

# Den russiske præsident Putin: Tyrkisk politik er islamisering

25. november 2015 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin fortsatte sin skarpe fordømmelse af den tyrkiske regering efter det tyrkiske luftvåbens kampfly nedskød det russiske Su-24 bombefly. Efter at han i går anklagede tyrkerne for »at stikke en kniv i ryggen«, kom han her til morgen i bemærkninger, der er udskrevet på Kremles webside, med anklager om, at Tyrkiets politik i Syrien er islamisering.

»Problemet ligger ikke i den tragedie, vi var vidne til i går (SU-24-hændelsen), problemet stikker langt dybere«, sagde han til reportere. »Vi ser – og ikke kun vi, men jeg forsikrer jer for, at hele verden ser, at – at det nuværende lederskab i Tyrkiet i en årrække har forfulgt en overlagt politik for opbakning til islamisering og en islamisering af landet.«

»Islam er en af verdens store religioner og en af Ruslands traditionelle religioner. Vi støtter islam og vil fortsat gøre det. Men problemet her er opbakning til mere radikale strømninger, der skaber et uheldigt miljø, der ikke er så åbenlyst ved første øjekast«, fortsatte han. »Efter det, der skete i går, kan vi ikke udelukke muligheden af yderligere hændelser. Hvis sådanne hændelser finder sted, må vi respondere på den ene eller anden måde. Vore borgere i Tyrkiet kunne stå over for betydelige risici, selvfølgelig, og Udenrigsministeriet er forpligtet til at sige dette.«

Den russiske premierminister Dmitri Medvedev var ligeledes barsk mht. konsekvenserne af nedskydningen for de russisk-tyrkiske relationer:

»De tyrkiske myndigheders hensynsløse handling med nedskydningen af det russiske fly har ført til tre

konsekvenser. Den første er den farlige forværring af relationerne mellem Rusland og NATO, som ingen interesser kan retfærdiggøre, inklusive beskyttelse af statsgrænser«, sagde Medvedev. »Tyrkiets handlinger gør det grundlæggende set klart, at landet beskytter ISIL. Det er næppe overraskende i betragtning af rapporterne om, at visse tyrkiske regeringspersoner har særlige interesser i det faktum, at billige olieforsyninger kommer fra Islamisk Stat«, fortsatte Medvedev. »Og for det tredje, undermineringen af langvarige, venligtsindede relationer mellem Rusland og Tyrkiet, inklusive de økonomiske og humanitære sfærer. Det vil blive vanskeligt at kompensere for denne skade, og dens umiddelbare konsekvenser kunne blive til afvisning af en række vigtige fællesprojekter og tabet af tyrkiske selskabers position på det russiske marked«, sagde Medvedev.

Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, Alexander Grushko, sagde, at gårsdagens NATO-møde kunne have været et »sandhedens øjeblik«, men at øjeblikket ikke indtraf. »Erklæringen fra NATO's generalsekretær indeholder ikke så meget som en tøddel fordømmelse af det tyrkiske angreb på et russisk krigsfly, der ikke udgjorde nogen trussel mod Tyrkiets sikkerhed, og som fløj i syrisk luftrum«, sagde han. »Der blev ikke udtalt noget ord til sympati eller beklagelse i forbindelse med russiske piloters død under tjeneste for at bekæmpe terrorisme. Men den påpegede imidlertid endnu engang russiske luftstyrkers angivelige farlige militære aktivitet«, tilføjede han.

»Ankara har essentielt set opnået sit formål – ved at dække sig bag den nok som bekendte allierede solidaritet, tvang det alliancen til at undskylde dets ulovlige handling, der ikke alene underminerer den fælles indsats for bekæmpelse af Islamisk Stat/forbudt i Rusland, men skabte også risici for sikkerheden for de lande, der har allierede forpligtelser sammen med Tyrkiet«, fortsatte han. »Dette har endnu engang bekræftet, at NATO ikke ledes af principper, som dets medlemmer holder så meget af at spekulere i, men af sådanne,

der tjener den politiske hensigtsmæssighed. Og denne kendsgerning kan næppe forklædes under udadtil politiske korrekte appeller om 'selvbesindelse og deeskalering'«, sagde NATO-ambassadøren. Grushko påpegede, at det var NATO, der afbrød den militære kontakt til Rusland, og at NATO intet har gjort for at genoprette disse kontakter.

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Putin siger, Tyrkiets »ferræderiske kniv i ryggen« er uforklarligt.*

---

## **Tyskland: Tyrkiet er uberegnelig**

25. november 2015 – Den tyske vicekansler, Sigmar Gabriel, har udtrykt sin bekymring over Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk militærfly og sagde i Berlin i går: »For det første viser denne hændelse, at vi her har med en spiller at gøre, der, iflg. erklæringer fra forskellige steder i regionen, er uberegnelig: det er Tyrkiet, og således ikke russerne.«

Gabriel tilføjede: »Det faktum, at russerne nu udløser konfrontationen gennem en krænkelse af luftrummet, må ikke få os til at glemme, at også Tyrkiet spiller en vanskelig rolle i denne konflikt.« Han sagde, at han ikke ville udelukke, at planen om en anti-IS-koalition, der inkluderede Rusland, er blevet beskadiget. Samme bekymring gav også udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier udtryk for, da han i går aftes sagde, at »man må frygte, at den lille spire af håb om en diplomatisk løsning nu er blevet knust.«

Formanden for Sikkerhedskonferencen i München, Wolfgang

Ischinger, sagde, at hændelsen atter engang viser, at der ikke er nogen koordinering af alle skridt imod IS. Det, der skete i går, kunne forventes før eller senere, sagde han, og krævede intensiveret direkte kommunikation mellem NATO og Rusland for at deeskalere situationen.

Mere kritiske over for Tyrkiet var bemærkningerne fra Harald Kujat, tidl. generalinspektør for de tyske bevæbnede styrker, der i et interview til Bremen Radio her til morgen sagde, at selv om der stadig henstod mange ubesvarede spørgsmål om denne hændelse, så viste de optagelser, der allerede var tilgængelige, klart, at der aldrig var noget angreb på Tyrkiet, og at nedskydningen af flyet derfor var »unødvendigt og kunne have været undgået«. Affæren gør blot situationen langt mere kompliceret, end den allerede er, tilføjede Kujat og opfordrede kraftigt til direkte kommunikation i samme øjenhøjde mellem USA og Rusland, inklusive genindkaldelse af NATO-Ruslandsrådet.

*Foto: Tysklands udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier: »Man må frygte, at den lille spire af håb om en diplomatisk løsning nu er blevet knust.«*

---

**»Ville Tyrkiet handle uden  
USA's tilladelse?«  
spørger politiske**

# **kommentatorer McAdams og Escobar; Andre advarer om atomkrig**

*25. november 2015* – »Et spørgsmål lyder, ville [den tyrkiske præsident] Erdogan gøre dette uden USA's tilladelse, uden USA's støtte?«, sagde Daniel McAdams, adm. dir. for Ron Paul Instituttet for Fred og Fremgang i et interview i dag med Sputnik International. McAdams, en mangeårig støtte til Ron Paul i Kongressen, anklagede Tyrkiet for kriminel aktivitet med at hjælpe ISIS: »Dette er meget alvorligt«, sagde han, » ... Tyrkiet har gjort det muligt for sig selv at blive til et super-arnested for ISIS og andre jihadister, der kan bevæge sig frem og tilbage fra Syrien til Tyrkiet ... hvis man vil have kriminel aktivitet, er Tyrkiet mindst en medskyldig i forbrydelsen.«

McAdams inkluderede Obama i forbrydelsen: »Netop i denne uge overvejede USA at invitere al-Qaedas affilierede Ahrar ash-Sham til også at deltage i drøftelserne [om Syrien]. Så, 14 år efter, at al-Qaeda angreb USA den 11. september, taler USA om at bringe en organisation, der er tilknyttet al-Qaeda, ind, som en moderat opposition til Syrien.«

Obamas rolle rejses også af Pepe Escobar: »Lad os gå lige ind til benet. Den idé, at Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk Su-24-fly af et 'made-in-USA' F-16 blev gennemført uden enten grønt lys eller i det mindste en på forhånd arrangeret 'støtte' fra Washington«, er næsten umuligt at tro på. Dernæst fremlægger Escobar en synopsis over Tyrkiets beskidte rolle under 'Sultan Erdogan' med at hjælpe ISIS og smugling af olie, stjålet af ISIS, fra Syrien og Irak. Han dokumenterer også, at »Bilal Erdogan, sultanens søn, er en betydelig spekulant« inden for denne handel, og som Putin, bemærker han, afslørede under G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, i sidste uge.

Der er også alvorlige advarsler om faren for en atomkrig. Den republikanske præsidentkandidat Rand Paul sagde i går, iflg. *The Hill*: »Nedskydningen af et russisk kampfly illustrerer præcist, hvorfor vi må have en åben linje« til Rusland. Han knuste også andre kandidaters krav om en flyveforbudszone og sagde, »nedskydning af de andre landes kampfly vil blive resultatet, og en krig mellem atomare stormagter en mulighed«. Redaktøren af antiwar.com, Justin Raimondo, siger, at »amerikanerne vil have en ny Cubansk missilkrise ... Er I parate til Tredje Verdenskrig?«

*Foto: Den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan.*

---

# **Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Godkendte USA på forhånd Tyrkiets handling?**

25. november 2015 – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry kondolerede på USA's vegne over for den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov over telefon i dag, iflg. en erklæring udgivet af USA's Udenrigsministerium. Forud for telefonopringningen sagde Lavrov til reportere i Moskva, at Rusland ved, at USA altid af sine koalitions partnere i Syrien kræver, at brug af amerikanske kampfly koordineres med USA. Han påpegede således, iflg. TASS, den mulighed, at de tyrkiske myndigheder havde diskuteret deres beslutning om at beordre deres krigsfly i luften til at nedskyde det russiske fly med USA.

»Nogle medlemmer af koalitionen, inklusive dem, der leverer deres kampfly til angreb mod Irak og Syrien, har betroet os, at de involverede fly var af amerikansk fabrikat, og amerikanerne kræver normalt en tilladelse fra USA til sådanne operationer«, sagde Lavrov. »Så vidt jeg forstår, blev vores fly skudt ned af et amerikansk fremstillet F-16-fly. Vi ved endnu ikke, om USA's krav gælder for Tyrkiet, og hvis det gør, ville jeg gerne vide, om Tyrkiet har spurgt USA om lov til at sende sine fly af sted på en kampmission og nedskyde et fly, selv om dette sandsynligvis er identificeret, over syrisk territorium.«

Lavrov mindede Kerry om, at, under bestemmelserne i Forståelsesmemorandaet (MOU) om dekonfliktion tager USA direkte ansvaret for de såkaldte koalitionspartners handlinger, og det omfatter Tyrkiet. Lavrov bemærkede ligeledes, at Tyrkiet og Rusland, uafhængigt af MOU'et, etablerede en 'hot line' telefonforbindelse, men at der ikke var nogen indsats fra nogen tyrkisk regeringsperson for at bruge denne linje til at afværge nedskydningen.

Lavrov talte også med sin tyrkiske modpart, Ahmet Cavusoglu, tidligere på dagen. Lavrov sagde, at Rusland ikke har nogen planer om at gå i krig med Tyrkiet, men at de planlagte russiske, diplomatiske besøg til Tyrkiet, og vice versa, heller ikke vil blive gennemført. Lavrov sagde, at hans tyrkiske modpart gav udtryk for beklagelse over Sukhoi-24M-hændelsen, men forsøgte samtidig at fremlægge undskyldninger for de handlinger, som det tyrkiske luftvåben begik.

»Hvad bør Tyrkiet gøre for at normalisere situationen?«, spurgte Lavrov. »Vi må nødvendigvis drage den konklusion, at angreb som det i går til syvende og sidst er absolut uacceptabelt. Jeg har hørt kondolencer fra [den tyrkiske udenrigs]minister Cavusoglu, men alle de andre erklæringer havde til hensigt at retfærdiggøre den tyrkiske holdning.«

Lavrov bemærkede også, at angrebet på Ruslands Su-24M-fly

ligner en planlagt provokation. »Vi betvivler alvorligt, at det var uagtsomt; det ligner en planlagt provokation«, sagde Lavrov og tilføjede, at nogle russiske partnere kalder nedskydningen for »et åbenlyst bagholdsangreb«.

---

## **Leder, 26. november 2015: Dump Obama, eller se en atomar udslettelseskrig i øjnene**

Den britiske agent Barack Obama stod bag den tyrkiske nedskydning af det russiske Su-24 fly over syrisk luftrum tirsdag, den 24. november, og den russiske regering har gjort det klart, at det er fuldt ud klar over Obamas medskyldighed. I en telefonsamtale med den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry onsdag påpegede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at, under bestemmelserne i forståelsesmemorandaet om dekonfliktion, som USA og Rusland for nyligt underskrev, tog USA ansvaret for alle de såkaldte koalitionsparnteres handlinger. Mere præcist, så påpegede Lavrov, at angrebet på det russiske fly blev udført af et amerikansk fremstillet F-16, og der foreligger en bindende forståelse, der går ud på, at offensive operationer med anvendelse af amerikansk fremstillede fly skal cleares forud.

I det umiddelbare kølvand på nedskydningen af den russiske jet var det vigtigt for præsident Obama at telefonere til den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan for at forsikre ham om, at USA fuldt ud støttede hans »suveræne« handlinger. I sin afskyelige pressekonference sammen med den franske præsident Hollande



tirsdag aften kastede Obama sig i sit storhedsvanvid ud i et angreb på Putin og Rusland og kaldte dem »afvigerne« og »tilbød« Rusland en sidste chance for at slutte sig til den amerikansk ledede »koalition«, der udfører den rigtige bekæmpelse af ISIS.

Obama gjorde det, han gør bedst – han løj, patologisk, på vegne af sine britiske herrer. I umindelige tider har den britiske kronens strategi været den at fremprovokere krig mellem USA og Rusland og bære ved til bålet for en permanent befolkningskrig internt i den muslimske verden, mellem sunni og shia, ved at anvende deres (briternes) saudiske juniorpartnere som hovedprovokatører. Nu er Tyrkiet, under det korrupte Erdogan-regime, blevet bragt ind i blandingen for at oppiske betingelserne for en verdenskrig. Obama har været hovedaktivet for denne britiske krigsstrategi, lige siden han tiltrådte embedet, og indledte sin første embedsperiode med et besøg hos Dronning Elizabeth og Prins Philip i London, tre måneder efter sin indsættelse.

Et voksende antal politiske analytikere har tilsluttet sig Lyndon LaRouches afsløring af Obamas medskyldighed i tirsdagens tyrkiske handlinger. John Helmer i Moskva, Justin Raimondo, Daniel McAdams fra Ron Paul Institute og Pepe Escobar har inden for de seneste 24 timer alle offentligt udtalt, at Erdogan aldrig ville have lanceret et angreb mod det russiske fly uden forudgående godkendelse fra Obama.

I respons til det tyrkiske angreb har præsident Putin annonceret flere omgående militære modforholdsregler, inklusive deployeringen af de mest avancerede S-400 luftforsvarssystemer til den russiske luftbase i den syriske provins Latakia, udstationeringen af et overflade-til-luft (SAM) missilskib ud for Syriens kyst, samt en opgradering af ledsagefly, der kan afværge angreb, til alle fremtidige russiske bombetogter imod ISIS og mål i Syrien. Den russiske regering har gjort det klart, at de har beviser, inkl. varmesporet fra det nedskudte Su-24-fly, på, at flyet aldrig

var inde over tyrkisk luftrum. En unavngiven amerikansk regeringsperson sagde til Reuters og andre nyhedsbureauer, at det russiske fly blev skudt ned over syrisk luftrum efter en meget kort passage gennem tyrkisk luftrum, der ikke kunne have varet mere end nogle få sekunder. Angrebet var planlagt på forhånd, med fuldt overlæg, og havde til hensigt at smadre klimaet efter angrebene i Paris, hvor en potentiel afgørelse af den fem år lange krig i Syrien og en koncentreret kampagne for at nedkæmpe ISIS og Nusra var ved at komme op at stå.

Putin vil svare tilbage med et flankangreb, på linje med sin deployering af russiske styrker i Syrien, der fundamentalt ændrede konfliktens kurs, i september måned.

Skulle der herske nogen tvivl om, at dette er et globalt, britisk/Obama-ledet krigsfremstød mod Rusland, så se blot på Ukraine, hvor Sektor Højre har bombet elektricitetsledninger til Krim, og hvor Victoria Nulands (USA's viceudenrigsminister for eurasiske og europæiske anliggender, -red.) kæledægge, 'Jats' Jatsenjuk, netop har meddelt, at han har forbudt russiske fly enhver adgang til det ukrainske luftrum. Det svarer til en trussel om at nedskyde et russisk fly, hvornår det skal være.

