

**RADIO SCHILLER den 3. oktober
2016:**

**Deutsche Bank kollapse:
Glass-Steagall eller kaos?//
USA's Kongres tilsidesætter
Obamas veto**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Kongressen leverer en
øredøvende lussing til Obama
og anglo-saudierne**

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. sept., 2016 – Den amerikanske Kongres leverede i dag en rungende tilsidesættelse af Barack Obamas veto fra 23. september imod S. 2040, JASTA-lovforslaget (Loven om Retsforfølgelse af Sponsorer af Terrorisme), med et stemmetal i Senatet på 97-mod-1 til fordel for tilsidesættelse; og en stemmeoptælling i Repræsentanternes Hus på 348-mod-77. Tilsidesættelsen krævede et flertal på 2/3 i begge Kongressens kamre, hvilket blev opnået med en bred, tværpolitisk margin.

Konsekvenserne heraf er massive.

Med JASTA-loven nu som gældende lov i landet, er de smuthuller blevet fjernet, der blokerede for, at familier og overlevende

fra angrebet d. 11. september kunne sagsøge Kongeriget Saudi-Arabien ved amerikanske føderale domstole, for deres meddelagtighed i 11. september. En høring er allerede planlagt i den Føderale Domstol for New Yorks Sydlige Distrikt i november, og her vil familier til ofre for 11. september endelig blive i stand til direkte at konfrontere det saudiske monarki og forfølge yderligere beviser på den saudiske regerings støtte til 11. september-flykaprerne, hvoraf 15 var saudiske statsborgere.

Muligheden for at gøre nye opdagelser vedrørende den saudiske rolle i angrebet d. 11. september 2001 blev for nylig, den 15. juli, 2016, yderligere forstærket med den offentlige frigivelse af det 28 sider lange kapitel fra den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11/9, fra 2002, som afslører tidligere hemmeligholdte beviser for den rolle, som den tidligere saudiske ambassadør til USA, prins Bandar bin-Sultan, spillede i at støtte mindst to af terroristerne fra 11. september, sammen med dokumentation for flykaprernes tilknytning til snesevis af andre saudiske embedsmænd på alle niveauer i regeringen og kongefamilien.

Prins Bandars rolle i angrebene d. 11. september er af særlig betydning på grund af hans nære forbindelser til Bush-familien og endnu tættere bånd til briterne. Bandar var, sammen med den tidligere britiske premierminister Margaret Thatcher, mægleren i Al Yamamah-aftalen, en tuskhandel om britiske våben for saudisk olie. Under Al Yamamah-byttehandlen blev hundreder af milliarder af dollars omdirigeret til hemmelige, fælles anglo-saudiske offshore-konti, med henblik på at finansiere terrorisme, mord og politiske kup i hele verden. Et fremtrædende medlem af det britiske Underhus, og som også er en højtplaceret person i det britiske forsvarsetablisement, advarede i juni ligefremt om, at, hvis JASTA skulle blive vedtaget som amerikansk lov, kunne det britiske monarki og den britiske regering blive sagsøgt, sammen med saudierne.

»En historisk sejr«

Lyndon LaRouche, hvis Politiske Aktionskomite (LPAC) har mobiliseret intensivt for dagens resultat, beskrev afstemningen som »En historisk sejr. Den er en anledning til glæde; den har vendt et nyt blad i historiebogen. Det verdensomspændende, positive potentiale er enormt.« Men LaRouche advarede imidlertid, »Hvor langt, og hvorhen, det bringer os, er endnu ikke klart. Gør jer klar til at finde ud af det.« Han tilføjede: »Husk, at I har såret Djævelen hårdt. Og Djævelen vil ikke takke jer for det!«

Det overvældende nederlag til præsident Obama og saudierne kom på trods af, at hele Obamaadministrationen var blevet mobiliseret til at lægge pres på Kongressen om at støtte hans veto, og det saudiske monarki har, rapporteres det, hældt \$9,4 millioner ind, i en desperat lobbyindsats for at købe medlemmer af Kongressen. I sidste ende afviste en tværpolitisk koalition af førende senatorer og kongresmedlemmer Obamaadministrationens løgne om, at JASTA udgør en trussel mod amerikanske interesser i udlandet, og de leverede det største politiske nederlag til præsident Obama, siden han først tiltrådte embedet.

I dag afholdt begge Kongressens kamre en to timer lang debat forud for den historiske afstemning, og langt de fleste af indlæggene understregede 11. september-familiernes rettigheder til langt om længe at opnå juridisk retfærdighed, og til at konfrontere det saudiske monarki og dets agenter for deres medskyld i det værste terrorangreb nogensinde på amerikansk jord.

Meget af debatten var optaget af at aflive Obamas påstand om, at JASTA ville åbne op for gengældelse mod amerikanske soldater, virksomheder og diplomater fra udenlandske regeringers side. Førende fortalere for JASTA, herunder senatorerne Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) og Charles Schumer (D-New York), og kongresmedlemmerne Robert Goodlatte (R-Va.) og Jerome Nadler (D-New York) gjorde det gentagne gange klart, at JASTA blot lukker et smuthul i lovgivningen, der har

eksisteret siden 1970'erne, og således nu gør det muligt for amerikanske borgere at sagsøge udenlandske regeringer, der beviseligt har ydet støtte til terrorangreb på amerikansk jord. Men dette smuthul har gjort det muligt for Kongeriget Saudi-Arabien at unddrage sig amerikansk, juridisk retfærdighed i de sidste 15 år, og den mulighed er nu bragt til ende.

Bredere strategiske muligheder

Den succesfulde, tværpolitiske indsats, der underkendte præsident Obamas veto imod JASTA, kan og skal nu, med samme intensitet, rettes imod andre vitale spørgsmål, begyndende med behovet for, at Kongressen omgående vedtager de lovforslag om genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der allerede er fremsat i begge Kongressens kamre; lovforslag, der sigter mod at opdele for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-banker, som befinder sig på kanten af et sammenbrud, der er langt værre end i 2008. Tysklands Deutsche Bank, den største indehaver af derivater blandt alle banker i verden, står umiddelbart foran sammenbrud, og hele det transatlantiske banksystem står til at krakke, som et direkte resultat heraf

En genindførelse af Glass-Steagall er det første, uomgængelige skridt mod at lancere en reel, økonomisk genrejsning, gennem massive kapitalinvesteringer i presserende tiltrængte infrastrukturprojekter, forskning og udvikling, og især en genoplivning af Amerikas nu kollapsede NASA-rumprogram. En sådan indsats kan, nu og her, skabe millioner af nye produktive arbejdspladser. I Eurasien bliver et massivt program for infrastrukturinvesteringer gennemført under Kinas ledelse, og under banneret af præsident Xi Jinpings initiativ for Ét bælte, Én vej. Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin har vedtaget dette initiativ og har foreslået, at den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union integreres i indsatsen, som tidligere USA-ambassadør Chas Freeman nyligt beskrev som det

I stedet for at arbejde på at sabotere det Ny Silkevejsprojekt, hvilket har været USA's politik under præsident Obama, bør USA fuldt ud omfavne programmet for Ét bælte, Én vej og således udvide det til at blive en ægte Verdenslandbro.

Afstemningen frembyder en større håbets bavn for, at den samme ånd af national interesse nu hurtigt kan overføres til de øvrige handlinger, der er afgørende for USA's og verdens overlevelse og fremgang.

Foto: USA's Senat vedtager med stemmerne 97 mod 1 at underkende præsident Obamas veto af Loven om Retsforfølgelse af Sponsorer af Terrorisme. Få timer senere fulgte Repræsentanternes Hus trop, og JASTA bliver nu landets lov.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 27.
september 2016:
Vil USA's Kongres**

tilsidesætte Obamas veto af JASTA

(Loven om Retsforfølgelse af Sponsorer af Terrorisme)?

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

Der er ingen forældelsesfrist for sandheden.

Schiller Institut-konference for 11. september i New York

Jeffrey Steinberg, EIR's efterretningsredaktør, havde følgende indlæg på Schiller Instituttets konference for at mindes ofrene for terrorangrebet, den 11. september 2001:

Jeg mener, at det virkelig er vigtigt at holde fast ved ånden i den **tale, Helga netop har holdt**, for mange af jer har holdt til mange, mange møder, hvor det generelle emne ikke var en samling eller opsummering af gode nyheder. Jeg synes, at alle her i lokalet bør lægge ud med at applaudere jer selv, for de sejre, vi har opnået omkring frigivelsen af de 28 sider, den nu vedtagne JASTA-lov, enstemmigt i begge Kongressens huse, og den kendsgerning, at begge politiske partier ikke kunne komme uden om at sætte genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall på deres partipolitiske platforme, er en hyldest til det vedholdende og ihærdige arbejde, som I alle har været en del af. Så jeg

finder det meget passende at applaudere os selv og jer selv for at udføre den form for mirakler, som kun mennesker er i stand til. [applaus] For disse præstationer er i sandhed mirakuløse, men det er den form for mirakler, der kommer som resultat af at tro på, at sandheden tæller, at der ikke er nogen forældelsesfrist for sandheden, og at vi virkelig bor i en demokratisk republik, hvor befolkningens stemme betyder noget.

Jeg kan, ud fra et meget detaljeret førstehåndskendskab, som jeg ikke tilnærmelsesvis har tid til at gennemgå i dag, fortælle jer, at grunden til, at de 28 sider blev frigivet den 15. juli, er, at vi kollektivt, med mange, mange andre, med familierne til ofrene for 11. september, med ledende kongresmedlemmer, kunne blive ved med at presse på og tvinge det til at ske.

Præsident Obama har *ingen som helst planer* om at frigive de 28 sider. Men underdønningen af krav om at kende sandheden om dette spørgsmål nåede et punkt, 15 år efter begivenheden, hvor hans nærmeste medarbejdere måtte gå til ham og sige, »disse 28 sider vil, med næb eller med klør, blive offentliggjort«. Det blev ganske klart den 6. juli, hvor kongresmedlemmerne Walter Jones og Stephen Lynch påkaldte Gravel-præcedensen, præcedens med Pentagon-papirerne, og sagde: Det er vores forfatningsmæssige pligt at informere det amerikanske folk om afgørende spørgsmål om den nationale sikkerhed, hvor hemmeligholdelse ikke har noget at gøre. I samme øjeblik, det blev klart, at de var parat til at gå så vidt, gik folk fra Det Hvide Hus til præsidenten og sagde, »dit valg er enkelt. Du bliver enten skurken i denne historie, eller også kan vi forsøge at spinne det, så du bliver helten«, selv om han ikke havde nogen planer om at frigive dem. Han fik at vide, »det vil ske under alle omstændigheder, hvad enten det gøres af den næste præsident, eller Kongressen tager det på sig at offentliggøre det; så du kan lige så godt få lidt kredit for det. Og for resten, så gør vi det netop, som Huset og Senatet

pakker sammen og tager på ferie i to måneder, og netop, som de to konventer til nominering af præsidentkandidater står for at finde sted, og al ilten vil blive suget ud af medierne i den næste måneds tid; så vi kan måske ligesom snige os igennem, og folk vil glemme det, og vi vil slippe godt fra at frigive det med mindst muligt bagslag.«

Det er tydeligt, at fremmødet her i dag, og andre begivenheder, der finder sted i denne weekend, gør det klart, at dette ikke bliver tilfældet; det vil ikke ske.

Og så, som Helga sagde, så må vi bygge videre på de sejre, vi har etableret. Jeg kan fortælle jer, at uroen i Washington er enorm. Det plejede at være sådan, at lederskab i Kongressen, lederskab i andre institutioner i Washington, bestemtes af, hvem man kender, og hvor godt man »går med på det, for at være med i klubben af de rigtige«. Og dette koncept er *dødt*.

Den kendsgerning, at folk er blevet ekskluderet af det gode selskab – Walter Jones har ingen udnævnelser til komiteer! Han burde efter al retfærdighed have været formand for en stor, i det mindste underkomite i House Armed Services Committee; han blev sparket ud af House Financial Services Committee, fordi han introducerede Glass-Steagall.

Men folk ved, at der er et nyt, fremvoksende lederskab.

Det er åbenlyst, at dette præsidentvalg gør det klart, at personlighed ikke er et kriterie for lederskab [latter], men at vi nu i USA kan gå over til et punkt, hvor vi her i USA kan vinde på basis af ideer og principper.

Så vi har fået disse sejre med de 28 sider, med 11. september, og med vedtagelsen af JASTA-loven. Præsident Obama har nu sommerens værste weekend, og det siger en hel del i betragtning af, hvad han netop har været igennem i Asien, især takket være præsident Duterte fra Filippinerne. Han står nu i et dilemma: Vil han nedlægge veto mod JASTA-loven? Og demokrater siger til ham: Hvis du gør det, så vil du alene få

skylden for, at Donald Trump bliver valgt til USA's præsident, fordi folk vil hade Demokraterne pga. dine handlinger.

Så vi befinder os i en meget interessant tid, og jeg tror, igen, at vi må tage det store billede i betragtning. Hele den bevægelse, der kommer ud af topmøderne, som netop er sluttet i Asien, og i øvrigt vil den samme proces komme her til vores egne græsgange, fra og med tirsdag, her i Manhattan, med åbningen af FN's Generalforsamling: De diskussioner, der fandt sted i Vladivostok, i Hangzhou, vil nu finde sted på Manhattans East Side, og verdensledere, udenrigsministre vil være her, mens det står på, og vi må holde deres fødder i ilden, for at disse ideer virkelig bliver virkeliggjort og gennemført.

Vores anden, mindre opgave, for øvrigt, er, at USA fuldt ud må bringes på linje med dette nye paradigme. Og det første skridt er at sikre, at Kongressen handler for at genindføre Glass-Steagall. Vi er nu, som Helga sagde, ved et punkt, hvor Deutsche Bank synger på sidste vers, og der er faktisk et væddeløb mellem Deutsche Bank og Dope, Inc.'s førende bank, HSBC, om, hvem, der først bukker under. Så vi befinder os på randen af en krise, der er langt større end i 2008, større end Lehman Brothers, for Deutsche Bank har den største eksponering til derivater i nogen bank i verden, og alle de store New York-banker er modpart i disse derivattransaktioner; de står til at nedsmelte.

Det første skridt er Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall løser et stykke af problemet. Den tager grundlæggende set affaldet bort, skraldemændene får travlt i mange måneder på Wall Street! Men det vil bare betyde, at vi er nået frem til det punkt, hvor vi genopbygger, og det betyder, at det andet element af det, hr. LaRouche har krævet under hele sin politiske karriere, og har sagt meget skarpt i løbet af de seneste år: genindfør Glass-Steagall, genetabler funktionsdygtige kommercielle banker. Gå tilbage til en lang, stolt tradition, hvor Kongressen plejede at have to budgetter.

Den plejede at have et budget for løbende driftsudgifter, og et budget, der var orienteret mod investering, et anlægsbudget. Hvis tiderne var hårde, kunne man altid stramme livremmen ind med 20 eller 30 % af driftsbudgettet; men man skar *aldrig* ned på anlægsbudgettet, fordi det er fremtiden. Det er de næste generationer: Det er infrastruktur, det er investering i videnskab og teknologi, og det er investering i uddannelse og alle disse ting.

Vi må tilbage til disse kerneprincipper. Og jeg mener, at momentum i denne weekend, og hvad der kommer ud af det, er af en sådan styrke, at vi virkelig kan vinde denne kamp i USA. Vi kan ikke løse problemet globalt, fuldt ud, før vi har vundet USA tilbage for disse kerneprincipper, og med baggrund i det, vi har opnået i denne seneste periode, gennem mange, mange års akkumuleret arbejde, så befinder vi os på tærsklen til en sådan form for sejr, og jeg mener, at mindehøjtideligheden i denne weekend, et levende mindesmærke for dem, der mistede livet den 11. september, samt den seneste rapport fra *Newsweek*, indikerer, at der nu er *400.000 mennesker*, blandt de første, der responderede og andre, der overlevede 11. september, men som lider af invaliderende sygdomme, fordi de var helte i dagene og ugerne og månederne, der fulgte.

Så vi har meget arbejde at gøre, men jeg mener, at vi må bære optimismens og tillidens fakkel fremad, og der er ingen tvivl om, at der venter os mange flere mirakler at udføre.

Tak. [applaus]

RADIO SCHILLER den 12. september 2016: 15 år efter den 11. september: Schiller Instituttets NYC-kor opfører Mozarts Rekiem ved 4 konserter

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

STARTEN PÅ EN HISTORISK UGE

4. september 2016 (Leder) – Søndag, den 4. september, gav præsident Xi Jinping startskuddet til G20-topmødet for statsoverhoveder i Hangzhou, Kina. Åbningsceremonien omfattede en bevægende opførelse af Ode til Glæden, der anslog den inspirerende tone for hele topmødet. I sine åbningsbemærkninger gentog præsident Xi sit krav fra den foregående dag ved B20-forum for erhvervsledere om, at hele det globale finanssystem må gennemgribende ændres, for at vende den aktuelle, globale krise omkring, og at G20 må tage føringen med hensyn til at skabe de nødvendige ændringer, der må have innovation og samarbejde mellem nationer som drivkraft.

Præsident Xis tale lørdag ved B20 var en stærkt ekko af den politik, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har udviklet hen over

årtier, inklusive Helgas seneste opfordring til, at G20-mødet tager skridt til fuldt og at virkeliggøre Verdenslandbroen.

Den signifikante opførelse af Ode til Glæden, et digt af Friedrich Schiller med musik af Ludwig von Beethoven, var en yderligere indikation på Xis forpligtelse over for principperne om videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og »win-win«-samarbejde mellem alle verdens nationer.

Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping holder hovedtalen ved Business 20-mødets åbningsceremoni (B20.)

Se uddrag på dansk af talen her.

Forud for G20-mødet blev der afholdt et uformelt møde for BRIKS-nationernes statsoverhoveder, hvor der blev gjort yderligere forberedelser til BRIKS-topmødet den 15. – 16. oktober, med den indiske premierminister Modi som vært, i Goa, Indien. BRIKS- og G20-begivenhederne begyndte umiddelbart efter afslutningen af det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Rusland, med præsident Vladimir Putin som vært, hvor den samme dagsorden med eurasisk udvikling og en samarbejdsånd mellem verdens ledende nationer blev promoveret. De to æresgæster ved Vladivostok-forummet var Japans premierminister Abe og Sydkoreas præsident Park, der således udvider alliancens samarbejde.

I stærk kontrast hertil brugte USA's præsident Barack Obama anledningen til at promovere alle de konfliktområder, der splitter USA og Kina, inklusive den Permanente Voldgiftsrets ulovlige afgørelse om det Sydkinesiske Hav, beskyldningerne om, at Kina skulle dumpe stål på verdensmarkedet, samt andre friktioner. Obama dukkede op i Hangzhou for at forsøge at genoplive det, som er dødt – hans svindelnummer med Trans Pacific Partnerskab (TPP) – såvel som også for at fremprovokere konflikt. Obama kunne ikke engang modstå fristelsen til at kaste kold vand på sin egen udenrigsminister John Kerrys indsats for at indgå en aftale med Rusland om

fælles militære operationer imod Islamisk Stat og al-Qaeda.

G20-topmødet fortsætter mandag, efterfulgt af endnu et asiatisk, økonomisk topmøde i Laos, den 6. – 9. september, der efterfølges af et møde mellem de 10+1 – de ti ASEAN-nationer og Kina.

Alt imens præsident Obama fortsætter med at isolere sig selv fra det voksende flertal af nationer, der forsøger at fremkomme med løsninger på det fremstormende kollaps af det transatlantiske område og fremstødet for krig, der kommer fra det døende britiske imperiesystem, så afsluttes denne uge med et intenst højdepunkt, med rækken af fire opførelser af Mozarts Rekviem i New York City-området, for at mindes 15-års dagen for angrebene den 11. september, 2001, på World Trade Center og Pentagon, hvor 3000 mennesker blev dræbt. Schiller Instituttets kor og orkester vil deltage i disse koncerter.

Med tidligere **senator Bob Grahams pressekonference sidste onsdag i Washington, D.C.**, og med en afstemning i Repræsentanternes Hus om Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) (Loven om Retsforfølgelse af Sponsorer af Terrorismen), der skal finde sted, når Kongressen genoptager arbejdet den 6. september, vil spørgsmålet om juridisk retfærdighed dominere denne uge. Som senator Graham sagde til medierne i Washington i sidste uge, så er proppen taget af flasken, med frigivelsen den 15. juli af det 28 sider lange kapitel af hans oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelses-rapport om 11. september, og nu må den fulde sandhed om Saudi-Arabiens rolle i historiens værste terrorangreb på amerikansk jord komme frem. Det betyder, at hele det anglo-saudiske terrorapparat nu kan bringes til fald, og det betyder igen, at de primære kræfter, der er ude på at forhindre virkeliggørelsen af Verdenslandbroen og et nyt paradigme for relationer mellem Jordens nationer, kan besejres, én gang for alle.

Titelfoto: 2016 G20-ledere. (Foto: RIA Novosti)

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 flowâ.

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 accomplishedâ|.

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

things 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.

Video, 5 minutter: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Den 28. juli 2016, v/næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

»Jeg inviterer dig til at lære Schiller Instituttet at kende og til at kontakte os.

Verden er i en dyb krise, en civilisationskrise. Det er en brydningstid. Det kan blive meget værre, med et fuldt finanssammenbrud, måske sat i gang af de italienske banker, som er i krise, eller sågar af Deutsche Bank, som står øverst

på listen over de store, systemiske krisebanker, og som teknisk set faktisk er bankerot.

Det kan også være krig med Rusland og Kina, ført af dem, som gerne vil forhindre, at disse nationer fører an i skabelsen af en alternativ økonomisk politik.

Vi oplever efterdønningerne efter Brexit-afstemningen i Storbritannien, og det har rystet hele EU. Men det giver os nogle muligheder. En ting, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, er en redningsplan for Deutsche Bank, men på betingelse af, at Deutsche Bank vender tilbage til den ånd, der var, da Alfred Herrhausen var chef i 1989, hvor han havde en produktionsbaseret politik for banken, og hvor han kom ud med et krav for gældssanering for de fattigste lande og for udvikling af Østeuropa. Dengang var Berlinmuren endnu ikke faldet.

Vi kan takke ja til samarbejde i stedet for krig med Rusland og Kina, om at bygge en Ny Silkevej hele vejen fra Asien til Europa. Vi kan udvide det til at blive en Verdenslandbro, en bro over land, gennem Sydvestasien og hele vejen ned til Afrika. Vi kan følge den tråd, der for nylig er kommet frem, med Saudi-Arabiens rolle bag angrebene den 11. september 2001, og følge denne tråd helt til det nuværende Britiske Imperiums fraktions rolle bag terrorisme; og så kan vi takke ja til samarbejde med Rusland om at bekæmpe terrorisme.«

Præcisering: Chefen for Deutsch Bank, Alfred Herhausen, blev dræbt af terrorister den 30. november 1989. Berlinmuren faldt den 9. november 1989. Hvis han, som var en ledende rådgiver til den tyske kansler Helmut Kohl, havde levet, ville verden have set anderledes ud.

