in the middle of the train. Someone on that train would say that those lightning flashes didn't occur at the same time; that one preceded the other. What that means is that there's no simultaneity; there's no ability to say anything took place at a certain time. Time now depends on who's looking at it. If there's no simultaneity, then there's nothing instant that can take place in the Universe; because there's no instant for anything to occur instantly in. So, for example, gravitational pull can't occur instantly; there can't be an instant action at a distance. In fact, nothing, no

effect could go faster than light; including gravitational changes. It meant a couple of things. One is that you can't separate space and time; but the other thing is that it makes you really have to reconsider what makes up reality. The idea that objects at places in times are facts; that's not reality. The thing that's most real is the principles that you're able to discover that don't change based on how you look at them, or how you're moving. Something like the way that light moves – that's a physical principle; no matter how you look at it, it's the same thing. It's a principle. A distance between two things? That's not a principle; that's not invariant. That can change, depending on how you look at it. So that the naïve sense that we get of the world around us, of our very concept of space, is just not right. Even though it seems totally intuitive and very popular, you have to force a different kind of understanding.

Now, there's a lot more to relativity than that, that's just a component of it. But it's undergone many, many tests over the decades. Things like starlight being deflected as it passes around the Sun; atomic clocks going in airplanes and rockets; light made by stars being a different color by virtue of their gravitation. Gravity waves, recently discovered somewhat directly by the SLIGO experiment, but a paper written about them in the '70s; having discovered indirect evidence for them from a pulsar. So, his thoughts have definitely stood the test of time

on this. Nothing shows that he was wrong. So that says something about how we think about the world.

Just to say something about Einstein's courage, on the third topic is the quantum world. In 1900, Einstein later colleague, Max Planck had made a discovery that he was able to explain the kind of light that hot bodies emit. Something that's hot and glowing like the filament in a light bulb; Planck was able to explain that based on an hypothesis that the way light was emitted from and absorbed by that hot body took place in pieces. That the light energy had to interact with that body in individually in quanta, the plural of quantum. A few years later, in Einstein's so-called "miracle year" of 1905, he generalized this and said that's just how light is; it comes in pieces. Light is not purely a wave; light is also somewhat of a particle. The field developed, and one of the things that came out of it that Einstein had realized, was a phenomenon called entanglement. To say it very briefly, it's the characteristic where you're able to make two particles, say two photons that have characteristics that are shared. In the case of photons, they have opposite polarizations. Or maybe you can make two electrons that have opposite spins. After you make them, here's the thought experiment Einstein would say. Let's say you make two of them; you don't look at them, and they go to very different places. One's in Tokyo and one's in New York. According to the theory, once you measure one in Tokyo and you get some sort of number for whatever its spin is; the one in New York automatically has the opposite spin. So Einstein said, does

this mean that measuring something in New York changed something in Tokyo, or vice versa? Could it have an instant effect somehow? How did it change the other particle that's so far away from it? Nothing can occur instantly anyway, because there are no instants. What's going on?

What it came to was a debate over decades, that was unresolved. Einstein believed that the way work in this field was going, was that people were giving up on reality; that they were saying that all we really ever know is an observation. That the world doesn't exist in a certain state independent of our measuring it. Not just because our measurements affect things — especially when they're very small; but that even God himself, so to speak, doesn't really know the state of say an atom. It simply doesn't have one; all that is really real is when you observe it later. So, Einstein made a lot of polemics against this, a lot of pedagogies about it, a lot of demonstrations; and although there have been experiments since the decades after his life that shed new light on it, I think the key thing to take from that is that Einstein recognized that there was something a bit unsettling about the way science was going. That people were willing to give up on the idea that things occurred for a reason.

To Einstein, that was throwing away reality; bidding farewell to the idea that there is a real world. Some of his thoughts on that, you might have heard him say he'd like to think that the

Moon is still there even when he doesn't look at it. But I think

the thing to take from that is his courage; even when almost everyone was against him, he stuck to his guns on that.