Briternes største sårbarhed i dette fremstød for krig er Barack Obama. Han har begået forbrydelser imod menneskeheden, og så mange kriminelle handlinger, der berettiger til, at han stilles for en rigsret, at han udelukkende kun stadig er i embedet takket være fejheden og opportunismen hos de fleste af Kongressens medlemmer og det amerikanske folk, der tolererer hans eksistens, med deres eget liv som indsats.

## **Dokumentation:**

## **Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Godkendte USA på forhånd Tyrkiets handling?**

25. november 2015 – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry kondolerede på USA's vegne over for den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov over telefon i dag, iflg. en erklæring udgivet af USA's Udenrigsministerium. Forud for telefonopringningen sagde Lavrov til reportere i Moskva, at Rusland ved, at USA altid af sine koalitions partnere i Syrien kræver, at brug af amerikanske kampfly koordineres med USA. Han påpegede således, iflg. TASS, den mulighed, at de tyrkiske myndigheder havde diskuteret deres beslutning om at beordre deres krigsfly i luften til at nedskyde det russiske fly med USA.

»Nogle medlemmer af koalitionen, inklusive dem, der leverer deres kampfly til angreb mod Irak og Syrien, har betroet os, at de involverede fly var af amerikansk fabrikat, og amerikanerne kræver normalt en tilladelse fra USA til sådanne operationer«, sagde Lavrov. »Så vidt jeg forstår, blev vores fly skudt ned af et amerikansk fremstillet F-16-fly. Vi ved endnu ikke, om USA's krav gælder for Tyrkiet, og hvis det gør, ville jeg gerne vide, om Tyrkiet har spurgt USA om lov til at sende sine fly af sted på en kampmission og nedskyde et fly, selv om dette sandsynligvis er identificeret, over syrisk territorium.«

Lavrov mindede Kerry om, at, under bestemmelserne i Forståelsesmemorandaet (MOU) om dekonfliktion tager USA direkte ansvaret for de såkaldte koalitions partners handlinger, og det omfatter Tyrkiet. Lavrov bemærkede ligeledes, at Tyrkiet og Rusland, uafhængigt af MOU'et, etablerede en 'hot line' telefonforbindelse, men at der ikke var nogen indsats fra nogen tyrkisk regeringsperson for at bruge denne linje til at afværge nedskydningen.

Lavrov talte også med sin tyrkiske modpart, Ahmet Cavusoglu, tidligere på dagen. Lavrov sagde, at Rusland ikke har nogen planer om at gå i krig med Tyrkiet, men at de planlagte russiske, diplomatiske besøg til Tyrkiet, og vice versa, heller ikke vil blive gennemført. Lavrov sagde, at hans tyrkiske modpart gav udtryk for beklagelse over Sukhoi-24M-hændelsen, men forsøgte samtidig at fremlægge undskyldninger for de handlinger, som det tyrkiske luftvåben begik.

»Hvad bør Tyrkiet gøre for at normalisere situationen?«, spurgte Lavrov. »Vi må nødvendigvis drage den konklusion, at angreb som det i går til syvende og sidst er absolut uacceptable. Jeg har hørt kondolencer fra [den tyrkiske udenrigs]minister Cavusoglu, men alle de andre erklæringer havde til hensigt at retfærdiggøre den tyrkiske holdning.«

Lavrov bemærkede også, at angrebet på Ruslands Su-24M-fly ligner en planlagt provokation. »Vi betvivler alvorligt, at det var uagtsomt; det ligner en planlagt provokation«, sagde Lavrov og tilføjede, at nogle russiske partnere kalder nedskydningen for »et åbenlyst bagholdsangreb«.

## **»Ville Tyrkiet handle uden USA's tilladelse?« spørger politiske kommentatorer McAdams og Escobar; Andre advarer om atomkrig**

25. november 2015 – »Et spørgsmål lyder, ville [den tyrkiske præsident] Erdogan gøre dette uden USA's tilladelse, uden USA's støtte?«, sagde Daniel McAdams, adm. dir. for Ron Paul Instituttet for Fred og Fremgang i et interview i dag med Sputnik International. McAdams, en mangeårig støtte til Ron Paul i Kongressen, anklagede Tyrkiet for kriminel aktivitet med at hjælpe ISIS: »Dette er meget alvorligt«, sagde han, » ... Tyrkiet har gjort det muligt for sig selv at blive til et

super-arnested for ISIS og andre jihadister, der kan bevæge sig frem og tilbage fra Syrien til Tyrkiet ... hvis man vil have kriminel aktivitet, er Tyrkiet mindst en medskyldig i forbrydelsen.«

McAdams inkluderede Obama i forbrydelsen: »Netop i denne uge overvejede USA at invitere al-Qaedas affilierede Ahrar ash-Sham til også at deltage i drøftelserne [om Syrien]. Så, 14 år efter, at al-Qaeda angreb USA den 11. september, taler USA om at bringe en organisation, der er tilknyttet al-Qaeda, ind, som en moderat opposition til Syrien.«

Obamas rolle rejses også af Pepe Escobar: »Lad os gå lige ind til benet. Den idé, at Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk Su-24-fly af et 'made-in-USA' F-16 blev gennemført uden enten grønt lys eller i det mindste en på forhånd arrangeret 'støtte' fra Washington«, er næsten umuligt at tro på. Dernæst fremlægger Escobar en synopsis over Tyrkiets beskidte rolle under 'Sultan Erdogan' med at hjælpe ISIS og smugling af olie, stjålet af ISIS, fra Syrien og Irak. Han dokumenterer også, at »Bilal Erdogan, sultanens søn, er en betydelig spekulant« inden for denne handel, og som Putin, bemærker han, afslørede under G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, i sidste uge.

Der er også alvorlige advarsler om faren for en atomkrig. Den republikanske præsidentkandidat Rand Paul sagde i går, iflg. *The Hill*: »Nedskydningen af et russisk kampfly illustrerer præcist, hvorfor vi må have en åben linje« til Rusland. Han knuste også andre kandidaters krav om en flyveforbudszone og sagde, »nedskydning af de andre landes kampfly vil blive resultatet, og en krig mellem atomare stormagter en mulighed«. Redaktøren af antiwar.com, Justin Raimondo, siger, at »amerikanerne vil have en ny Cubansk missilkrise ... Er I parate til Tredje Verdenskrig?«

---

# **Leder, 25. november 2015: Obama har organiseret en krigshandling – Ekstraordinær diskussion med Lyndon Larouche torsdag – Ekstraordinær live diskussion med Tom Gillesberg torsdag aften – Vær med**

Lyndon LaRouche responderede i dag til den tyrkiske nedskydning af et russisk kampfly ved at erklære, at »Obama har organiseret en krigshandling og har således sat USA, såvel som resten af menneskeheden, i fare.

Kvalificerede amerikanske personer har, i det umiddelbare kølvand af Tyrkiets handling, understreget, at Tyrkiets præsident Erdogan aldrig ville have udført denne aktion, hvis han ikke på forhånd vidste, at han havde stiltiende støtte fra Obama. De samme kilder observerede, at Obama i weekenden var rasende over, at den franske regering, under et enormt folkeligt pres, har taget skridt til en reel alliance med Rusland for at knuse ISIS. I skarp kontrast til denne fornuftige, franske respons til angrebene i Paris den 13. november har Obama gentaget sine krav om, at afsættelsen af den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad må finde sted omgående, og må gå forud for aktionerne imod Islamisk Stat.

LaRouche krævede Obamas omgående fjernelse fra embedet. »Der

kan ikke være nogen undskyldninger for Obama, hvis menneskeheden skal overleve. Vejen bort fra Tredje Verdenskrig er, at retskafne amerikanere fordømmer præsidenten ved enhver given lejlighed.«

Gå ind på <https://larouchepac.com/> og hør **Lyndon LaRouche i en ekstraordinær diskussion, fremkaldt af denne nødssituation**, med aktivister i hele USA

onsdag, kl. 21 Eastern time (kl. 03.00 torsdag dansk tid)

**OBS! Benyt chancen for at diskutere live med Tom Gillesberg torsdag aften, se opslag om konferencelinje her på hjemmesiden**

---

## **De fem brændpunkter for Tredje Verdenskrig**

22. november 2015 – Robert Farley, en seniorlektor ved Patterson School for Diplomati og International Handel ved Kentucky Universitet, advarer om, at der er fem mulige måder, hvorpå Tredje Verdenskrig (eller efter hans mening snarere Femte Verdenskrig, idet han tæller Syvårskrigen og Napoleonskrigene med som verdenskrige) kunne begynde.

Brændpunkterne omfatter de følgende:

\* **Syrien** – Enten kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly i luften over Syrien eskalere ud af kontrol, eller også bliver ISIS besejret, men USA, Frankrig og Rusland bliver rivaler over, hvordan Syrien efter ISIS skal se ud.

\* **Indien og Pakistan** – Indien og Pakistan kunne komme i krig igen af flere grunde. USA har generelt været tæt på Pakistan, men har været i færd med at dyrke tættere relationer med Indien. Kina har længe militært været tæt på Pakistan. Farley nævner ikke Rusland, der rent historisk har haft tætte relationer til Indien, inklusive militært.

\* **Det Østkinesiske Hav** – Kina og Japan er modstandere mht. Senkaku/Daiyou-øerne. USA er traktatmæssigt forpligtet til at forsvare Japan, hvilket gør det næsten sikkert, at, skulle der udbryde kampe, ville USA gå ind på Japans side.

\* **Det Sydkinesiske Hav** – En krig mellem USA og Kina kunne trække Japan og Indien med og kunne resultere i en udveksling af atomvåben.

\* **Ukraine** – En konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland kunne forårsage, at Rusland tyer til taktiske atomvåben, hvis det mener, det ikke kan overleve.

Farley konkluderer, at vi mangler den Kolde Krigs »rædselsvækkende« klarhed. »Der kunne udbryde krig flere steder, som kunne trække krigsførende parter med ind på uforudsigelige måder«, skriver han. »Krigsførende parter begynder meget sjældent en krig med overlæg; lederne af verdens mest magtfulde nationer må være på vagt over for truslen om en optrapning af kriser.«

*Foto: Russiske jets under en "aerobatic" flyveopvisning i Rusland. Kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly over Syrien komme ud af kontrol og eskalere?*



---

# Leder, 23. november 2015: Det er det Britiske Imperium, tåbe!

Med Bruxelles i højeste alarmberedskab på anden dag i forventning om endnu et større terrorangreb fra Islamisk Stat på samme skala som massakren i Paris den 13. november, er der stigende opmærksomhed omkring den kendsgerning, at omdrejningspunktet for jihadistisk terrorisme i realiteten findes i hjertet af Europa. Bruxelles, hovedstad for både NATO og Den europæiske Union, har nu fået kaldenavnet Brusselstan, ligesom London længe er blevet refereret til som Londonistan på grund af den kendsgerning, at bogstavelig talt enhver jihadistisk, narko- og separatistterrororganisation har fået husly, beskyttelse og finansiering af det britiske monarki. For nylig frafaldt den britiske regering alle anklager imod en angiveligt jihadistisk våbensmugler, fordi hans forsvarsadvokat påpegede, at de samme grupper, som han stod anklaget for at bevæbne, blev åbenlyst støttet af det britiske efterretningsvæsens MI6.

Dette er en gammel historie. London har været centrum for global terrorisme i årtier. Executive Intelligence Review var ophavsmand til et dossier, som blev overgivet USA's Udenrigsministerium i 2000, og som krævede, at Storbritannien blev sat på listen over stater, der sponsorerede terrorisme. Dossieret byggede udelukkende på bevismateriale, der var fremkommet gennem regeringer i hele verden, inklusive Rusland, Egypten, Indien, Pakistan, Colombia og Peru, og som på afgørende vis viste, at den britiske krone husede verdens værste terrorister, som en del af imperiesystemet. De største britiske banker, med HSBC (tidligere HonKong og Shanghai

Bankselskab, berygtet for opiumskrigene) i spidsen, er verdens mest berygtede hvidvaskningsinstitutioner for narkopenge, som det for nylig er blevet dokumenteret af USA's Senat.

Det er ligeledes det britiske kongehus, der har udsendt Ridderkommandør John Schnellhuber til at kapre Paven og Vatikanet for ideen om en radikal befolkningsreduktion, baseret på den videnskabelige svindel med menneskeskabt, global opvarmning.

Alle de grusomheder, som præsident Obama har begået – fra hans massedronedrab i Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen og Somalia, til hans voldelige afsættelse og koldblodige mord på Gaddafi i Libyen, der skabte en zone af kaos, terror og utilstrækkelige stater i store dele af Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, og til decimeringen af livsvilkårene for det store flertal af amerikanere – kan anbringes på det britiske kongehus' dørtærskel. Obama er intet andet end en britisk agent, der blev udvalgt af briterne til at blive installeret som præsident for USA, på vegne af Kronen og City of London.

Efter grusomhederne i Paris er det i stigende grad ved at blive åbenlyst gennemskueligt for et voksende antal tænkende mennesker, at Islamisk Stat er en skabelse af Obama og briterne. Al-Qaeda blev skabt og næret af briterne, USA og Saudi Arabien i 1980'erne, som kollektivt samlede et slæng af terrorister fra fængsler i hele den arabiske og islamiske verden, for at drive sovjetrusserne ud af Afghanistan. I 1985 sluttede Prins Bandar bin Sultan, bogstavelig talt et medlem af Bush-familien, sig til den britiske premierminister Margaret Thatcher for at lancere Al-Yamamah-byttehandelen (våben for olie), under hvilken en 100 milliarder dollar stor, hemmelig fond blev etableret for i hemmelighed at bevæbne al-Qaeda og andre terrororganisationer. I 2001 deployerede Bandar nogle af disse Al Yamamah-midler til at finansiere 11. september-flykaprernes angreb på World Trade Tårnene og angribe Pentagon.

Hvis man vil forstå, hvorfor den britiske agent Barack Obama har nægtet at ophæve hemmeligstemplingen af de 28 sider af den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, må man begynde fra toppen, med denne redegørelse for, hvordan briterne og Obama skabte al-Qaeda og, senere, Islamisk Stat. Tidligere chef for USA's Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, general Michael Flynn, har åbenlyst rapporteret om, at præsident Obama bevæbnede de syriske oprørere fra Benghazi og fortsatte med at gøre det, fordi det var regeringens politik. DIA-dokumenter fra sommeren og efteråret 2012 forklarer i detaljer de fælles britisk-amerikanske operationer fra Benghazi til smuglerhavne i de områder i Syrien, der kontrolleredes af oprørerne.

Lyndon LaRouche sagde ligefremt til medarbejdere søndag den 22. november, at man må udrydde det britiske monarki, eller også vil der ikke være nogen løsning på krigen i Syrien eller andre globale brændpunkter. Med mindre Det britiske Imperium fjernes, står vi over for en global krig imod Rusland og Kina, der vil føre til udslettelsen af store dele af menneskeheden. Barack Obama er en britisk agent, der blev selekteret til at blive USA's præsident af briterne. Vi må sænke Det britiske Imperium og alt, hvad det repræsenterer, eller også vil vi stå over for en optrapning af rædselsforestillinger over hele planeten.