Denne video blev lavet i forbindelse med omdeling af Schiller Instituttets materiale i jyske og fynske byer.

Kontakter i Jylland:

Kolding: Preben Samsøe, 4146 4714

Aarhus: Hans Schultz, 4841 4096; 6016 4096

Randers: Poul Gundersen, 2082 0350

Her er nogle vigtige links:

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Menneskehedens skønne fremtid – hvis vi undgår dinosaurernes skæbne.

Hovedtale på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni, 2016

Baggrundsmateriale:

Lyndon LaRouches 3-punktsprogram for genopbygning af realøkonomien:

1. Hvorfor en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling ville løse finanskrisen og ødelægge Wall Street
 2. Hvordan man skaber ikke-inflationære kreditter gennem et nationalt kreditsystem
 3. Infrastrukturprojekter og fusionsøkonomi
-

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016:

Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

I kølvandet på den britiske beslutning om at forlade EU står ikke blot Det Britiske Imperium og EU's drømme om et imperium for fald, men hele det defekte paradigme, den vestlige verden har været præget af. Deutsche Banks krise er en sammenbrudskrise for hele finanssystemet, og Deutsche Bank må reddes for at undgå kaos – men samtidigt må banken bringes tilbage til Alfred Herrhausens politik for realøkonomisk vækst. Frigivelsen af de 28 sider må betyde afsløringen af Saudi-Arabiens og Storbritanniens støtte til international terrorisme og en fælles front med Rusland for at udrydde den. Chilcot-kommissionens rapport om Storbritanniens deltagelse i Irakkrigen afslører ikke blot Tony Blair som en løgner, men er en opfordring til et skifte fra det vestlige paradigme for permanent krig tilbage til respekt for FN og national suverænitet. Det mislykkede kupforsøg i Tyrkiet, som kom efter tyrkiske tilnærmelser til Rusland, vil fremskynde Erdogans planer om total magt, men kan være med til at stoppe hjælpen til IS gennem Tyrkiet. Udtalelsen fra Den Internationale Voldgiftsdomstol i Haag øger faren for krig i Det Sydkinesiske Hav. Danmark og Europa må gå med i Kinas og Ruslands nye paradigme for fredelig sameksistens og fælles udvikling.

Dette er en redigeret version af en briefing af Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet, den 18. juli 2016. Den kan høres på <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13685>

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Efter terrorangrebene i Nice, Würzburg og München er samarbejde med Rusland endnu mere presserende nødvendigt – uacceptabelt at benytte anledningen til at indføre politistat. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Det er derfor bydende nødvendigt og på høje tid at tage imod det tilbud, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med under FN's Generalforsamling i 2015, og i hvilket tilbud han satte fokus på de fatale konsekvenser af Vestens politik med at uddanne angivelige »moderate« oprørere til at bekæmpe sekulære regeringer i Mellemøsten, som dernæst i stimer hoppede af til ISIS. Helga Zepp-LaRouche fortsætter dernæst med at citere fra Putins tale, hvor han opfordrer til samarbejde mellem alle lande for at bekæmpe dette onde og nævner anti-Hitler-koalitionen under Anden Verdenskrig og understreger behovet for, at muslimske lande spiller en nøglerolle i en sådan koalition, i betragtning af disse ekstremisters korrumpning af deres religion, islam.

23. juli 2016 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, forkvinde for det tyske parti Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet

(Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität, BÜSo) og stifter af Schiller Instituttet, skrev en artikel om den strategiske krise og hvad det vil kræve at løse den. Det følgende er en oversættelse af afsnittet om terrorisme, i kølvandet på den dødbringende skudepisode i München den 22. juli.

Hele Helgas tyske artikel kan læses på BÜSos webside: <http://www.bueso.de/node/8688>.

Tyskland blev kastet ud i en choktilstand efter massakren i et indkøbscenter i München, med en 18-årig tysk-iraner som gerningsmand, og som fandt sted kun få dage efter, at en 17-årig afghansk flygtning med en økse angreb og sårede passagerer på et tog i byen Würzburg. Alt imens gerningsmændenes baggrund og motiver stadig er ved at blive undersøgt, så understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en artikel den 23. juli, at terrorisme, uanset i hvilken form, er blevet en hovedtrussel for hele menneskeheden.

CSU-parlamentsmedlem Hans-Peter Uhl har ret, skrev hun, i at kræve forbedrede forebyggende forholdsregler og øget samarbejdet mellem relevante myndigheder, både nationalt og i udlandet, for at bekæmpe terrorisme. Men, i betragtning af den radikale islams udvikling og måde at operere på, så indebærer dette selvfølgelig samarbejde med Rusland, »det offer, der har den største ekspertise i de tjetjenske netværk og disses forbindelse til Sektor Højre i Ukraine og til ISIS, og som beviseligt, gennem sine militære interventioner i Syrien, er det eneste land, der har haft held til at trække ISIS' magt tilbage.«

Det er derfor bydende nødvendigt og på høje tid at tage imod det tilbud, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med under FN's Generalforsamling i 2015, og i hvilket tilbud han satte fokus på de fatale konsekvenser af Vestens politik med at uddanne angivelige »moderate« oprørere til at bekæmpe sekulære regeringer i Mellemøsten, som dernæst i stimer hoppede af til ISIS. Helga Zepp-LaRouche fortsætter dernæst

med at citere fra Putins tale, hvor han opfordrer til samarbejde mellem alle lande for at bekæmpe dette onde og nævner anti-Hitler-koalitionen under Anden Verdenskrig og understreger behovet for, at muslimske lande spiller en nøglerolle i en sådan koalition, i betragtning af disse ekstremisters korrumpning af deres religion, islam.

»Siden Chilcot-undersøgelsesrapporten i Storbritannien satte fokus på, hvordan Tony Blair havde iscenesat aggressionskrigen i Irak på baggrund af overlagte løgne«, bemærker Zepp-LaRouche, »og efter afsløringen af de 28 sider af den officielle Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om angrebene 11. september [2001] ikke efterlod nogen tvivl om Saudi-Arabiens rolle i finansieringen af terrorisme, vil en politik med 'mere af det samme' være det samme som at være medskyldig i alle nye terrorangreb.

»De tyske myndigheder kan ikke længere skjule sig bag de sædvanlige sociologiske sofismer. Troværdigheden hos hr. Uhl og indenrigsminister Thomas de Mazière, hos medlemmerne af Forbundsdagens komité for interne anliggender og selvfølgelig, hos kansler Angela Merkel, vil afhænge af, om de indleder en officiel undersøgelse for så hurtigt som muligt at kaste lys over disse to dokumenters – Chilcot-rapportens og de 28 sider – implikationer og drage konsekvenserne af dem.

»Det er under alle omstændigheder uacceptabelt at bruge angrebene i Würzburg og München som en anledning til at opbygge en politistat sådan, som Erdogan er i færd med, og at samarbejde med netop de lande, hvis rolle er blevet belyst i Chilcot-rapporten og de 28 sider.«

Tiden er inde til, at krigen mod terror bringer Det britiske Imperium til fald – LaRouche: »Glass-Steagall vil gøre det af med Imperiet.«

20. juli 2016 (Leder) – For næsten et år siden foreslog den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin en global koalition til bekæmpelse af Islamisk Stat og andre jihadistiske terrorister, en koalition, der er bygget over modellen for den amerikansk- og sovjetisk-ledede koalition til nedkæmpelse af nazismens og fascismens svøbe under Anden Verdenskrig. Nylige begivenheder gør det klart, at tiden nu er inde til netop en sådan kampalliance – rettet mod Det britiske Imperium.

Frigivelsen, efter 14 års lange kamp, af **de 28 sider fra den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelse af 11. september [2001]** har fastslået det saudiske monarkis indiskutable rolle i historiens værste terrorangreb på amerikansk jord, og en omhyggelig gennemgang af Al Yamama-sagen gør det klart, at saudierne i denne grusomhed handlede som agenter for Det britiske Imperium.

Den ligeledes nylige udgivelse af **Chilcot-kommissionens rapport har bevist, at den tidligere britiske premierminister Tony Blair var skyldig** i samme klasse af krigsforbrydelser, for hvilke topnazister blev retsforfulgt og dømt ved domstolen i Nürnberg.

I kølvandet på rapporten fra Repræsentanternes Hus' Komite for Finansielle Tjenester, som afslører den britiske regerings og Obamas Hvide Hus' rolle i mørklægningen af **hvidvask af penge,**

der stammer fra narkotikahandel og anvendes til terror, og som i enorme proportioner er blevet bedrevet af den britiske krones bank, HSBC, blev to topfolk fra HSBC arresteret af FBI i denne uge på anklager om finansielt bedrageri. Dette er kun toppen af isbjerget.

Taget sammen, repræsenterer disse udviklinger det største dødsstød mod Det britiske Imperium i meget lang tid. Det nylige kup i Tyrkiet kan kun forstås ud fra et standpunkt om den britiske krones rolle i sponsorering og beskyttelse af de tjetjenske terrorister, samt stort set alle andre etniske separatistgrupper på Jordens overflade. Tjetjenerne har udgjort rygraden i al-Qaeda og Islamisk Stat og har nydt godt af den britiske krones beskyttelse, lige siden begyndelsen af den første Tjetjenske Krig i midten af 1990'erne. Tjetjenerne stod bag selvmordsterrorangrebet den 28. juni mod Istanbul Lufthavn, der fandt sted kun kort tid efter, at den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan, under enormt internationalt pres og isolering, udstedte en offentlig undskyldning til den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin for den tyrkiske nedskydning af et russisk kampfly i november 2015. Dette er den afgørende kulisse, på baggrund af hvilken man skal foretage en kompetent vurdering af de igangværende begivenheder i Tyrkiet.

Det britiske Imperium er under angreb, det er bankerot, og det er isoleret. Enhver, der seriøst vil standse det omsiggribende mønster med global, blind terrorisme, bør erkende, at denne kun kan bekæmpes ved at gå helt til toppen, og derfra nedefter – og det betyder, at man må bringe Det britiske Imperium til fald.

I USA er Wall Street, som er en gren af det britiske finansimperium, vågnet op til den kendsgerning, at der finder en fuldt optrappet revolte sted imod deres korrupsion og tyveri. Denne revolte har omgående taget form af, at man, i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske partis valgplatform, har inkluderet en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, noget, som er kommet totalt bag på Wall Street. Dette har forårsaget en

hysterisk reaktion fra finansoligarkiet.

Som Lyndon LaRouche i dag understregede: »Glass-Steagall vil gøre det af med Imperiet. Og USA's økonomi kan ikke overleve, med mindre man vender tilbage til Glass-Steagall.«

**RADIO SCHILLER den 18. juli
2016:**

**Deutsche Bank handlingsplan//
Offentliggørelsen af de 28-
sider om Saudi-arabiens rolle
bag terror//
Terror i Nice//
Kupforsøget i Tyrkiet**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Brug 'de 28 sider' og undgå

Frankrigs skæbne

16. juli 2016 (Leder) – Det er en stor ironi, at Frankrig er blevet ramt af et tragisk stik af sin tætte accept af Saudi-Arabien – og hermed også al-Qaeda i Syrien – lige så vel som, at Obamaregeringen er blevet tvunget til at frigive beviser, der har været hemmeligholdt i 15 år, på Saudi-Arabiens rolle i »al-Qaeda«-terrorangrebene i USA, den 11. september, 2001.

Den franske præsidentkandidat og leder af Solidarité et Progrès, Jacques Cheminade, understreger dette forhold i sin stærke erklæring (se: **»Stop kilden til terrorisme«**), om katastrofen i Nice. Frankrigs regering har heppet på al-Nusra Front (al-Qaeda i Syrien) imod den syriske præsident Assad. Den gav førsteprioritet til relationer med Saudi-Arabien, om hvem regeringen vidste, at de leverede våben, der skulle til al-Nusra og denne organisations aflægger i Syrien – lige indtil al-Nusras meget store og berygtede rekrutteringscelle i Nice udløste et dødbringende stød hjemme.

Samme tragedie fandt sted, med Bushregeringens oprindelige undertrykkelse af 'de 28 sider', der omsider blev frigivet i fredags, og som viser årelang saudisk assistance til al-Qaeda samtidig med, at angrebene 11. september blev planlagt og forberedt. Hvis dette hemmeligholdte afsnit var blevet frigivet sammen med resten af Kongressens 11. september-rapport fra 2002, kunne USA ikke være blevet inddraget i krig med Irak, »for at hævne 11. september«.

Nu er 'de 28 sider' omsider blevet tvunget frem af pres fra offentligheden, og deres offentliggørelse får ekstraordinær bred og fremtrædende mediedækning i hele verden. Dette giver os en enorm åbning for at ændre hele den transatlantiske politik for bekæmpelse af terrorisme og til forhindring af krig, som Cheminade understreger – og ligeledes til at skaffe retfærdighed for ofre for jihadisme.

Obamaregeringens Hvide Hus hævdede, mens de 28 sider blev frigivet – og fortsat med henved 150 redigeringer (overstreget af censuren) – at de ikke indeholdt »noget nyt«. Men i realiteten er helhedsbilledet i dette kapitel nyt; et langt mere fyldestgørende efterretningsbillede af en langt mere mangesidet saudisk operation for at assistere al-Qaeda, med det formål at undgå amerikanske operationer imod det.

New York Times, der anstrengte sig for at være enig med Obama, kunne ikke: »Men dokumentet, der blev frigivet fredag, er skånselsløst i sin kritik af den saudiske indsats for at underminere de amerikanske forsøg på at afmontere al-Qaeda i årene op til angrebene 11. september. Det fremstiller ydermere FBI som generelt set befindende sig i mørke mht. saudiske regeringsfolks manøvreringer internt i USA i denne periode.« Dette henviser til de sidste seks sider i kapitlet, som hidtil har været totalt ukendte for offentligheden. Overskriften i *The Times* var »Et overblik over saudisk indsats for at forpurre USA's aktion mod al-Qaeda«.

Intet nyt? Storbritanniens *Guardian* fremfører: »De såkaldte 28 sider indikerer et langt større netværk af forbindelser mellem al-Qaeda og den saudiske kongefamilie, end det hidtil har været kendt.«

En gennemgribende og helt ny undersøgelse kan nu være med til, at den amerikanske offentlighed kan se et nyt paradigme, et paradigme, gennem hvilket USA og hele Europa, inklusive Frankrig, kan komme ud af de seneste 15 års regimeskift- og terrorhelvede.

Dette betyder, at vi skal have en undersøgelse, der går et godt stykke tilbage til den nu afslørede 11. september-fremmende, Prins Bandars berømte »Al Yamama-aftale ('olie-forvåben') med Storbritannien, der leverede de hemmelige offshore-konti til så mange destabiliserings- og terroraktioner.

Det er, hvad vi nu har krævet. Det samme har familierne til ofrene for 11. september, der i går voldsomt angreb Obama for at forsøge at lukke døren i ansigtet på sandheden netop, som den er begyndt at åbne sig.

Vi henviser til nedenstående udstrakte dækning af 'de 28 sider' fra både vores danske hjemmeside og ligeledes fra LaRouche-bevægelsens ditto.

Vi anbefaler især LPAC's 56 min. lange featurefilm fra 2011, »Ten Years Later«. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=quYYA1wtUwc>

USA: Kongressen har nu frigivet 'de 28 sider': LaRouchePAC kræver en ny undersøgelse af terrorangrebene 11. september 2001



*15. juli 2016 (Leder) – Under enormt pres fra familierne til ofrene fra 11. september, fra et par modige medlemmer af Kongressen og fra LaRouchePAC, der har været forkæmper i forreste linje for denne historie siden 2009, har Efterretningskomiteerne fra Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet endelig offentliggjort en redigeret version af de hemmeligstemplede 28 sider af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelse (2002), der detaljerer den saudiske involvering i terrorangrebene den 11. september, 2001. Disse sider, der i 15 år er blevet holdt skjult for det amerikanske folk, må nu blive begyndelsen af en *de novo* undersøgelse, fra toppen og ned, af angrebene 11. september og den efterfølgende mørklægning. Lad denne sejr blive begyndelsen til et nyt paradigme for sandhed og ansvarlighed i USA. For evigt fremad!*

**Bliv medlem af Schiller Instituttet
i dag!**

**Der er så meget, der skal gøres ...
Din verden har det rigtig skidt –**

Vi har løsningerne!

Læs vores danske dækning:

»Kongressen frigiver 'de 28 sider'« Inkl. pdf af siderne.

»Frigivelsen af 'de 28 sider' en strategisk sejr. Nu må vi have en ny undersøgelse.

Den 10. september, 2011, udgav LaRouchePAC en feature-film, »11. september, ti år senere, der undersøger de politiske, økonomiske og overordnede geo-strategiske motiver til angrebene 11/9«. *Må se!*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=quYYA1wtUwc>

Vi henviser til LaRouchePAC's side med udstrakt dokumentation om organisationens årelange kamp for denne sag.

Frigivelsen af 'de 28 sider' en strategisk sejr; Nu må vi have en ny undersøgelse



15. juli 2016 – Obamaregeringen ventede til de allersidste timer af Kongressens samling, før den går på seks ugers ferie, med at frigive det let redigerede, 28 sider lange kapitel af den oprindelige rapport fra 2002 over den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse af begivenhederne den 11. september, 2001. På trods af denne timing var frigivelsen en enorm sejr, der nu anbringer hele det Anglo-Saudiske Imperium i direkte skudlinje pga. dets nu dokumenterede rolle i den værste terrorgrusomhed, begået på amerikansk jord. Desuden gør en omhyggelig gennemlæsning af de delvist redigerede 28 sider det ganske klart, at kongresmedlem Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) havde fuldstændig ret, da han sidste år sagde, at de 28 sider tvinger os til fuldstændigt at gentænke alt, hvad der er sket i løbet af de seneste 15 år.

Graden af bevis for det saudiske monarkis involvering i angrebene 11. september går langt ud over det, der hidtil har været offentligt kendt. Snesevis af saudiske regeringsfolk og medlemmer af den kongelige familie var intimt involveret med al-Qaeda, og mange havde direkte forbindelse til selve flykaprerne. Amerikanske tjenester havde beviser for et dybtgående saudisk sponsorskab af al-Qaeda i årevis før angrebene den 11. september, men ethvert forsøg på at slå ned på dette forhold blev undertrykt, og detektiver blev fyret

eller forflyttet, hvis de stillede for mange af de rigtige spørgsmål.

Det, der nu er et presserende behov for, er en undersøgelse, fra toppen og ned, der begynder med den anglo-saudiske hånd bag 11. september, men som går langt videre end til disse begivenheder for 15 år siden og undersøger alle de efterfølgende terrorgrusomheder og terrorbegivenheder, såsom invasionerne ind i Irak og Libyen, den igangværende indsats for at fremtvinge et regimeskifte i Assads Syrien, samt meget mere endnu.

Lyndon LaRouche understregede i dag, at vi må bevare dette momentum for en ny undersøgelse, der udforsker dybderne i det anglo-saudiske kompleks. Intet mindre vil være i stand til at rykke terrorpesten op ved rode.

Udgivelsen af de 28 sider, der kommer blot få dage efter **udgivelsen af Chilcot-kommissionens rapport i Britannien**, udgør et **dødbringende, et-to-stød mod hjertet af Det britiske Imperium og dets saudiske partnere.**

Efter udgivelsen af den 28 sider, overbragte kongresmedlem Walter Jones, der anførte i kampen i Kongressen, sin tak og sine lykønskninger til LaRouche-bevægelsen for vores afgørende rolle i at fremtvinge en frigivelse af dokumenterne. Han afgav løfte om at gå videre til næste niveau af undersøgelse og ikke stoppe, før den fulde sandhed er offentliggjort, for åbent tæppe.

Foto: Walter B. Jones (født 1943) er kongresmedlem i USA's Repræsentanternes Hus for North Carolina 3rd kongresdistrikt. Han er medlem af det Republikanske Parti.

USA: Kongressen frigiver de længe hemmeligholdte '28 sider', der peger på saudernes forbindelse til 11. september-angrebene. Inkl. pdf af siderne.

Følgende er citeret fra en historie i RT:
<https://www.rt.com/usa/351327-congress-releases-pages-saudi/>

15. juli 2016 – De længe ventede 28 sider af Den fælles Kongres-undersøgelsesrapport fra 2002 om begivenhederne den 11. september, 2001, er blevet frigivet, og et afsnit peger på, at prominente medlemmer af den saudiarabiske regering var involveret i planlægningen og udførelsen af terrorangrebene.

Hemmeligstemplingen af dokumenterne blev ophævet af Kongressen fredag og frigivet til offentligheden samme dag. Dokumenterne bekræftede mistanken om, at terroristerne, der var involveret i angrebene den 11. september 2001 – og af hvilke de fleste var saudiske statsborgere – efter al sandsynlighed modtog støtte fra højtplacerede saudiske efterretningsofficerer.

Saudi-Arabien, der er USA's allierede i Mellemøsten, har på det bestemteste benægtet enhver involvering i angrebene og har afvist disse anklager, og de havde tidligere bekæmpet ophævelsen af hemmeligstemplingen af de 28 sider. Nu har piben fået en anden lyd, efter fredagens offentliggørelse af

dokumenterne, hvor Riyadh nu officielt hilser rapporten velkommen i det håb, at den vil fjerne mistanken om den saudiske regerings handlinger.

»Siden 2002 har Kommissionen for 11. september og flere regeringskontorer, inklusive CIA og FBI, undersøgt indholdet af de '28 sider' og har bekræftet, at hverken den saudiske regering eller højtplacerede saudiske regeringsfolk, og heller ingen person på vegne af den saudiske regering, har ydet nogen som helst støtte eller tilskyndelse til disse angreb«, sagde Abdullah al-Saud, Saudi-Arabiens ambassadør til USA, i en erklæring, iflg. Reuters.

»Vi håber, at frigivelsen af disse sider én gang for alle vil opklare alle spørgsmål eller mistanker, der måtte hænge i luften, om Saudi-Arabiens handlinger, planer eller mangeårige venskab med USA.«

Vedhæftet dokument: de 28 sider, pdf.

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

For krig og terrorisme: Erinyerne har først lige taget fat i Blair

9. juli 2016 (Leder) – Angrebet på dem, der, med Tony Blair i spidsen, brugte angrebene 11. september (2001) til at føre illegale aggressionskrige og slippe international terrorisme løs, optrappes.

På en dag, hvor den nye filippinske præsident udfordrede Blair og USA som værende kilderne til terrorismen, og hvor medlemmer af den amerikanske Kongres opfordrede til en mobilisering for at fremtvinge offentliggørelsen af beviserne mod saudierne og briterne, står Blair ligeledes over for voksende sagsanlæg fra britiske militærfamilier og udsigten til retsforfølgelse.

Avisen *London Telegraph* rapporterede, at den af juridiske kilder havde fået at vide, at Chilcot-kommissionens rapport gav grundlag for juridiske søgsmål om skadeserstatninger mod Blair, anlagt af sårede veteraner fra Irak og af familier til soldater, der døde dér. Den sagde, at foreløbig 29 familier til døde soldater har bedt advokatfirmaet McCue & Partners om at lægge sag an mod Blair »for hver en penny«, og mange andre forventes at følge trop. Firmaet forventer at føre en civil retssag for »myndighedsmisbrug i offentligt hverv«, der viser, at Blair havde

»handlet ud over sine magtbeføjelser, og at skade herved er blevet forårsaget, og at denne skade kunne have været forudsagt.«

Myndighedsmisbrug under udførelse af offentligt hverv giver potentielt mulighed for ubegrænsede skadeserstatninger.