So, in terms of concluding on that, or drawing a reflection

from it, it's a constantly under-appreciated miracle that our minds are able to understand the Universe in a way that gives us

power over it. That unlike a koala bear or a grasshopper, that

are unable to use their understanding of nature to change their

relationship to it to transform their species, we're able to do

that. There's something coherent between the way our minds piece

together and understand the world around us through our thoughts,

through our concepts. There is a harmony between those concepts

and the way the Universe actually operates that gives us access

to act on those principles to bring about new states of

existence; and is the basis of economics. So, I think that in addition to a radical transformation and improvement in culture

that's needed, people like to think that they've got a lot of scientific knowledge these days; because you own a smart phone and you think you know something about science. Or you say that

everybody knows there's global warming and only anti-scientific

people disagree with that. That's not a basis of knowing

anything; and there's a lot of room for a dramatic improvement.

A real renaissance of taking Einstein's identity as an example

and really developing a fresh and powerful view of science to solve many of the problems that we're confronted with right now, that without a different approach, might never be solved.

So, that's a very inadequate beginning about Einstein; but it's a job for all of us to do. To figure out who is this man; what can we learn from his approach? I think we'll be hearing more from LaRouche and his thoughts on how he views his importance as an individual for us today.

ROGERS: I think that's very important. What I think is important to go back to in terms of LaRouche's role and what he said in the presentation that we showed earlier. And going to the understanding of what is actually happening with the role that Russia, under President Putin, and the role that President Xi Jinping is playing in relationship to what Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche had set into motion several decades ago with the development of the Productive Triangle, of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the Silk Road Development Plan. This coming into motion now, and at that very time, during that presentation that we saw in the beginning of this program, made the point that these nations would be brought together in collaboration and form a coalition of nations representing nations such as Iran, China, Russia, India, and so forth, to put an end – once and for all – to the British Empire. And the intentions of the British Empire to destroy this very conception of what is the truly human identity; the identity of the creative human process. I think it's very important to look at that from the standpoint of the

presentation you just gave, Jason. Because that's what missing.

What we're talking about is not a political fight from the standpoint of how do you bring down one political candidate over the other; but how do you destroy a system, particularly the British Empire, in all of its facets and what it represents, that denies this creative human process. Right now, what we're looking at from the United States is that as the rest of these nations are moving in the direction of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, moving with the Silk Road economic development plan; where is the United States right now? The United States is continuing to go along with the evils and destructive policies of the British Empire. This has been the case for decades now; this has been the case under the murderous, insane agenda of President Obama, who should have been removed a long time ago. Or the policies of the Bush administration, and the lies and the cover-up. Now, we have an opportunity. What we're discussing here is not just some nice scientific ideas, and let's look at Einstein and people think they have their different conceptions and understanding and "Oh, I studied this in elementary school." No; the idea is, what has been taken away from society? Why have we allowed an Empire to dominate our existence and our nation and culture for far too long?

So, I think it is the case that in 1997, when Mr. LaRouche made the point that what we're dealing with is nations have to

come together to bring about that truly human identity to destroy this empire once and for all; that's what we're going to use Einstein to do. I'll just make that point.

STEGER: Just to add, because I think it's worth considering; there are so many developments that we're on the verge of. This coming six weeks have such a dramatic nature that we've already seen a certain sense of in terms of a consolidated effort to end this British Empire system; the very key emphasis Lyn took up in 1997. That there is now an orientation to resolve the question of the Balkans, the Caucuses, Kashmir, the South China Sea; even North Korea are essentially on the agenda of these major nations. To end the potential of world war, and to really consolidate a new economic system. So, it is kind of striking that Lyn's emphasis is, as Matt you raised, on Einstein. Why the emphasis now? But it's clearly because in the minds of this collaborative effort among these nations and among any patriotic Americans, as we see in the performances we're developing in New York around the 9/11 anniversary, the question has to be the long-term development of mankind. Not one's children, not one generation ahead, but the actual ongoing development that now is possible to embark upon as a human species on this planet. And I think Einstein craved and desired no less. His discoveries and passion unleashed that kind of potential, which he probably saw as a young man himself, and that quality. It's not just simply a liberal emotion; it is of a

scientific endeavor which Einstein really captured. I think Lyn's comments then and today also do as well.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's with a full amount of confidence that we can move forward and understand that the epic era-changing kinds of developments that are occurring around us right now, are things that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been in the middle of for decades, literally. They've had their fingers on the pulse of history right up to this point. Helga LaRouche pointed out yesterday that the speech that she gave at the Rasina Dialogue in India just a couple of months ago, seems like it's exactly what is now being undertaken by the Indian government in terms of their collaboration with China and Russia to project the Silk Road into the Middle East to resolve this terrible crisis that exists there. And Mr. LaRouche's continuing role in terms of the intellectual sounding board around which the rest of history is continuing to move. It's with confidence that we can look back at that speech and everything else that is on the record in terms of their role. It's an identity which we need to maintain within ourselves and those who are collaborating with us, that yes, your finger is on the pulse of history; the imagination of what the future can become is what is continuing to shape the actions in the present. And it's a moment of decision; it's the {punctum saliens} moment in terms of which direction does mankind go right now. We have a rich potential,

and I think it's extremely clear; but it's also extremely dangerous.