---

**LaRouchePAC    Fredags-webcast  
20. november 2015:**

# **Obamaregeringen skaber kaos med overlæg ved at sprænge verden luften. Fjern ham, eller se en større katastrofe i øjnene.**

*Som hr. LaRouche eftertrykkeligt erklærede under vores diskussion med ham, så er den amerikanske præsident Obamas politik den førende årsag til det kaos, som verden nu befinder sig i, og har ikke alene bevirket skabelsen af en frugtbar yngleplads for vækst og deployering af terrororganisationer som ISIS i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, men har også bragt os helt ud på randen af krig med Rusland og Kina – en krig, som ville blive en verdenskrig med anvendelse af atomvåben, som ville betyde udslettelsen af det store flertal af denne planets befolkning. Med Jeff Steinberg m. fl.*

*Engelsk udskrift.*

International LaRouche PAC Webcast for Friday November 20 2015

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 20, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly broadcast

here from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in the studio tonight by both Jeffrey Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and we have

a very timely and important presentation prepared for you tonight, which was informed by a meeting that the three of us had

earlier today with both Lyndon LaRouche, as well as Helga

Zepp-LaRouche, who joined us via video-call from Europe. Obviously we're meeting here tonight exactly one week following the horrific terrorist attacks in Paris last Friday. As Helga LaRouche emphasized during our discussion with her earlier, the sheer horror of these attacks, striking as they did at the heart of one of the leading cities of Europe, claiming the lives of 130 innocent people, who were slaughtered in cold blood as they went around their usual business on a Friday night – this has absolutely changed everything, and has served to force people across Europe, and in the United States, to recognize that a sudden and dramatic change in policy must be adopted, or else the entirety of Western Civilization is on the verge of descending into a total hell on earth, from which it would be virtually impossible to return. As Mr. LaRouche emphatically stated in our discussion with him, the policies of US President Barack Obama are the leading cause of the chaos which the world now finds itself in, and have served not only to create a fertile breeding ground for the growth and deployment of terrorist organizations like ISIS in the Middle East and North Africa, but have brought us right to the edge of a war with Russia, and with China – a war that would be world war, which would involve the use of thermonuclear weapons, which would mean the extermination of a vast majority of the population on this planet. Now in a very significant development, which I know Jeff will go a little bit more into, and will elaborate on in his remarks, this fact has been explicitly stated by a Congresswoman,

whom we've spoken about previously on these broadcasts, Rep. Tulsi Gabbard, a Democrat from Hawaii, in a press release which

she issued earlier today, announcing the filing of a bill in the

House of Representatives that, in her words, would bring an immediate end to the illegal, counter-productive war to overthrow

the Syrian government of Assad, Barack Obama's war. Congresswoman

Gabbard explains:

"The war to overthrow Assad is illegal and counterproductive, because it actually helps ISIS and other Islamic extremists achieve their goal of overthrowing the Syrian

government of Assad and taking control of all of Syria." Then she

lists 10 reasons, which include the fact that if we are to succeed in overthrowing Assad, as Barack Obama wishes, it would

open the door for ISIS to take over all of Syria, including Damascus, in which case, she says, "there will be genocide and suffering on a scale beyond our imagination."

She also states that the overthrowing of the government of Assad is the goal of ISIS, and other Islamic extremist groups, and "we should not be allying ourselves with these Islamic extremists by helping them achieve their goal, because it is against the security interests of the United States and all of civilization." And she also says that we should learn from the past mistakes in both the regime changes in Iraq and in Libya, which is saying something from a combat veteran, Congresswoman Gabbard, who was herself deployed in the war in Iraq.

Now, she also makes the point that Obama's war has been the direct exacerbation of the chaos and the carnage in Syria inflicted by ISIS on the innocent people of that country, which

has caused the number of refugees being forced to flee Syria

and

elsewhere, to continue to increase at a rapid rate. And later in

the broadcast that is something that I know Ben Deniston will also be addressing.

But most significantly, she lists as reason number 10:

“Because our war to overthrow the Assad government puts us in direct conflict with Russia, and increases the likelihood of war

between the United States and Russia, and the possibility of another world war.” So, as far as I know, that makes Tulsi Gabbard the only sitting member of Congress to have had the guts

to state that fact as explicitly and clearly.

I just want to read one more short excerpt from her press release before introducing our institutional question for this evening. Congresswoman Gabbard concludes her press release by stating: “To destroy ISIS will take international alliances.

If

we are serious about defeating ISIS, and solving the refugee problem, we’ll work in partnership with Russia, with France, and

anyone else who is serious about destroying ISIS and affiliated

Islamic extremist organizations worldwide. The problem is because

the U.S. is trying to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad,

and Russia is supporting the government of Assad, it is impossible for us to have an effective cooperative relationship

with Russia in our mutual fight against ISIS. Our focus on overthrowing Assad is interfering with our ability to destroy ISIS. We must immediately end the illegal, counterproductive war

to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad, and ally ourselves

with any countries willing to focus on destroying the Islamic extremists who pose a genuine threat to civilization.”

So this brings us directly to our institutional question for this evening, to which I’m going to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche’s response. The question reads as follows: “Mr. LaRouche, the Russian Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev has said that the best way to combat the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, or ISIS, is for Russia to unite with the West in a grand alliance to defeat this common threat of terrorism. In this regard, Russia is already coordinating airstrikes against ISIS with France. How do you envision a closer collaboration between the United States and Russia in this fight to defeat ISIS, and all of its affiliated terrorist organizations?”

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Mr. LaRouche was very blunt, as you’ll hear in a just a moment, and in fact, he took the question one step beyond the otherwise very important and admirable comments made by Congresswoman Gabbard today. And by the way, that press release was announcing the introduction of a bill into the U.S. House of Representatives that would formally ban the Obama administration from any further actions to overthrow the Assad government. Now, during our discussion with Mr. LaRouche, I took rather detailed notes so what I’m about to read to you are not verbatim transcripts of what Mr. LaRouche had to say, but they will give you a very clear flavor, and represent I think a pretty accurate accounting from Mr. LaRouche’s comments. And the very first thing that he said is, to defeat ISIS in partnership with the



Russians,  
you have to get rid of Obama. Putin surprised everyone with his  
military move into Syria in September; and it was the only way to  
do it. Obama is sunk in, and there is no alternative until he is  
removed; and this cannot be postponed. We're running out of  
time,  
and we are on the verge of the total collapse of the US  
system;  
he must be thrown out immediately. And LaRouche went on to  
add,  
we must totally dump Wall Street and adopt the approach of FDR  
at  
the start of his New Deal. Roosevelt solved the problem within  
weeks of taking office, by changing the entire direction of the  
nation after the disaster of President Herbert Hoover. Everything  
changed within a few years. The idea of totally shutting down  
Wall Street is not difficult for intelligent people to  
understand; nothing else works. Congress is pussyfooting  
around.  
Wall Street must be shut, and a new Federal operation must be  
launched to rebuild the nation. Do not try to salvage any part  
of  
the old system. The problem is that most people in Congress  
are  
idiots; and the President of the United States is a criminal.  
When you have a criminal leading idiots, you have a system  
that  
will not work. So, Obama must be thrown out, and there is no  
alternative to that. All of the evidence is there. Shut down  
Wall  
Street! It's not needed.  
Furthermore, Obama has committed so many crimes in fact,

that he can be removed from office at any moment. Start with his Tuesday kill sessions; these are crimes that not only demand his removal from office, but should land him in prison for mass murder. Obama has presided over the destruction of the US economy, to the point that a majority of our citizens are facing the disaster of impoverishment. He has followed the George Bush/Dick Cheney cover-up of 9/11; this is typical for Obama, who is nothing but a British agent protecting the brutish. And so, the problem is not with the evidence; the problem is that most members of Congress lack guts. The Tuesday kill meetings tell it all. The vast majority of people killed on Obama's personal orders, were innocent bystanders; not even the so-called "legitimate targets". And Obama personally signed off on every one of those killings.

Now, I want you to take a look at one of the documents that was released as part of the "Drone Papers". We've talked about this repeatedly for the last four or five weeks. The "Drone Papers" that were published by {The Intercept}, a web-based news organization founded by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill, are hundreds of pages of documents from the Pentagon and from the House Select Committee on Intelligence. Now the specific document that you're looking at, is a flowchart that goes through step-by-step the procedures that are used to establish who will be killed. This is the process that ultimately leads up to those Tuesday kill meetings, where President Obama personally presides.

If you follow the chain of command – and this is dealing with two specific operations within the overall drone kill program –

one operation in Somalia called Operation Jupiter Garrett; and another operation in Yemen called Copper Dune. In every instance,

the process for deciding on the kill order goes up from the local

military intelligence units on the ground, up through the military command all the way through the Joint Chiefs of Staff,

up to the Secretary of Defense, and up to the Principals Committee and the Deputy Principals Committee; these are the Cabinet and Deputy Cabinet officials of the government. But ultimately, everything leads back to the President of the United

States. And it's only with President Obama's personal signature

that the kill orders go out; the clock starts, and there is a 60-day deadline to track down and kill the designated target. Now, even by the criteria that are contained in this

document, we know from the House Intelligence review and from other exposés that none of the guidelines have been followed; and

that all of procedures that were supposedly built in to make sure

that innocent civilian casualties were avoided, that there was direct confirmation of the whereabouts of the target – none of those things were adhered to. At the very bottom, it says that

“At every level, the targetting window suitability is determined

by rules of engagement.” The rules of engagement are that there

must be low collateral damage estimates; meaning “collateral damage” is a polite word for innocent civilians being killed in

the course of the attacks. There must be “near certainty” of

the high-value individual's presence, based on two forms of intelligence and no contradictory intelligence; and then, all the way up the chain of command – including the host government – must all concur, or otherwise no strike is allowed to take place.

Now, I can tell you that having reviewed the totality of the "Drone Papers", that these procedures – as minimal and as limited as they are – were never adhered to. None of these conditions were met in the overwhelming majority of these kill incidents. And to give you an idea of the callousness of this structure under President Obama, the formal name given to the summary documents; the photographs and documentary evidence that

was used to determine whether or not the President will sign off

on a kill order, is referred to in these meetings as the "baseball card". So, in other words, the lack of any sense of what this program is all about, is absolutely stunning.

Now, let me just add that, earlier today, President Obama, Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, and CIA Director John Brennan received a letter that was written by four former US Air Force Drone Team members. They are: Brandon Bryant, Sion Westmoreland,

Stephen Lewis, and Michael Haas; all four of them operated for years as members of the drone crew. And they wrote this letter,

urging the President to end the program right now; and I want to

read you what they had to say, because I think it's one of the most powerful testaments to the murderous criminality of our President. And it should make very clear that anything short of

immediate removal from office, by impeachment, or invoking of the

25th Amendment, or forcing his immediate resignation is

unacceptable and doesn't rise to the magnitude of the crisis that we're in, or the crimes that he's committed. Here's the letter:

"We are former Air Force service members. We joined the Air Force to protect American lives and to protect our Constitution. We came to the realization that the innocent civilians we were killing, only fueled the feelings of hatred that ignited terrorism and groups like ISIS, while also serving as a fundamental recruitment tool similar to Guantanamo Bay. This administration and its predecessors have built a drone program that is one of the most devastating driving forces for terrorism and destabilization around the world. When the guilt of our roles in facilitating this systematic loss of innocent life became too much, all of us succumbed to PTSD – post-traumatic stress disorder. We were cut loose by the same government we gave so much to, sent out in the world without adequate medical care, reliable public health services, or necessary benefits. Some of us are now homeless. Others of us barely make it. We witnessed gross waste, mismanagement, abuse of power, and our country's leaders lying publicly about the effectiveness of the drone program. We cannot sit silently by and witness tragedies like the attacks in Paris, knowing the devastating effects the drone program has, overseas and at home. Such silence would violate the very oaths we took to support and defend the Constitution. We request that you consider our perspective, though perhaps that request is in vain, given the unprecedented prosecutions of truth-tellers who came before us, like Chelsea Manning, Julian Assange, and Edward Snowden. For the sake of this country, we hope it is otherwise."

Now, again, Mr. LaRouche has put the right punctuation mark on the situation, and has made clear that nothing can be accomplished, nothing can be effectively achieved in partnership

with the Russians, unless Obama is removed. I want to continue briefly reading the remainder of Mr. LaRouche's comments to us this afternoon, and then we'll move on. He said, the gutlessness of the Congress really started in the current context

with the attacks of 9/11, with Cheney and company. He said, I still have vivid recollection of the planes crashing into the twin towers. This is a Manhattan issue. It goes to the heart of

the Bush family, and the heart of the Obama legacy. Obama's personality was shaped by his step-father, who was a cold murderer. Obama has blood on his hands; he's too dangerous for mankind. Since the Russians launched their Syria operations in September, and especially since the Paris attacks of one week ago, there is an implicit taming of Obama, but he is still too dangerous to be allowed to remain in office. Imagine where we would be today without Putin's actions and the actions of China.

The Victory Day parade in Beijing attended by Xi Jinping and Putin established the Asian factor as a supreme factor in world

affairs. Compare that to the mess we see in France, the mess we

see in Germany, and elsewhere. So you must remove Obama from office, or we can't make it.

Now, he then returned to the question of Wall Street, which Obama's Presidency has protected up and down the line. Wall Street is about to implode, and we must shut it down now. Treat

Wall Street as something that no longer exists. Use FDR's methods

with even more emphasis. Write off all of Wall Street's assets out of existence, and develop a program, an FDR program, to

change the direction of the economy. Create a credit system, and make it known that nothing will be paid on the useless assets of Wall Street. And Mr. LaRouche ended by simply noting, Clinton was blackmailed into going along with the end of Glass-Steagall, and Hillary was unfortunately used as a tool in that process. So, again, there is no question that a coordinated alliance between the United States and Russia to defeat ISIS, using the same approach that was used to defeat Hitler in World War II, is feasible. Some leading retired American military officials have openly called for a formal military alliance between the United States and Russia. Let Russia, which has been formally invited into Syria, handle the assault on the ISIS forces from the Syrian side, and let the United States, which has been invited-in by the Iraqi government, handle the assault against the Islamic State from the Iraqi side. Run that as a pincer operation. Hit them from both flanks, and crush them under the weight of the capability that could be brought to bear by the United States and Russia in combination. But again, while that is absolutely feasible, there is no reason to assume that the British will let that happen, so long as Obama remains in office. And therefore, it is essential, if we are going to have this alliance, if we are going to avoid many more Paris-es – perhaps the next one on the streets of New York City, or Washington DC, or Chicago, or Los

Angeles – then Obama must be removed now, and Congress collectively must find the guts to take the necessary action.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, as we mentioned last week on our broadcast here, which we recorded just hours after the initial attacks occurred in Paris, before there was last Friday's attacks in Paris, which killed 130 people, there were also the fore-going attacks in January of this year, against the editorial offices of the satirical magazine {Charlie Hebdo}.

As a matter of very eerie coincidence, just hours after those attacks occurred, on January 7th of this year, several members of Congress, including Walter Jones, and Stephen Lynch, as well as former Senator Bob Graham, of the State of Florida, and additionally, family members of the victims of 9/11, convened a press conference on Capitol Hill, on the morning of January 7th, which had been previously scheduled, on the subject of a bill to release the redacted 28 pages of the Congressional Joint Inquiry Report into the attacks on 9/11, an inquiry of which former Senator Bob Graham had been co-chair at the time. We are going to replay a very short excerpt of Senator Graham's remarks at that press conference then, January 7th of this year, but while we play this for you, I want you to reflect on how even more relevant and urgent his statements are, now, in the wake, in the aftermath of last Friday's attacks in Paris, not to mention the attacks in Beirut, the attacks in Mali earlier today, and elsewhere, and the fact that the failure to release these pages {then}, on January 7th, or January 8th, in the immediate wake of



that press conference, the failure to release the 28 pages {then}, puts the blood of the innocent victims of these subsequent attacks on the hands of those who insist on perpetuating this cover-up to this day. So watch this brief excerpt from the press conference on January 7th.

[RECORDING] CONG. WALTER JONES: I introduce the esteemed Senator from Florida, Bob Graham. Thank you.

SENATOR BOB GRAHAM: Walter, thank you very much. And I, too, want to thank Walter and Steve – Congressmen Jones and Lynch – for their leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. I want to thank the family members, who have been without question the most influential force in all of the changes that have occurred as a result of 9/11, and will be the most significant force in terms of convincing the President that it is time to give the American people the truth. Needless to say, my remarks that I will espouse this morning, are considerably different than they would have been, but for events in Paris this morning, which in my judgment, bring this matter into its proper focus.

What have been the consequences of this refusal to release the pages? The consequences, in my judgment are three: One, is a denial of the truth. A core question in 9/11 is, did these 19 people act alone, or did they have a network of support which facilitated their ability to carry out a very complex plot? No one who has looked closely at the facts, including the individuals that I just named, has come to a conclusion other than that it is highly improbable that the 19 people could have acted alone. Yet, the official position of

the

United States government has been that they did act alone, and that there is no necessity for further inquiry into the question

of whether there was a support network.

The second issue, is the issue of justice. Some 3,000 members of the families who were lost on 9/11 have been trying for years to get justice through our system for the losses that

they have suffered. The position of the United States government

has been to protect Saudi Arabia, at virtually every step of the

judicial process. When the United States government was called upon to take a position, it has been a position adverse to the interests of the United States citizens seeking justice, and protective of the government which, in my judgment, was the most

responsible for that network of support.

The third consequence is the issue of national security, and frequently those who have defended nondisclosure, have said, this

cannot be made available to the American people, because it would

be adverse to our national security. It will affect methods and

sources of information, or other information that is inappropriate to be made publicly known. As the two Congressmen

have just said, they both read the report not 12 years ago, when I

participated in writing the report but they have read it recently,

and have both come to the same conclusion that we did a dozen years ago: that there is no threat to national security in disclosure.

I'm going to make the case today, that there is a threat to

national security by non-disclosure, and we saw another chapter of that today in Paris.

Here are some facts:

The Saudis know what they did. They are not persons who are unaware of the consequences of their government's actions.

Second, the Saudis know that we know what they did! Somebody in

the Federal government has read these 28 pages, someone in the Federal government has read all the other documents that have been covered up so far. And the Saudis know that.