Telegraph fremfører, at Sir John Chilcots undersøgelse fandt, at

»Hr. Blair burde have set de problemer, der resulterede af invasionen i 2003, og kom til at indikere, således også for ham, at denne militæraktion var illegal.«

Den bemærker også, at Blair

»har skabt sig en formue, anslået til 60 millioner pund ... Reg Keys, hvis søn Tom var én af seks soldater i det Kongelige Militærpoliti, der blev dræbt ved Major al-Kabir i 2003, sagde: »Tony Blair har tjent en masse penge på et offentligt hverv, som jeg mener, han misbrugte.«

»Roger Bacon, hvis søn Matt Bacon, en major i Efterretningskorpset, blev dræbt af en vejsidebombe i 2005, sagde: 'Sagsanlægget for myndighedsmisbrug i offentligt hverv giver os mulighed for at sagsøge ham for ubegrænsede skadeserstatninger. Jeg ønsker, at disse midler indsættes på en fond for genopbygning af Irak. Det ville hjælpe med at kompensere for det, det skete dér.«

BBC offentliggjorde uafhængigt en juridisk ekspertanalyse af spørgsmålet, »Kunne Blair stå over for juridisk sagsanlæg over Irakkrigen?« BBC's juridiske korrespondent Clive Coleman rapporterer, at »aggressionskrig«, den alvorligste krigsforbrydelse, ville være den mest indlysende kriminelle anklage mod Blair. Men, siger Coleman, 1998-Romtraktatens skabelse af den Internationale Forbryderdomstol fjernede retsforfølgelse af aggressionskrige fra nationer, men udskød en aftale om, at den Internationale Forbryderdomstol skulle gøre det, til i hvert fald 2017!

Det er derfor mere sandsynligt, mener Coleman, at Blair i fremtiden kommer til at stå over for retsforfølgelse for »forseelser i offentligt hverv«, for hvilken Chilcot-kommissionen leverer grundlaget. Anklagen om kriminelle handlinger er alvorlig og har en indlysende lighed med »myndighedsmisbrug i offentligt hverv«, for hvilken anklage familierne har til hensigt at sagsøge ham »for hver en penny«.

Verden efter den britiske Chilcot-rapport om Irak- krigen; samt foredrag om Albert Einstein og kreativitetens nødvendighed, v/ Phil Rubinstein, LaRouchePAC, USA. Video og lyd; uddrag på dansk

Video 2. del:

Lyd:

Følgende er et dansk uddrag, let redigeret, af den første del af indlægget:

Phil Rubinstein, (en leder af LaRouchePAC i USA): Det, jeg vil forsøge at gøre, er, at jeg vil begynde med lidt politisk baggrund; men i dag drejer det sig ikke om at give en briefing, og så fortsætte med et emne. Der er et par ting, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har talt om i de seneste år, og faktisk i løbet af de seneste par uger; og der er to ting, som jeg vil komme ind på. Det første er, at Helga, under denne nylige konference i Berlin, har udsendt en appel om en dialog mellem civilisationer; men hvad der er vigtigere, så har Helga understreget den pointe, at vi må have et skifte i kulturen,

den globale kultur. En del af at få ændret den globale kultur er at få en relation imellem de eksisterende nationer, der bedst kan bygges på hver enkelte civilisations højdepunkter – den renæssance, der har fundet sted i de forskellige civilisationer, f.eks. den storslåede renæssance i Kina, Tongdynastiet og andre perioder; Konfucius. I Indien var der Gupta-perioden med store udviklinger inden for klassisk kunst og videnskab, og naturligvis også den græske renæssance, den italienske renæssance, og mange tilfælde, som vi ikke ved ret meget om. Men, at bringe disse sammen, og det var især det, der fandt sted ved koncerten lørdag aften – jeg kan kun opfordre folk til at gå til websiden og se det, hvis man ikke selv var til stede. Og dette er, hvad Helga har stillet krav om som en politisk nødvendighed i dag, nu. Intet mindre kan gøre det. Politik har ændret sig over de seneste 10, 20, 30 eller 40 år, for man kan sige, at, for fyrre år siden var behovet for en sådan total forandring i det kulturelle syn ikke så påkrævet, og vi ville måske have kunnet gennemføre et par reformer, der kunne have fået os igennem krisen. Det er ikke længere tilfældet. I dag står vi, 25 år efter Sovjetunionens fald. Og på det tidspunkt sagde LaRouchebevægelsen og Schiller Instituttet, at dette ikke betød Vestens sejr over Østen, men at det vestlige system sådan, som det var i færd med at udvikle sig på det tidspunkt, også gik sit sammenbrud i møde. Og dét, som Helga og Lyn sagde på det tidspunkt, var, at den eneste måde at undgå dette på, var at åbne op for den fulde udvikling af den eurasiske landmasse. Så langt tilbage går vores fremgangsmåde, med den Eurasiske Landbro, mindst tilbage til 1989-90. I modsat fald ville der komme et sammenbrud i den globale kultur. Hvis vi forsøgte at udbrede den eksisterende London/Wall Street-akse, det såkaldte Washington-konsensus efter ordre fra Storbritannien; fra selve Monarkiet, og det vil jeg gerne understrege, for folk mener, at det er absurd, selv i Europa, selv i USA, mener folk, at det er absurd. Men det er i realiteten dér, vi står. Lyndon LaRouche er kommet med et specifikt udtryk for dette, som går ud på, at spørgsmålet her

først og fremmest drejer sig om kreativitet. Spørgsmålet for de fleste af os er: Hvad betyder dette? Hvad er kreativitet? Og Lyn(don) siger, at det er kreativitet i sig selv. Det er simpelt hen kreativitet, og hvis vi forstår det som et faktisk princip om menneskelig udvikling og vores forhold til universet som helhed. Her på det seneste har Lyndon sagt, tænk som Einstein. Og det morsomme er, at for år tilbage – jeg hader at lyde gammel, men det er jeg, ikke så gammel endda, men det skrider frem; måske er jeg den ældste person i lokalet? – Nå, men for mange år siden havde vi et blad, der hed The Campaigner, som var vores teoretiske magasin, tilbage i slutningen af '70'erne, og vi havde et nummer, der hed: Tænk som Beethoven! Jeg vil gerne fastslå den pointe, at der ikke er den store forskel. For, et af de afgørende punkter i at tænke som Einstein er klassisk musik. Det kommer jeg tilbage til, når jeg kommer til Einstein, men blot for nu at give jer en smagsprøve på, hvad det er, Lyn talte om. For det drejer sig ikke bare om, at Einstein var et videnskabeligt geni, og det var han – vi kommer ikke på den særlige relativitetsteori, men jeg vil komme ind på nogle af de kontroversielle elementer af det – men han var, i hele sin personlighed, som person, et geni. Han havde den rigtige opfattelse af stort set alle spørgsmål, som han blev involveret i, inkl. nogle kontroversielle videnskabelige spørgsmål, hvor mange mennesker mente, at han havde uret. Og jeg taler ikke om de specifikke resultater, men om hans tilgang, fremgangsmåde, selv nu her 100 år efter, eller omkring 60 år efter hans død, er man nødsaget til at komme tilbage til at diskutere nogle af hans ideer. Videnskaben udvikler sig selvfølgelig. Som folk måske ved, og det er blot en del af det, f.eks. men videnskabsfolk er nu, efter at have rakket ned på ideen, gået tilbage til begrebet om en helhedsanskuelse af videnskab. Dette må gå langt videre end det, de tænkte, og selv det, Einstein vidste, og Lyn har været en ledende person. For, en del af problemet er denne adskillelse af forskellige discipliner ikke alene er en adskillelse fra videnskab, men også en adskillelse inden for de forskellige videnskaber: fysik, biologi osv. Og de er i

virkeligheden slet ikke adskilte. Det er ikke blot det, at de ikke udgør adskilte områder, men at det er en fejl at tænke på dem adskilt fra hinanden. De kan ikke eksistere adskilte. En af de ting, jeg gerne vil understrege, er, at, for virkelig at kunne opnå det, som Lyn og Einstein taler om, må vi anskue fysik fra et helt andet synspunkt; ud fra et synspunkt om, ikke alene biologi, men om livet; ting, der ikke er entropiske, men, hvad der er endnu vigtigere, selve det menneskelige intellekt. Det er altså ikke hjerne, som de fleste mennesker ... jeg så en af disse videnskabsvideoer, og de havde et afsnit om Einstein; Einstein og hans videnskab, Einstein og hans et eller andet; og så Einstein og hans hjerne. Der var en journalist, der stillede spørgsmål til topvidenskabsfolk, hvilket ikke gør det bedre, og hun var fikseret på hjernen! Det var en fyr, der studerede Einsteins (fysiske) hjerne fra noget skørt materiale, og hun blev ved med at komme tilbage til, hvor stor var hans hjerne, og hvor mange hjernevindinger var der, det var sindssygt! Så vi taler altså ikke om hjerne, men om det menneskelige intellekt. (Se også LPAC-videoen: *The Extraordinary genius of Albert Einstein*, med indledning af Phil Rubinstein, -red.)

Til dels, for at komme derhen, hvorfor taler Lyn og Helga om det på denne måde, at man må have en tilgang ud fra synspunktet om intellektet. På én måde siger man, at intellektet er adskilt fra det fysiske univers, på en anden måde siger man, at intellektet blot er en sen opdagelse, i det mindste her på planeten Jord; vi ved ikke, om der intellekt andetsteds i universet. Så hvorfor begynde dér? Faktisk er det sådan, at det menneskelige intellekt er det, som universet har frembragt. Vi kan bevise en vis relation til dette univers, hvilket er, hvad Einstein arbejdede ud fra. Men hvorfor må vi tage dette udgangspunkt? Vil de fleste mennesker sige. Er det ikke lidt meget; I har måske ret, det kunne muligvis være interessant at tale om dette. Men lad os nu ... som Lyn ynder at sige: Lad os nu være lidt praktiske. Hvad kan vi (rent praktisk) gøre? Kan vi ikke applikere en anden tilgang? Lige

nu; lad os få et bedre system i Europa; lad os håndtere euro-spørgsmålet. Lad os forbedre vores relation med Rusland, lad os få en dialog med Rusland. Det er en god ting. Briterne forlod (EU); lad os se, hvad vi kan gøre med det, der er tilbage; vi må på en eller anden måde holde sammen på Europa. Lad os være praktiske! OK, vi må tage os af spørgsmålet om kineserne. Vi må konkurrere med dem, for det handler altid om konkurrence. En nation imod den anden, det er altid geopolitik, det er altid et nulsums-spil; lad os være praktiske.

Det problem, vi står overfor, er, at tingene nu er kommet til det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen praktiske skridt, der kan tages, *undtagen en form for revolution*. Jeg taler ikke om at kaste med brosten og mursten. Hvis vi ikke gør det rigtige, vil jeg gerne understrege, at det kan komme så vidt nogle steder. Hvis vi ser på Mellemøsten, dér har vi en forfærdelig situation. Men en revolution i kulturen. Den slags ting, der må udtænkes, f.eks. har vi med musikken, vi har opført koncerten i Berlin, men mere generelt, så bruger vi udviklingen af musikalske kor til at mobilisere folk. Jeg er sikker på, man har noget lignende i Europa; i USA er der mange unge mennesker, der mener, at Rapp-musik er kreativt. De siger ikke bare, at de kan lide det – det siger nogen måske – men det virkelige argument er, at det er kreativt. Det er poesi. Det er virkeligt. Det er gaden. Det er mit liv. De er måden, hvorpå jeg udtrykker mig. Og kendsgerningen er, at, på dette tidspunkt, så, hvis man ikke erkender, at det ødelægger deres intellekt, så kan man ikke organisere det. Men mindre, man i det mindste engagerer sig i denne debat, engagerer sig i ... min hustru er dansk, og Danmark er et vidunderligt land, folk er lykkelige, men jeg har set ungdommen. Og de ligner alt for meget det, vi amerikanere kalder 'Goths', gotere, skinheads osv., med tatoveringer, med alternativ påklædning med kranier og skeletter og 14 nåle igennem næsen, osv. Hvis man har en ungdom, for hvem hæslighed er et højdepunkt af deres kultur, noget, man forsøger at opnå, så har man en ungdom, der har

mistet enhver fornemmelse af formål i verden. Mistet enhver fornemmelse af, hvad det vil sige at være menneske. For, at være menneske er ikke hæslighed. Og dette er et virkeligt problem, hvor man ser forskellighederne i kulturer. Især Kina har ungdommen tendens til at være optimistiske. De overtager sikkert nok noget af den vesterlandske kultur, det gør de, og det er et problem. Men bortset fra det, så har de en fornemmelse af, at det at være menneske har en egenskab af skønhed, af udvikling, en egenskab af fremskridt og opdagelse og spænding. Det ser man ikke hos ret mange unge i Vesten i dag, generelt, selv om der nok skal være nogen.

Se på, hvad der foregår lige nu. Vi har et sammenbrud af det vestlige finansielle system. Deutsche Bank – 50, 70 billioner i derivater – de siger selvfølgelig, at det vil udligne sig, men det er ikke sandt, sådan sker et krak ikke. De sidder ikke der og udligner det hele, og så bliver det til nul, og sluttelig med 50 billioner i derivater, udveksler man en dollar frem og tilbage, og så er det hele løst. Siden hvornår har det fungeret sådan? Det er deres argument. Men det fungerer ikke sådan. 50 billioner i Deutsche Bank – der i virkeligheden ikke er en tysk bank, den har grundlæggende set base i New York osv., men altså, hvad er Tysklands totale BNP? Der er på omkring 3 billioner, sådan noget. Det totale BNP i EU er 18 billioner dollars. Så vi taler altså om mellem 3 til 4 gange det totale BNP. Deutsche Bank er bankerot. I USA har vi ikke råd til noget, undtagen bankerne. Jeg har netop set en rapport fra New Jersey, med 8 millioner indbyggere, den tættest eller næst-tættest befolkede delstat, lidt mere som i Europa mht. befolkningstæthed, der ikke ligner noget andet sted i USA. Der har de en idiot som guvernør, der stillede på som præsidentkandidat, og de har netop erklæret, at de vil standse al reparation og vedligeholdelse af veje og motorveje, for budgettet blev ikke vedtaget. Så han prøver at presse folk. I USA har vi, for første gang i vores historie, en stigning i antal dødsfald i aldersgruppen 25 – 54. Med andre ord, så er antallet af dødsfald pr. 1000 mennesker, eller pr.

100.000 mennesker, er i denne aldersgruppe steget under Bush- og Obamapræsidentskaberne. Undersøgelsen spændte over perioden 1999 til 2012/14. Selvmordsraterne er steget. Men den virkelige historie om sundhedsvæsenet i USA, det er forvirrende, jo, vi har da en 5 – 10 hospitaler i USA, der er hospitaler i verdensklasse. Det er ikke sådan, at vi ikke har disse ting. Men, de bliver ikke brugt, med mindre man tilhører de højere samfundslag, eller udvælges til at deltage i et eksperiment; men bortset fra det, så er bundlinjen lige nu, at, hvis du er over 65, må vi lige overveje, om det kan betale sig at tage os af dig. Så de sætter altså indbetalingen for lægebehandling op, osv.

Hvad ser vi? EU falder fra hinanden. Hvad er signalerne? Vi ved ikke helt, hvad det er, der foregår i Storbritannien. Vi forsøger at finde ud af det. Men vi ved, at Europa var chokeret over den idé, at briterne stemte for at forlade EU. Det her har en særlig drejning. Den idé, som briterne har spillet, og som giver én en idé om deres rolle, er, at de godt kan lide altid at sætte visse ting op på en sådan måde, der giver kontrol; men de bliver aldrig rigtigt selv en del af det, de sætter op. De holder sig altid lidt udenfor. Churchill er et godt eksempel. Churchill gjorde det meget klart, at de ikke ville opgive Imperiet. Det er grunden til, at de kæmpede mod nazisterne; det gjorde de ikke, fordi de ønskede at redde jøderne, glem det. De kæmpede mod nazisterne – efter at de først havde installeret nazisterne – fordi de ikke ville miste en del af deres imperium, og de indså, at det var den vej, det gik. Men ikke desto mindre var deres exit af EU en faktor, der var noget af en overraskelse, især uden for Storbritannien ... igen, hvad det britiske etablissement tænkte, og jeg vil tro, at der var splittelser selv i det britiske etablissement, og det er sandsynligvis grunden til, at det var så tæt løb. Men en overraskelse, de er ude, og den Europæiske Union er død. Der vil fremover ikke findes noget EU. Disse fyre, Juncker og Schultz, der siger, at vi får et nyt Europa, et stærkere Europa, et kerne-Europa, det grundlæggende Europa – glem det.

Europa (EU) er fuldstændigt røget. Til dels, fordi hele banksystemet er røget.

Nu har man Chilcot-rapporten. Jeg mener, at dette også vil vise sig at være betydningsfuldt. Tony Blair udgjorde modellen for det seneste amerikanske præsidentskab. Som det fremgår af selve Chilcot-rapporten, så var han bonkammerat med George W. Bush, og den idé, at det skulle have været George Bush, der kommanderede rundt med Tony Blair, er mere end absurd. Som vi plejede at sige, så var George W. Bush ikke i stand til at holde fast i en idé på vej fra den ene ende af lokalet til den anden. Dette var Tony Blairs krig. Dette var briternes imperie-krig. Det var USA under Bush. Obama har ambitioner; han vil gerne være mere ligesom Blair. Han vil ikke indrømme, at han ikke ved, hvad han foretager sig, han er alt for narcissistisk, han modellerer sig efter Blair i mange henseender. Dette er det nye Labourparti, husker man måske. Hvad det havde med arbejde (labour) at gøre, aner jeg ikke. Det var så nyt, at de slet ikke behøvede at arbejde!

Chilcot-rapporten gør dette klart. Vi vidste dette; vi sagde dette. Der var andre, der også sagde det. Men den kendsgerning, at dette nu kommer ud få dage efter Brexit, som en rapport – og jeg så faktisk Blair, der forsøgte at undskylde, og han var noget rystet. Så vi har altså enden på EU; vi har de kollapsende banker, og dette har naturligvis udløst en virkning, hvor Carney, som er chef for Bank of England ... og nu har vi bare penge, som de pumper ud, så meget, som de kan. I USA kalder vi det 'helikopter-penge'. Der findes ikke engang en mekanisme længere, hvor f.eks. centralbankerne opkøber obligationer ... det gider vi ikke længere, det virker ikke mere, for det giver centralbankerne for meget gæld. Nu siger man bare, kom, vi giver dig penge, hvis du bliver hjemme, kaster vi penge ned over dit hus!

Systemet er totalt færdigt. Og dette finder selvfølgelig sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er en ny bølge af terrorisme, med Bagdad, Bangladesh og netop i dag har der været en bombe i

Taiwan på metroen, hvor 21 mennesker kom til skade. De har ikke erklæret det for en terrorhandling, så jeg ved ikke, hvad det drejede sig om. Men Bagdad, 250 døde, premierministeren har indrømmet, og er under ekstremt pres, og hvad er det, Chilcot-rapporten bekræfter? At alt dette er en konsekvens af især Irakkrigen i 2003. En afgørende faktor for at forstå Blair, mener jeg, og nogle af jer husker måske dette; denne britiske skuespillerinde, Helen Mirren, spillede Dronning Elizabeth II og vandt en Oscar; og selv i filmen – og dette er sandt – så er den person, der redder den britiske kongefamilie fra vanære efter Dianas død, hendes mord, Tony Blair. Han var deres mand; det var ham, der fortalte dem, hvad de skulle gøre, hvad de skulle sige, hvordan de skulle håndtere pressen. De vil måske ofre Tony Blair, og uanset, hvad historien er, så er det ikke let blot at feje ham til side som endnu blot en politiker, vi bare skaffer os af med. Dette er fyren der var gesandt for kvartetten til Mellemøsten.

Jeg vil også gerne sige, og dette er meget vigtigt, at, siden mordet på Gaddafi, og i stigende grad siden Ukraine, har der været en konfrontation med Rusland, og med Kina til en vis grad. NATO er rykket frem mod øst, det er rykket nærmere og nærmere til Ruslands grænse. Lad mig sige én ting: så snart, jeg personligt, i november 2013 hørte, at der var et initiativ for at tage Ukraine ud af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union og ind i den Europæiske Union, og der var nogle demonstrationer – så vidste jeg, at det var dårligt. For Ukraine repræsenterer noget, som er hjertet af Rusland på dette tidspunkt, ikke, fordi det er Rusland, men man må indse, at Anden Verdenskrig for to tredjedele vedkommende blev udkæmpet i det, der nu er Ukraine og dele af Polen; det var her, russerne konfronterede nazisterne. Jo, det kom også til Moskva; men en enorm del af denne kamp blev udkæmpet i Donbass, i Ukraine, i de områder af Ukraine, der efter krigen blev en del af Polen osv.

Man har en situation ligesom den, man har i Polen netop nu, hvor man har et sindssyg hørefløjspræsidentskab og -regering,

og de vil begynde at tænke på at tage territorium tilbage og konfrontere Rusland. Det er udelukket, at Rusland ikke vil respondere på dette. Man måtte være sindssyg og totalt ude af kontrol. Russerne mistede 27 millioner mennesker i Anden Verdenskrig. Der er en grund til, at de kalder det den store, patriotiske krig. I USA kalder man det Anden Verdenskrig, hvis man kan tælle. Der er ting i USA, der går bedre end det; men blandt de yngre generationer? Man vil få vanskeligheder med at finde en person under tyve, der kan fortælle dig, hvilket år, USA gik ind i Anden Verdenskrig. Jeg tør ikke vædde på, hvilken procentdel, der ville svare rigtigt. Og en af de meget vigtige ting, der har udviklet sig – der er to ting, der gør dette anderledes end blot at være et dystert billede, og det er kineserne. Kineserne repræsenterer nu en økonomisk og politisk fremtid. Og det er ikke blot – de har gjort bemærkelsesværdige ting. 600.000 – 1 million mennesker er blevet løftet ud af fattigdom. Ti tusinder af mil med højhastigheds-jernbaner og andre former for jernbaner, hvor de nu er ved at bevæge sig ind i det indre af landet. De startede Et bælte, én vej-politikken, den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank. Deres anskuelse er det, som Xi Jinping kalder win-win-politik; ikke nulsumsspil, ikke geopolitik, men et samarbejde om udvikling af især udviklingslandene. Og det er meget inspirerende for folk, der ser, at, min Gud, de mener det. De spiller ikke bare et spil. Afrikanerne, for det meste. Og jeg siger ikke, at der ikke er problemer, men man har jo en eller anden journalist fra *Washington Post* eller *The Economist*, der rejser ud og siger, føler I ikke, at kineserne kommer og voldtager jer? Og afrikanerne siger 'nej'. De bygger noget. Lad mig give et eksempel. Etiopien. Vi havde en etiopier, der talte ved konferencen (i Berlin), og Etiopien er et meget interessant sted, det er det næststørste land i Afrika, der er omkring 90-95 millioner mennesker. Der var tilsyneladende et tilfælde, hvor en journalist rejste derned og talte med en højtplaceret person i regeringen, og sagde, 'indser I ikke, at I bliver plyndret? Er det ikke det, Kina vil', typisk koloniherre'. Og fyren svarede, 'nej, det mener

jeg ikke; vi har ingen råmaterialer'. Jo, de har kaffe, men kaffe er ikke noget særligt i Kina. De bliver ikke udplyndret. Dette er ikke et kolonialistisk foretagende. Så man har altså rent faktisk en modstand, og udvikling, begge dele. Ikke kun det negative. Vi så i Syrien, at der er modstand. Folk vil kæmpe. I Etiopien falder de ikke bare til patten. Man ser dette i Afrika i stigende grad. Man ser det i hele Asien. Der er en modstand, og en løsning.