I'd really like to thank Jason for giving a little bit of a foretaste of what's going to be elaborated much more, I'm sure, on the show next Wednesday. That's going to be broadcast, and we would ask you to tune in to that. I also want to encourage people to continue to participate in the process of inundating Manhattan with this new publication, {The Hamiltonian}. This is issue 2, and it continues to be the center of our intervention into shaping the United States and answering the question that Kesha asked: Why is the United States not yet a part of this emerging dynamic on the planet? What must be done to cause that to occur?

So, I'd like to thank all of you for tuning in; and encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com. And we'll see you next week.

USA: Med præsidentvalget har vi en enestående chance for at bringe USA

på linje med alternativet til krig; principperne bag udviklingen af Eurasien

Det afgørende spørgsmål i dette præsidentvalg er, vil det amerikanske folk tolerere kandidater, der ønsker, at USA skal være på linje med et allerede dødt system? Eller, vil vi følge en anden kurs, hvor USA kommer på linje med dette nye, fremtidsorienterede alternativ? Rent historisk betragtet har Amerika altid befundet sig på denne fremtidsorienterings side; i det mindste, med udgangspunkt i USA's grundlæggende principper – ideerne i Hamiltons tradition er i realiteten det, der ligger til grund for denne eurasiske udvikling. Vi må vinde kampen om at transformere USA tilbage til det, som det repræsenterede rent historisk, som byen, der ligger på et bjerg.

Uddrag af LPAC fredags-webcast, 12. august 2016. Se hele webcastet, med engelsk udskrift, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14144>

Matthew Ogden: En ting, jeg gerne vil sige i sammenhæng med den foreståede FN Generalforsamling; der foregår allerede en krig imod alt det, som BRIKS repræsenterer. Hvis man tænker ét eller to år tilbage i tiden, så blev aftalen i Fortaleza, Brasilien, indgået i sammenhæng med denne krig, som [dav. præsident] Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner førte i Argentina imod gribbefondene. Disse nationer kom sammen i solidaritet med Argentina og sagde, vi vil ikke tillade, at I dræber det argentinske folk for at få pengene til gribbefondene. Siden dette tidspunkt har vi set en samling omkring Putins, Xi Jinpings og Modis lederskab i BRIKS-strukturen; dette er det nye, fremvoksende paradigme. I den mellemliggende periode har

der fundet en samlet indsats sted for at bryde BRIKS op; og lige nu befinder vi os midt i et sådant angreb. Vi så, hvad der skete med Cristina Kirchner i Argentina; nu sker det samme med Dilma Rousseff i Brasilien. Netop i denne uge har et flertal i det brasilianske parlament vedtaget at indlede afhøringer af Rousseff; hvilket vil sige, en rigsretssag mod Brasiliens præsident. Der har været en vis respons mod dette kup internt i USA; og dette er faktisk emnet for det spørgsmål fra institutionelt hold, vi har fået til i aften.

Jeg ved, at hr. LaRouche havde nogle detaljerede bemærkninger om dette. Jeg læser nu spørgsmålet op, og så kan Jeff måske træde ind og sige lidt om det. Spørgsmålet lyder:

»Hr. LaRouche: Kongresmedlem John Conyers, demokrat fra Michigan; Marcy Kaptur, demokrat fra Ohio; Keith Ellison, demokrat fra Minnesota, samt flere en 30 andre fra Repræsentanternes Hus sendte i denne uge et brev til udenrigsminister John Kerry, hvor de opfordrede ham til at afholde sig fra handlinger, der kunne fortolkes som støtte til Brasiliens midlertidige regering. Og til i stedet at »udtrykke sin stærke bekymring mht. rigsretssagen og angrebet på den brasilianske præsident Dilma Rousseff«; og til at »kræve beskyttelse af det forfatningsmæssige demokrati og regering ved lov i Brasilien«. Brevet er det første brev fra kongresmedlemmer, som udtrykker bekymring over Brasiliens demokrati, i mere end to årtier. Hvilke handlinger bør USA's regering, efter Deres mening, gribe til, for at fremme retfærdighed og beskytte demokratiske institutioner i Brasilien på nuværende tidspunkt?«

Jeffrey Steinberg: Det første, han understregede, var, at vi ikke har med en »brasiliansk situation« at gøre, på samme måde, som vi heller ikke har med en »syrisk situation« at gøre.