What would you think the Saudis' position would be, if they knew what they had done, they knew that the United States knew what they had done, and they also observed that the United States

had taken a position of either passivity, or actual hostility to

letting those facts be known? What would the Saudi government do

in that circumstance, which is precisely where they have been, for more than a decade?

Well, one, they have continued, maybe accelerated, their support for one of the most extreme forms of Islam, Wahhabism, throughout the world, particularly in the Middle East. And second, they have supported the religious fervor, with financial

and other forms of support, of the institutions which were going

to carry out those extreme forms of Islam. Those institutions have included mosques, madrassas, and military. Al-Qaeda was a creature of Saudi Arabia; the regional groups such as al-Shabaab

have been largely creatures of Saudi Arabia; and now, ISIS is the

latest creature!

Yes, I hope and I trust that the United States will crush ISIS, but if we think that is the definition of victory, we

are

being very naive! ISIS is a consequence, not a cause it is a consequence of the spread of extremism, largely by Saudi Arabia,

and if it is crushed, there will be another institution established, financed, supported, to carry on the cause.

So the consequences of our passivity to Saudi Arabia, have been that we have tolerated this succession of institutions violent, extreme, extremely hurtful to the region of

the Middle East, and a threat to the world, as we saw this morning in Paris.

So I conclude by saying, this is a very important issue. It may seem stale to some, but it is as current as the headlines that we will read today. It is an issue that goes to the core of

the United States' contract with its people, that the people would give the government the credibility and support to govern;

the government would give the people the information upon which

they can make good judgments, as to the appropriateness of governmental action. It's as fundamental as justice to our people, who have suffered so, by this evil union of extremism and

a very powerful nation-state. And it is the security of the people of the United States of America.

So, I again thank the Congressmen for their leadership. I hope that they will soon be joined by a rising tide of other members of Congress who recognize the importance of this issue.

And then, finally, that the President of the United States will

declare that he is going to adopt the Lincolnesque standard of full disclosure, and rely on the intelligence and judgment and patriotism of the American people to decide what the appropriate

course of action should be.

Thank you.

OGDEN: Now both Jeff Steinberg and myself had the opportunity to be in that room on that day, January 7, present at that press conference, and I know Senator Graham's presentation sent chills through the audience, especially because it came in such proximity to these terrible attacks on that day, on the headquarters of {Charlie Hebdo}; but especially when he said – and I think this stood out for you, probably, when you were just listening to this again – when he said, this is a very important issue. It may seem stale to some, but it is as current as the headlines we will read today. And tragically, that applies just as much this week, in the aftermath of the horrific attacks in Paris of last Friday, as it did then, in the aftermath of the attacks at {Charlie Hebdo}. And as long as this cover-up continues, innocent people continue to die. Paris, Beirut, Mali, the Russian airliner – what's next? What must be done to ensure there {is} no next time? So I know that Jeff has been deeply involved in this issue for several years, over a decade, and I'd like him to come to the podium to briefly comment on the significance of what you just heard Senator Bob Graham say.

STEINBERG: The statement I read a few moments ago from the four former drone pilots reminded me that among the documents that were released in 2010 by WikiLeaks, which of course began the process of revealing some of the murderous behavior of the

Obama administration, included a document which was a cable from then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to Richard Holbrooke, who was the Special Envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, who was preparing to make a visit to Saudi Arabia soon after that memo was written, towards the end of 2009. And what that memo said was well, we're in possession of massive evidence that the number one source of financing for all of the various Sunni jihadist terror groups is Saudi Arabia. And we've got to begin to develop a policy for putting some kind of pressure on Saudi Arabia so they'll cut it out. So, in other words, there was full knowledge in 2009 at the very beginning of the Obama administration throughout the administration that Saudi Arabia was still continuing to be a major source of support for the al-Qaeda networks that carried out the 9/11 atrocities. Remember also that General Michael Flynn, the head of the Defense Intelligence Agency until he was unceremoniously fired last year by President Obama for daring to continue to supply intelligence on the fact that Obama's own policies were fueling the growth of al-Qaeda and eventually fueling the growth of the Islamic State – ISIS. So, this should be a further reminder of the points that were made by Senator Graham and the others that this administration, from day one, has been fully on notice about the continuing role of Saudi Arabia as the principal source of financing and logistical support for the activities of these hideous jihadist terrorists. Now just in the past week, really in the past several weeks,

we can account for hundreds of people who've been killed by the very apparatus that this President has refused to take any action against. You had the bombing of the Metro Jet airliner – 224 people killed when the plane blew up by a terrorist bomb over the Sinai Desert. Secondly, you had two suicide bombings in the southern portions of Beirut, targetting a largely Shi'ite neighborhood. We don't have the precise number of people killed, but it was a large number of people killed and wounded. And of course, we now have a death toll of 130 in Paris. And even earlier today, you had a jihadist assault on the Radisson Blue Hotel in Mali, where again we're still awaiting the body count; but 180 or so people were taken hostage by a group of armed gunmen, and ultimately Malian, French and American commandoes raided the hotel. And again, we witnessed a significant fire fight; people were killed – innocent civilians arbitrarily targetted simply because they were in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Now, let's face the reality. If those 28 pages had been published back in 2002, and had revealed the indications of the role of the Saudi monarchy and Saudi intelligence and Saudi defense industrial company in providing the key support for the 9/11 hijackers, there would have been a public outcry. There would have been a serious investigation into Saudi Arabia. There would have been a fundamental change in the US relationship to Saudi Arabia. And by the way, the investigation into the specific funds provided by Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar bin Sultan to the Saudi intelligence agents who were managing and supporting two of the hijackers in San Diego, would have directly led to

the  
doorsteps of the British; because some of the money that went  
from Bandar's personal account into the hands of those  
terrorists, came from the al Yamamah agreement – the  
British/Saudi barter agreement, which {EIR} documented created  
an  
offshore slush fund of tens of billions of dollars, perhaps  
hundreds of billions of dollars over the scope and sweep of  
that  
agreement – that was used to finance terrorism. Prince Bandar  
openly boasted that funds from the al Yamamah project went to  
financing what were then called the Afghan mujahideen; the  
so-called freedom fighters who soon were known as al-Qaeda and  
Taliban.  
So, the track record is enormous; it's unambiguous. There  
has been a top-down Presidential cover-up of the Saudis and  
British and their role in this terrorism under the Bush/Cheney  
administration, and continuing under Obama. And in spite of  
all  
of that evidence, the Obama administration continued to  
smuggle  
weapons out of Benghazi into the hands of Syrian rebels;  
including those who became part of ISIS and the Nusra Front.  
And  
that's not idle speculation; that's from documents from the  
Defense Intelligence Agency that were presented to the  
President  
by no later than the Fall of 2012. One of those documents  
specifically said, why are we still smuggling weapons into the  
Syrian rebels out of Benghazi, when those networks just  
assassinated a US ambassador and three other American  
officials?  
So again, let's go back to the original comments in response  
to tonight's institutional question by Mr. LaRouche. Obama's  
got  
to be removed from office because he's got blood on his hands.  
And the United States will never ever be able to actually



re-establish its role as a leading force for good in the world,  
so long as we tolerate a President in office who's got that much  
blood on his hands and continues to carry forward the same policies despite all of the evidence and all of the warnings.

OGDEN: Now, a direct correlative of this entire situation in Syria, Libya, Iraq, and elsewhere is the unprecedented refugee crisis now being experienced by the people of this region; who are flooding across the Mediterranean and into Europe. And I know

this is one of the items that was directly cited by Congresswoman

Tulsi Gabbard in her list of ten reasons why the illegal war against Bashar al-Assad must be ended. And it's impossible to underestimate the urgency and the significance of the currently

ongoing refugee crisis. This is a massive displacement of human

beings on the scale of millions, flooding into Europe from the Middle East and North Africa; fleeing from the carnage and the chaos which have taken over that region, which is a direct result

of the regime-change wars of first the George W Bush administration, and now the Barack Obama administration.

Again,

the culpability lies on the doorstep of Obama. And in Europe, even before the terrorist attacks in Paris last Friday, we saw a

frightening rise of a right-wing, proto-fascist, xenophobic backlash within the European population against these refugees;

driven by the effects of the policies of such persons as Schäuble

and his so-called "Black Zero" policy. And the danger is that this could drastically worsen and spin out of control as the

economic breakdown in the trans-Atlantic region continually gets

worse; and it will get worse rapidly, as long as the necessary policies of a top-down complete bankruptcy re-organization of this Wall Street system are not taken, which must begin with Glass-Steagall, and the correlated policies that Franklin Roosevelt enacted at the beginning of his New Deal.

Now this is the real civilizational crisis, threatening Europe, the United States and the entire world, and {not}, as Obama and his fellow travelers in the British Royal Family would

have you believe, the so-called crisis of anthropogenic global warming. This is the real crisis: this refugee crisis, the crisis

of the destabilization of the entire region of the Middle East and North Africa, and the threat of a total blow-out of the trans-Atlantic bankrupt financial system. This is the real crisis, which responsible leaders of the world's leading powers

should be discussing as they gather in Paris next week for the so-called COP21 Summit in Paris.

So before I say more about that, I would like to ask Ben Deniston to come to the podium to make some very relevant comments in that regard.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Matthew. From our discussion with Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche earlier today, we were discussing

a certain article that had just been released in the last couple

days, and Helga and all of us thought it would be an important thing to highlight, given the relevance of this article to what

Matt just referenced. You should have graphic on your screen, just a screen-shot of one publication, one blog, which is hosting

this article. The title is, as you can read, "Terrorism and a Cold Winter Refugee Crisis," with a subline reading "A Brutal

Cold Spell Could Kill Refugees.” Paris COP21 delegates need to discuss this climate issue.

Now this article was authored by two leading so-called climate skeptics, two individuals who have been out front fighting against this fraudulent claim of a man-made climate change crisis. One individual, just to give you a sense of who they are, Joseph D’Aleo, is a certified consulting meteorologist;

he’s a fellow of the American Meteorology Society; and he’s one

of the original co-founders of the Weather Channel. So, he’s somebody familiar with climate and weather. The other author is

Paul Driessen, who is a self-proclaimed former environmentalist,

until the environmentalist movement went against human beings, and he decided it wasn’t a good thing to stick with. But he’s the

author of such books as the 2003 book “Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death.” And he’s also done a number of interviews with {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine, one of which is part of the 2015 report put out by {Executive Intelligence Review}, which, if you don’t have a copy of, we encourage you to

get a copy of immediately. Our recent report “Global Warming Scare is Population Reduction, not Science”

So, they came out with a rather interesting piece which we want to just put on the table and then comment upon. But just to

quote the beginning of their article. They open by saying “Even

after these latest Paris massacres, and previous radical Islamist

atrocities in the USA, in France, in Britain, in Canada, in Spain, India, Iraq, Syria, Nigeria and elsewhere, politicians still absurdly say that hypothetical man-made global warming is

the greatest threat facing humanity. In reality, fossil fuel contributions to the climate change pose few dangers to people or planet, and winters actually kill 20 times more people than hot weather.”

So after that lunge, they go on to highlight some very relevant facts. They go into focus on the millions of refugees that Matthew just referenced, who are desperately now trying to escape the horrors of what frankly Obama has unleashed with the Islamic State. As we discussed, many of them fleeing into Europe.

Well, the authors of this article make the relevant point that these people are coming from a climate that is on average generally 20 to 30 degrees warmer in the winter time than their current destinations they’re heading into in Eastern and Northern Europe. That this people who are fleeing desperately to get out with their lives intact, are simply not prepared to just plunge into this much colder climate of Europe, and especially if they’re just simply left to try and survive in makeshift shelters or tents, we could be seeing the beginnings of a very horrific mass death scene, as these people suffer the horrors of a cold European winter.

And these authors give a warning, that this could actually be worse, this particular winter, if we see the return of some of these periodic blasts or movements of frigid, extremely cold Siberian air transfer over Europe, which is a not-uncommon phenomenon, and could give rise to, again, a very cold, deadly cold in this case, winter over Europe.

Now, they make the point: this prospect of a potentially harsh cold is obviously in stark contrast to just the insane propaganda lies about global warming, including, for example – a

couple of their highlights are rather useful, if anything, for comic relief. But they cite a headline article from the German publication {Der Spiegel} from 15 years [ago], from the year 2000. And the title of this article was: " Goodbye, Winter. In Germany cold winters are now a thing of the past." This was declared in 2000 to be the reality. Or a scientist with a British

Climate research unit, who was quoted saying, again about 15 years ago, around the year 2000: "Children are not going to know

what snow is."

So, despite these crazy lies that have been spouted for decades, and are being spouted again now, they make the relevant

point that for five years, between 2008 and 2013, you had a whole

series of extremely cold winters throughout Europe, in some cases

setting many records. England, for example, having one of the coldest winters they had in centuries. Mind you, 8 to 12 years after it was proclaimed that children in England would no longer

know what snow is, they had the coldest winter they've had since

sometime in the 1600s, in the Little Ice Age.

So anyway, they go on to point out that with most recent scientific knowledge, these particular climate conditions, these

blasts, this movement of very frigid, cold air from the Siberian

region into Europe, tends to be associated with certain fluctuation in the Atlantic ocean, certain multi-decadal cycles

in the Atlantic, in correspondence with certain changes in solar activity. There's a very close correlation and indications between these solar phenomena and this particular process leading to extremely cold winters in Europe. And they – obviously none of this having anything to do with human CO2 emissions. But Driessen and D'Aleo do make the point that the fact of the matter is that the current phase of what the ocean is doing in the Atlantic, the current phase of solar activity, generally points to the possibility that we could be seeing another very harsh, very cold winter in Europe. Now, it's not to say for certain that's going to happen, but that is the type of reality, the type of threat to these people, that we should be thinking of – that the people in Paris should actually be addressing. So, with literally millions of lives on the line, we thought today in our discussion that these authors' call could not be more correct, could not be more relevant: their call on the delegates to this upcoming UN conference on climate change – which, as Matt said, is going to start in just a little over a week and run for two weeks in December – that at this event, this is the climate issue that should be being discussed. And they present this refugee crisis against evidence for a broader reality, that quite frankly – and as has been shown even in more detail on some recent studies – cold weather generally kills something on the order of 20 times more people than hot weather. Periods of extreme cold, winter is on average, averaged over many locations, far more deadly than warming. And on top of that, this

entire Green energy program makes it even worse; it's making it more expensive if not impossible for many people – especially in cold regions – to be able to afford basic heating for their home to keep themselves alive during the winters.

So with this framework, this particular article concludes rather sharply that it would be an “unconscionable crime against humanity if the nations gathering in Paris implement policies to protect our planet’s energy-depraved masses from hypothetical manmade climate change occurring decades from now by perpetuating poverty and disease that will kill millions of people tomorrow.

These are the reasons that climate change is a critical, moral issue. We need to recognize that and stop playing games with people’s lives.”

So again, in the discussion earlier today, we thought that this recent article, Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in particular that this should serve as a real challenge to people. This should be a challenge to many of the so-called “climate skeptics” out there; it should be a challenge to really all individuals who, for one reason or another might be claiming they’re opposing this upcoming UN climate conference. And it should really be a challenge obviously, to anybody participating directly in this process. This is not an academic debate; this is not a debate about one scientific theory against another in academia. This is a life or death issue for millions upon millions of people. This

has real world consequences; it has had them, it's having them now, it's going to have them in the future. If this type of thing

is going to go through, you're literally condemning millions of

people – potentially billions – to unnecessary poverty, to suffering, and to early death. Those are the facts of the matter.

So the question on the table right now is, will you let this happen? Will you go down in history as having let this happen? And as we've documented, especially in this report and in other

locations, we know what this is all about. This is intentional;

this is the 21st Century version of Thomas Malthus' policy.

This

is the modern Zeus policy.

Who did we just hear is going to be one of the leading prominent speakers at this Paris COP 21 conference? Prince Charles, the British Empire; the next in the series of degenerations of the British Royal Family, following Prince Phillip and Queen Elizabeth. And it's no secret these people are

promoting a policy of outright genocide; they're advocating and

promoting a policy saying the world can only support 1-2 billion

people. And we need to push to reduce the world's population to a

few billion people. So if you let this type of program to go through, this will go down in history as the greatest mass killing on record; save perhaps Obama's thermonuclear war if we

let him launch that. But if that's not launched by Obama, this would go down in history as the greatest mass death; and you will

be the people who let that happen.