Og kendsgerningen er den, at Putin har spillet en meget, meget betydningsfuld rolle. En af de ting, jeg mener, har ændret dynamikken således, at man i Vesten får en Brexit fra befolkningen. Man får endda det kaos, vi har i USA – jeg siger ikke, at kaos er godt; kaos kan føre til helvede. Men hvis man ikke har et reelt lederskab, så vil folk respondere. Man kan ikke sige til folk, 'vær ikke kaotiske'. De vil på et vist tidspunkt sige, ad helvede til med det. Tag USA, med levestandarden, der er ved at bryde sammen, kollapsende infrastruktur; vi er ikke længere den førende nation. Vi kunne stadig væk være en førende nation.

Kina har ført an i udforskning af rummet. Månens bagside, osv. USA plejede at være en førende nation i udforskning af rummet – det er vi ikke mere. Vi har stadig noget, der er blevet tilbage – vi har netop opsendt en satellit for at udforske Jupiter, hvilket er godt – men hvorfor tog det fem år at komme dertil? Fordi vi ikke havde udviklet visse brændstoftyper. Og hvordan bliver satellitten forsynet med energi? Gennem solpaneler. Dette kunne være en endnu mere effektiv mission, hvis vi f.eks. brugte plutonium som brændstof. Men vi gør i det mindste dette. Obama, der så berømt sagde, da han blev spurgt om at tage til Månen, 'Åh, der har vi været!' Det ville jeg ikke engang sige om Grand Canyon, eller om Weis-museet, 'Åh, der har jeg været. Har gjort det.' Under en anden valgbegivenhed var der en, der spurgte ham om fusionsenergi, og han svarede, 'Åh, vi behøver ikke noget af alt det der smarte'. Dette er forskningens fremskudte grænse! Hvis man

ikke gør det, hvad gør man så!

Så forskellen i situationen, er, at den måde, som Putin handlede rent strategisk – han har f.eks. været meget åben omkring spørgsmålet om en dialog med Europa, inkl. om Ukraine-situationen. Han tog initiativ i Syrien-situationen, det sandsynligvis mest åbenlyse tilfælde, for ingen forventede, at han ville gå ind i Syrien og rent faktisk åbne for muligheden af at ødelægge ISIS. Hvordan ser USA så lige pludselig ud? Vi er der, og vi støttede ISIS, forstået på den måde, at vi beskyttede dem mod luftangreb ved at blande dem sammen med disse 'moderate' terrorister. Moderate terrorister? 'Det var en mindre smertefuld død'. Det kunne man formodentlig sige. De hugger ikke hovedet af én; måske bruger de mindre smertefulde metoder, jeg ved det ikke. De er moderate terrorister! Vi støtter dem, og derfor vil man ikke skyde på en fra ISIS, for de står ved siden af – ikke en civil person – men en moderat terrorist! Civile kan vi dræbe. Droneangreb på et par hospitaler, der er i orden. Men lad os ikke gøre en moderat terrorist fortræd. Hvis man ikke gør nar af den slags – man er jo vred, man er indfanget af debatten, hvad skal man sige til en 'moderat terrorist'?

(Mere oversættelse følger. Bliv på kanalen!)

Phil, 36 min., fortsat:

Som vi ved ... en af de ting, der skete i går, som jeg ikke har en fuld rapport over, er, at kongresmedlem Walter Jones sammen med et par andre kongresmedlemmer holdt en pressekonference om disse 28 sider, der ikke er blevet offentliggjort, og som peger på saudernes rolle, sammen med briterne, men her i særdeleshed de 28 sider omhandlende saudernes rolle i [terrorangrebet på World Trade Center] 11. september [2001], og som er nært forestående, og som vil blive et punkt, der intensiverer sagen. Men de krævede den omgående offentliggørelse af de 28 sider; og ét af kongresmedlemmerne, Lynch, sagde faktisk, at, hvis dette ikke sker snart, og

senest til 11. september, så vil vi oplæse de 28 sider i kongressalen, der således optages i protokollen. Det er et andet univers. Hvorfor sker det? Jeg tror, det er pga. det, kineserne og russerne laver, for det er sådan, verden fungerer. Alle leder efter en årsag nær ved hjemmet, og forsøg for resten ikke at forudsige det amerikanske præsidentvalg. For vi har Trump, der er et 'wild card', en sindssyg mand ... men hvorfor kom han så langt, som han er – fordi folk er vrede. Folk er oprørte over det, de gennemlever. Vi har Sanders, som folk troede, havde et bedre omdømme, men faktisk – han havde stemt for Irakkrigen osv., og han var et falsum et langt stykke hen ad vejen. Så er der Hillary, der virkelig er dårlig, og hun undersøges nu med denne FBI-ting. Verden befinder sig i en utrolig urolig tilstand, især i det, vi kalder det transatlantiske område (vesten). Men der er fremskridt i Asien, i Kina, og der er en nyligt valgt filippinsk præsident, der måske er i færd med at trække sig tilbage fra en konfrontation med Kina. Og USA presser på for en konfrontation med Kina over det Sydkinesiske Hav.

Det, som Lyn og Helga siger, i det mindste, som jeg forstår det, er, at, i betragtning af en verden, der befinder sig i denne form for uro, så kan man ikke tage det væk. Noget af det, det foregår i USA – jeg kan ikke vurdere det alt sammen – men blot inden for de seneste par dage, med hvad der svarer til disse opstande, er, at vi har haft en ny runde med politiskudepisoder mod sorte mænd i USA, så protesterne er begyndt igen. Men der er en ustabilitet i situationen, der er global og universel. Vi har netop set åbningen af den sekundære Suezkanal, Panamakanalen åbner, kineserne investerer i det – faktisk er et stort flertal i verden i en position nu, hvor, hvis vi gjorde det, de kan sige, 'London er forbi. Vi gennemfører Glass-Steagall, New York [Wall Street] er forbi. Vi går tilbage til FDR med denne sag, og vi gennemfører win-win-politikken'. Men det, vi må gøre for at få dette til at ske, er, at *vi må ændre vores syn på mennesket*. Vi har i det tyvende århundrede været igennem – og det er Lyns pointe, og

hvor jeg kommer lidt frem til Einstein – i det tyvende århundrede er det, der i stigende grad er kommet frem, et syn på mennesket, der grundlæggende set kan reduceres til at være et dyr eller en maskine. Vi har måske – altså, folk går i kirke, i moskeen, folk har andre måder at udtrykke det, de har forskellige former for overbevisninger, som de taler om, spirituelle o. lign., men det siger faktisk ikke noget om, hvad arten af den menneskelige natur beviseligt er. I de fleste tilfælde vil det dreje sig om at opgive mennesket i denne verden, og om, hvad man så kan gøre for at redde sig selv. Hvad enten det nu drejer sig om at være en af 'de udvalgte', eller at komme i himlen; hvad historien nu måtte være. Og så har vi det system, som vi rent faktisk lever under, og dette står for mig mere end noget andet som det, som Det britiske Imperium vi sige, og hvorfor Obama er så dårlig. Og vi mener stadig, at Obama bør fjernes fra embedet; det ville være et pragtfuldt spark i – buksebagen – uanset, hvor længe han endnu kan sidde ved magten, fem eller syv måneder. Det vigtigste element i Det britiske Imperium, mener jeg, og det er noget, jeg i hvert fald til en vis grad har lært af Lyn, er britisk epistemologi (erkendelsesteori; den menneskelige erkendelses natur, betingelser og grænser). Briternes syn på menneskeheden. Det er darwinisme, i den betydning, at, eftersom der er en evolutionær udvikling, så kan vi reducere mennesker til deres biologi, til at være aber, eller til noget, der stammer fra dyreliv. Eller gå længere endnu: at man kan reproducere menneskelig intelligens med en maskine. Der er nu opstået en hel ny runde af denne tænkning i øjeblikket. Denne idé kommer i bølger, at vi kan producere kunstig intelligens, at vi kan skabe maskiner, der tænker som mennesker. Det er rent ud sagt beviseligt, at man ikke kan. Kurt Gödel beviste det. Vi kan måske på en måde kontrollere biologiske former og skabe visse former for levende organismer, men det ville kræve en total ændring inden for videnskab. Det ville kræve, at man forstod princippet om livet; hvad det er, der gør livet levende. Jeg så et af disse causeriprogrammer med videnskabsfolk, hvor de angiveligt,

eller faktisk talte om det, de kaldte kvantebiologi, som har nogle interessant punkter, men den store pointe hen imod slutningen var, at en af disse fyre sagde, 'jamen, det virkelige problem her er, at vi ikke ved, hvad livet er'. Men det her handler alt sammen om kvantebiologi. Og vi ved selvfølgelig virkelig ikke, hvad livet er. Hvad er det for et princip, der reflekteres i en levende organisme, og som giver det retning, formål? Som giver det en egenskab af hensigt? Af en drivkraft fremad ('go-orientation'), det, vi kalder teleologi[1]; endelige formål. Det er, hvad vi har med at gøre med livet; livet er under forandring, det er levende; det gør ting, der ikke er tilfældige. Hvad med menneskeligt liv? Og man hører disse diskussioner, og én af disse fyre vil indrømme, 'jamen, hvad er bevidsthed?' Og det er ikke blot bevidsthed, men det, som Lyn kalder kreativitet (evnen til at skabe).

Lad mig træde et skridt tilbage og give jer en idé om, hvad denne form for begreb om kreativitet er. For det, Lyndon LaRouche siger, er, at kreativitet er nødvendig. Man kan sige en ting om kreativitet: På en vis måde er kreativitet det, som Leibniz ville kalde 'nødvendigt og tilstrækkeligt'. Den definerer, hvad menneskelige væsner er. Det er en bestemmende egenskab, der viser, at vi ikke er som dyrene. Vi tilhører et andet domæne. Vi plejede at referere til dette som 'transfinit', altså med andre ord, at vi lever i et domæne, der er således, at man ikke kan måle noget som helst af, hvad vi gør, ud fra et standpunkt om et forudgående domæne. Man kan ikke måle noget som helst, der er af menneskelig art, ud fra standpunktet om abe-liv. Der er så mange mærkelige ting om alt det her med dyrene; det er simpelt hen vanvittigt. For det første er chimpanser nogle af de mest afskyelige væsner, du nogen sinde har mødt. De er simpelt hen ondsindede. De slår hinanden ihjel, de æder deres afkom, i modsætning til dette billede, som folk engang yndede at udbrede. Jeg synes, det er mærkeligt, at modsætningen til chimpanser er det, de kalder bonobo-aber, en slags chimpanse af en anden art, den er

yndefuld, slank, og hvad er så deres store ting? De har konstant forskelligartede former for sex. De er konstant engageret i seksuel aktivitet, og det gør dem så til en bedre version af chimpansen. Så det er altså det valg, man har. Man kan være en chimpanse og gå rundt og dræbe og føre krig og æde egne unger, eller også kan man være en bonobo, der hænger ned fra et træ og er engageret i sex i flæng hele dagen lang. Det er altså ikke det, der skete.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Det interessante; indgangsvinklen til at forstå det, som Lyn siger, er hans fysiske økonomi, fremsat i dens enkleste principper. Og man indser, hvor forskelligt dette er fra den måde, folk tænker på, til trods for, at det faktisk ikke er særlig kompliceret – jeg skriver ingen formler op. Jeg er alligevel ikke skrap nok til matematikken, og matematik er under alle omstændigheder ikke kreativitet. Hvad var det, Lyn gjorde med den fysiske økonomi? Han gik ud fra det standpunkt, hvad er menneskets forhold, i samfundet, til naturen; hvordan overlever vi? Hvordan reproducerer vi menneskeslægten? Jamen, vi gør noget, der er meget enestående: vi applikerer viden, i form af teknologi, til en evne til, fra naturen, at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der. Selv jæger-samlere – som jægere udgør vi ikke den store mulighed: vi er ikke hurtige, vi har dog en hel del udholdenhed i forhold til andre dyr, så hvis man vil tilbringe sit liv med at jage giraffer i Kalahariørkenen, så er vi nogenlunde udrustet til at gøre det. Men den tankegang, at vi kan overleve som et kødædende dyr, er temmelig langt ude.

Så udviklede vi landbrug. Hvad gjorde vi? Vi tog videnskabelige kundskaber, ikke blot redskaber, men vi lærte visse ting om astronomi – hvem ved, hvor langt tilbage i tiden, der har været astronomi – sandsynligvis mindst et sted mellem 5.000 og 10.000 år. Der er endda fundet hulemalerier, der er 30-40.000, eller endda 50.000 år gamle, hvor der er tegn på kalendere. Men mindst 5 – 10.000 år. Vi anvendte denne

videnskab til at ændre vores forhold til naturen. Vi blev i stand til at få ting ud af naturen, der tilsyneladende ikke eksisterede, som f.eks. vores evne til at anvende kobber og tin til at fremstille bronze, til fremstilling af metalredskaber. Og derfra rykkede vi opefter i vores viden om udvikling af metallerne. Det var alt sammen videnskabelige kundskaber, der blev anvendt til teknologi, der forbedrede vores evne – disse ting var der jo ikke bare, man kan ikke finde bronze i et flodleje, og der vokser ikke stål på en bjergside. Hvordan gjorde vi det – var det ved forsøg-og-fejl-metoden? Nej, det, der sker, er, at visse mennesker får en idé, de har en forestilling, men det er en ubøjelig forestilling; de vil finde ud af, hvordan de skal bruge deres tanker om det, der findes, til at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der for sanserne at se, og som i realiteten, i den form, i hvilken vi bruger det, ikke findes. Vi skaber eksistensen af i det mindste tætheden af visse materialer, osv., gennem skabende videnskabelig nyskabelse.

Hvis vi ikke gjorde det, ville vi ikke overleve. Vi ville ikke klare det, for vi ville løbe tør for ressourcer, ikke, fordi ressourcen ikke er der – det berømte eksempel er, at der i én kubikmeter jord findes praktisk taget ethvert mineral, man kunne ønske sig, men man kan ikke udvinde det, fordi det kræver en enorm mængde energi at udvinde det. Så, i takt med, at ens energi støder mod visse barrierer, må man udvikle ny videnskab, mere videnskabelig viden for at udvikle nye teknologier, der giver os nye ressourcer. Som vi altid har sagt, olie var ikke en ressource i 1400-tallet. Hvis man fandt olie i sin baghave, var det dårligt nyt. Det blev man ikke rig af, det blev man meget fattig af. Og så blev det til rigdom. Hvorfor? Det var ikke land-rigdom. Rigdom ligger ikke i jordbesiddelse.

Hvis man tænker over dette, hvad betyder det så; hvad er det, man i realiteten ønsker at skabe i en økonomi? Flere genstande – det har man til en vis grad brug for. Det, man virkelig har

brug for, er flere mennesker. For, i takt med, at disse udviklinger finder sted, så øges uddannelsesniveaue, den forventede levetid, adgang til levestandard, og jeg mener ikke bare en levestandard, hvor man lever godt. Hvis man f.eks. ønsker at skabe børn, der kan, skal vi sige, arbejde i en moderne økonomi, kan man ikke berøve dem adgang til visse af et sådant samfunds produkter. Hvordan begynder et barn at lære om elektricitet, om at kontrollere lys og andre ting? Det lærer, at det har en vis magt over disse genstande. Og magten kommer visse steder fra. Det lærer også at relatere socialt til andre mennesker, fordi det har brug for disse mennesker for at kunne håndtere disse objekter og denne magt. Hvis han eller hun ikke har det, er han berøvet evnen til at forstå den videnskab, teknologi og det samfund, han eller hun lever i. Hvis man producerer fattigdom, er det ikke kun fattigdom, man producerer, men man underminerer udviklingen af selve samfundet og de kreative evner.

For det andet, så er kreativitet det træk, der definerer den menneskelige art. For nu at bruge et filosofisk-teknisk udtryk: Rent ontologisk er det menneskets natur at være kreativt, at vi har evnen til at være kreative. Vi kan udtrykke ideer, der frembringer kreativitet. Ideer, der udvikler andre mennesker. Hvis vi ikke har det, så agerer vi ikke i overensstemmelse med den menneskelige arts natur. Jeg tenderer – jeg er ikke en person, der har en vis baggrund – mod at fastslå den pointe, at dette er nødvendigt. Det er skønhed, hvis man tænker over det, at mennesker – ethvert menneske – har dette, og at det er en moralsk forpligtelse at give børn adgang til dette. Og jo mere videnskabelig udvikling, desto flere børn har man brug for, desto mere kreativitet har man brug for, og desto mere har man brug for at tænke på fremtiden.

De fleste af os – hvis vi ønsker at besvare nogle af de teologiske spørgsmål: Hvad er mit bidrag, hvad er min sjæl, hvad er det, jeg efterlader mig? Man efterlader en fremtid til

de fremtidige generationer. Man bidrager til denne fremtid. Ideer, undervisning, udvikling, at redde mennesker. Og ikke alene det, for man må gøre noget, mener jeg, man må ikke alene skabe en fremtid; men man må skabe en fremtid på en sådan måde, at disse mennesker vil have evnen til at skabe en fremtid. Man må på en vis måde se ud over horisonten, længere end til horisonten til ting, som man ikke kan se; men at man har en følelse af, at man må agere på det, man må give de mennesker, der befinder sig på denne horisont, en garanti for, at de vil blive i stand til at se ud over den næste horisont. Og så begynder det i det mindste at nærme sig formålet med samfundet.

Dét er Lys fysiske økonomi; det er i det mindste ét udtryk for det. Vi er af nødvendighed kreative, og med mindre vi får denne idé ud til andre nationer, andre folkeslag, til os selv, vil det ikke lykkes os at gennemføre det, vi må gøre lige nu for at garantere en fremtid. Vi vil stå over for krig. Lyn har sagt, briterne bluffer, Obama bluffer; vi kan ikke gå op imod russerne på de østlige grænser med 4.000 tropper, eller hvor meget, det er. Men vi leger med ilden. Hvis vi tror, vi kan tyrannisere russerne, kineserne, presse dem, tvinge dem til at indvilge, efter det, vi gjorde mod dem i 1990'erne, er det højst usandsynligt.

Hvad vil det så ske? Jamen, enten provokerer vi russerne til et angreb, hvilket ikke er udelukket, hvis de tror, de selv vil blive angrebet – et atomangreb – eller også, hvis vi bluffer og bluffer, og vores bluff afsløres, ja, så affyrer vi, af ren desperation. Det er ikke bare 'krig ved et uheld', som man skal være bange for, selv om det er en mulighed.

Det er ét aspekt. Det andet aspekt er det, jeg fortalte om USA. Vi befinder os på en nedadgående kurs – jeg vil ikke gå i detaljer. Vi har høje rater af afhængighed af smertemedicin, osv. Vi har en voksende fattigdomsandel i befolkningen. Vi har ikke en infrastruktur, der er under udvikling. Vi har meget lidt videnskab tilbage, og det, der er tilbage – jeg vil

fortælle noget, bare for at fortælle en vittighed. Vi plejede at sige, vi skaber raketforskere, og de arbejder på Wall Street! De hyrer nogle af topmatematikerne, videnskabsfolk, raketingeniører osv., de hyrede dem i '80'erne og '90'erne til at udføre disse fantastiske algoritmer for finansverdenen, for en derivat; man skal være et geni for at regne det ud ... jeg bruger ordet bredt. Nu er Wall Street på spanden, så hvor bliver disse fyre hyret? De veluddannede fysikere? De bliver hyret til sportshold! Og hvad bliver de hyret til at gøre? De bliver hyret til at udføre endnu mere sofistikerede dataanalyser og fysiologi af atleten for at få dem til at præstere bedre og bedre og bedre og blive i stand til at vælge dem, der virkelig er de bedste spillere. Dette gælder for sport i USA, jeg kan nævne de sportshold, der har hyret nogle af disse fyre. Sikke et utroligt spild! Det er sandt; det er ikke noget, jeg står og finder på. Vi producerer knap nok tilstrækkeligt med videnskabsfolk, og så udregner de data for det lokale fodboldhold.

Det, som Lyn taler om, er ægte kreativitet, og det er derfor, han refererer til Einstein. For at komme til pointen – men før jeg kommer til det, vil jeg fastslå en anden pointe, for det er vigtigt for at forstå Einstein. For spørgsmålet er: Hvordan skaber man kreativitet? Det, vi virkelig har behov for at reproducere, er kreative mennesker. Den virkelig værdi i en økonomi er raten af produktion af kreative mennesker, af videnskabelige og kunstneriske genier. Det er det mål, hvormed man måler sig selv. Hvordan gør man det? Man vil sige, at man uddanner folk videnskabeligt – ikke matematisk. De store videnskabsfolk var ikke matematikere, i modsætning til, hvad folk tror. Matematik er destruktiv, medmindre den anvendes som et tillæg til ægte videnskab. For hvad er matematik andet end et sæt af regler, som man må blive indenfor, hvilket betyder, at man ikke kan frembringe noget nyt? Man kan ikke skabe noget.