Vi befinder os midt i en betydningsfuld, global, strategisk omorganisering. Som du sagde, så havde man, ved BRIKS-landenes

møde i Fortaleza for to år siden, lanceringen af den Nye Udviklingsbank, efterfulgt af Kinas lancering af den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB). Der er tydeligvis et politisk initiativ centreret omkring de store, eurasiske magter, men som også omfatter Brasilien og Sydamerika, Sydafrika og Afrika, med det formål at reorganisere verden omkring en radikalt anden fremgangsmåde; en fremgangsmåde, der er orienteret mod fremtiden, centreret omkring store projekter for økonomisk udvikling, der er ægte win-win-projekter. Der er intet geopolitisk nulsumsspil. Og så har vi et dødt system, som er det britiske imperiesystem, og som i de sidste 15 år er blevet repræsenteret gennem den kendsgerning, at briterne har haft kontrollen over det amerikanske præsidentskab; først under George W. Bush, og dernæst under Barack Obama.

Så det første, USA bør gøre, er at opgive sin egen, direkte rolle i promoveringen af dette kup. Dette er ikke noget, der finder sted, fordi en flok personer internt i Brasilien har besluttet at angribe Dilma Rousseff. Der er hedgefondenes internationale apparat; der er Adam Smith Institutes netværker i Storbritannien; der er Chicago Skolens apparat her i USA; de er alle virkemidler i dette fremstød – ikke for at skade Brasilien – men for at ødelægge Brasilien, fordi det er en del af denne nye BRIKS-organisering. Jeg forsikrer jer for, at, hvis USA offentligt gik ud – hvis Kerry offentligt fremkom med en erklæring, der sagde, at USA mener, at dette er et statskup, der ikke nødvendigvis anvender skydevåben, men som anvender handlinger fra købt-og betalte, korrupte regeringspersoner for at vælte en lovligt valgt regering, der forsøger at bringe Sydamerika på linje med dette nye paradigme for udvikling, centreret omkring Eurasien; så ville det her forsvinde. De brasilianske senatorer, der har stemt for det her, er absolut skamløse; de personer, der står bag dette kup, er alle sammen selv underkastet en lovlig undersøgelse for kriminelle handlinger, for massivt økonomiske bedrageri. Hvis man undersøger det brasilianske element af skandalen omkring Panama-papirerne[1], vil man finde disse topregeringsfolk –

formanden for parlamentet, præsidenten for Senatet, den aktuelle præsident (idet Dilma Rousseff er suspenderet, -red.), den aktuelle udenrigsminister; alle de personer, der har allieret sig imod Dilma, er selv en del af det mest korrupte apparat. Men de er beskyttet, fordi de er en del af det Britiske Imperium og Obamaregeringens beskyttelsesapparat; og deres mål er at forsøge at ødelægge BRIKS.

Så dette er et globalt spil; dette er ikke en brasiliansk historie. Det er ikke noget, der er snævert forbundet med begivenheder i Sydamerika, eller med korrupsion, eller sådan noget. Dette er en langt større, værre og farligere ting; og det er en del af det overordnede billede. Vil verden gå i retning af at forsvare et system, der allerede er dødt? Fremtrædende økonomer beskrev i denne uge Deutsche Bank som »dead bank walking« (amr. udtryk, 'dead man walking': når den dødsdømte går den sidste, korte strækning fra sin celle til henrettelsesstedet, -red.); og det er en passende beskrivelse. Så det er et spørgsmål, om et dødt, Britisk Imperium, der i det store og hele har kontrolleret det amerikanske præsidentskab i de sidste 15 – 16 år, grundlæggende set vil bringe resten af verden til fald med sig – for det vil aldrig kunne overleve. Eller, om det skal kastes bort, besejres og erstattes af et nyt system, der allerede er godt på vej.