So the crisis conditions facing these refugees are a leading expression of this more general threat. And this is occurring at the same time as we're seeing this gathering for this fake global warming scare conference in Paris, which is just about to occur. If you reflect on this process, it really almost sounds like you're describing the opening scenario of a rather famous short story by Edgar Allan Poe; it's almost reminiscent of something like {The Mask of the Red Death}. We have some major gathering of representatives of upper class layers of society, gathering in some isolated, climate-controlled conference halls – very comfortable; hoping they can celebrate their own delusional picture of the world. Hoping they can celebrate their determination of the fate of the masses of people, under the fantasy that they themselves are going to free from the effects of their actions. Well at the same time that this absurd scene is going on, you have millions of desperate people gathering around them throughout Europe; fleeing into Europe. Running from the policies which most of the people at this conference refuse to address; Obama's policies. Masses of people suffering from the reality that those people at this conference refuse to accept; which is the fact that global warming is nothing but a Malthusian hoax. So, it's got an eerie similarity to some stories of the past, but unlike Poe's dramatic account, what we have now is that you still have the time to act.

OGDEN: Thank you very much Ben. And let me just say in conclusion, there is a petition which is circulating; it was

authored by the Schiller Institute, and it is now posted on the LaRouche PAC website titled, "A Resolution To Defend Billions of Lives; We Say 'No' to Paris COP 21". So, we invite you to sign that and to circulate that as widely as you can in the coming days. Also, as Ben mentioned, that {EIR} Special Report is available from {Executive Intelligence Review}. So, that's available for you to obtain as well. So, I'm going to bring a conclusion to our broadcast here tonight. I want to thank very much both Ben and Jeff for joining me here; I want to thank you for tuning in, and please, stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

---

## **Vladimir Putin advarer igen USA mod at bryde den strategiske atomvåbenbalance**

*12. november 2015:* Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med skarpe åbningsbemærkninger inden mødet med topforsvarsfolk fra regeringen og repræsentanter for det russiske militære/industrielle kompleks under det årlige revisionsmøde. Mødet, der fandt sted tirsdag i Sotji, faldt sammen med meddelelsen om, at det russiske forsvarsbudget for næste år vil være 49 mia. dollar, hvor de 35 mia. er direkte øremærkede til de russiske bevåbnede styrker. Til sammenligning er det amerikanske forsvarsbudget 10-15 gange STØRRE: og to nye, amerikanske våbenprogrammer – det nye F-35 stealth kampfly og udskiftningen af ubåde, der medfører ballistiske missiler – er hver for sig mere kostbare end hele det russiske forsvarsbudget.

Putin fokuserede sine indledende bemærkninger omkring den trussel mod Rusland, som udgøres af USA's og dets allieredes globale missilforsvarsprogram. Putin sagde i begyndelsen af sine bemærkninger:

*»Som vi alle ved opbygger USA og dets allierede uophørligt deres globale missilforsvarssystem. Desværre tager man hverken vore bekymringer eller vore samarbejdsforslag i betragtning. Vi har ved flere lejligheder indikeret, at vi anser sådanne handlinger for at være et forsøg på at underminere den eksisterende atomvåbenbalance, og på faktisk at destabilisere hele systemet med regional og global stabilitet.«*

Putin bemærkede, at Washington vedvarende har hævdet, at ABM-deployeringerne relaterede til faren fra Iran, men deployeringerne fortsætter, selv efter P5+1-aftalen. Han sluttede:

*»Derfor«, konkluderede han, »er henvisninger til de iranske og nordkoreanske atommissiltrusler et dække for de sande intentioner, der i realiteten drejer sig om at neutralisere andre atomstateres strategiske atompotentiale, ud over USA og deres allierede; primært vedr. Rusland, selvfølgelig, og om at opnå en afgørende militær overlegenhed med alle de heraf følgende konsekvenser.«*

Det faktum, at Putin ikke uddybede »de heraf følgende konsekvenser«, udvandede på ingen måde hans direkte budskab: Obama, lige som Bush og Cheney før ham, er hastigt i færd med at drive verden mod en atomar konfrontation. Putin gjorde det klart, at Rusland allerede forbereder sig til en sådan konfrontation gennem netop det arbejde, der var emnet for dette særlige, årlige møde, som han talte til.

Putin forklarede:

*»Vi har gentagne gange sagt, at Rusland vil tage de nødvendige, tilsvarende forholdsregler for at styrke sit*

*atompotentiale. Vi vil ligeledes også arbejde på anti-missilforsvarssystemer, men i det første stadium, som vi gentagende har sagt, vil vi fokusere også på offensive systemer, der kan overvinde ethvert anti-missilforsvarssystem.»*

Putin bemærkede i sine slutbemærkninger, at Rusland i de seneste tre år har arbejdet på at udvikle

*»flere lovende våbensystemer, der kan udføre kampmissioner i dybden under betingelser med et anti-missilforsvarssystem«,*

og bemærkede, at kampenhederne er begyndt at modtage sådanne nye våbensystemer allerede i år.

Det er ikke alle, der i USA og Vesten ikke har opfattet pointen. Stephen Blank, senior-stabsmedlem ved USA's Udenrigspolitiske Råd, skrev for nylig en artikel med overskriften, »The West Underestimates Putin at its Peril« ('Vesten undervurderer Putin, til sit eget fordærv'). Han begynder,

*“For den store, britiske militæranalytiker Basil Liddell-Hart var det aksiomatisk, at formålet med krige var en bedre fred. Med andre ord, så, for at være succesfulde, må de sættes i forbindelse med politiske resultater og strategiske landvindinger.» Efter en bemærkning om, at Obamaregeringen har vist sig at være ude af stand til strategisk tænkning, skrev Blank, »Hvilke fejl, Rusland og dets bevæbnede styrker så end måtte have, så er foragt for strategi ikke en af dem. Washingtons eliter, med få undtagelser, kan ikke acceptere, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tænker og handler strategisk.» Dernæst demonstrerer Blank, at, i det aktuelle tilfælde med Syrien, er det præcis, hvad Putin gør. Han konkluderer, at »Putin kunne måske sluttelig tabe spillet i Syrien, for intet er så uforudsigeligt som krig. Men denne mulighed kan ikke retfærdiggøre den selvbehagelighed, arrogance og intellektuelle dovenskab, der truer USA's*

*interesser og dets allierede.»*

I *Guardian* den 10. nov. bragte Julian Borger spørgsmålet direkte tilbage til USA's atomvåbenprovokationer mod Moskva. Borger rapporterede om nylige advarsler fra tidl. viceformand for Generalstabscheferne, gen. James Cartwright, der udtalte, at moderniseringen af USA's taktiske atomvåben i Europa, B-61 12, gør dem »brugbare«, og dette udgør en alvorlig fare for at glide ind i en atomkrig. Cartwright sagde til PBS, »Hvis jeg, med bevarelse af samme sprængkraft, kan nedbringe sprængstofmængden, og derfor det sandsynlige atomnedfald, osv., gør dette det så mere anvendeligt i en præsidents eller national sikkerhedsbeslutningstagers øjne? Og svaret er, at det sandsynligvis kunne være mere anvendeligt.« Borger bemærkede, »Det store ved atomvåben var, at deres anvendelse angiveligt var utænkkelig, og de var derfor et afskrækkelsesmiddel mod overvejelser om en ny verdenskrig. Når de først bliver 'tænkkelige', befinder vi os i et andet, og langt farligere, univers.

---

## **Leder, 12. november 2015: Putin har ret: Obama gør fremstød for et termonukleart Armageddon**

Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin talte ved åbningen af en konference med ledere fra Forsvarsministeriet og militærindustrien i Sotji, Rusland, tirsdag, hvor han i skarpe vendinger advarede om, at præsident Barack Obamas politik er i færd med at drive verden mod en termonuklear udslettelse i en

meget nær fremtid. I realiteten fremkom Putin med det mest vandtætte argument for, hvorfor USA's præsident må fjernes fra embedet nu.

Putin gjorde det klart, at USA har løjet om grundene til, at det bygger et globalt missilforsvarssystem, eftersom Iran nu har underskrevet P5+1-aftalen og afstået fra atomvåben. Målet for USA's og dets allieredes globale ABM har hele tiden været at ændre den globale, militære balance til fordel for USA's Prompt Global Strike-doktrin, dvs. evnen til at kunne lancere et atomart førsteangreb imod Rusland (og som angiveligt skulle ødelægge modpartens evne til et gengældelsesangreb, *-red.*). Rusland for sin del vil ikke finde sig i dette; og Rusland bygger nye våbensystemer, af hvilke nogle allerede er i felten, og som kan modgå enhver ABM-fordel, som USA måtte opnå.

Dette er den samme Barack Obama, hvis mærke for udenrigspolitisk »succes« har været massedrabs-droneprogrammet, under hvilket et ukendt antal uskyldige civile er blevet dræbt for blot posthumt at blive klassificeret som »fjender dræbt under kamp«, eller, mere enkelt, »offer for krigen«. Under diskussion med sine medarbejdere fra LaRouches Politiske Komite onsdag trak Lyndon LaRouche en klar linje mellem menneskelige væsener og uhyrer, som Obama, der ikke har nogen evne til agape, næstekærlighed, og således mangler de menneskelige, følelsesmæssige egenskaber, der adskiller mennesket fra dyret.

LaRouche bemærkede, at Californiens guvernør Jerry Brown har samme karakter som Obama, totalt distanceret fra ethvert begreb om agape.

Selv, hvis et termonukleart Armageddon kan undgås i den umiddelbare fremtid, så har Obamas syv år i embedet, der fulgte efter otte år med Bush-Cheney, haft en total disintegration af livsvilkårene for det store flertal af amerikanere til følge. Den seneste grusomhed er den massive

stigning af kokainproduktionen i Colombia, der uundgåeligt meget snart vil antage form af en strøm af billig kokain, der kommer ind i USA. Dette kommer oveni det allerede epidemiske spring i heroinafhængighed og afhængighed af smertestillende medicin. Det amerikanske folk er udset som målskive for en ny og ondsindet, britisk Opiumskrig. Tilfældet med Colombia eksemplificerer dette; med præsident Santos, en protege af Tony Blair og Obama-allieret, der åbenlyst har promoveret legalisering af narkotika, har nedlukket coca-udryddelsesprogrammerne og nu er i den endelige fase for forhandlinger om en narko-fred med den berygtede narko-terrorist FARC.

Præsidenten for Boston Federal Reserve Bank er også kommet ud i denne uge med svare advarsler om en nedsmeltning af den kommercielle ejendomsboble og bemærkede, at situationen er mere alvorlig end i september 2007, hvor bolig- og erhvervsejendomsmarkedet først nedsmeltede; dette førte til nedsmeltningen i 2008 og den efterfølgende kvantitative lempelse ('pengetrykning').

Hvis vi ser bort fra faren for atomkrig, så er de reelle livsbetingelser for det store flertal af amerikanere blevet ødelagt i løbet af de seneste 15 år med Bush og Obama. Europa er i en endnu værre tilstand med førende nationer som Tyskland og Frankrig, der er håbløst kollapsede, og med Storbritannien allerede i et totalt økonomisk sammenbrud. Alt imens det transatlantiske område går fra ondt til værre, og førende britiske kredse pønser på krig som en vej ud af deres dilemma, så er situationen i Asien og Eurasien en kvalitativt anden, med Kina, Rusland og Indien, der fører an i indsatsen for at afstikke en ny kurs for virkeligt, globalt samarbejde og en videnskabelig revolution, der vil blive til gavn for hele menneskeheden.

Muligheden for at lancere et sådant »nyt paradigme for menneskeheden«[1] er forhånden, og det første, altafgørende skridt er afsættelsen af Obama og nedlukning af Wall Street,

så processen med økonomisk genrejsning og heling i USA kan påbegyndes.

[1] Se video med Helga Zepp-LaRouche m.fl., »Et nyt paradigme for civilisationen«, engelsk, med dansk udskrift.

## ***Supplerende dokumentation:***

### **Vladimir Putin advarer igen USA mod at bryde den strategiske atomvåbenbalance**

*12. november 2015:* Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med skarpe åbningsbemærkninger inden mødet med topforsvarsfolk fra regeringen og repræsentanter for det russiske militære/industrielle kompleks under det årlige revisionsmøde. Mødet, der fandt sted tirsdag i Sotji, faldt sammen med meddelelsen om, at det russiske forsvarsbudget for næste år vil være 49 mia. dollar, hvor de 35 mia. er direkte øremærkede til de russiske bevåbnede styrker. Til sammenligning er det amerikanske forsvarsbudget 10-15 gange STØRRE: og to nye, amerikanske våbenprogrammer – det nye F-35 stealth kampfly og udskiftningen af ubåde, der medfører ballistiske missiler – er hver for sig mere kostbare end hele det russiske forsvarsbudget.

Putin fokuserede sine indledende bemærkninger omkring den trussel mod Rusland, som udgøres af USA's og dets allieredes globale missilforsvarsprogram. Putin sagde i begyndelsen af sine bemærkninger:

*»Som vi alle ved opbygger USA og dets allierede uophørligt deres globale missileforsvarssystem. Desværre tager man hverken vore bekymringer eller vore samarbejdsforslag i betragtning. Vi har ved flere lejligheder indikeret, at vi*



*anser sådanne handlinger for at være et forsøg på at underminere den eksisterende atomvåbenbalance, og på faktisk at destabilisere hele systemet med regional og global stabilitet.»*

Putin bemærkede, at Washington vedvarende har hævdet, at ABM-deployeringerne relaterede til faren fra Iran, men deployeringerne fortsætter, selv efter P5+1-aftalen. Han sluttede:

*»Derfor«, konkluderede han, »er henvisninger til de iranske og nordkoreanske atommissiltrusler et dække for de sande intentioner, der i realiteten drejer sig om at neutralisere andre atomstaters strategiske atompotentiale, ud over USA og deres allierede; primært vedr. Rusland, selvfølgelig, og om at opnå en afgørende militær overlegenhed med alle de heraf følgende konsekvenser.»*

Det faktum, at Putin ikke uddybede »de heraf følgende konsekvenser«, udvandede på ingen måde hans direkte budskab: Obama, lige som Bush og Cheney før ham, er hastigt i færd med at drive verden mod en atomar konfrontation. Putin gjorde det klart, at Rusland allerede forbereder sig til en sådan konfrontation gennem netop det arbejde, der var emnet for dette særlige, årlige møde, som han talte til.

Putin forklarede:

*»Vi har gentagne gange sagt, at Rusland vil tage de nødvendige, tilsvarende forholdsregler for at styrke sit atompotentiale. Vi vil ligeledes også arbejde på anti-missilforsvarssystemer, men i det første stadium, som vi gentagent har sagt, vil vi fokusere også på offensive systemer, der kan overvinde ethvert anti-missilforsvarssystem.»*

Putin bemærkede i sine slutbemærkninger, at Rusland i de seneste tre år har arbejdet på at udvikle

*»flere lovende våbensystemer, der kan udføre kampmissioner i dybden under betingelser med et anti-missilforsvarssystem«,*

og bemærkede, at kampenhederne er begyndt at modtage sådanne nye våbensystemer allerede i år.

Det er ikke alle, der i USA og Vesten ikke har opfattet pointen. Stephen Blank, senior-stabsmedlem ved USA's Udenrigspolitiske Råd, skrev for nylig en artikel med overskriften, »The West Underestimates Putin at its Peril« ('Vesten undervurderer Putin, til sit eget fordærv'). Han begynder,

*“For den store, britiske militæranalytiker Basil Liddell-Hart var det aksiomatisk, at formålet med krige var en bedre fred. Med andre ord, så, for at være succesfulde, må de sættes i forbindelse med politiske resultater og strategiske landvindinger.» Efter en bemærkning om, at Obamaregeringen har vist sig at være ude af stand til strategisk tænkning, skrev Blank, »Hvilke fejl, Rusland og dets bevæbnede styrker så end måtte have, så er foragt for strategi ikke en af dem. Washingtons eliter, med få undtagelser, kan ikke acceptere, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tænker og handler strategisk.» Dernæst demonstrerer Blank, at, i det aktuelle tilfælde med Syrien, er det præcis, hvad Putin gør. Han konkluderer, at »Putin kunne måske sluttelig tabe spillet i Syrien, for intet er så uforudsigeligt som krig. Men denne mulighed kan ikke retfærdiggøre den selvbehagelighed, arrogance og intellektuelle dovenskab, der truer USA's interesser og dets allierede.»*

I *Guardian* den 10. nov. bragte Julian Borger spørgsmålet direkte tilbage til USA's atomvåbenprovokationer mod Moskva. Borger rapporterede om nylige advarsler fra tidl. viceformand for Generalstabschefen, gen. James Cartwright, der udtalte, at moderniseringen af USA's taktiske atomvåben i Europa, B-61 12, gør dem »brugbare«, og dette udgør en alvorlig fare for at glide ind i en atomkrig. Cartwright sagde til PBS, »Hvis jeg,

med bevarelse af samme sprængkraft, kan nedbringe sprængstofmængden, og derfor det sandsynlige atomnedfald, osv., gør dette det så mere anvendeligt i en præsidents eller national sikkerhedsbeslutningstagers øjne? Og svaret er, at det sandsynligvis kunne være mere anvendeligt.« Borger bemærkede, »Det store ved atomvåben var, at deres anvendelse angiveligt var utænkkelig, og de var derfor et afskrækkelsesmiddel mod overvejelser om en ny verdenskrig. Når de først bliver 'tænkkelige', befinder vi os i et andet, og langt farligere, univers.