Hvordan frembringer man så kreativitet? Det er her, klassisk

kunst kommer ind ... man kan ikke bare sige til et barn, gå ud og opdag noget! Man må have en idé om, hvordan intellektet må fungere for at gøre en opdagelse. Af hvilken art, den menneskelige natur er. Noget får man fra historien, ved at se på, hvordan opdagelser blev gjort, ved at gentage videnskabelig aktivitet. *Men kernen i det får man fra klassisk kunst.* For, hvad er det, man gør, især inden for musik, men også med poesi og drama; de har hver deres aspekt. Men hvad er det, man gør? Man skaber et vist tilsyneladende paradoks, en tilsyneladende problemstilling, hvor, hvis folk fortsætter med at agere, eller musikeren fortsætter ud ad det spor, han følger, i kompositionen, eller i opførelsen af kompositionen, så vil den bryde sammen, den vil ende med at lyde som støj. Eller også bliver den bare kedelig, for noget af det, der sker, er, at man bare bliver ved med at gentage sig selv. Måske med en let ændring, men hvis man lytter til visse former for musik, som rapp-musik, men selv folkemusik. Et af problemerne, hvis man kun har folkemusik, den kan være smuk, har måske dejlige melodier, men den har tendens til at være repeterende. Så, hvis man ikke har en fornemmelse for at skabe noget nyt af den kanoniserede musik, så sidder man fast. Og hvad gør klassisk musik? Bortset fra korformen, den sociale form osv., så gør den det, at den af dig kræver, at du skaber noget, der aldrig hidtil er blevet hørt. Eller at man i det mindste opfører den, og i processen med at opføre den, så repeterer man på en vis måde i sit intellekt den oprindelige opdagelse. Hvad havde komponisten i tankerne, og hvad gjorde han eller hun, der ændrede musikkens natur og udtrykte den fundamentale idé om skabelsen af ideer? Musik er på en vis måde en meta-disciplin. Man skaber ideer om, hvordan ideer skabes. Man ser dette i kor, det er derfor, polyfoni er så vigtigt. Det er derfor, det veltempererede klaver var så vigtigt. For det gav grader af frihed i udviklingen af og udtrykket for nye ideer.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Dette er én ting, som Einstein, og især hans generation, men som Einstein vidste. Han var en rimeligt habil violinist. Nogle mennesker siger, at han ikke var særlig god, nogle siger, at han var virkelig god; jeg har ingen anelse. Men iflg. alle overleveringer var han en rimeligt habil violinist. Det, der var vigtigt for ham, var, at musikken var afgørende for hans evne til at tænke. Ikke sådan, at han gav sig til at spille violin, og så følte han sig afslappet, og så fik han en idé. Men det var sådan, at musikken var den måde, han tænkte bedst på. [Max] Planck var lige ved at blive koncertpianist, og det var først ved et givent tidspunkt, han besluttede, det var bedre for ham at blive fysiker. Og i den generation spillede de fleste af dem, Nurdst, de spillede alle, Aronfels, de var ikke alle store videnskabsmænd; men denne kultur med at udvikle ideer, gennemarbejde nye ideer, gøre nye ideer gældende var rodfæstet i klassisk kultur, i Schiller. Einsteins moder var f.eks. en stor læser af Schiller, Heine, og hans fader var vist også en stor tilhænger af Heine. Det var i heldigste fald den kultur, der blev udviklet. Og det var dette, der gjorde det muligt for sådan en som Einstein at blive en stor tænker. Han var f.eks. ikke nogen stor matematiker; han var ikke en dårlig matematiker, men han var ikke en stor matematiker; han var fysiker. Han havde sine berømte 'gedanken'-eksperimenter: Han skabte i sine tanker visse betragtninger, og han spurgte dem, hvad er løsningen på problemet i disse betragtninger, eller hvad var det, der reflekteredes? Hvad, om jeg kan rejse lige så hurtigt som en lysbølge? Ville universet stoppe? Er det muligt at rejse hurtigere ... Det var ikke løsningen, men det gjorde det muligt for ham at tænke over ting, som han ellers ikke ville have tænkt over. Og sluttelig fik han nogle afgørende ideer, om lysets hastighed var konstant, men mere endnu, det, at love, fysiske love, var universelt gældende. Det er det, relativitetsprincippet ... relativitetsprincippet er det modsatte af det, man tror, det er, og som det ofte fremstilles, var blot ens perspektiv. Nej, hele pointen med Einstein, i betragtning af nogle af tidens problemer, der er

af mere teknisk art, om elektromagnetisme, teorien om æteren osv., dukkede der visse problemer op. Og Einstein sagde, vi må have et system, hvor dette systems love gælder for hele universet, for alt! Uanset, hvad den uniforme bevægelse er, uanset, hvad accelerationen var, og uanset raten af forandring, det var generel relativitet. Så det var ikke relativitet, men i virkeligheden, hvad er de universelle principper, som jeg kan sige er sande uanset hvilken bevægelse, der foregår? Og dette var, hvad han anvendte på grundlæggende set alting. Og hans indsats inden for enhedsfeltet var ikke én enkelt ligning, men det var et forsøg på at finde de underliggende, universelle principper, der styrede alle de tilsyneladende spørgsmål i universet. Elektromagnetisme, tyngdekraft, den stærke og svage kraft, og atomkerneniveauet. Og tænk over, hvad der foregår i det 20. århundrede. I det 20. århundrede er der et angreb på denne form for tænkning. Fra Bertrand Russell, til en vis grad fra Hilbert; og det, der udgjorde en del af angrebet, var, at vi må holde os til matematikken. Lad os aksiomatisere matematikken.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen.)

[1] filosofisk anskuelse, hvor man mener, at det, der sker i verden, har et formål, en hensigt.

Vi har nået det springende

punkt – Vi må tage lederskab nu!

Hr. LaRouche havde en langt mere fundamental pointe, som han ønskede at fastslå for os i dag, og det er, at, uagtet disse faktorer på kort sigt, så er hele det transatlantiske finansielle system parat til at nedsmelte. Vi ved ikke præcis, hvornår det vil ske, men vi ved, at det er fuldstændig uundgåeligt, og det afgørende spørgsmål er derfor: hvilken slags planer vil der foreligge; hvilke fornuftige spillere her i USA og Europa vil udvikle en strategi for en erstatning af det nuværende system? Det er håbløst bankerot. Der findes ingen måde, hvorpå denne proces kan løses.

Fuld dansk oversættelse af LPAC Fredags-webcast, 17. juni 2016:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Vi er kommet til punctum saliens – det springende punkt;
Vi må udøve lederskab nu!**

Hvornår kommer nedsmeltningen?

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 17. juni 2016.

Video, engelsk

– Vi befinder os tydeligvis i en situation under hastig forandring, i hele verden. Vi har i løbet af de seneste dage haft uddybende diskussioner med både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche var meget kortfattet i sit råd, da han i går sagde: »Vær årvågne. Tingene kommer til at ændre sig meget hurtigt. Dette er en farlig periode.« Vi har stadig væk en trussel om global atomkrig, som er meget umiddelbar, men der er også en masse ting, der ændrer sig, som det meget tydeligt ses af de skiftende holdninger i Europa, Xi Jinpings besøg i Centraleuropa netop nu for at fremme Den Nye Silkevej, samt begivenhederne på det Internationale Økonomiske Forum i Skt. Petersborg.

Hr. LaRouche gik i dybden med nogle punkter tidligere på dagen, men jeg vil bede Jeff [Steinberg] foretage en hurtig gennemgang for at få en hurtig orientering om den globale situation, og vi vil dernæst i diskussionens forløb trække mange af punkterne frem og følge flere af de ledetråde, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fastslog i deres bemærkninger tidligere på dagen.

Engelsk udskrift. Dansk oversættelse af uddrag af webcastet følger snarest. Bliv på kanalen!

WE ARE AT A PUNCTUM SALIENS; – WE MUST EXERT LEADERSHIP NOW! How long before the blowout?

LaRouche Friday Webcast, June 17, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Afternoon! It is June 17, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here from LaRouchePAC.com, which we hold every Friday evening. I'm joined via video by Dave Christie from our Policy Committee, who's joining us from Seattle, Washington; and Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science team, who is currently joining us from Houston, Texas, where she's engaged in some activities there with Kesha Rogers. Here in the studio I'm joined by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science team as well; and by Jeffrey Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review.

We're obviously in a very fast-changing situation, worldwide. We've had extensive discussions over the past few days with both Lyndon LaRouche and Helga LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche was very concise in his advice when he said yesterday, "Stay alert. Things are going to change very rapidly. It's a dangerous period." We still have a very proximate threat of global thermonuclear war, but we also have a lot which is changing, as can be seen very clearly by the changing attitudes in Europe,

the
visit by Xi Jinping to Central Europe right now, to push the
New
Silk Road, and the events at the St. Petersburg International
Economic Forum.

Mr. LaRouche had some points to elaborate earlier
today, but
I'm going to ask Jeff to go through a very quick sort of
overview
briefing of the global situation, and then in the course of
the
discussion we can draw out a lot of the points and follow a
lot
of the threads that both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche made in
their
remarks earlier today. So, Jeff.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: It's critical to bear in mind that
between now and when we sit down a week from today for another
LaRouche PAC discussion, that we will know the outcome of the
Brexit vote in Britain. People are terrified of the
implications,
no matter which way that vote goes, and now we have the added
dimension of the assassination of a Labour Party member of the
British Parliament, Jo Cox, which may or may not have been
directly related to the issues of Brexit. We'll still wait
judgment on that.

Mr. LaRouche had a much more fundamental point that he
wanted to make to us today, which is that regardless of these
short-term factors, the entire trans-Atlantic financial system
is
really about to blow. We don't know exactly when it's going to
happen, but we know it's absolutely inevitable, and therefore
the
critical question is: what kinds of plans will be in place;
what
kinds of reasonable players here in the United States, in

Europe,
are going to develop a strategy for replacing the current system?

It's hopelessly bankrupt. There is no way to manage that process.

There was a commentary earlier this week by an economist

named Simon Black, who just pointed out that major U.S. banks, led by Bank of America and Wells Fargo, have resumed the whole liar loans, just absolute fraudulent mortgages, that was one of

the root factors at least involved in the 2008 blow-out. He joins

Mr. LaRouche in saying that we're headed for a far bigger blow-out at some unknown point in the very near future.

Mr. LaRouche's point was that what's needed under these

circumstances is a return to classic economic principles, Hamiltonian economic principles, in which {physical} economic factors, and not {money} factors, are the priority, and where you

have to start, is by wiping the slate clean and wiping out all of

the existing gambling debt on the books.

You've got a clear recognition, on the part of some world

leaders, that this is the nature of the crisis-moment that we've

now reached. President Putin spoke yesterday during the opening

plenary session of the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum. There were around 16,000 people there. Whatever Obama's plans, or British plans [were] to isolate Russia, clearly the isolation is broken. The Italian Prime Minister Renzi was there.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the EU Commission, spoke there on the opening day. The Secretary-General of the United

Nations, Ban Ki Moon, was there.

We're still awaiting the complete translation of Putin's speech, but what from what we've seen so far, he's made it very clear that the global financial situation, the system, is very unsettled. The problems of 2008 have not been resolved. He emphasized Russia's commitment to be the bridge between the Asia developments centered around Xi Jinping's One Belt, One Road policy, and the bringing of Europe into that equation as a cooperative factor.

So, there are alternative ideas out there, but there's a desperate moment from the standpoint of the British. We see it in these two incidents, almost back-to-back: of the brutal terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, followed a few days later by the first time in {hundreds of years} that a British Member of Parliament was assassinated in cold blood on the streets of Britain.

OGDEN: Absolutely! Right in the midst of that, you have a very important initiative from Congressman Walter Jones, who has taken the next step beyond what he has already done, around the campaign to release the 28 pages, which would expose the entire Anglo-Saudi apparatus behind what led to 9/11 and what continues to be the threat of terrorism, world-wide today.

He had 70 co-sponsors on H-Res. 14, but this week he has introduced a new resolution, which says, Look, we don't have

to

wait for Obama at all. We're going to bypass the Obama administration, and Congress itself needs to take the initiative

to de-classify these 28 pages. It's a very important bill. The text of it should be read in full. It cites the precedent. The Supreme Court decided in favor of (former) Senator Mike Gravel,

who read the Pentagon Papers into the Congressional Record; and

also cites the fact that this is Congress's prerogative indeed.

That continues to be a very critical element in this fight

to dismantle what is in fact, as you were saying, the Anglo-Saudi

apparatus behind this entire campaign. Actually, just because we've brought that up, I wanted to read, very quickly, our "institutional question" for this evening, and then we can follow

the discussion out from there. It reads as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche: Recently a scholar at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies penned an article in the

{Asia Times} warning that the Saudi-sponsored Wah'habi terrorism

is coming to Southeast Asia, and the United States has been the

essential enabler of this spread by boosting the Saudis with protection. Dr. Christina Lin described the Saudi

'religious-industrial complex' as the source of spreading Wah'habi ideology. Hillary Clinton recently rebuked Saudi Arabia

and two other U.S. allies – Qatar and Kuwait – by name, for their support of terrorist networks and ideology. Mr. LaRouche,

in your opinion, what types of religions reform must Saudi

Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait, and other Wah'habi-oriented nations,

need to enact, to deal with Salafi-inspired jihadi terrorism?"

Jeff, I know that you wrote a sort of summary article earlier, in the beginning of this week, that goes through the entire Al-Yamamah case, and everything that is implied by the fact that that's still an on-going apparatus. Maybe you want to

give a little bit of a background on that, in response to this question.

STEINBERG: Well, let me just start by saying that I think

the idea of any kind of near-term reform of Saudi Arabia or these

other countries that subscribe to Wah'habism, is a very unlikely

phenomenon. We've got to take the approach that this whole apparatus has to be exposed, top down, and completely dismantled.

It's going to have to come from the outside.

A very, very interesting discussion took place earlier this

week [on June 14] on the John Batchelor [radio] show in New York,

where Dr. Stephen F. Cohen, a Russia specialist, professor emeritus of Russian studies, history and politics at New York University, for the first time touched on the issue of Obama's removal from office. He said one of the greatest crimes that Obama has committed, has been the breaking of the cooperation with Russia, that basically the U.S. has no understanding or no

capacity for dealing with this threat of Salafist terrorism, but

Russia does. Therefore Obama's demonization of Putin, refusal to

cooperate with Russia, is piling up the body-count around the

globe.

In a very real sense, the Obama question and the British Al-Yamamah question goes to the heart of what Dr. Lin said in that [Asia Times] article, namely, who are the enablers? Who makes it possible? Because Saudi Arabia on its own could do very little, were it not for the sponsorship by Washington, by London, and we can't leave out Paris in this equation, of the whole development of the strategy of playing the Islamic fundamentalist card for regime change. It started with the Soviet Union. It extended to Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and now this is really what's playing out in Syria.

Unless you're willing to force the severing of the British and U.S. support for this jihadist spread of terrorism, then you're really not going to address the problem. If you single out Saudi Arabia and leave out Britain, then you're leaving Al-Yamamah and everything that that implies off the hook. This was an arrangement that was made in 1985 between [then-Saudi Ambassador to the U.S.] Prince Bandar [bin Sultan] and [then British Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher, to set up what was ostensibly an oil-for-weapons deal. But under the cover of that, they amassed hundreds of billions of dollars in offshore slush-funds, and those funds have been really what's been behind the terrorism.

The 28 pages make it clear that Prince Bandar was a source of funding to the 9/11 hijackers at a time that he was getting upwards of \$2 billion wired into that account from the Bank of England, as the result of his sponsorship of Al-Yamamah. If you

talk about the Saudis without talking about the British and without talking about Bush, and now Obama, then you're never going to solve the problem.

OGDEN: You mentioned what Stephen Cohen had to say. I think this is obviously a very big step for him to make these remarks, but he said, "The major single largest cost of this unnecessary cold war with Russia, is Washington's refusal to cooperate with Russia against international terrorism, whether in Syria or in homeland security. That, I think, is an indictment of our political class, the Obama administration and Congress in particular, that we all should judge very, very harshly, because they're endangering each and every one of us and our families. Russia knows how to do counter-terrorism. We know we don't know how to do it very well."

And then he said, "I would call this anti national security. These are impeachable offenses by our government, that they are not doing things, out of this political, ideological Cold War against Russia, that could help protect us. Whether we talk about Syria or talk about homeland security, it's a pattern, and it needs to end right away."

One thing that just developed out of this yesterday, is front-page coverage in the {New York Times} of a "dissent channel," [a draft copy of an internal memo] by 50 mid-level State Department officials, "urging the United States to carry out military strikes against the government of President Bashar

al-Assad to stop its persistent violations of a cease-fire in the country's five-year-old civil war," which is obviously a direct declaration of war against what Russia is doing in Syria right now.

STEINBERG: Absolutely!

DAVE CHRISTIE: This is occurring in the middle of where the Syrian government has just unleashed leaflets into Rakka, saying, "We're coming!" The Russians have been very clear on this, that they're not going to sit around and play games, or allow Obama and his gang to play games, around this idea that we need more time to separate out the moderate terrorists, which don't exist anyway. This is a move to shut them down.

Coming back to this point that what has been raised on the nature of the terrorism, going back to the Al-Yamamah deal, this was effectively the geo-political enforcement wing of what was ushered in at that time. We had some discussions earlier this week where this was coincident at the same time that Thatcher brought in the whole "Big Bang" program to have London be the center of global finance and this speculative offshore financial system, which was sort of the consolidation of what had come in in 1971, as Mr. LaRouche forecast, that when they broke with the Bretton Woods system, they turned their back on the real economic progress that we saw under Kennedy and, of course, Roosevelt

before then.

There was an explicit destruction of the American System

that could have swept the planet, were it not for that intervention by the British in '71. Mr. LaRouche was clear at that point, that this would result in fascism. We've now seen that come to fruition. But the point is, that's the bankrupt system that is now collapsing; and what Mr. LaRouche said today I

think is very important on the Obama question, and more importantly what Obama represents. Because he represents the British Empire, he represents this integrated financial apparatus

which is funding itself through the dope trade, enforcing it through terrorism, the whole migrant crisis; all of this is part

of the integrated policy of the British Empire. And what LaRouche said about Obama and that system is that they can't win;

Obama is going to lose, period. The question is, will others win? And what Lyn also said today I think is very important, he

says that Putin has shown this leadership; he's straight on this,

he's the best leadership we have so far. And I think that's part

of this growing recognition that the BRICS nations and specifically Russia, China, India, are now the world leadership;

the British are having to react. And I think what we're seeing

in terms of their reaction is, of course, increasingly dangerous;

because they see what the writing on the wall is in terms of the

imminent collapse of their financial system while this New Paradigm is being consolidated. Helga made the point on this

question of the German bonds; their 10-year bonds are trading at negative interest rates, so that is a huge psychological shock to the German people. Anybody in business knows the implications of that.

So you can really see that the political turmoil here in terms of the potential of Europe to begin to shift towards this new emerging leadership; similarly in Japan that we see. The fact that the situation in Korea is similarly potentially shifting; and of course, Ban Ki Moon just spoke in front of the St. Petersburg Economic Forum. So, you just really get a sense of what the potential is to shift this thing. And I think what we have to do is recognize that that global leadership is now being established; but it's up to the American people to recognize that Obama will lose. People think that he's all-powerful and they look at this crazy political election, which is frankly designed around Obama. The whole circling of the wagons around Hillary wasn't so much circling the wagons around Hillary in terms of her campaign; it was really circling it around Obama. And of course, Trump, what is this? It's nothing but a clown show to allow Obama to continue with this agenda. But as Mr. LaRouche said, he will lose. The question is, will we take up the leadership and responsibility to win?

OGDEN: And the point that Jeff made about the attempts to isolate Russia clearly have failed. I think that the St. Petersburg Economic Forum is a testament to that fact. And then

you have the very strong collaboration between Putin and Xi Jinping right now, which is being acknowledged on all fronts. I think that it was very poetically at the St. Petersburg Economic Forum by one of the visiting ministers from Ecuador, who said "We view with envy the great projects that change the history of civilization." That's where we are. I think Helga LaRouche was calling it an "epical moment"; it's a change in epic, both with the emergence of this new world system, but also the fact that we're experiencing for the first time in history the negative interest rates within the European system and so forth. But this Ecuadoran minister said, these projects that change the history of civilization, with the New Silk Road that China has proposed, the creation of the AIIB, the BRICS bank, the Eurasian project which Russia has defended. I don't know if people saw the full speech that Indian Prime Minister Modi made when he came to Washington last week; but when he spoke in front of the joint session of Congress, what he concluded his remarks with was beautiful. He said, "The foundations of the future are now firmly in place." And then he quoted from a poem by Walt Whitman from {The Leaves of Grass}; a poem called "To Think of Time." And Modi said, "The orchestra have sufficiently tuned their instruments. The baton has given the signal"; and then Modi said, "Let me add to that if I might, there is a new symphony in play." And I think that's a perfect way of describing the new world system which is now breaking onto the horizon. And it

really has, despite the attempts by Obama and his allies, to isolate this and to try to beat this back. It is continuing to take hold.

ROSS: That's true; it's undeniably taking hold in the world in such a way that it's clear to everybody, too, that that's a real standard of value. You're not looking at the U.S., you're not looking at the European Central Bank; you're looking at where the growth is coming from; anyone can see that who is looking at it. And the obligation that we have to prevent the U.S. from being the stumbling block in this; because it's astonishing to read the contrast between the speech that Modi made, or the remarks of this Ecuadoran who you mentioned, with these kinds of think-tanks or institutions in the U.S.. They're talking about threats to American power; how are we going to secure American power in the coming world with all of its difficulties. It's such a bizarre outlook to even try to have. It's so outdated, so European oligarchical, it sounds like it's something from centuries ago; it hardly sounds like anything that represents what the U.S. was founded to be under the economic leadership of Hamilton, under the direction that we have taken at our best times. So, the great opportunity that we have to join in this in the U.S., can make all the difference in the world; and it's unfortunate that it comes to us from such a negative direction. If we don't do something, the U.S. is blocking this and Obama is

going to create a war to prevent it.

STEINBERG: Putin made a point in St. Petersburg that clearly there is now a profound strategic partnership between Russia and through Russia the Eurasian Economic Union, with China. And he said, this is not a closed partnership; we welcome European participation with open arms. And then he went after the TTIP, this U.S.-British free trade agreement that is, in fact, an exclusive arrangement that would cut off Europe from any cooperation across Eurasia with Russia, the Eurasian Economic Union, China. And he just said, look, we're past the point where we create alliances that are exclusionary; and he pointed out that there are now 40 countries that are seeking trade agreements with Russia and the Eurasian Economic Union. So, I think that this idea of this openness and a common future and destiny, is something that is not only at the core of what Xi Jinping is now in Poland, and he's on a five-day tour of eastern and central Europe; and then he's going back through central Asia. So, he's clearly got this idea of moving forward with the extension of these policies into Europe; and in effect, there's a major split beginning to develop in Europe. It comes down to this fundamental question of, do you focus on physical economy, or are you stuck in the British system purely money game. It's a point now of clash where the two systems are so irreconcilable that they can't both survive. That's also why the war danger is so pronounced at this point.

BEETS: Well, let me just add something in on this

point

about this newly forming world system being led by China and Russia. I was remembering that a couple of years ago, around the

time of the BRICS summit in Fortaleza, Brazil, Mr. LaRouche said

that this is the beginning of a world system; but it's not the final form. There has to be now a discovery process undertaken

by peoples of the world to uncover and come to a point of discovery of what the human species ought to be. And I think is

really the point that is missing from 99% of the discussion that

goes on; most especially in the trans-Atlantic. But even – and

I would put this out as a question – how self-conscious of a discussion is this in other parts of the world as well? And I think it's important, because Mr. LaRouche's emphatic point this

morning was that the entire system has to be scrapped; we are at

the point of blow-out. Any moves that are taken to try to save

it are complete foolishness; because anything you try to save in

the system is about to become completely worthless.

So, you have to re-found a new system upon a newly discovered notion of physical value. And that gets exactly to the principle that is the most fundamental; but is also the least

known, and the most contradicted in the United States today.