Det afgørende spørgsmål i dette præsidentvalg er, vil det amerikanske folk tolerere kandidater, der ønsker, at USA skal være på linje med et allerede dødt system? Eller, vil vi følge en anden kurs, hvor USA kommer på linje med dette nye, fremtidsorienterede alternativ? Rent historisk betragtet har Amerika altid befundet sig på denne fremtidsorienterings side; i det mindste, med udgangspunkt i USA's grundlæggende principper – ideerne i Hamiltons tradition er i realiteten det, der ligger til grund for denne eurasiske udvikling. Vi må vinde kampen om at transformere USA tilbage til det, som det repræsenterede rent historisk, som byen, der ligger på et bjerg.[2]

Matthew Ogden: Jeg mener, at det er signifikant, at de kongresmedlemmer, der underskrev dette brev, overlapper kernegruppen af ledere omkring Glass-Steagall.

Steinberg: Det er rigtigt.

Ogden: En anden ting, du netop nævnte: Hvad er 'ideerne efter Hamiltons tradition'? Det, der er kernen i det sammenhængende, forenende princip i disse, hr. LaRouches Fire Nye Love, er den idé, som han udtrykker mod slutningen af dokumentet: At der ikke findes nogen målestok for økonomi inden for pengenes domæne; penge er ikke repræsentant for værdi, når vi taler om økonomi. Det er beredvilligheden til at afvise monetarisme, der gør den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB) og den Nye Udviklingsbank – til banker af en totalt anden art. Det er ikke blot en anden version af IMF/Verdensbanksystemet. Der er en helligelse til at forøge produktiviteten hos massive mængder af planetens befolkning; milliarder af mennesker vil blive berørt af den Nye Silkevej, af disse udviklingsprojekter, der har været vedtaget i 40, 50 og 60 år. Nu bliver de faktisk bygget, takket være de investeringer, der kommer fra BRIKS-banken (Ny Udviklingsbank) og fra Kina (AIIB), osv. Men det er udtryk for en opfattelse af økonomi, som jeg mener, har været det enestående bidrag, som hr. LaRouche har ydet til verdenshistorien i løbet af de seneste 40-50 år; og som er hans enestående opfattelse af, hvad den sande målestok for økonomi virkelig er. Det er en konstant forøgelse af akkumuleringen af menneskehedens evne til at indsætte nye, fysiske principper, som mennesket har opdaget, for at forøge vores magt i og over Universet.

Jeg mener, at Albert Einsteins eksempel på to specifikke måder er meget vigtigt med hensyn til dette.

For det første, blot i form af en analogi: Albert Einsteins opfattelse af, at man ikke kan have en målestok, der kommer internt fra et system; men at der må være en målestok, der er eksternt, og som er et princip. Lige som absolut tid og absolut

rum ikke eksisterede for Einstein, så er dette den form for opfattelse, for forståelse, som man må anvende på fysisk økonomi.

Og **for det andet:** Måske mere end nogen anden person er Albert Einstein paradigmatisk for den form for menneskelig, kreative tænkning, der gør det muligt for menneskeheden at gøre fremskridt; der, som Helen Keller så smukt beskrev, bringer os op fra jorden, som dyr, der kryber på vores bug og reagerer på omstændighederne omkring os, og til at blive Universets medskaber.

Jeg syntes, at du forklarede dette på en meget smuk måde i slutningen af din artikel i denne uges udgave af *The Hamiltonian*[3] (pilotudgaven), Michael [Steger]; du måtte gerne sige lidt mere om dette spørgsmål.

Michael Steger: Jeg synes, du netop har sagt det meget fint. Hvad der måske kunne være af værdi at komme tilbage til, mht. den kreative personligheds rolle, som Keisha (Rogers) talte om under mandags-showet; Einstein indså også, at det er individets enestående rolle at udforme og skabe grundlæggende set de nye love, som samfundet dernæst vedtager. At opdagelsen af disse højere principper, eller naturlig lov, dernæst gør det muligt for det samme samfund at gøre fremskridt. Vi ser i dag, at mange mennesker er på ferie; alt for mange mennesker, mener jeg, ser Olympiade. Jeg mener, at den virkelige doping-skandale er at finde internt i Det Hvide Hus. Men det, som Putin har gjort med sin diplomatiske indsats, er, at vi nu ser på den mulige løsning af den syriske krise i Aleppo. Der finder en form for proces sted, der kan løse disse ting i de kommende måneder.