---

## **NYHEDSORIENTERING NOVEMBER: Samarbejde eller krig?**

*Flygtningekrisen i Europa er skriften på væggen. Kun ved at erstatte Obamas konfrontationspolitik med et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina kan der gives en vej ud. IS må besejres militært, men samtidig må der også økonomisk opbygning til. Høring i USA's kongres om faren for atomkrig. Obama afsløret som morder i nye, lækkede dronepapirer. Stem nej 3. december. Skift COP21 i Paris fra konferencen for folkemord til konference*

**for udvikling for hele menneskeheden. Dette er en redigeret udgave af Tom Gillesbergs nyhedsopdatering fra den 9. november. Lyt med på [www.schillerinstituttet.dk/](http://www.schillerinstituttet.dk/)**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **USA: Obamas forsvarsminister Ash Carter på krigsstien mod Rusland ... og Kina**

8. november 2015 – Den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ashton Carter talte i Ronald Reagans Præsidentielle Bibliotek i Simi Valley, Californien, i går, på vej hjem fra sin rundrejse i Asien, der var spækket med provokationer imod både Rusland og Kina. Hans bemærkninger var en direkte trussel om, at USA forbereder sig til krig med Rusland, primært, og Kina sekundært, fordi, som AP opsummerede Carters pointe, »disse trends tilsammen afprøver amerikansk forrang og USA's stilling som forvalter af verdensordenen«.

Carter reserverede sine »stærkeste ord« til Rusland. »Det er yderst foruroligende, at Moskvas raslen med atomsablerne rejser spørgsmål om Ruslands leders forpligtende engagement mht. den strategiske stabilitet, deres respekt for normerne for anvendelse af atomvåben, og hvorvidt de respekterer den dybe forsigtighed, som ledere i atomalderen viser mht. at svinge vildt med atomvåben.«

Han sagde, at terroristgrupper som ISIS bestemt udgør en trussel, »men andre udfordringer er mere komplicerede og, i betragtning af deres omfang og kapacitet, potentielt set farligere« – en temmelig åbenlys henvisning til Rusland og Kina. Dernæst advarede han: »Vi søger ikke at gøre Rusland til en fjende. Men tag ikke fejl: USA vil forsvare sine interesser, vore allierede, den på principper hvilende internationale orden og den positive fremtid, som denne har at tilbyde os alle ...

Vi udforsker de teknologier, der er mest relevante over for Ruslands provokationer, såsom nye, ubemandede systemer, et nyt, langtrækkende bombefly og innovationer inden for teknologi som den elektromagnetiske railgun, lasers og nye systemer til elektronisk krigsførelse, i rummet og i cyberspace, inklusive et par stykker, der er overraskelser, og som jeg faktisk ikke kan beskrive her.«

---

## **USA: Usædvanlig begivenhed på Capitol Hill advarer om Obamas atomkrigsprovokationer mod Rusland**

*4. november 2015* – Et usædvanligt, offentligt møde fandt sted her til eftermiddag på Capitol Hill, Washington, USA, som advarede om farerne ved, at Obamas provokationer imod Rusland fører til atomkrig. Begivenheden var arrangeret af kongresmedlem John Conyers (D-Mich.), som er alderspræsident, dvs. det længst siddende medlem, i Repræsentanternes Hus. Flere andre kongresmedlemmer deltog i mødet, og mødepanelet

inkluderede en række eksperter, herunder Stephen Cohen, Jack Matlock og Joseph Pepper.

Antallet af mødedeltagere var imponerende, og der var kun ståpladser. Kongresmedlem Alan Grayson åbnede arrangementet med at påminde tilhørerne om den Kolde Krigs dage, hvor skolebørn måtte gå i beskyttelsesrum og afholde øvelser om, hvad de skulle gøre i tilfælde af atomkrig. Grayson advarede om, at amerikanerne, som følge af Obamas provokationer imod Rusland, var på vej tilbage til samme slags fare.

I sine åbningsbemærkninger advarede kongresmedlem Conyers om, at dæmoniseringen af præsident Putin og Rusland førte tilbage til den Kolde Krigs mørkeste stunder og kunne føre til atomkrig.

Tidligere amerikansk ambassadør til Sovjetunionen Jack Matlock, der for blot to uger siden sad på podiet, da den russiske præsident Putin talte ved Valdai-klubbens årlige begivenhed i Sotji, Rusland, gennemgik den beskidte historie med USA's krænkelse af aftaler med Rusland, NATO's provokationer med udvidelsen mod øst, osv. Cohen støttede op om Matlock ved at advare om, at hvis NATO etablerer flere baser op ad den russiske grænse, eller endnu et land, der grænser op til Rusland, indlemmes i NATO, så vil det betyde krig. Cohen citerede tidligere ambassadør til Moskva Michael McFaul som en af de fanatiske provocateurs imod Rusland. Alle talerne advarede om, at den største fare vil være, hvis der ikke er nogen, der går til modstand imod dette sindssyge fremstød for krig.

Joseph Pepper, en tidligere direktør for store, amerikanske selskaber, sagde, at også han var et barn af den Kolde Krig og beskyttelsesrummene, og han krævede, at der kom en nedtoning af hade-retorikken imod præsident Putin, med referencer til denne som værende en Hitler eller en Satan. Obama trækker røde linjer for Tredje Verdenskrig overalt, advarede han.

Både Matlock og Cohen bemærkede, at Obamas provokationer imod Rusland allerede har ført til brud mellem Tyskland og USA og til, at Tyskland allierer sig mere med Rusland. Cohen advarede om, at, med mindre, der kommer en modstand mod Obamas galskab, der kan trænge ham tilbage, så kunne der hurtigt ske en udvikling, hvor der vil være en alliance mellem Tyskland, Rusland og Kina, og hvor USA står fuldstændig isoleret tilbage.

På et tidspunkt under forløbet kom kongresmedlem Walter Jones gående ind i salen, hvor høringen fandt sted, og Conyers bad ham omgående om at tilslutte sig ham på podiet. Jones fik en stående ovation fra tilhørerne.

Denne begivenhed har intet fortilfælde på Capitol Hill og afspejler et voksende oprør imod Obamas krigsgalskab, som man må udnytte til sidste hvid. Livlige debatter med LPAC-aktivister fandt sted, så snart arrangementet sluttede, med mange af deltagerne som mangeårige kontakter, inklusive folk som Ray McGovern, der har talt ved Schiller Institut-konferencer i både New York og Tyskland. Denne begivenhed repræsenterer et enormt potentiale for et udbrud.

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 9.  
november 2015:  
Havner vi i himmel eller  
helvede?**

# **Faren for atomkrig, samt muligheden for samarbejde**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**LPAC Fredags-Webcast 6. november 2015:  
Obama beordrer medieicensur af Drone-papirer –  
Læger uden Grænser udgiver egen rapport om Kunduz –  
Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina tilsigter 3. Verdenskrig. O.m.a.**

Dette webcast: Obama beordrer medieicensur af dækning af afsløringer af Drone-papirerne. Seneste afsløringer om bombing af LuG's hospital i Kunduz – LuG udgiver egen rapport. Hundrede tusinder af flygtninge pga. Obamas ulovlige krige i Sydvestasien og Nordafrika. Faren for global udslettelse i 3. Verdenskrig vokser, pga. Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina. O.m.a. Engelsk udskrift.



## TRANSCRIPT:

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 6, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly broadcast here from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com) of our international Friday night webcast. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*, as well as Megan Beets of the LaRouche PAC Science and Research Team.

Now, the three of us did have a chance to meet with Helga and Lyndon LaRouche just a few hours ago; so that has definitely informed the content of the broadcast that you'll hear tonight. What you will hear tonight is a thorough exposition of the continually building case for immediate legal action to be taken against the murderous policies of the Barack Obama Presidency. The case against him continues to snowball. You'll hear about the media censorship that was ordered directly from the Obama White House to eliminate any coverage in the leading newspapers of record of the United States, including the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, of the damning story that was broken by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill in *The Intercept* of the so-called "Drone Papers"; which exposes the lurid details of Obama's weekly kill sessions, which have routinely resulted in innumerable innocent civilian deaths. You'll hear about the most recent revelations in the case of the bombardment of the Doctors Without Borders hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan; in which it is now being revealed that doctors and other medical personnel who were fleeing the hospital, fleeing the bombardment of this medical facility, were systematically gunned down by US military gunships. [This is] further building the case that this is indeed an intentional targetting of a medical facility, and amounts to nothing less than a war crime. You'll hear about the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been fleeing the illegal wars that have been perpetrated by the Obama administration in the Middle East and northern Africa, resulting in the massive social displacement of entire portions of these populations as

well as widespread death and destruction, as Obama continues to lend his support to the overthrow, by radical jihadists, of sitting sovereign governments in this region. You'll hear about the shocking statistics of the rise in the death rates, rising dramatically throughout the United States; particularly among the former skilled, industrial and manufacturing labor force, who were sacrificed at the altar of the bail-out of the bankrupt Wall Street banks by first the Bush and now the Obama administrations. One of the leading causes of this increase in death rates across the United States, and especially in this formerly productive sector of the American labor force, is an unbelievable surge in deaths from heroin and related drug overdoses; not only among the inner city minority populations, but also now among suburban middle and upper class white populations, surpassing automobile and firearms rates of mortality and now reaching an epidemic level as characterized by the Centers of Disease Control.

And finally, you'll hear about the continuing mounting danger of global extinction warfare as the Obama administration continues to attempt to provoke World War III confrontations with both Russia and China. Now, this final item was the explicit discussion at a landmark event that occurred earlier this past Wednesday on Capitol Hill; which I personally had the opportunity to attend and to be an eyewitness to. This extraordinary event was set up as an informal hearing by Representative John Conyers, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee and the dean of the House of Representatives – the longest serving member of Congress on the House side. Also in attendance were a number of other Congressmen, including Representatives Barbara Lee, Alan Grayson, Charlie Rangel, Sheila Jackson Lee, and Congressman Walter Jones among others. The distinguished members of the panel at this informal hearing were all founders of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord, including: former US Ambassador Jack Matlock, who was ambassador to the Soviet Union under President Ronald Reagan;

NYU Professor Steven Cohen; and John Pepper, a leading businessman and former CEO of Proctor & Gamble. The subject of this hearing was none other than the fact that the Obama policies are on the verge of provoking a thermonuclear confrontation with Russia; a subject which was explicitly presented in those terms, and the fact that without a drastic change in US-Russian relations which must be induced, there is no way that this World War III confrontation can be avoided.

The invitation to this event, which was published by the Committee on East-West Accord and was circulated by the office of Congressman John Conyers, read in part as follows: "The Ukrainian crisis represents a low in US-Russia relations not seen since the fall of the Soviet Union. And the recent Russian involvement in the Syrian situation is now making the danger even worse. American and Russian jets flying bombing missions in close proximity to one another, raises the possibility of a military accident between two nuclear-armed powers. As the *New York Times* warned, the complicated and shifting landscape of alliances leaves us 'edging closer to an all-out proxy war between the United States and Russia.' The majority of Americans never lived through the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 or the darkest days of the Cold War. They have led lives without the looming specter of nuclear war, but the areas of conflict between our nations are growing. The conflict in Ukraine, the expansion of NATO, Russia's involvement in Syria, and other lesser issues are driving a new wedge between the US and Russia. While most would agree that conflict between the United States and Russia benefits no one, the likelihood of such a conflict, as well as the serious consequences that it would bring, is not being discussed on Capitol Hill."

In the interest of fostering more robust debate on US-Russia relations, Representative Conyers has convened an informal hearing featuring four eminent American experts on this subject, and those four members were the members that I named:

the members of the board of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord.

Now each member of this panel, and a number of the Congressmen, each in their own way referred to the darkest days of the Cold War, which they all remembered as members of the senior statesmen of this country. John Conyers being the dean of the House of Representatives, Jack Matlock being a former ambassador and a close collaborator of President Ronald Reagan – they referred to the Cuban Missile Crisis. They recalled the experience of duck and cover, hiding under one's desk, nuclear air raid drills, underground bomb shelters, nuclear bunkers, and stated that although the situation at that time seemed bad, the situation today is as bad, or worse; and that unless the direct provocations against Russia are halted, there is very real possibility which exists of open nuclear warfare breaking out, and exterminating the human race.

Ambassador Matlock echoed much of what he had stated previously during previous appearances in Washington, D.C., but also especially during his recent appearance on the same dais as President Vladimir Putin at the Valdai discussion club in Sochi, Russia two weeks ago. Matlock elaborated the 20-year process of broken promises and outright lies and deceptions that resulted in the Eastward expansion of NATO all the way up to Russia's borders, which has an immediate and calculated threat to Russia's domestic security, worse than, in fact, as Matlock pointed out, the Berlin crisis of 1961. The fact that Berlin was not directly on Russia's borders, but now you have the immediate proximity of Ukraine, and other countries right on the borders of Russian territory.

Steven Cohen underscored Matlock's remarks and warned point-blank, in no uncertain terms, that the placement of one more base on Russia's borders, or the incorporation of one more country in Eastern Europe into the NATO security alliance, military alliance, would mean war between the U.S. and Russia,

and everything that entails. He pointed out that Michael McFaul's blog has shifted from what he called "Mickey Mouse democracy promotion" to now, all-out strident calls for outright warfare and regime change provocations. Cohen emphasized that the danger of war today is far worse than at any time during the Cold War, mostly because of this cross-partisan 100% close-to-consensus when it comes to the demonization of Putin, and Russia, and the lack of any substantial pushback from among the corridors of power in Washington, against this narrative, especially from within Congress – although this was something which, he noted, was changing with this historic event, changing in front of the eyes of all those who attended this event, over a packed audience, standing room only, with this hearing that was sponsored by John Conyers and other members of Congress: the first open discussion of this kind in a forum such as this by *anyone* on Capitol Hill.

And finally, John Pepper made a very impassioned call for a completely new paradigm in U.S.-Russia relations, one which is founded on a concept of common security, and a creation of a mutual common security architecture, against what he identified as the *real* enemies, as opposed to the made-up enemies: the real enemies of both the United States and of Russia. Number one: international terrorism, and ISIS, in specific. And number two: what he identified as the greatest enemy of all mankind, which is thermonuclear warfare itself. He stated, the true enemy that we must guard ourselves against is the enemy of nuclear annihilation, and I think we can all find common cause in that.

So, as I said, this was really an extraordinary event, especially when you juxtapose it to another event which was happening literally simultaneously on Capitol Hill, just a few doors down from this hearing room. And this was a hearing featuring none other than Victoria Nuland herself, and that counterposition was pointed out very clearly by numerous

participants in this event, both members of the panel, and members of the audience, as representative of the two stark choices that are facing the American people right now: Obama's World War III and thermonuclear annihilation, or a new international policy of cooperation and partnership with Russia, as well as with China. Which means the immediate end of the murderous and deadly policies of the Obama administration.

So, with that said, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to come to the podium for the next segment of tonight's broadcast, to elaborate a little bit more on what I've just covered.

**JEFF STEINBERG:** Thanks, Matt. There was obviously some important things that were said during that John Conyers event on Wednesday afternoon up on Capitol Hill, but I think it's critical to recognize that there was one thing that was *not* said, and that was that the only viable solution is the removal of President Obama through either impeachment, or invoking of the 25th Amendment, or some combination of actions, as happened with Richard Nixon, to force his immediate resignation.

The fact of the matter is that you had prominent American diplomats, prominent American scholars, leading members of Congress, standing there, and saying to the American people that the President of the United States is pushing the world towards thermonuclear annihilation, and yet nobody took it to the logical conclusion, which is that we've got to get this guy out of office.

Now in our discussion earlier today with Lyn and Helga LaRouche, Mr. LaRouche really was reflecting on where we stand, in terms of the dangers represented to, really, the survival of the entire trans-Atlantic region. Because that's really what's on the table right now. Assuming we even avoid the immediate threat of thermonuclear war and annihilation, the simple fact is that if the current trendlines continue,

without a reversal, in a very short period of time the entire trans-Atlantic region will be doomed, will be finished, will not resemble anything like what Europe and the United States historically represented, particularly the United States.

Parts of South America may very well survive, because they're already aligning themselves with the Asia-Pacific region, and with Eurasia more broadly, where countries like China, India, Russia are doing relatively well compared to the complete breakdown process that's inflicted the entire trans-Atlantic region.