The

most fundamental principle of economics; which is that man is not

an animal. And that there is a scientifically knowable principle

which separates mankind as a species from all other species known to us today. And that's expressed in the fact that as a species, mankind is the only species that is not fixed. We're the only species for whom the new generation can be fundamentally different than the previous generation; as expressed in the powers wielded by the individual. The scientific powers, the powers in and over processes in the Universe, which is expressed in the productive powers of labor of the individual; which reflect knowledge of principle which is completely new to that generation. Which is both more perfect and higher than the knowledge of principles of the Universe possessed by the previous generation.

I think if we go back and look back to the United States and to our tradition, we see this expressed most recently – aside from the leadership taken by Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche in the recent decades – we see this expressed by the leadership of Krafft Ehricke and his role in establishing and fighting for the United States space program. Krafft Ehricke was completely committed to the idea, and it was a discovery in his own mind, that for human beings there are no limits to growth. There's no such thing as a fixed set of resources, for exactly the reason I cited, of man's potential to always discover a higher principle. Krafft Ehricke fought for the idea that man must always progress; and therefore, man cannot be limited merely to the Earth. Man cannot be a

species of a single globe. We have to move out into conquering space; becoming a species which is exerting power in an over the Solar System. Reorganizing, shaping, perfecting other planets in the Solar System, beginning with the Moon. Just to put it forward, that's the only legitimate basis for an economic system, is to organize the social activity of man to effect and promote that kind of activity; and to protect and promote that kind of capability which exists in potential in each and every human being. I think that we in the United States especially, have a responsibility to wake up, and to have a renaissance in the United States. Where we once again demand our space program, and demand that it represent the kind of principle expressed by Krafft Ehrlicke; and expressed by Mr. LaRouche's insights into the science of economics.

CHRISTIE: Just to follow up on that, I think that is probably also the place where geopolitics is – it's the symbol of the absolute end of geopolitics. And Mr. LaRouche has been discussing the idea of moving beyond nation-states. That doesn't mean a homogenized global McDonald's or something like that kind of approach to economy. What it means is, you're still going to celebrate the cultural differences, you're going to still celebrate the fact that people have histories and shared languages and so on and so forth; but you're going to see that the core of what it is to be human. We're all human; there's only one species. And that's no better expressed than in

space
exploration.

I also think that what you're beginning to see is how that's operating now in terms of breaking up – or nations now collaborating and not allowing themselves to be manipulated around the British strategies of divide and conquer. For example, you just recently had Xi Jinping make a trip to the Baltic nations; to work out the Baltic nations' entry into the Silk Road program. And that is one way to defuse the tensions that the Baltic nations would have with Russia. India is working with Iran on the Chabahar port; where you get access to some of the central Asian nations, which of course, could be pitted against China. And of course, China's working with Pakistan around the Gwadar port; and defusing potential confrontations that Pakistan and India might have. You begin to see that they are all collaborating around this common mission; and seeing that all these nations' relationships and integration is important. And I think that, in terms of what has to happen in the United States, we should also recognize that what is going on in these nations, that is determining the global dynamic; and that is also what is going to determine the internal political situation.

So, all the Americans who are depressed about this crazy election process, should just flush it down the toilet where it belongs; because it has no real bearing on what is actually occurring internationally. It is being defined by this new concept of thinking beyond nation-states; or at least beyond the manipulation that can occur under geopolitics where these

nations

are beginning to collaborate. That's the point of space exploration; that's also the point of Mr. LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative, which he raised today in discussions.

This

present war drive, which is why the British are trying to tear down this emerging New Paradigm, really began with the Bush crowd

sabotaging the Strategic Defense Initiative of Mr. LaRouche.

Had

that gone through, we wouldn't be on the edge of thermonuclear warfare; we would have already begun that collaboration back then. So now is really our last opportunity to take up that initiative; but we've got to bring this New Paradigm into the United States.

STEINBERG: I was at an event in Washington when Prime Minister Modi was here, and one of the speakers was a former Indian ambassador to the United States. I thought he made some

very important and pretty frank points. He said, first of all,

the most important thing that came out of the meeting, other than

the speech that Prime Minister Modi gave before the joint session

of Congress, was the nuclear deal. The fact that Westinghouse had been contracted to build six nuclear power plants in India.

So, he's viewing what remains of the actual technology base of the United States; of course, it's now a company that's working

very closely with the Japanese in order to even meet the construction requirements. But the other thing that he said was

that the United States has been blocking India from playing any

kind of constructive role in Middle East peace. He said India has a very important role to play; we have close relations with all of the Arab countries. But, he said, India views Iran as a crucial ally; not only economically because of the Chabahar port and the prospects of India, Iran, Afghanistan economic integration. But, he said, the threat to India and to Asia of Islamic terrorism, is coming from Wah'habism; and that they've never had any experience of terrorism coming out of the Shi'a branch of Islam. Therefore, India views Iran as a buffer against the spread of this kind of Saudi-sponsored terrorism into South Asia and the subcontinent. So, these are areas where there's an enormous amount of room for a change in policy being forced in Washington; where the kinds of problems that are right now seemingly intractable, can be solved through that kind of new approach.

On the question that Megan raised; Jason, you may want to say something about this. There was a very high-level dialogue that was going on 300 years ago between Western and Chinese scholars on this question of the nature of man. Leibniz was engaged in a tremendous exchange with China, via some of the Jesuit missionaries who were there in China for a period of more than 100 years. So, this common concept of the nature of man is not something that is alien to leading thinkers in Asia; and I think what China and even Russia are doing now, is really reflective of at least an intuitive, if not completely self-conscious idea of this unique character of human beings as

the only creative species.

ROSS: Xi Jinping – I forget the occasion of his making his speech – but in some recent remarks that he made, he had traced through the history of mankind. He was detailing all the big discoveries that made modern humanity possible; but he went all the way back. Fire, metallurgy; he talked about in the past 200 years, the incredible revolutions of steam power, of chemistry, electricity. So, there's definitely a recognition that something very special happened in a scientific way coming out of Europe from the period of the Renaissance; that's undeniable. The aspect of it that was universal, you bring up the work that Leibniz was doing about 300 years ago to try to maintain and have a dialogue with China; to have an opportunity for European science to make inroads into China, to uplift people's living standard there and to find more collaborators to work on things with. And also at the same time, his view that Chinese natural philosophy, or natural theology, or an outlook on the world and on social relations, that there was a potential for the rest of the world to learn a great deal about that from China. His view was that if one were to ignore Christianity, which he saw as given as a revealed religion based on – in other words, it wasn't a discovery that anybody could have made. It occurred through a personality who was in the Western world. That leaving

that aside, China was superior in its moral and cultural outlook.

The attacks on it today are pretty astonishing. People saying, "Oh, look at China's economy; it's faltering. Look their growth rate is only 10 times ours; it used to be 20 times ours. They're going down." Meanwhile, it's just negative interest rates; it's obvious where the growth is coming from. Also, the way they have to play up the idea of China being a threat; it sort of seems like a psychological case of projection almost.

STEINBERG: Sure, yeah. I think it was pointed out that in the case of Russia that the U.S. defense budget, when you count in all of the defense expenditures, is over \$1 trillion a year. There's a \$1 trillion program to completely overhaul and modernize our nuclear weapons arsenal; and that's in the Department of Energy budget. That doesn't even show up in the \$600 billion Pentagon budget. That's \$1 trillion that's going into preparation for the insanity of being able to launch, fight, and win a nuclear war. Russia's entire defense budget is \$84 billion; so it's literally less than 10% of the U.S.'s. And China similarly; it's a fraction of what the U.S. is spending.

OGDEN: Yeah, as Stephen Cohen said, Russia knows how to do counter-terrorism; we don't know how to do it very well.

ROSS: We're certainly not acting on it if we do have that knowledge.

OGDEN: And I think there is an element, as Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing, of President Putin's own unique insight as a world leader. Going back to the very beginnings of his Presidency, with what he did in Chechnya to defeat the threat of Islamic terrorism there; he said the threat here is that Russia is Balkanized. That we become the new Yugoslavia. And what would that imply for the civilization of the world? But even going back to the fact that Putin's background is as an intelligence officer, he very well knows that the source of this whole Islamic terrorism threat has its roots in the Al-Yamamah deal and the efforts that were made by Prince Bandar and Margaret Thatcher at that time to deploy the mujahideen in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union. The Al-Yamamah deal was a Cold War deal; and the fact that this has not been dismantled, means that this is still an active threat.

STEINBERG: The other thing that sort of begs that same question is, is it that we're not good at it? Or really on the other side? I think you've got to look at the case of this shooter down in Orlando – Omar Mateen; and consider the fact that he was employed for 7-8 years by a British company called G4S, which is the third-largest private corporation in the world, behind Walmart and some Asian supermarket chain. It's a mercenary company; it's a "private security company". They're involved in mercenary activities all over the world. They were in Iraq as part of the so-called "contractors" involved in the

occupation. In Israel, they man the checkpoints; they provide the technology. They are the security for the illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank. Here in the United States, they have the contracts to provide the security for 90% of the nuclear power plants in the U.S.. They're a major contractor for the Department of Homeland Security. And they had this ticking time bomb on the payroll; even when he was under investigation by the FBI for a period of a year, his job was never in jeopardy. You almost get the sense that these British companies maintain a small army of people who are severely mentally disturbed; who can be triggered at any time that there's a necessity for a pretext.

Remember that in January of 2001, Mr. LaRouche gave testimony in opposition to John Ashcroft's confirmation as Attorney General; because he said the character of the Bush administration was that they would look to create a Reichstag Fire incident to go for dictatorship. That was seven months before the 9/11 attacks that that warning was issued; and it was absolutely prescient. So, I think what Dr. Lin said in her article, that the U.S. and the British – although she focussed on the United States – have used these jihadists as tools in a policy of regime change that has destabilized the Middle East and a lot of other parts of the world. We are part of this jihadist structure; the British – pivotally so through things like Al-Yamamah – but for the last 15 years with the Bush administration and now Obama, we've been part of that same equation. So, this is something that we've got to face the cold hard truth of if we're ever going to deal with this problem.

OGDEN: And you see this rabid opposition to even the declassification of the 28 pages and the 9/11 Report. What Brennan is doing right now to run cover for the Saudis, is disgusting.

STEINBERG: And who did Obama meet with today?

OGDEN: Prince Salman; exactly. Well, I think with the activation of this Walter Jones bill, this is definitely going one step further; and I think a lot of people have begun to recognize that you have to call out Obama for what he's done on this front. We've celebrated the courage that Senator Mike Gravel had on this when he exposed the Pentagon Papers in the 1970s; and I think that this continues to inspire people. Obviously, it has inspired Walter Jones. The depth of the resolution is, I think, beyond your average fare for Congressional "Whereas" clauses. What it says in terms of citing George Washington, in terms of citing the Supreme Court case in support of Mike Grave; and just generally making the point. And also not pulling your punches on the Saudi aspect of this; it names explicitly the Saudi government and the role that this has played. And Bob Graham has repeatedly warned – and I think this every single time there is an attack of this nature, it has to be repeated – the fact that the 28 pages were not declassified, means that the logistical support network that was in place before 9/11, which enabled the 9/11 attackers to do what they did, was not dismantled. And for all we know, is very well still in place; and a lot of the connections. The Sarasota aspect

of
the cover-up by the FBI of the 80,000 pages, this speaks to
the
fact that this attack happened in Orlando. Then, there's the
entire southern California aspect, which was documented in the
investigations that went into putting together the 28 pages.
I
know you've said a lot about this already, Jeff, but all of
these
points have to continually be touched upon.

CHRISTIE: I would just add, I think that that as a
flank is
very crucial; because it goes right to the gut – not just of
Obama and the cover-up – but more simply of the Bush crowd and
their illegal wars that we've launched since under the guise
of
so-called terrorism after 9/11. Targetting nations that had
nothing to do with it, but really had to do with the
geopolitical
games against Russia, China, and India. But as Mr. LaRouche
mentioned on the occasion of the Orlando incident with this
Mateen shooting up the club; Mr. LaRouche brought it back to
Al-Yamamah. That you have to see it in a much larger context;
these are not isolated cases. So, I think the flank of the 28
pages goes right to that whole structure that has been brought
in
since the Al-Yamamah deal, which has been connected to the
various aspects of the financial system and so forth. What
Mrs.
LaRouche said is, if you look at everything, we are at an
absolute {punctum saliens} moment; where you have – as we
discussed at the opening of the show – the question of vote on
the Brexit on the 23rd, which is already having huge
implications. Obviously, we don't know all the details, but
it's
highly likely that this assassination of the British Member of

Parliament was related to this. You have the Brexit vote, you have the financial collapse; now admitted that they're going back to the crazy mortgage fraud that had threatened to bring down the system in 2007-2008. You have the German bonds trading at negative interest rates; Japan's central bank putting out negative interest rates. You just have all of this coming together. The war games and the desperation by the British. And what Mr. LaRouche said is that we have a situation that is unpredictable. And I think what that means for all of us and our fellow Americans, is to say that this really is open for what we decide to do.

In other words, there may be various players who might have all their different ideas of what to do in this moment of crisis; but we have to have the sense that we know what to do because of what Lyn and Helga have done over these decades. And this is an opportunity now to take the leadership and demand that our program and policies be implemented. But even more importantly perhaps, is a way of thinking about it; and a way of creativity being at the forefront of what we think of economics, of what we think of human relations in general. So, we just seize on this moment of the {punctum saliens}; that this is the time to exert leadership.

OGDEN: I think that's a very well-stated point to close our show on. Again, the {punctum saliens} – the pregnant moment; the moment of decision. As Jeff mentioned, by the time we meet

here next week, the Brexit vote will have occurred; a lot is changing very rapidly. We have a lot to watch from that.

I would like to thank everybody for joining me here today.

Thanks, Jeff and Jason both; and also Dave and Megan for joining

us via video. And thank you all for tuning in; please stay tuned

to larouchepac.com for critical daily updates. If you have not

yet subscribed to the LaRouche PAC Daily email, you may do that

through our website. And if you have not yet subscribed to our

YouTube channel, please subscribe to our YouTube channels to be

sure that you do not miss any of our regularly scheduled shows here on larouchepac.com. So, thank you very much and good night.

**Britisk, saudisk og FBI's
medskyldighed i massedrab i
Orlando, Florida, afsløret:**

Det er de samme, som gav os 11. september

16. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Det indledningsvis børneeventyr, der fortalte, at massedrabene i Orlando var Islamisk Stats værk, disintegrerer hastigt i takt med, at nye beviser peger på den selv samme kombination af magter, der udførte de oprindelige 11. september-angreb – briterne, saudierne og FBI.

Massemorderen fra Orlando, Omar Mateen, var en mangeårig ansat hos et af den britiske Krones største og mest modbydelige private sikkerhedstjenester – G4S, der har 620.000 ansatte i flere end 100 lande. G4S er det tredjestørste, private selskab i verden, og det er en afgørende del af det britiske monarkis »usynlige imperium«, bestående af private lejesoldater, mordere og hemmelige operatører. I USA har G4S sikkerhedskontrakter på 90 % af nationens atomkraftværker, er en hovedunderentreprenør for USA's Departement for Intern Sikkerhed (Homeland Security), og udførte endda sikkerhedsopgaverne for offshore olieplatformene fra British Petroleum i Den mexicanske Golf, hvilket er det sted, hvor Omar Mateen arbejdede i en årrække.

På trods af den kendsgerning, at kolleger krævede, at Mateen blev fyret pga. hans psykotiske og voldelige adfærd, beholdt firmaet ham og arrangerede en tilladelse til at få et hemmeligt våben for ham.

Mateen foretog to rejser til Saudi-Arabien, i 2011 og 2012, hvor han boede på firstjernede hoteller og andre indkvarteringer i den dyre klasse. Det vides ikke, hvad han lavede der, men begge rejser fandt sted, mens han var ansat af G4S.

I næsten et helt år var Mateen genstand for en FBI-

undersøgelse pga. mistanke om bånd til terrorister, men FBI droppede sluttelig sagen, og hans job hos G4S var på intet tidspunkt i fare. Faktisk gør nylige rapporter i *New York Times* og *The Intercept* det klart, at selve FBI har styret en hær af betalte »islamistiske« provokatører, der kørtes gennem de klassiske »sting-operationer«[1], der blev berømte gennem 1970'ernes og '80'ernes Operation Abscam og Brilab, hvor FBI-agenter forklædte sig som rige, saudiske prinser for at narre kongresmedlemmer og medlemmer af fagforeninger i fælder. Halvdelen af alle de såkaldte »terrorsager«, som FBI har indledt siden 11. september, involverer disse sting-teknikker, og i mange tilfælde var ofrene mentalt syge eller i desperat penge nød, eller begge dele.

Hvis man vil forstå, hvordan briterne kontrollerer og manipulerer amerikansk politik, skal man blot omhyggeligt studere denne anglo-saudiske-FBI-forbindelse. Det er dette apparat – der har været en dominerende faktor siden lanceringen af den anglo-saudiske Al Yamama olie-for-våben-aftale i 1985, med dens hemmelige offshore-konti til at finansiere global, jihadistisk terror – som må afsløres og knuses fuldstændigt, hvis USA nogensinde igen skal genvinde sin selvstændighed.

Dette er grunden til, at briterne og saudierne og FBI er rædselsslagne ved udsigten til, at de 28 sider [af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelses-rapport om 11. september fra 2002, -red.] skal blive frigivet til offentligheden. Beviserne, som indeholdes i disse sider – uagtet de løgne, der kommer fra John Brennan og Barack Obama – åbner vinduet for hele det Britiske Imperiums topstyrede kontrol over global terrorisme. Den netop indgivne Resolution i Repræsentanternes Hus nr. 779 (H.Res.779), der kræver, at det hemmeligstemplede 28 sider lange kapitel fra den Fælles Kongresundersøgelses-rapport om 11. september omgående udgives i Kongressens protokoller, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/hres779/text>

uden indblanding fra Obama eller John Brennan, under den forfatningsmæssige opdeling af magten, er en magtfuld intervention. Det faktum, at lovforslaget blev fremstillet samme dag, som den saudiske vicekronprins og magten bag tronen, prins Mohammed bin Salman, ankom til Washington for at mødes med [udenrigsminister] John Kerry, [forsvarsminister] Ashton Carter, [chef for CIA] John Brennan, [efterretningschef] James Clapper, [formand for Repræsentanternes Hus] Paul Ryan og [tidl. formand for R.H, nuværende leder af mindretallet i samme] Nancy Pelosi, viser en perfekt timing.

Dette er et opgørets øjeblik, og alle mentalt raske kræfter må mobiliseres for at tvinge sandheden om det Britisk-Saudiske Imperium frem, og for at bringe dette imperium til fald én gang for alle.

[1] Et kompliceret undercover-spil, der planlægges og udføres omhyggeligt af agenter (især for at fange forbrydere)

STOP 3. Verdenskrig: International terror. »Efter 'De 28 sider' – 11. september: Ti år senere«. Video, engelsk.

Følgende præsentation indeholder arkivoptagelser af angrebene på World Trade Center og Pentagon, den 11. september 2001.

Lyndon LaRouche, juni 2007: »Verden har levet under et system, som er 11. september-systemet – der allerede eksisterede, som jeg advarede om, i begyndelsen af 2001. FØR præsident George W. Bush blev indsat første gang, og hvor jeg sagde, 'Verdens system har nået et punkt, hvor et fremstormende kollaps af systemet nu er i gang. Og jeg sagde dengang, at faren består i, at noget lignende dette vil indtræffe, under de nuværende tendenser i USA, og det indtraf! Og det hed '9/11' – 11. september.'«

Se også: **USA: I har nøglerne til at standse terrorbølgen. Brug dem!**

Se også: **»Den anglo-saudiske baggrund for den aktuelle, internationale terrorisme: Frigiv sandheden, og lad os lukke imperiemagternes topstyrede terrorapparat ned, én gang for alle!«**

Idet han taler til forsvar for saudierne, angriber CIA-direktør John Brennan Iran for at være de "virkelige" terrorister i Mellemøsten

13. juni, 2016 – På tærsklen til den saudiske stedfortræder-kronprins Mohammed bin Salmans besøg i Washington, annoncerede CIA-direktør John Brennan faktisk, at han arbejder for den saudiske kongefamilie.

I sit omfattende interview med TV nyhedskanalen *Al-Arabiya* d. 11. juni, angreb Brennan Iran for at være den vigtigste terroristtrussel i Mellemøsten, alt imens han uddelte savlende ros til kong Salman og stedfortræder-kronprins Mohammad bin Salman, for at være USA's stærkeste partnere "i denne kamp mod terrorisme." Han fortalte sin interviewer, "Vi har et fortræffeligt samarbejde med Saudi Arabien. Jeg har arbejdet med mine saudiske partnere i mange, mange år. Jeg gjorde tjeneste i Saudi Arabien i omtrent 5 år under lederskab af kronprins Mohammad bin Nayef, som også er indenrigsminister. Over de seneste 15 år er saudierne blevet en af vores bedste partnere i kampen mod terrorisme."

De seneste 15 år? Inkluderer det d. 11. september 2001?

Idet han frikender saudierne for nogen som helst meddelagtighed i det rædselsvækkende angreb i 2001, rapporterer Brennan, at han fortsat er meget bekymret over "Irans støtte til terroristaktiviteter og terroristgrupper inden for Irak, i Syrien og andre lande i regionen." Idet han kalder Iran for en "statssponsor for terrorisme", spiller

Brennan klog på, at Iran "stadig har lang vej tilbage, før jeg er overbevist om, at de er interesseret i at imødegå og knuse terrorisme." Han tilføjede, at han har "nul" kontakt med sine iranske kolleger.

Idet han hyklede forståelse for behovet for forhandlinger for at løse den syriske krise, klagede Brennan over, at Rusland ikke gør nok for at bruge sin "indflydelse på Syrien til at tilskynde til en overgang væk fra Bashar al-Assad-regimet." Rusland "sidder i virkeligheden med nøglen" til, hvorvidt Assad går af, hævdede Brennan, og tilføjede igen, hvor "skuffet" han er over, at Rusland ikke gør mere for at "bringe denne konflikt til ende." Brennan anklagede Assad for at være lovligt ansvarlig for tilvæksten i terrorisme og ekstremisme i Syrien. "Der er behov for, at han forlader scenen."

**Leder: USA: I har nøglerne
til at standse terrorbølgen:
Brug dem!**

**– Samt en kort gennemgang af
det britiske og saudiske
monarkis rolle i
international**

terror gennem de seneste 30 år, inkl. video: 'Beyond the 28 Pages – 9/11, Ten Years Later'

13. juni 2016 (Leder) – Det masseorderiske voldsorgie i Orlando, Florida, angiveligt begået af en tilhænger af Islamisk Stat, Omar Mateen, er blot det seneste i en række af forfærdelige terrorangreb, der alle udspringer af den tredive år gamle »olieaftale« mellem det britiske og det saudiske monarki. Denne aftale har givet dem stor magt og store, skjulte ressourcer til at skabe nutidens globale jihadistiske organisation for angreb imod nationer.

Med mindre, og før, denne anglo-saudiske organisation afsløres – som vi kan gøre det med afsløringen af de dokumenter om 11. september, der er blevet hemmeligholdt i 15 år – og opløses, vil verden konstant stå over for blinde terrorangreb, over alt og til enhver tid.