Og så har man i september måned præsidenterne for Sydkorea, Japan og Kina, der vil møde Putin i Vladivostok. Så drager de sammen til G20-topmødet i Kina – hvor Putin vil være æresgæst – med de 20 største nationer; med Brasilien, Argentina, Mexico, Tyrkiet, nationer fra Afrika, fra hele Asien og

Europa, der deltager. Dernæst vil mange af disse statsoverhoveder komme til New York City på samme tid som vore koncerter; men de kommer til FN's Generalforsamling. Og så vil mange af disse statschefer fra BRIKS mødes i Indien i begyndelsen af oktober.

På dette tidspunkt, som Jeff sagde tidligere på ugen, kunne hele dette finanssystem – Deutsche Bank og de øvrige storbanker – hurtigt gå i opløsning, bryde sammen. Bankerotten kan blive en opsprætning af banksystemet, som grundlæggende set kommer i den nære fremtid. Så har vi præsidentvalget. Selv om Donald Trump er nok så meget en nar, så har han vist sig at være i stand til at slå en masse af de andre, inkompetente politikere i debatter; og jeg mener, at det bør bekymre Hillary Clinton en hel del, at hendes historie sammen med Obama er en absolut og alvorlig svaghed. En Akilleshæl pga. det nuværende klima i den politiske situation, som vi konfronteres med i dette land. Så vi befinder os altså virkelig på et bemærkelsesværdigt tidspunkt. Og så kollapset af det transatlantiske system; en konsolideret indsats, der er ved at udspille sig, i Eurasien under Putins lederskab, og så denne egenskab med kreativt geni, som du henviser til mht. Einsteins eksempel. Det er i realiteten den indflydelse, som Lyndon LaRouche har haft på planeten; og det er virkelig, hvad nu må få indflydelse på det præsidentielle system i USA. Lyn må blive en del af udformningen af den præsidentielle politik, nu. Det er vi grundlæggende set; men det må blive det amerikanske folks forpligtelse, og ikke at blive indfanget af alt muligt andet, for vi har i dag en særdeles sjælden mulighed.

[1] Panamapapirerne er 11,5 millioner lækede dokumenter, der afslører finansiel information og advokat-klientinformation for mere end 214.488 offshore-enheder. De lækede dokumenter blev udfærdiget af en Panama-advokatfirma og udbyder af tjenester for selskaber, Mossack Fonseca; nogle af dem går tilbage til 1970'erne. De lækede dokumenter fortæller,

hvordan rige personer og offentlige (regerings-) personer er i stand til at holde personlig, finansiel information privat. Alt imens offshore forretningsenheder ofte ikke er ulovlige, så fandt reportere, at nogle af Mossack Fonseca facadeselskaber blev brugt til ulovlige formål, inklusive bedrageri, kleptokrati, skatteunddragelse og omgåelse af internationale sanktioner.

[2] Afsnittet om »Byen på et Bjerg« fra en prædiken med titlen »En Model for Kristen Barmhjertighed« blev skrevet i 1630 af puritanernes leder John Winthrop, mens den første gruppe af puritanske emigranter endnu befandt sig om bord på deres skib, Arbella, og ventede på at gå i land og skabe deres første bosættelse i det, der skulle blive til New England. Afsnittet om »Byen på Bjerget« i denne prædiken blev af senere læsere trukket frem som en krystallisering af den puritanske mission i den Nye Verden. (-red.)

*'En by på et bjerg' refererer til Jesu Bjergprædiken, hvor Jesus fortæller ligningen om 'Jordens salt og Verdens lys'. Matthæus 5, 13-16: I er Jordens salt. Men hvis saltet mister sin kraft, hvad skal det så saltet med? Det duer ikke til andet end at smides ud og trampes ned af mennesker. **I er verdens lys. En by, der ligger på et bjerg, kan ikke skjules.** Man tænder heller ikke et lys og sætter det under en skæppe, men i en stage, så det lyser for alle i huset. Således skal jeres lys skinne for alle mennesker, så de ser jeres gode gerninger og priser jeres Fader, som er i himlene.(-red.)*

[3] Læs Michael Stegers artikel, »Det Nye Præsidentskab: Det begynder med 'LaRouches Fire Love'«, på dansk her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14101>