Now the problem of not directly addressing the clear and obvious solution to the this crisis, namely the constitutional removal of President Obama from office, is in fact indicative of a much deeper problem, a problem that very few people other than people like Mr. LaRouche think about constantly. The bottom line is that since the very beginning of the 20th Century, since the intervention by Lord Bertrand Russell and others around him to destroy Classical science, and to replace it with mathematics and with the disease of pragmatism, since that process began at the beginning of the 20th Century, we've been on a steady downward trajectory – culturally, economically, philosophically, morally. We've been, throughout the trans-Atlantic region, in a slow but now intensifying complete collapse of society, and when you broach the issue of a President who has committed atrocities, such as his drone kill policy. All you need to do, is go back on the LaRouche PAC website, and review the last three Friday evening webcasts. You'll have all of the details you need to know about that.

The fact that there has not been a move to remove this president from office, is because the disease of pragmatism has infected our political institutions to such a great degree, and has infected our general population to an even greater degree, that the only measure that can prevent the possible annihilation of mankind, is considered to be

“unpractical, it’s not pragmatic, there’s no guarantee that this process will succeed.” So, we’ve been on this long trajectory downward. It’s very much like the principle of how you boil a frog. If you put a pot of water on the stove, and get that water boiling to a full boil, and try to throw the frog in the boiling water, the frog’s going to jump right out. He’ll run away and you’ll never find him. If you put the frog in a pot of warm water, comfortably warm water, and have a low flame, then, gradually, that water will reach a boiling point, and the frog won’t notice it, because the incremental changes are gradual. That’s why you’ve got to look back and consider where we are as a trans-Atlantic civilization today, and ask yourself, from that standpoint: can we survive by continuing to cling to pragmatism and avoid taking the necessary urgent measures that can save us from otherwise certain doom?

The drone policy, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion today: it’s emblematic of Obama. He’s a mass killer. He *boasted* to White House staff, back in 2011, that he was really good at killing. Coming into the office of the Presidency, he had *no idea* how good he was at targeting people to be killed by others. But that’s the character of it; that’s what the “Drone Papers,” like the “Pentagon Papers” earlier, brought down [president] Richard Nixon. The “Drone Papers,” alone, are more than sufficient to bring down President Obama. But it has not yet happened, because a few phone calls from the White House to the *New York Times*, to the *Washington Post*, got the word out: this story is taboo; it’s not practical to tell the truth about this mass murderer, because we might get cut off from access to the White House. So, you’ve got this phenomenon.

You have the new reports that Matt just mentioned, that, at the bombing of the Doctors Without Borders [msf] hospital in Kunduz [afghanistan], more and more evidence is coming out that it was a pre-meditated assault on an international medical facility under the lamest of excuses, and that as



doctors and nurses and patients were fleeing, they were being shot, on the grounds that anybody who was there was automatically, *de facto*, Taliban and fair game for another mass kill.

But there's many, many more things to consider. You have the conditions of life of the American people, which have been destroyed, systematically, boiling-frog style, over a period of, really, the last 40 years, or you could say even the period going back to the death of [president] Franklin Roosevelt in April of 1945. It's been a largely downward trajectory ever since then, and that is merely a slice of the process that began right at the turn of the 20th Century, with Bertrand Russell's invasion and assault against science. If you look back at the sweep of the 19th Century, you had some of the greatest accomplishments in culture and in science – in real, physical science. You had [bernhard] Riemann, you had the great classical composers – Beethoven, Brahms. You had the work of Friedrich Schiller, branching over from the 1700s into the 1800s. You had a renaissance underway, particularly in Europe, particularly in Germany, during the end of the 19th Century, covering the whole sweep of that Century. And suddenly, it came it came to a screeching halt, with the British top-down intervention, personified by Bertrand Russell. And we've been on a cultural downslide ever since. If you destroy the culture, you destroy the moral fabric of a society.

So, where are we now? Earlier today, as I'm sure many of you are aware, a series of propagandistic lies were put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, saying that 271,000 jobs were created last month in the United States, and that the unemployment rate is now officially down to 5%. Five percent unemployment is considered to be tantamount to full employment.

Well, those figures are an absolute lie, and I think if any of you think about it, any of you watching this broadcast now,

think about whether your conditions of life are better or worse than they were at the start of the Obama presidency, or, even more so, at the end of the Clinton presidency, when Bush and Cheney came in. If you say, "My conditions are better, my prospects for my children and grandchildren are better," then you are in an extremely small minority. The simple reality is that half of the 271,000 jobs claimed to have been created, are *purely fictitious*. They're the result of a mathematical slight-of-hand trick, projecting, on average, death and life rates and starts of new businesses and bankruptcies. But there's nothing normal about the current economy. So, forget that number! If you take the fact that 94 million working-age Americans, qualified to be in the labor force, are *not* counted as part of the labor force, because they are either chronically unemployed or have never been able to find a job, then if you add those 94 million people, working-age people, in, you find that the actual unemployment rate in the United States, is 23%! That number is on a par with the worst, darkest, days of the Great Depression in the 1930s, before Roosevelt put people back to work.

We have statistics that have come out. A study came out just this past week from Harvard University, indicating that for the first time in a long time, there are more and more Americans dying during their middle-age – their 40s and 50s. And this is due to a combination of job loss, of lack of access to adequate medical care, addiction to drugs and alcohol – again, a reflection of a process of chronic unemployment or under-employment. In rural United States, according to a report in the *New York Times* earlier this week, the rate of suicides is rising astronomically.

In a few moments, Megan will give you a detailed readout on the fact that we're in the midst of a heroin epidemic in the United States, and it's mostly afflicting middle class and upper middle class households all over the country. You have all of the signs there, as if anyone out there needed to be

reminded or told about the actual collapse of the conditions of life.

So, this has occurred during the period of the Bush-Cheney administration and during the period of Obama. There's nothing that we can do right now, in particular, about Bush and Cheney, from the standpoint they're out of office. They should have been impeached for a whole range of reasons, and they were not impeached. Yet President Obama is the current President. And he stands guilty of crimes that even go beyond the scope of what Bush and Cheney did. The drone killing policy is a policy of mass murder. In effect, you should be thinking about President Obama from the standpoint of somebody who is a bigger mass murderer than Charles Manson. How would you feel about having Charles Manson in the White House? Well, guess what? Maybe you do. So, the question is, and this is addressed to the outstanding individual who did appear at that Congressional forum, and it's also addressed to you, the American people. When are you going to shed the disease of pragmatism and face the reality of the situation that you are now living through? This is not something you watch on television, or read about in the newspapers or on your personal computer. This is the life that you are being subjected to; and there's no reason for it.

The trans-Atlantic region is dead; the US economy is dead. The European economy is even more dead in many areas than the US economy is. Yet, Asia is not thriving because of the impact of the trans-Atlantic crisis; but Asia is doing vastly better. There's growth going on. China, India, even Russia; there's growth going on in the entire region. There's a perspective of optimism, about space exploration, about extending the high-speed links from the Asia-Pacific coast on to the Atlantic coast of Europe. The United States and Europe are living as if on a different planet with a different mindset; and that can and must be broken. And one of the first steps that must be taken is that there's got to be a genuine outpouring that says

that this President's got to go. That Wall Street has got to be shut down; because one of the greatest crimes that President Obama has committed has been to be a lackey of Wall Street and the City of London. To put their interests above those of the American people.

So, it's time to wake up to your own condition and do something about it, and as I say, there are leading political figures who are scared to death that we are on the cusp of thermonuclear war; they're now talking about it more openly. Don't get me wrong, it's not insignificant that leading American diplomats and members of Congress talked about the fact that we're on the edge of thermonuclear war at a public forum on Capitol Hill. But how many of you even knew about that before you heard this broadcast tonight? I can assure you, you did not read it on the front page of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*; you didn't hear about it on the six o'clock news. So, it's time to wake up; and those people, who are in responsible leading positions, have got to stop being pragmatic and pulling their punches. And they've got to join us and join Mr. LaRouche in saying "We've got an immediate mission. We've got to bring down this Presidency, and we've got to bring down Wall Street." If you don't do that, then you're not serious about stopping thermonuclear war, and you're not serious about turning around the collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic region.

So, that's the issue on the table. And it was a wonderful event on Wednesday, but this missing ingredient is deadly if it's not actually picked up.

**MEGAN BEETS:** So, on the topic of Obama being very good at killing, let's take a closer look at what's been done to the working population of the United States over the course of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. As Jeff mentioned, on November 4, the Drug Enforcement Administration released their 2015 National Drug Threat Assessment Report, which paints a similar

report released by the CDC in August; a staggering picture of the drug use and drug overdose increases in the United States, which has risen to epidemic levels under the regimes of Bush and Obama. The document reports that drug-related deaths, as Matthew mentioned in the opening, drug-related deaths have risen to become the leading cause of injury death in the United States. More than firearms; more than car accidents. And in 2013 alone, the United States lost 46,470 people to drug overdoses; 46,000 people. That's more than 120 per day. Now among drugs, controlled prescription drugs – mainly opioids and heroin – account for the largest type of drug by far; and the slight decline of the use of prescription drugs is being steadily replaced by the use of heroin, as people shift over to what's a much more deadly drug. But what's also much cheaper and much, much more widely available.

Now, to illustrate that a little bit, in 2013 there were 169,000 new users of heroin; many of them very young. Between 2013 and 2014, the rate of current heroin use – in other words, people who have used heroin in the past 30 days – rose by 51%. Between 2007 and 2013 – or in other words, during the course of Obama's Presidency – the addiction to heroin rose 150%; and the deaths by overdose of heroin more than tripled.

Now the primary area where this increase of death has occurred, is in the Midwest; the formerly industrial centers that LaRouche took the spear point to save over the course of 2005 and the following years, when under the Bush-Cheney administration the auto industry and related machine tool sectors were gutted and crushed. Now it's the Midwest, followed closely by New England and the New York/New Jersey area; all of these the formerly productive industrial centers of the country which have suffered in every way under Bush and Obama. Now the increase, as you might guess, for the most part is not concentrated in the inner cities; although I will mention that in the city of Baltimore, one in ten people is a heroin user. It's not centered among the poorest people in the

country; it's centered in the middle class, the working class. For example, families with an income of \$50,000 or more, for families of that income rate, heroin addiction has risen by 60% in the last 4 years. These are working class, upper class families and their children.

But this picture of the epidemic use of drugs is just part of a broader picture. Death is on the rise under President Obama. A study was released just a few weeks ago in September, which is this week receiving wide coverage, which states that since 1999, over the course of the four terms of Bush and Obama, the death rate among middle-aged white Americans in the age range of 45-54 has risen dramatically; in an unprecedented way. 10 % overall, and 20 % among the poorer, less educated strata. This increase of the death rate of middle-aged people is not a natural shift in demographics; it's not due to some overall change in disease mortality rates. In fact, for comparison, in comparable industrialized countries around the world, the mortality rate for exactly this class of people has *fallen* by 25 % to 30 %. So, this is purely the result of a conscious policy in the United States by Bush and Obama.

The leading cause is not disease. The leading causes are signs of the complete degeneration and despair among the American population: drug abuse; alcohol abuse. And in fact, the authors of the report note particularly, heroin and other opioid overdoses; suicide. And as Jeff referenced, in rural areas of the United States, the suicide rates since 2004 have risen by 20%.

So here you have an overview of the stark reality of the Obama death policy, so clearly seen in the attack on the hospital in Afghanistan, turned against the American people. When presented with some of these figures the other day, LaRouche responded with this: He said, "Why didn't we, as a nation, respond years back, and take action to stop this from happening? How did people get set up to accept the economic policies of destruction of science, of industry, along with

endless bail-outs of Wall Street? How were we induced to submit to do this to ourselves?" So, I'd like to ask Jeff to come to the podium to respond and elaborate.

**STEINBERG:** I think it goes back to what I said earlier. Slowly, the level of culture, the level of real science that had permeated our culture even here in the United States in the 19th Century has been under steady and constant assault; largely coming from the British, particularly reflected in people like Lord Bertram Russell, who wrote books professing to be about science. He wrote a book in 1951, *The Impact of Science on Society*; he didn't talk about science. He talked about methods of destruction of young minds by turning the education system into a system that basically drives people into accepting their subservience to be trained, to be submissive, to be non-inquisitive. And again, the disease that Russell imposed from the beginning of the 20th Century, was the disease of replacing physical science with mathematics. Everything comes down to a formula; everything comes down to a probability. If it's not highly probable, then it's not practical, and therefore, don't go there.

So, you've had an assault on education, both from the kindergarten level on up, all the way to the major universities professing to be the great halls of advanced education. You've had a culture that has been destructive in the most unbelievable and egregious way. And the net effect is that even compared to the early 1970s, people have lost a certain sense of fight. They'd rather watch reality television. Our leaders have accepted the idea that there are boundary conditions on what they can even dare think about.

Last week on this broadcast, we talked about former Senator Mike Gravel, who, as a lowly first-term Senator from Alaska, had the audacity to put the Pentagon Papers in the Congressional record. That act in 1971 led to the demise of President Nixon, and contributed mightily to the end of the Vietnam War. So, there are glimmers of recognition among some

of our elder statesmen that things used to be different. And so, we've got an enormous challenge on our hands right now. Do we continue to tolerate, even knowing that the President of the United States is sitting down every Tuesday afternoon with a small group of White House advisors and basically ordering the murder of individual citizens from nations all over the world, some of them American citizens, without any kind of oversight, and without any accountability for his actions?

As Megan just said, he's presided over an invasion of drugs, whether it's over the counter, prescription or black-market illegal drugs; we have 94 million citizens of working age who are not working in the real economy. Clearly not every one of those people is sleeping under a bridge somewhere. How many of them are directly involved in the black market economy that's shoving heroin at a record rate into the arms of American citizens? It's all of a package.

And again, as I said earlier, and as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion this afternoon, Obama's got to go, and the book of evidence is absolutely there. It's comprehensive, it's irrefutable. Some of the crimes that he is documented to be guilty of are crimes that go beyond simply the question of impeachment. They may wind up being the basis for criminal prosecution, because the immunity afforded to elected officials does not extend to outright criminal action.

So, we've got Wall Street, that's a parasite sitting on top of and destroying the U.S. economy. There are straightforward measures that could be taken to eliminate Wall Street, starting with the idea of simply re-instating Glass-Steagall. There are many things that could be done. We could issue credit to rebuild our infrastructure. We could be adopting the model of Franklin Roosevelt from when he first came into office, setting up training programs for young people to give them the necessary skills and to also give them the sense of optimism that they've got a constructive role to play in society, and that they've got a bright future ahead of them.



All of these things could be done. They're all right there. If you go to the LaRouche PAC website, you will see there's a massive amount of material spelling out chapter and verse exactly what kinds of measures can and must be taken to turn this situation around. But ultimately it starts with a very subjective question: Are you prepared to fight for your own vital interests? Are you prepared to hold elected officials to a constitutional standard, and to hold them accountable if they fail to live up to it? These are the issues. These are the questions that are really right now staring us in the face, because we don't have much time left. We don't have a great deal of time to solve these problems, to tackle these issues, and the question is, are you prepared to give up your pragmatism, to turn off your television, and to do something constructive for your country, for your family, and for your future generations?

That's really the issue and that's the question that should be the burning issue on everybody's mind at this moment.

**MATT OGDEN:** Now, our final question for this evening is our institutional question, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the Russian-operated Airbus A321M crashed last Saturday shortly after taking off from the Red Sea resort of Sharm al-Sheikh, on its way to St. Petersburg, killing all 224 people on board. There are strong but unconfirmed reports that the plane had been downed by a bomb, a claim contested by both Egypt and Russia. British Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond, however, said that Britain had weighed the whole information picture, including the Islamic State's claim of responsibility after the crash, and had concluded that there *is* a significant possibility. If these reports are substantiated through examination of the plane wreckage, what actions do you suggest the Russian government should take against the perpetrators of this tragic crime?"

**STEINBERG:** First of all, I think the actions taken by the British Foreign Secretary were obnoxious and egregious. The

British have no role whatsoever in this investigation. If they had communications intercepts suggesting that terrorists were planning such an attack, then the obvious question is why didn't they inform the Egyptian and Russian authorities, if they knew this was happening? The fact of the matter is that the British basically staged an ambush for Egyptian President el-Sisi, because it was upon his arrival in London for a long-scheduled state visit that Hammond made these comments, and basically announced at the same time that British Airways was suspending flights into Egypt.

So, you've got a British game being played here, and an Obama game, because an unnamed Obama Administration official immediately came out and told Reuters that the U.S. is in agreement with the British in terms of jumping the gun, and drawing these hasty and perhaps completely false conclusions.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said is, first of all, you've got to let the Russians conduct the investigation. The Russians are perfectly capable of conducting a thorough and honest and comprehensive forensic investigation to determine what happened. And because of the nature of the area where the crash occurred, namely, in the Sinai desert, all of the remains of the plane have been recovered. The black boxes have been recovered, with a little bit of damage to one of them. All of the bodies by and large have been recovered. And therefore, because you're dealing with people who have competence, and who have a vested interest in finding out what really happened, Mr. LaRouche emphasized, let the Russians do their job. Don't jam them. Don't try to speed it up. Patiently wait for the investigation to be concluded.