Præsident Obama blev en overlagt og villig agent for briterne og saudierne i sine evindelige krige, der har spredt kaos i hele Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og terror i hele verden.

Hvilket »sammenræf«, at Obama skal mødes med den saudiske kronprins Salman i Washington, mens hans CIA-direktør, John Brennan, gør sit yderste for at »frikende« Saudi-Arabien for sin rolle i at arrangere angrebene den 11. september og drabene på 3.000 amerikanere. Både Obama og Prins Salman mødes med blodige hænder.

EIR's stiftende radaktør Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at han har været klar over denne britisk-saudiske magt for ondskab i årtier; og at dette bidrog til, at han den 2. januar, 2001, fremkom med en særdeles offentlig og publiceret

advarsel om, at der forelå en trussel om et større terrorangreb mod USA, der ville finde sted i efteråret 2001.

»Det er stadig det samme, det drejer sig om, selv i gårsdagens masse mord i Orlando«, sagde LaRouche.

Den unge Orlando-drabsmand var rejst til Saudi-Arabien i 2011 og 2012, mens han var ansat i det britiske, internationale sikkerhedsfirma G4S; og han kom tilbage som en tilsyneladende meget forandret person.

LaRouche understregede, at, fordi Obamas krige nu umiddelbart fører til en konfrontation med Rusland, og truer med at blive til Tredje Verdenskrig, er det af afgørende betydning at afsløre de saudisk/britiske hænder bag – begyndende med 11. september – og at tvinge Obama ud.

'Aftalen', der lancerede 1000 angreb

I 1985 indgik Prins Bandar bin-Sultan, daværende saudisk ambassadør til USA, et langvarigt partnerskab med den britiske regering under daværende premierminister Margaret Thatcher. Under dække af en olie-for-våben-aftale ved navn Al Yamamah (arabisk for »duen«), etablerede de britiske og saudiske monarkier en offshore-fond, der voksede til enorme proportioner og er blevet brugt til at føre global terrorisme imod udpegede nationer.

I løbet af de mere end 30 år, siden Al Yamamah blev lanceret, har de britiske og saudiske monarkier ophobet langt over \$100 mia. i en kæde af hemmelige offshore-fonde, til finansiering af terrorisme, politiske mord, kupplaner og andre forbrydelser som den aktuelle saudisk/britisk/amerikanske invasion og bombing af Yemen.

Under Al Yamamah sendte den britiske våbenproducent BAE Systems for anslået \$40 mia. våben til det Saudiske Forsvars- og Luftvåbenministerium, og for anslået yderligere \$20 mia. i bestikkelser til saudiske prinser og regeringsfolk inden for forsvaret. Til gengæld sendte saudierne 600.000 tønder olie pr. dag til briterne. Gennem de anglo-hollandske oliegi-ganter British Petroleum og Royal Dutch Shell blev olien solgt på de internationale spotmarkeder og skabte profitter for hundreder af milliarder af dollars. En *EIR*-undersøgelse fra 2007 anslog, at, som et minimum, blev \$100 mia. i overskud ophobet og deponeret i hemmelige offshore bankkonti, til brug for hemmelige, fælles anglo-saudiske operationer.

I en officiel biografi pralede Prins Bandar med at bruge disse hemmelige midler og med den særlige natur af Al Yamamah-aftalen, som kun kunne have været gennemført mellem to absolutte monarkier, der kunne agere over loven og udviske skellet mellem offentlige og private handlinger.

ISIS har, med andre ord, absolut IKKE været verdens rigeste, islamistiske terroroperation.

I 2007, da de britiske medier gennemførte en begrænset afsløring af Al Yamamah-bestikkelsesskandalen, lukkede den britiske premierminister Tony Blair den britiske Afdeling for Alvorligt Bedrageris (SF0) efterforskning, med den begrundelse, at det anglo-saudiske partnerskab var af afgørende betydning for den britiske nationale sikkerhed. Ordren til at lukke efterforskningen kom få timer efter, at den schweiziske regering havde besluttet at give SF0 adgang til de hemmelige bankkonti, tilhørende Wafiq Said, en stråmand for Al Yamamah-midlerne.

Al Yamamah-aftalen var en lukrativ transaktion for Prins Bandar, som fik en kommission for sin rolle i lanceringen af programmet på mindst \$2 mia. (amerikanske efterretningskilder anslår, at Bandar fik mere end \$10 mia. for aftalen).

Spørgsmålet om 3.000 dræbte amerikanere

Bandar er direkte indblandet i angrebene den 11. september på World Trade Center og Pentagon. Penge fra den personlige bankkonto tilhørende Bandar og hans hustru, prinsesse Haifa (søster til den mangeårige direktør for saudisk efterretning, Prins Turki-al-Faisal), blev videregivet til to af de oprindelige flykaprere fra 11. september, Khalid al-Mihdhar og Nawaf al-Hazmi, via de saudiske efterretningsofficerer Omar al-Bayoumi og Osama Basnan. Penge overførtes fra Bank of Englands konti fra det Britiske Forsvarsministeriums Støttekontor til Forsvarseksport (DESO) til Bandars konto i Riggs National Banks. Desuden modtog al-Bayoumi og Basnan penge gennem en 'skygge'-ansættelse i et saudisk forsvarsfirma, Dalah Aviation, der var eneste entrepriseindehaver for det Saudiske Forsvarsministerium.

En føderal dommer (dvs. udpeget af præsidenten) i Sarasota, Florida, gennemgår nu flere end 80.000 sider af tilbageholdte FBI-dokumenter, der drejer sig om en celle bestående af flykaprerne den 11. september, og dennes forbindelser til en prominent, rig, saudisk forretningsmand med stærke bånd til det saudiske monarki. Nogle uger før angrebene den 11. september, forlod den saudiske familie, der opholdt sig i et indhegnet bosted i Sarasota, meget pludseligt landet. De efterlod sig ejendele, der indikerede, at de brød op med meget kort varsel. FBI gennemførte en uddybende undersøgelse af familien, fordi de husede tre af flykaprerne fra 11. september, inkl. ringlederen Mohammed Atta i mange tilfælde, iflg. sikkerhedslogs og videooptagelser, der viser Atta og de andre gå ind og ud af ejendommen.

FBI hemmeligholdt dokumenterne og det faktum, at de foretog en

undersøgelse, for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse og 11. september-kommissionen. Tidligere senator Bob Graham, der var med-formand i den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, hævder nu, at eksistensen af forbindelsen mellem de saudiske royale og Sarasota-cellen, når dette ses i sammenhæng med beviset for den saudiske regerings støtte til San Diego-cellen, nu rejser yderligere spørgsmål om angrebene 11. september. Hvad med Herndon, staten Virginia, og Paterson, staten New Jersey, har senator Graham offentligt spurgt?

Et 47 sider langt dokument, skrevet af de to stabsmedlemmer af 11. september-kommissionen, der tidligere havde arbejdet for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, og som havde skrevet det 28 sider lange, undertrykte kapitel, identificerede i alt 20 saudiske regeringsfolk med beviselige bånd til de 19 flykaprere forud for angrebene 11. september.

Disse forbindelser gik fra det sydlige Californien til den Saudiske Ambassade i Washington og til den Saudiske Ambassade i Berlin, Tyskland. Tidligere flådeminister John Lehman, medlem af 11. sept.-kommissionen, sagde til '60 Minutes', at kommissionen ikke førte en uddybende undersøgelse af de ledetråde, der burde have været forfulgt, og som relaterede til det saudiske monarki og det saudiske regimes støtte til flykaprerne. Lehman, blandt andre kommissionsmedlemmer, har krævet en tilbundsgående, fra øverst til nederst, ny undersøgelse af 11. sept. – en undersøgelse, hvor alle de undertrykte ledetråde og åbne spor til de saudiske royale fuldt ud forfølges.

I løbet af denne trediveårige periode med Al Yamamah-programmet er der flydt penge fra disse hemmelige offshore-konti, så vel som også gennem saudiske velgørenhedsorganisationer, til finansiering af et globalt netværk af moskeer og madrasser (skoler), der har rekrutteret flere generationer til det ekstreme wahhabi/salafist-apparat, som udgør rekrutteringspuljen til sunni jihadistisk terror over hele verden.

Hvad der skal gøres

De beviser, der indeholdes i det stadig hemmeligstemplede, 28 sider lange kapitel af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelse af 11. sept., åbner døren til en optrevling af hele det anglo-saudiske terrorapparat. Uden en forståelse af den rolle, som det britiske monarki og de britiske efterretningstjenester har spillet i det jihadistiske apparat, er det umuligt at lukke dets evne til at operere ned.

CIA-direktøren fremførte i et interview søndag, at amerikanere »ikke burde tro på« dette 28-siders kapitel, som han nu frygter, vil blive tvunget til at blive frigivet, med en ophævelse af hemmeligstemplingen. Men et republikansk medlem af Kongressen rapporterede i et tweet, »CIA-direktøren må referere til nogle andre 28 sider end dem, jeg har læst. Frigiv dem, og lad det amerikanske folk træffe afgørelsen.« I har i jeres hænder midlerne til at gå til modangreb mod denne britisk/saudiske operation. Brug dem. Fremtving en offentliggørelse af de saudiske beviser. Fremtving Obamas afgang. »Dette må gøres hurtigt«, sagde LaRouche i dag, »for at forhindre yderligere international ødelæggelse.«

Video: *'Beyond the 28-pages – 9/11: Ten Years Later'* – Otte måneder før angrebene 11. september, 2001, forudsagde Lyndon LaRouche, at USA havde en høj risiko for en begivenhed à la 'Rigsdagsbranden', en begivenhed, der ville gøre det muligt for dem, der var ved magten, gennem diktatoriske midler at styre en økonomisk og samfundsmæssig krise, som de i modsat fald ikke var kompetente til at håndtere. Vi lever nu i det ubrudte kølvand af dette stykke historie.

Titelbillede: Obama og Kong Salman bin Abdulaziz under et af præsidentens mange besøg i Saudi-Arabien samtidig med, at han

]

Barske ord; Hvem kan høre dem?

(Lyndon LaRouche) – Hovedtale ved konferencen i San Francisco (v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche)

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det

9. juni 2016 (Leder) – I går lykkedes det næsten indgriben fra FBI at forhindre Lyndon LaRouches deltagelse via internet i en stor konference i Nordcalifornien, arrangeret af hans medarbejdere. Hvis ikke lederskabet dér havde grebet ind i tide, ville LaRouche ikke have kunnet deltage.

Da LaRouche endelig kunne tale, var hans udgangspunkt den aktuelle, akutte trussel mod den menneskelige eksistens.

»Det væsentligste spørgsmål, jeg bekymrer mig om, er truslerne

mod den menneskelige arts eksistens, i det totale område, lige nu. For, lige nu, på dette tidspunkt, står hele den menneskelige arts eksistens på den yderste rand, og vi må derfor være lydhøre over for at forstå, hvad det er for problemer, der er involveret i det her, og hvad det er for midler, der kan sikre en udvej for menneskeheden generelt.

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det.»

Men fra dette øjeblik og fremefter – lad os sige det ligeud – rev hovedindholdet i LaRouches bemærkninger slemt i nerverne på mange lyttere. Han blev ved med at komme tilbage til spørgsmålet om personlig identitet, men især spørgsmålet om hans egen personlige identitet. På et spørgsmål om, hvordan det individuelle sind overvinder forhindringer for at vinde en kamp for menneskeheden, svarede han:

»Lad mig sige, at jeg har temmelig gode levnedsegenskaber. Jeg er en aktiv person i samfundet, og jeg er en ældre person, og en erfaren, ældre person, en af de mest erfarne af alle personer i denne kategori. Så jeg tror ikke, nogen ville have nogen vanskeligheder med at forstå, hvem jeg er, hvad jeg er, hvor jeg kom fra og hvad jeg gør.

Andre personer holder måske fast ved en idé om en anden identitet hos en anden person, som jeg ikke kender, men sådan synes det at være.»

LaRouche drejede næsten hvert spørgsmål rundt på denne måde. Dette her irriterer dig måske, men det første spørgsmål, du skal stille dig selv, er: er det sandt? Er det sådan, at »tingene bare sker«, eller er det sådan, at »tingene bringes til at ske« af mænd og kvinder, der, som LaRouche sagde, er

»kvalificeret til at skabe historie?« Da MacArthur blev tvunget ud af Filippinerne den 12. marts 1942, var det da rigtigt af ham at sige, »Jeg vender tilbage«, eller burde han have ændret det til »vi vender tilbage«? Ville mennesket have klaret at komme til Månen i 1969 – eller nogensinde – hvis det ikke havde været for den enlige skikkelse, den første og største tyske rumpioner, Hermann Oberth (1894-1989). Oberth var fattig det meste af sit liv. Efter at have kæmpet for rumrejser i årtier, havde han næppe mødt en eneste person, der både var enig i, og forstod, disses betydning. Men det er takket være denne »næppe en eneste person«, såsom Werner von Braun, at vi fik den revolution, som var rumprogrammet.

På et spørgsmål om, hvordan vi kan afgøre, hvorvidt vore forestillinger er fantasteri eller er sandfærdige, svarede LaRouche:

»Hvorfor siger vi simpelthen ikke, lad os identificere et sandfærdigt eksempel, en sandfærdig identitet. Jeg er. Og enhver, der vil benægte dette, ville tage fejl, ville være tåbelig.

Jeg er kendt som, identificeret som en historisk skikkelse igennem det meste af det 20. århundrede, og de fleste mennesker fra det 20. århundrede bør vide, hvem jeg er, og de bør vide, hvad jeg gør. De kender måske ikke alle detaljer omkring, hvad jeg gør, men sådan er det: Jeg er en prominent, en særdeles prominent, skikkelse på denne planet, blandt de mest prominente.«

Den senere del af det 20. århundrede ville have været uigenkendelig, hvis det ikke havde været for LaRouches sejr over det britiske, økonomiske system i en debat i 1971 på Queens College, New York, som dernæst, ad indirekte veje, førte til hans sejr med det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i Reaganregeringen i 1983.**

Dette banede igen vejen for hans og hans hustru Helgas

initiativ, som nu er blevet til den Eurasiske Landbro og den Nye Silkevej, og som er det 21. århundredes hovedudvikling frem til i dag.

Hvorfor er det så irriterende at lytte til det indlysende: at LaRouche er en hovedskikkelse i det 20. og 21. århundrede? Fordi vi i skolen lærte om demokratiets dyder? Er det den virkelige årsag, eller skyldes det snarere, at vi lukker ørerne, fordi vi finder det mere beroligende for os personligt at benægte, at nogen mand eller kvinde rent faktisk kan være ansvarlig for menneskets tilstand og menneskehedens skæbne?

Læs her Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedindlæg på konferencen i San Francisco, Californien, den 8. juni:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 3. juni
2016:**

Vi må rejse ud i rummet og virkeliggøre vores fælles bestemmelse

Ben Deniston gennemgår bl.a. de mange, internationale tiltag, med grafiske fremstillinger, der støtter alternativet til det anglo-amerikanske imperiums fremstød for global atomkrig, og Kesha Rogers fra Texas taler om afdøde tysk-amerikanske rumforskningspionér Krafft Ehrickes filosofi omkring menneskets indtagelse af rummet, og mennesket som et 'multi-globalt' væsen, der ikke er begrænset til blot én planet, m.m.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST GO OUT INTO SPACE AND REALIZE OUR COMMON DESTINY

Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast

June 3, 2016

MEGAN BEETS: Hello! It's June 3rd, 2016. I'd like to welcome

all of you to our regular Friday broadcast here at LaRouche PAC.

My name is Megan Beets. I'm joined tonight in the studio by Ben

Deniston, and I'm also joined, via video, by LaRouche PAC Policy

Committee members Kesha Rogers, joining me from Houston Texas and

Diane Sare, joining us from New Jersey and Manhattan.

To start things off tonight, I'm going to read the question

that came in to Mr. LaRouche from our institutional contact in Washington, and then turn it over to you, Diane, to deliver Mr.

LaRouche's response, as well as some opening remarks, to start

our discussion off.

The question reads: "Mr. LaRouche, the U.S. Senate passed a controversial bill known as the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) that would allow the families of 9/11 victims to sue the government of Saudi Arabia for its alleged financial support of al-Qaeda. The bill now goes to the U.S. House of Representatives for a vote. What are your recommendations to the House of Representatives?"

DIANE SARE: Well, I can report what Mr. LaRouche had to say about that, specifically, and then more in the background. He said that "We must state the case straightforwardly. It must be a clean bill with no loopholes, i.e., loopholes which would allow the Obama administration, or whatever administration that's covering up for the Saudis, to claim that there's negotiations going on with them that would prevent the families from being able to sue." He said, "It must not only be passed, but with a veto-proof majority. The issue is clear. The British and the Saudis were behind the crimes of 9/11 and should be held legally accountable."

I think this is extremely important with what I wanted to say, in terms of starting off the discussion this evening, which is that the American population is in somewhat of a quandary. They're in an unfair position because, thanks to our terribly controlled news media, they're operating without full knowledge of the situation that they're in. They're thinking that we're in a presidential election campaign where they have to choose between Hillary Clinton, who is nothing but a lying, killer

clone

of Barack Obama; maybe Bernie Sanders, who's really just a fraud,

and who has never met an anti-Russian policy that he has not supported; or Donald Trump, who is an FBI agent with a glorified

toupee.

Actually, this is simply not the case. There's a much greater dynamic in the world right now, which is that the trans-Atlantic system is completely bankrupt. That means the British Royal Family and their Saudi and American puppets like Barack Obama, like the Bush family, are in a mad scramble to somehow maintain their grip, even as their system completely disintegrates. What Ben is about to present is the new dynamic of

the planet, which is absolutely huge. It involves over half of the world's population and it involves over half of the world's

population actually moving in a progressive, future-oriented, direction, which is something completely anomalous to most people

and most people's thinking in the United States today.

So, what I just wanted to give a sense of is (1) the danger,

in terms of the urgency of yanking down Obama by exposing his collusion with Saudi Arabia and Britain, the very people who committed the atrocities on September 11, 2001 in our country, so

that we don't have thermonuclear war; and (2) that the United States can be brought to join this greater paradigm, which is actually what's affecting everything inside the United States, not the local affairs as you see them.

I'll just say, people may recall that our Defense Secretary

Ashton Carter a couple months ago actually said that we should quadruple our defense spending in Europe. He said that we had to

be prepared for a threat from Russia – which is not threatening

us. But, what we are in fact doing is aggressively moving against

Russia, by supporting NATO military drills in the Baltic nations.

Germany has sent 1,000 troops into Lithuania for these drills.

NATO is erecting anti-ballistic missile systems. They have already been placed in Romania. Now we're talking about placing

them in Poland. These systems can easily be converted to carry {offensive} weapons; they're not just {defensive} systems. You can equip any of these rockets with nuclear warheads.

Putin has addressed this very directly. I'll just share what

Putin had to say about that. He talks about these compact launch

pads. "At the moment, the interceptor missiles installed have a

range of 500 km (310 miles), soon this will go up to 1,000 km (621 miles), and worse than that, they can be re-armed with 2,400

km (1,491 mile) offensive missiles even today, and it can be done

by simply switching the software, so that even the Romanians themselves won't know. How can this not be a threat to us? It certainly is. That is the reason why we have to respond now, and

if yesterday some areas in Romania did not know what it is like

to be a target, today we will have to take action to ensure our

security. Let me repeat, these are response measures, a response

only. We were not the first to take such steps. The same will be

done with regard to Poland. We will wait for certain actions

to
be taken in Poland. We are not going to do anything until we
see
missiles on the neighboring territory. And we have the
necessary
resources. You saw, the whole world saw our capabilities in
term
of our medium-range sea- and air-based missiles." He's
referring
to what Russia just did with regard to Syria, the phenomenal
accuracy of missiles launched from the Mediterranean and
elsewhere on wiping out ISIS targets. "We are not violating
anything, but our ground-based Iskander missile systems have
proven themselves as superb."

This is what Putin is now saying, and then our Defense
Secretary Ashton Carter went on to give a raving speech in a
U.S.

Naval Academy Commencement Address, where he talked about the
great technological superiority of American weapons, which is
simply not the case. Kesha will elaborate further [that] since
Obama has dismantled out space program, we simply do not have
the

science and research to produce accurate and effective defense
weapons systems. It's simply a fraud. I'm sure we are spending
a

lot of money. It's probably like our health care system, where
we're spending more money than anyone else on the planet, and
doing the worst job of producing anything.

I'll just say that there was just this study that came
out

from a fellow at Dartmouth College, and the Bush School of
Government at Texas A&M University. Secretary of State James
Baker III, at the time when negotiations were being held with
Gorbachev for the reunification of Germany, was {lying to
Gorbachev at that time} [in 1990] – that the United States was
already engaged in plans for expansion of NATO, even as we
were

telling Gorbachev that we were not, in terms of the conditions to reunify Germany.

So, it is no wonder that Putin is responding in this fashion. The aggressor is NATO and Obama, as tools of a bankrupt British Empire system. And what Americans need to know, and what the world needs to bear in mind, is the strength of the new paradigm, which is actually huge. It is the actions of Putin and Xi Jinping which are the reason why we've not plunged into thermonuclear war earlier. I think, as you'll see, they definitely have the upper hand in this situation. This is something that Americans should actually be acting in concert with, as opposed to the myopic focus of the current U.S. election campaign.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks Diane. We were discussing with Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche yesterday, and had some discussions earlier in the week, and I think maybe just to reference what Mrs. LaRouche defined as just two stark directions the world is going in. On the one side, as you're saying, you have this insane, frankly imperial-style push, still, as long as you have Obama as this Puppet-in-Chief for the British, they're going for this threat of war drive. Every step they take is just further and further to insanity.

I think part of what we're facing in the United States is people are not going to understand what's really going on unless they look at the global picture, and unless they look at the

global picture from the right perspective. I think you're absolutely right. These elections are a joke unless you see them

in the context of where the world's actually going right now. Obviously, the United States plays a critical role, but you're not going to define what the United States does, or where the United States goes, from within the United States. People have to

look at what's happening in the world, to know how to act here in

the United States to actually achieve something.

So, we want to take some time today and just put a little

bit of depth – and I think we're going to be doing more of this

in additional shows, additional segments in the future – but we

want to put some depth on this new paradigm that is emerging.

I just want to reference some of the developments, some stuff recently, some stuff from the months and years, but look at it together as one picture of an emerging – I would really call it

this "win-win" paradigm to reference the refrain and the concept

of China's President Xi Jinping, where he said that what China is

pursuing is a "win-win" policy.

What we've seen recently, over years, but also just in the

recent days and weeks, is a real consolidation of other nations

coming around that policy, coming around the idea of a win-win principle. Maybe different nations are approaching it in different terms, or they have different words for it, or different expressions, or maybe stated in different languages, but I think there's a clear unification around this principle

—
that we have to move beyond the idea that every nation is competing for some finite set of resources, and the gains of another nation are somehow implicitly and inherently going to be a loss for your nation. In other terms, sometimes, this general "geopolitical view," as some people discuss it and think about it — the idea that the world is this big game being played and you have to ensure that you get the biggest slice of the pie, and any gains made by another nation are somehow going to be detrimental, because that's less potential gains for you.

You've seen a very clear and explicit break from this, not just in words, not just in statements, but in actual action from this new paradigm, centered around China, China's alliance with Russia, and increasingly, cooperation with India. And you're seeing a clear commitment to the idea that the future of mankind depends on cooperation in common progress, in common development — that progress and development in joint cooperation between nations benefits both parties and other parties involved in, in the nearby area: this idea of win-win cooperation. It's not win-loss cooperation. Just because you win doesn't mean the other guy loses. We need to rise to a real mature understanding of how mankind progresses, what the nature of progress is for the human

species – that mankind creates wealth, creates progress, by creative development, and the only way we're going to have a stable, progressive, future-oriented world – or any world at all, frankly, at this point, at the level of thermonuclear technologies – is a policy based on this principle, this recognition: that we can no longer tolerate the suppression or the denial of progress of other nations, and we must embark on policies that ensure cooperative development among nations.

These are nice ideas. We could talk about this. Everybody's heard politicians saying these kind of things. Maybe not in the U.S. so much even, these days. The point is this is actually happening. These are not just "nice ideas." This is where the world is going. This is happening now. This is the dynamic taking over the world. This defines what we have to do in the United States to ensure that we can be part of this process.

On the first graphic here we have displayed [Fig. 1], a lot of this centers around China's pivotal role with their One Belt-One Road program, comprised of a land-based revival of the Silk Road orientation, as a real development corridor, bringing development into the interior regions of Asia and Eurasia, but also coupled with their Maritime Silk Road initiative. This has kind of been a keystone of an expanding development of Asia as a whole, bringing in more and more nations, again, not in a competitive way necessarily, but in a way of a win-win policy.

I do want to illustrate, just give a quick sketch, on some of the developments that have been occurring. But I'd like to premise this by just referencing some of the recent statements by

the leaders of these nations. Again, Russia, China, and India coming along as a critical third partner in this whole process.

Just to highlight a few things, the President of India was in China just this past week; and while he was there, he gave an address on India-Chinese relations. And just to quote what he said, he said: "India and China are poised to play a significant and constructive role in the 21st Century. When Indians and Chinese come together to address global challenges and build on their shared interests, there is no limit to what our two peoples can jointly achieve." He went on to say, "Both sides should work with the aim of insuring that we do not burden our coming generations, by leaving our unresolved problems to them." So, that was the President of India speaking in China.

Also earlier this week, you had a former Chinese ambassador to Russia travel to Moscow and speak about Russian-Chinese relations. And he just said quite frankly, bilateral relations between Russia and China are now at a 400-year high. You hear politicians in the United States, you're lucky if they talk about a 4-year perspective or a 4-year analysis; let alone a 400-year assessment. This former ambassador to Russia from China said there's obviously differences; anytime you have two major nations, you have differences. But he said, these are of a secondary level; and he said it's his assessment, as somebody who deals with top-level relations between these two nations, that the Presidents of the two nations – Xi and Putin – have a clear

conceptual understanding, a clear conceptual agreement. So that's significant; again, reflecting this orientation.

Just this past Tuesday, the Premier of China was speaking to media editors and newspaper editors for various Asian publications; and then speaking to an Indian editor, he really emphasized that Chinese-Indian cooperation not only benefits China and India, but all of Asia. So again, here's the Premier of China, you had the President of India saying similar things; the Premier of China saying similar things. It's a reflection of Russia being a part of this. These are clear statements just in the recent period of this move towards this integration perspective. China's Premier also said – as an interesting note – that China welcomes India's leadership and role in this new development project linking India, Iran, and Afghanistan; we can see this on the next image here on the map [Fig. 2]; centered around Iran's Chabahar port. This new proposal for water transport, shipping, the development of this port; the development of the rail lines and related industry, and stretching up into Afghanistan. So, this is a new development project that India's partaking in; Iran's partaking in; and is going to bring critical development also into Afghanistan. And this is just typical; this kind of project – if you look at it in the old paradigm, maybe China could say this threatens our interests, because it's insuring other nations are gaining more power and that might be more threatening to our geopolitical role in the region. But no, this is a different paradigm; this is a new paradigm.

That kind of thinking applies in the US and London

still; it
still dominates the trans-Atlantic. But you go to Asia, and
the
Chinese Premier is saying, great; this is excellent. We
encourage
India's role in this type of development; we want more of
this.
So, I think this project is just one of a number of projects
that
I think are moving closer and closer to what the LaRouches
defined with their Eurasian Land-Bridge perspective. A lot can
be
said, but just to highlight a few things. You have this
Chabahar
port project, linking India and Iran into Afghanistan. You
have
the One Belt, One Road, including the New Silk Road program
going
through the heart of the Eurasian continent. You also have
just
within the past year, the completion and upgrading of some of
these rail lines; where now you can travel directly from China
all the way to Germany, faster than you could by shipping
route,
by direct rail connections through the whole heart of Asia
into
Europe across Eurasia. You have the prospect of regular
upgraded
rail connections and transport from China down into Iran, now
that the Iran sanctions are lifted; and we have the prospect
of
Iran playing a larger role in the development of this region.
These are just a few examples of building off of
China's One
Belt, One Road, further related development projects; just
reflecting the overall orientation towards growth,
infrastructure

investment, scientific investment, development throughout the Eurasian continent, led by these nations.

I think also indicative of this whole New Paradigm orientation, very interesting and illustrative of what we're talking about; you also have in the last two years, the creation and emergence of another economic development bloc – the Eurasian Economic Union – highlighted here in yellow. Of which Russia is the largest component of this economic agreement, this new economic zone which includes Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan. So, this is kind of central north Asian bloc of economic development.

So again, if you're thinking like a British geopolitician, you might think this is a competition to China's One Belt, One Road program. Here you have Russia coming in, working with these other nations in the northern regions, trying to expand their economic development; while China is leading the way with their One Belt, One Road program. But in Asia, in the New Paradigm, in the way these leaders are thinking in a real sane, human fashion, they're not thinking about it in those terms. You had President Putin recently explicitly saying that they're looking towards integration and cooperation with the One Belt, One Road program explicitly. He said they're even working on specific projects as part of the Eurasian Economic Union, which will directly integrate into the New Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road program.

It's not competition; it's not a geopolitical perspective. It's a perspective of win-win cooperation of development, or progress; and this is what has the trans-Atlantic powers, these geopolitical mindset people all freaked out.

Just to highlight a few other things, you have space. You have a Renaissance of space exploration in Asia, while the US is decaying under Obama's cancellation of the manned space program and his cuts and his complete lack of leadership in space; you have rapid progress being made in Asia. Just within the recent period, you have two new space launch centers, advanced space launch centers now open in Russia and China; as indicated here.

[Fig.3]

You have major water projects; massive south water north projects, which is remarkable. They've made manmade rivers of a large scale, directing water from the abundant waters of the south to the water-starved regions of the north. And they've made major steps in managing and developing their water system as a nation as a whole; and they've got plans to further that with some of the more challenging aspects going further west with some of the western routes. So, they've already accomplished certain parts of this; and they're taking further steps.

But again, they're looking at positive developments for the whole region; they've recently said that they're looking towards helping the development of the Mekong River valley down in

Southeast Asia. Where you have the Mekong River running through

Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam – this region here – and there's been recent droughts, major water shortages and difficulties; largely just from lack of development, lack of doing what the US did under Franklin Roosevelt with the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. Lack of developing basic dams, irrigation reservoirs, water management systems to actually manage this river valley as a whole to insure regular, steady water supplies are available to the people. So, China's saying they want to look into helping to facilitate that process as a new project.

You have India now re-raising the prospects for another massive water transfer program – their river inter-linking project; where they can actually interlink some of the major rivers and again manage their water system as a national territory as a whole in a much more efficient and much more productive program.

And I'd just like if you look at these projects together, and this is just a sample of some of the stuff that's either in process, or is becoming likely, or is being coming discussed and could be a future orientation. If you look at this together, you're looking at the greatest development and management of the water cycle in this entire East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia region, to be the greatest management of water that mankind has ever undertaken in the history of our species on this planet.

So, these are the kinds of things you see happening, in a win-win cooperative paradigm. And I want to end with just one

last project; something very close to Mr. LaRouche specifically, because he's played a major role in supporting this. Which is the

Kra Canal proposal; and this is a canal for water transport that's been proposed to cut through the Kra Isthmus in Thailand.

To facilitate greater trade between, as you can see here, the South China Sea and obviously stretching into the Pacific and China and Japan and Korea and into the Indian Ocean. From which,

India is obviously a major player there; but then also, those routes obviously go up through the New Suez Canal – constructed

by Egypt in a remarkable amount of time – and up into Europe.

These major anchor points of world trade – in the Pacific with China, Japan, Korea on the one side; and then in the Indian Ocean

and over into Europe on the other side. This entire trade process

suffers a massive bottleneck currently, as all this trade has to

currently go through the Malaccan Strait; which is this narrow passage between Malaysia and Indonesia.

Right now, something on the order of one-fourth of all global trade goes through these narrow straits; not one-fourth of

the trade in this region, or one-fourth of the Asian trade.

One-fourth of all trade globally goes through this region. I've

seen different estimates, I'm not sure; that might be one-fourth

of total ships or one-fourth of tonnage, or one-fourth of value,

I'm not sure exactly. I've seen other estimates say that it's 40%

of global trade; I think it probably depends upon exactly how

you

count. But this is a major chunk of all trade occurring on the whole entire planet; going through this one congested, some parts

very shallow and narrow, region down around Singapore in the Malaccan Straits. And this has been known now for many years to

be major bottleneck constraining cheap, efficient, rapid trade between these sections of the world. So, in the '80s, Mr. LaRouche became very involved in this proposal to make a new canal through this relatively narrow passage; this narrow isthmus

in Thailand. And enable a dramatic increase in the volume; reduction of the cost; increase in the speed of trade through these regions. Despite having been fought for for many years, now

in this new paradigm, this is now being put on the table again.

You just had an official advisory board of the Thailand

government endorsing this program. China has made it clear it would like to do this program, and maybe even finance the whole

thing if it goes forward. You have official experts in the United

States recognizing the importance of this program as kind of a keystone; relieving this bottleneck, and another major component

of facilitating this vast expanse of economic growth, trade, and

development in this whole region.

So, this is a very exciting, singular project, but it's

emblematic and I think an example of the whole perspective we're

talking about. And again, I think the theme is win-win. You have

China, you have Russia, you have India; they've had conflicts, they've had wars, they've had tensions. But you have leaders now

in these nations – typified by Xi Jinping, typified by Putin, Modi's role in India. They're now saying, we as mankind, as nations, as participants in humanity, need to move beyond this geopolitical approach to our existence on this planet. We have to

move to a policy where we recognize growth, development, progress; all these things we're talking about here are necessary

for everybody. Not just for us. We can no longer tolerate the suppression of this kind of development for others; we have to go

to a global system centered around this kind of development. And

again, that's not just being talked out, as you saw here, as you

see what's going on with these developments.

Again, this is just a sketch; you could spend weeks going

through what's happening in the world. And by the time you got done, you'd have a whole other set of things to catch up on; because a lot would have happened since the time you started.

But

this is now the center of what's happening in the world; and this

defines how we need to think about what's happening. This is what

has these London-Wall Street imperial faction people freaked out.

Because how have the British existed? Well, it existed on geopolitics; they've been the geo-politicians. They've been existing based upon looting; if there's nations they can't loot

directly, I'm sure there's perpetual conflict between different

regions. And especially under Obama, the United States has come under this geopolitical imperial orientation.

And to just come back to what you said Diane, the opposition from this imperial faction couldn't be clearer. They're taking step after step towards what would be thermonuclear annihilation in response to this emerging New Paradigm. This NATO summit coming up; the exercises being started now by NATO. Putin couldn't be clearer or saner in his response; saying, we've been talking about this for years. You guys are making clear overt military threats to us with your expansion of NATO, with the development of more advanced weapons systems closer and closer to our borders. What do you expect us to do? We have to respond for our own safety, and for the safety of the world, quite frankly.

So, I just think the situation couldn't be more stark; but I think especially here in the United States, we have to uplift the level of discussion to this global perspective. What's happening in Asia now, what's happening between Putin and Russia and China, increased collaboration with India; that is now increasingly becoming the defining factor for the world situation.

ROGERS: I think that what we're seeing going on in the world right now, and what you just laid out, really puts the perspective on the table of the decades-long fight of Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche now coming to fruition. I thought that it was important that you brought up Mr. LaRouche's fight around

these

development projects; around the Kra Canal in the '80s. And the

fact of the matter is, at that very time, he was also fighting for the development of space exploration; around the "Woman on Mars" Mars mission, and the importance of mankind in space.

Now, I think what we're seeing right now can really be characterized from the standpoint of what the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehricke described as the emergence of mankind into a poly-global world. And I think when you think of

this conception of a poly-global world, where mankind is not confined to the limited resources of one globe, but moves out into the expansion of space; that's what we're seeing happen right now. What Russia and China represent is a move away from —

we're not just talking about one globe; we're talking about one

globe that has been dominated by a British Empire, a policy of murder. A population reduction, and defying this conception of the creative nature of human beings and the human mind. When you

think about Russia and China are doing to pull together over 50%

of the world, this is quite remarkable; and it can only be looked

at from the standpoint of a new species of mankind. It's a real

force of good versus evil; and the evil is completely being destroyed and losing. Because the drive right now for thermonuclear war being pushed and perpetuated continuously by the stooge Obama in the White House; who's been pushing the murderous policy to protect the British Empire, protect the Saudis. And to continue to push a policy that's going to lead to

not just a continuation of a confinement to one world; but a one

world where people are on the verge of being exterminated and blowing themselves up, unless we change our attitudes now. And I think the matter is, is what Diane and you both presented; which is that we have a real clear choice and opportunity before us. I think it's very important as to the very important fight that our international organization is leading right now, that we have to put an end to Obama, to this drive for thermonuclear war, and to NATO and what it represents in terms of its escalations and provocations of war towards Russia and China.

But I think to continue to look on the optimistic, positive side, which most of the world is moving toward, we have to give the United States and American people a sense of what we must be participating in, in terms of our mission to join in this drive toward peaceful cooperation and progress. I think it's very important to note that today is the 51st anniversary of the first American to walk in space – Ed White; which was June 3, 1965.

As I was stating, you take the conception laid by the German space pioneer Krafft Ehricke; what he conceptualized was not something that was confined to one people or one nation. But that was going to be the intention that was going to unify all people in a common interest that our destiny and mission as mankind was to break with the confines of Earth that put limitations on

man,

and that bestialized human beings and pit human beings against each other; to find our common interest in the development of space. And you're seeing more and more people starting to recognize this intention and this need for cooperation. It was just reported today that at an international air show in Germany,

the head of the European Space Agency, Johann-Dietrich Wörner, actually made the point of manned missions being indispensable for space and planetary research. He said because human astronauts can access and act independently – unlike robots. He

also talked about the need for building permanent lunar bases; and he called this a Moon Village. And he said that this Moon Village can be constructed with a lot of material already existing on the Moon; and that the Moon Village would be a stepping stone to reaching other planets such as Mars and so forth.

Now, I wanted to say in that context, that I attended an event last night, and the speaker was speaking on the Curiosity mission; which most people remember landed on Mars in 2012. What

I brought up at that time was that the excitement around the fact

that – as Mr. LaRouche conceptualized it – that the mind of man

and the extended sensorium of man had now been put on Mars; but

that there are limitations to that. And the speaker recognized those limitations and he said something to the effect of what Mr.

Wörner said in Germany; which is, we have an obligation as mankind to actually go out into the reaches of space. To colonize

the Moon; to colonize Mars. And to build these colonies

because
of the limitations that are put on mankind. And he said that
we
have to look at it from the standpoint that this is our
destiny.

This is exactly what Krafft Ehrlicke recognized as he
presented a principal work called {Lunar Industrialization and
Settlement; Birth of Poly-Global Civilization}. In the work,
he
summarizes "the major aspects of lunar industrialization and
settlement, and identifies that scientific and evolutionary
facts
leading to a definitive justification of why man must
industrialize space. Changing our present closed world into a
present world. He also establishes the philosophy of the
extra-terrestrial imperative as a defense of justification for
a
long-term based on mankind's ability to transcend the limits
of
one small planet." And that is what Russia and China are
representing; the transformation and transcendence of this one
small planet being controlled by an imperial policy which is
ready to be ended and to be destroyed, {if} we do the right
thing
and we take the right actions.

If you look at this from the standpoint of the
continued
aspect of what you presented, Ben, as the objective of what
China
put forward as a win-win strategy of cooperation. They're
continuing to do that, as the Chinese space leaders have just
put
forth an additional perspective to that win-win strategy of
cooperation, international collaboration on the future Moon
missions. The first Chinese astronaut presented that a study
is
being conducted to justify the importance of lunar

exploration;
and Russia and the European Space Agency are already discussing
collaboration on lunar missions. The intention is that there
would be astronauts sent to the Moon by China by 2036; and he
presented this speaking at a conference on manned space
exploration in Russia. I think that that is quite
extraordinary,
because when you look at the fact that Obama has continued to
push a murderous policy against our space program, and to
continue to drive and perpetuate an extermination war for
mankind. The question is, why are the American people still
stuck
in a completely insane world of lies and fraud; thinking that
an
election actually has some real bearing on the future of
mankind,
when it doesn't?

What is going to determine the future is that the
United
States has to join with this perspective of a poly-global
world,
a world not confined by limitations; as Krafft Ehricke laid
out.
I think what we're going to witness – and Megan has presented
this on many occasions – within the next two years with
China's
mission to the far side of the Moon, puts a real perspective
on
the development of space. And building the permanent colonies;
but more importantly, it puts a perspective on that which is
going to determine what the future of mankind is going to be.
It's not going to be this election; it's not going to be this
bankrupt British Empire and Wall Street system. It's going to
be
the emergence of a new human species that – as Mr. LaRouche
has

defined – is actually focusing on what type of future do we want to create and must we create for our children and grandchildren. And that's the way that Russia and China and 50% of the world is joining them; they're not taking up these projects just because they want to build infrastructure and new projects. No lower intention of our perspective as a species can be taken up, except for the one which actually transforms the conception of who we are as a human species. That's what this political election is missing; that's what we've been missing in society as we've sat back with our eyes closed, blindfolded. Doing nothing about the injustices, the murderous policy, the war and so forth that has been dominating our society for far too long. Now that you're seeing that this drive for evil is about to end now, we should be a part of participating in that perspective for mankind; which is the alternative that's being presented right now.

SARE: Well, I think that's great. And to return to what was brought up at the very beginning, one of the flanks on this matter is the question of the Saudi role and Obama's protection of them in the 9/11 attacks. If you think about all of the wars that the United States has been engaged in since September 11, 2001, if that could be addressed in a sharp fashion; and if Obama were to be brought down, jailed, impeached, indicted. That

obviously would have a dramatic impact on what the future of the United States looked like, and the potential for our nation to be a welcome partner in this phenomenal change of direction for the world.

DENISTON: Yeah, that's definitely the critical flank we have. And I know, Diane, that you've expressed the importance of this obviously in New York in particular; obviously the major epicenter of these attacks. But the other aspect of this is, Obama has to go; the idea that we're going to wait for the election or something. This is bigger than that; this is about freeing the United States from this 9/11 dynamic as a whole. You look at this British-Saudi operation; it wasn't just something in and of itself. It was the event that was used by these British assets, who were created well before the event and had been operating well before the event, for these types of activities. Something that LaRouche has been going after since the '80s in terms of these covert, irregular warfare-type operations the British have created; including these Saudi fundamentalist factions.

I was just looking back at Putin's statements recently; how he was referencing the threat Russia is being faced with in regards to this NATO advancement. And he again referenced the US pulling out of the ABM Treaty in 2002. What was the ostensible reason for us doing that? 9/11. Now are we worried about ballistic missiles coming from the mujahideen in Afghanistan? Is

that why we had to pull out of the ABM Treaty; because we worried about Osama bin Laden out of some case we can't even find, operating ballistic missiles? It's been the cover to really pursue this whole insane perpetual war policy; this police state policy in the United States. The things you hear – "It was Bush, not Obama. So, how are you blaming Obama?" Obama is actively covering up for the worst atrocity committed against Americans on American soil in American history; and he's protecting that. And he's protecting the continuation of that as a process to ensure that the United States continues to act in this post-9/11 mode.

So I think breaking this issue, like you're saying, there's nothing else that needs to happen but that at this point.

BEETS: And on that, I think people are beginning to wake up to the war danger, which is becoming impossible to ignore especially in places like Europe. You had on Thursday night, a significant television segment on German TV which was titled "The Backers of 9/11; The Secret of the 28 Pages". Which centered on an interview with former Senator Bob Graham; going through exactly how the Bush and Obama governments have covered up what was clearly known to be Saudi government involvement in funding 9/11. And poses the question that not only do the past 15 years have to be re-examined and understood from a new perspective;

but
also raising the question of what this means for Germany. And I
think that's very important from the standpoint of what you
just
raised, Diane. What are the flanks; what are the things we can
pull? And we have this petition featured on the LaRouche PAC
site
right now, which is beginning rapidly gain signatures
internationally; which is called "The Warsaw Summit Prepares
for
War; It's Time to Leave NATO Now". And I would encourage
everybody to get on the site, sign it, and circulate it. I do
think this discussion has been very important, because it
really
does pose the question to the American people: Are we going to
continue in this perpetual state of childhood, adolescence?
Closing our eyes and sleepwalking into what would be the
biggest
disaster for mankind in all of history – complete extinction
warfare – will we permit that? Or will we choose a more
beautiful and better future? Which I think you laid out
beautifully, Kesha. And it reminded me, I just finished the
memoirs of the astronaut Michael Collins last night; the
third,
sometimes forgotten member of the Apollo 11 crew. And he says
at
the end of the book, I wish every member of government could
get
out into space and look down onto our planet; because borders
completely disappear. And you begin to realize that the so-
called
"conflicts" between people on Earth amount to nothing and that
we
have a common destiny. So, I think what you laid out there,
Kesha, really is what people need to be thinking about.

We need to forget our commitment to this dangerous

insanity

and silliness; and decide that we're committed to building a future.

So, unless there's anything else, we could leave it there for this week.

DENISTON: We have a lot more coming. I know there's going to be a rather exciting conference in the San Francisco Bay area, coming up in the middle of next week; June 8th. So, I think we'll look forward to getting reports on that, and more focal points of focus on getting the United States shifted to the direction we need.

ROGERS: If you're in the area, you should attend this.

DENISTON: Absolutely. It's to be seen as another follow-on after the excellent conference we had in Manhattan just recently. There's a lot going on; we're going to be doing a lot more. And again, this petition; we can post a link to it in the description below. People should be circulating it, signing it; getting as many signatures as possible. This is certainly a critical flank right now in the build-up to the upcoming NATO summit.

BEETS: Good. Thank you Diane and Kesha; thanks Ben. And I'd like to thank all of you watching; so stay tuned to larouchepac.com.