And I should say that the head of the Russian FSB, their intelligence service, Alexander Bortnikov, issued a statement today. I'll just read it—it's brief—but it goes very much to the point that Mr. LaRouche just made. Bortnikov said, and it was publicized on Channel 1 TV in Russia today:

“We need to obtain absolutely objective and verified data on the reasons for the crash of the plane. This is necessary for purposes of investigating the cause of this disaster, and for informing the public. This work must be done in the most meticulous fashion, taking as much time as may be required, and I want to state that until we determine the actual causes of what happened, I think it is appropriate to halt Russian civil aviation flights to Egypt. This chiefly involves tourism. At the same time, we find it necessary to cooperate actively with the Egyptian authorities in joint work on the investigation of the causes of this disaster. Now, Russia 1 then quoted the official spokesman for President Putin, Mr. Peskov, who said the President concurred with Bortnikov’s recommendations; and he added “Halting the flights does not yet mean that the version that it was an act of terrorism is being viewed as the main one in the investigation of this air disaster. Experts continue to exclude nothing, including the possibility of a bomb explosion onboard the plane.” So, this is the beginnings of an investigation into a serious tragedy; 224 people were killed in it. And it’s not known yet; we don’t have the results of that forensic investigation.

Now as the question of what the Russians should do, I think the answer is, pretty obviously, that they’re already doing it. The Russians, as of September 30, are carrying out a systematic, targeted campaign against the terrorist networks that are operating inside Syria. They are, at the same time, aggressively pursuing a diplomatic track to try to bring an end to this 5-year horror inside Syria; and that will obviously have major implications for the situation next door in Iraq, in Lebanon, in other parts of the entire Middle East region. So, in effect, Putin already made a command decision and launched the flanking operation against the Islamic State and allied jihadist groups and their sponsors in countries like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Turkey. So, it would be a mistake to veer off what is already an extremely effective and ongoing flanking operation. If it turns out – and again, it’s

premature to make any judgement on this – but if it does turn out that the Islamic State or some affiliate or spin-off was involved in planting a bomb on that plane, then that's another story; and you've got to carry it several steps further. What was the infrastructure through which that operation was conducted, if it proves to have been a bomb rather than a mechanical failure? Now, if you're talking about the Islamic State, if you're talking about Nusra, if you're talking about al-Qaeda, then ultimately, face it; you're talking about operations that were allowed to grow and allowed to fester as a result of the policies of the Bush and now Obama Administrations, and the Blair and Cameron governments in Britain.

So, ultimately, all roads lead back to what we've been discussing throughout the entire evening broadcast tonight; namely, as the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA], General Mike Flynn, told al-Jazeera, and has subsequently repeated in interviews with American and Russian media; the President, the administration were warned that the actions that the US was taking in places like Benghazi, was fueling the growth of jihadist organizations. And it was not an oversight, or that the warnings were ignored, as General Flynn said, it was in pursuit of the ongoing current policy that they made a willful decision to keep doing what they were doing, having been fully informed that this was fueling the growth of not just al-Qaeda. But back in 2012, DIA was already looking at the prospects of the creation of a jihadist caliphate in the area on the territory of parts of Iraq and Syria.

So, in other words, the head of the DIA has said openly and publicly President Obama willfully pursued a policy that created ISIS. So, let me ask you, if – and we're not there yet by any means – but if it turns out that this was a bomb; if it turns out that the Islamic State was involved in it, then let's go higher up the political and logistical chain of

command. Are we not talking about the consequences of Bush and Obama administration policies and certainly the policies of the parallel British government? So, that's another dimension of what I want you to think about this evening. And I hope that you've been disturbed enough by what we've discussed tonight that you'll lose a bit of sleep and think about what's required to end the tyranny of pragmatism. To end the tyranny of basically "go along to get along"; and what it will take to actually solve these crises before they bring the entire trans-Atlantic region down, or may ultimately lead to thermonuclear annihilation.

**OGDEN:** So, as I said at the outset of this broadcast, the evidence has continued to accumulate. The case against Obama has now begun to snowball; the avalanche is ready to begin. It is now incumbent on those who are in responsible positions of leadership to take the legal and Constitutional actions which must be taken to protect the American people and to protect the people of the entire world from the deadly consequences of the continuation of the policies of the Obama Presidency.

So with that said, we want to thank you for joining us here tonight. Please, stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com), and please circulate this video and the discussion that Mr. LaRouche continues to have with activists in Manhattan and with people across the entire nation in his weekly Fireside Chats, as widely as you possibly can.

Thank you for joining us, and good night.

---

# Leder, 5. november 2015: Dump Obama nu, eller stå over for et atomart Holocaust

Menneskehedens skæbne ligger nu i vægtskålene, og det centrale spørgsmål, nu mere end nogen sinde før, er, hvorvidt det amerikanske folk samt en håndfuld valgte regeringsfolk har det fornødne mod til at gennemtvinge præsident Obamas fjernelse fra embedet. Drone-papirerne er at sammenligne med Pentagon-papirerne, anno 2015, og som dokumenterer, at USA's præsident er den største massemander i amerikansk historie.

Det faktum, at de amerikanske massemedier har mørklagt betydningen af Drone-papirerne, var forventeligt. Det forringer ikke i mindste måde beviserne, ej heller gør det Obama mindre skyldig i krigsforbrydelser og forbrydelser mod menneskeheden.

Han sidder på toppen af en klart defineret, kriminel kommandovej, der har kommissioneret mord over hele verden, inklusive imod amerikanske borgere. Forbrydelserne er klart dokumenteret i Drone-papirerne, der inkluderer en høring i Kongressens Efterretningskomite om CIA's og Fælleskommandoen for Specialoperationers drone-programmer til mange milliarder dollar om året, og som viser, at der ikke er nogen kontrol med dem, og at uskyldige civile rutinemæssigt bliver dræbt, for blot posthumt at blive kategoriseret som fjender, dræbt under kamp, for at skjule forbrydelsernes omfang.

Obama fortsætter stædigt med at mørklægge bombningen af Læger uden Grænser-hospitalet i Kunduz, Afghanistan, og afviser gruppens krav om en uvildig undersøgelse under Genevekonventionen. Obama er en dræber, der er på mordtogt, og han må stoppes af den relevante, forfatningsmæssige handling, enten gennem en rigsretssag eller gennem det 25.

## Forfatningstillæg.

Der er en voksende stemning i landet for netop en sådan handling – under forudsætning af, at man kan opmarchere det rigtige lederskab, der kan få det til at ske. Onsdag eftermiddag fandt et usædvanligt møde sted på Capitol Hill med kongresmedlemmerne John Conyers, Walter Jones og Alan Grayson, samt fhv. amerikanske ambassadør Jack Matlock, NYU-professor Stephen Cohen og selskabsdir. Joseph Pepper. De advarede enstemmigt om, at Obamas opførsel er i færd med at føre verden ud i en atomkatastrofe og krævede, at der skulle sættes en stopper for Obamas provokationer imod Rusland og Putin. Den ene taler efter den anden genkaldte Koldkrigsoplevelsen, hvor man levede under truslen om en umiddelbart forestående atomar udslettelse, og advarede om, at den nuværende situation, som et resultat af Obamas handlinger, er endnu mere farlig.

Vi har nu et muligheds øjeblik. Ved at fjerne Obama gennem de relevante, forfatningsmæssige midler, og ved samtidig at tage skridt til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og omgående igangsætte en reel, økonomisk genrejsning i Franklin Roosevelts ånd, kan vi genrejse USA til sin historiske rolle som en nation, der leder ved sit eksempel og ikke ved imperial politik og krig.

Alternativet blev skåret ud i pap på Capitol Hill og var en gentagelse af de advarsler, som Lyndon LaRouche har udtalt fra Obama-præsidentskabets allerførste dage. At tillade, at en farlig narcissist forbliver i embedet én eneste dag til, er at sætte selveste menneskehedens overlevelse på spil.

Det amerikanske folk har lidt under 15 års Bush- og Obamaregeringer, og konsekvenserne har allerede været ødelæggende. Fattigdom, arbejdsløshed, narkomani, selvmord – dette er de menneskelige konsekvenser af Bush' og Obamas ødelæggelse af den amerikanske økonomi. Og nu har præsident Obama bragt verden til selveste randen af en mulig, atomar udslettelse.

---

# Russisk advarsel på højt niveau: Obama-strategier overvejer global krig

*Søndag, 1. november 2015* – Ruslands vicepremierminister leverede en offentlig advarsel den 30. okt. om, at Obamaregeringen overvejer en verdenskrig imod Rusland.

Dmitri Rogozin talte til journalister efter et møde i det Russiske Nationale Sikkerhedsråd, der muligvis har drøftet spørgsmålet, og fordømte USA's »nuværende Prompt Global Strike-doktrin«, en strategi, der går ud på at undertrykke en modstanders (Ruslands eller Kinas) evne til at udføre et angreb som gengældelse for et førsteangreb. Rogozin kaldte dette for »illusorisk«, men i vendinger, der ikke kunne misforstås.

»USA's strategier er for første gang begyndt at have illusoriske visioner om, at de kan opnå sejr over en atommagt i en ikke-atomar krig. Dette er nonsens, dette vil aldrig ske«, sagde Rogozin efter mødet, refereret af TASS.

Rogozin syntes imidlertid at advare om en atomkrig med diskussioner om planer for at genoplive »civilforsvar« i Rusland. »Men konfronteret med en sådan trussel er opgaven at beskytte befolkningen«, sagde han. »Grundlæggende set må vi atter bygge civilt forsvar og sikkerhedsfaciliteter til befolkningen, og hvad vigtigst er, så må denne handling



udføres på en ordentlig, strømlinet måde.«

Rogozin kom med denne advarsel i en situation, hvor den største NATO-øvelse i mange år, »Trident Juncture«, er i gang og inkluderer en øvelse i et førsteangreb på russiske styrker.

Mens stemmer i USA's Demokratiske Parti begynder at angribe Obamas »illegale og forfatningsstridige« krigsplaner, så har EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche under hele Obamas anden embedsperiode understreget, at han (Obama) er i stand til, og med sandsynlighed vil, lancere atomkrig imod Rusland og/eller Kina, med mindre han fjernes fra præsidentembedet, for hvilket han ikke er skikket.

*Foto: Dmitri Rogozin, fra tidligere på året.*

---

## **Obama gør fremstød for tre krige samtidig**

29. oktober 2015 – Præsident Obama bevæger USA stadig nærmere til global krig mod Rusland i Europa og Mellemøsten og mod Kina i Asien. Han ønsker at myrde et massivt antal mennesker, og han gør det gennem udflugter og 'snigende missioner' (dvs. missioner, der gennemføres i smug, uden nogen debat og uden korrekt bemyndigelse, -red.) med det formål at sabotere enhver reel diskussion i USA. I stedet for at komme med regulære erklæringer om den vedtagne politik fra Det Hvide Hus, gør Obama det i form af lækker gennem anonyme regeringsfolk længere ned på rangskalaen til diverse nyhedsorganisationer. Hvis Obama ikke bliver stoppet gennem en forfatningsmæssig fjernelse fra embedet, vil en atomkrig blive resultatet af en

eller flere af disse konfrontationer:

\* *Wall Street Journal* rapporterede i går, at NATO overvejer at udsende på en fremskreden post et stort troppekontingent i Polen og de tre baltiske stater. Den plan, der er under overvejelse, omfatter udsendelse af en bataljon, omkring 800-1.000 mand, under NATO-kommando i hvert af de tre lande. En light-version af planen går ud på at sprede en enkelt bataljon hen over alle fire lande, men 15-20 % af soldaterne ville i alle tilfælde være amerikanske. Det forlyder, at tyske regeringsfolk giver udtryk for tilbageholdenhed og under private diskussion siger til deres allierede, at de ikke vil true Moskva som en permanent fjende, eller smække Moskva ude af Europa. Begge versioner af planen vil i Moskva blive opfattet som en provokation, hvad tyskerne meget vel ved, men artiklen henviser til unavngivne amerikanske regeringsfolk som kilde, en indikation på, at det er Obama, der har indledt en diskussion om dette fremstød hen imod atomkrig.

\*I en anden artikel, der bygger på anonyme lækker fra Obamaregeringen, rapporterer Reuters, at det var Pentagon, der gjorde fremstød for provokationen i Det sydkinesiske Hav, under hvilken destroyeren USS Lassen sejlede frem til inden for 12 sømil fra de kunstige øer den 26. okt. i en »frihed for sejlads«-øvelse. De siger, at Pentagonfolk har krævet en sådan aktion for at udfordre Kina siden maj måned, men at det var Det Hvide Hus og Udenrigsministeriet, der »bremsede« det indtil denne uge. Men aktionen byggede på en anmodning om »muligheder« fra forsvarsministeren Ash Carter – der trods alt er udnævnt af Obama – angiveligt for at respondere til den hurtige opbygning af disse øer. Det er den samme kampagne hen imod atomkrig, som Obama er engageret i, i Europa.

\* Underhåndsudvidelsen af USA's krig i Mellemøsten følger den samme fremgangsmåde, hvor Obama overvejer at udvide USA's militære operationer i Syrien og risikere et sammenstød med Rusland; og i Irak, hvor regeringen hævder, at amerikanske tropper ikke er involveret i kamp, selv om en amerikansk

soldat er blevet dræbt og fem andre såret i kamp, og med Carter, der lover mere af samme slags.

---

# **Leder, 29. oktober 2015: Sandheden er afgørende: Obama er en morder, og han må fjernes fra embedet nu**

I går udstedte Lyndon LaRouche på ny et presserende nødvendigt krav om, at Barack Obama omgående må fjernes fra USA's præsidentskab ved forfatningsmæssige tiltag, for at han ikke skal føre hele planeten ud i en atomar udslettelseskrig. LaRouche henviste til Obamas seneste runde med militære provokationer imod Kina i Det sydkinesiske Hav, hans eskalerende krig i Syrien og hans masseorderiske droneprogram – blandt andre – som typiske eksempler på den politik, der som en skrigende nødvendighed må bringes til ophør.

LaRouche erklærede under en diskussion i dag med LPAC Policy Committee:

*»Jeg mener, at problemet her ligger i det faktum, at Obama ... Obama er grundlæggende set i færd med at foretage træk, som han gør med operationerne ved Kina osv., og han er fast besluttet på at lancere en atomkrig. Og alle tendenser i hans adfærd går i den retning. For eksempel som angrebet på den medicinske facilitet [i Kunduz, Afghanistan]. Fyren er i virkeligheden en morder. Han er slet og ret en morder, og han bør smides ud af embedet.«*

»Og hvis vi ikke siger dette og fører en kampagne omkring dette, så mener jeg, at verden som helhed, verdens folk som helhed, står på randen. Se blot på, hvad Obama er i færd med at foretage sig i Kina, med angrebet på Kina, som er en absolut forfalsket operation.«

»Obama viser sine fæle poter, eller sine blodige poter, i diverse operationer. Denne mand må trækkes ud, hans embedsperiode må annulleres! Vi har et præsidentielt princip, under hvilket han må klassificeres, og under hvilket han må fjernes fra embedet. Hvis vi ikke fjerner ham fra embedet, så vil vi komme ud i en meget farlig situation.«

»Den anden side af sagen er, at vi ikke har en Kongres, der er kompetent til at udtrykke sig, som det er nødvendigt. Gå tilbage til præsidentskaberne før denne. Vi har før haft disse. Man kan ikke være useriøs med dette og behandle det ved at sige: 'Vi må forhandle os igennem det her.'«

»Vi må sige, 'Nej!' Og jeg mener, at vores organisation har evnen til at sige 'nej'. Og jeg mener, at vi må sige nej ved simpelt hen at opregne nogle af de forbrydelser, han har begået. Og sige: Disse forbrydelser, alt imens de ikke er afgjort mht. en endelig afgørelse, så er faktum, at kravet er, at han må underkastes undersøgelse for at demonstrere, hvorfor han ikke skal smides ud af embedet. Det er der beviser nok til.«

Den seneste tids række af forbrydelser, som Obama har begået, inkluderer bl.a.:

- Provokationen den 27. okt. med at sende et amerikansk krigsskib ind i Det sydkinesiske Hav, mens han lover at fortsætte med lignede provokationer til vands og i luften i den nærmeste fremtid. En direkte militær nærkontakt mellem USA og Kina bliver højst sandsynlig, hvis dette fortsætter.

- Lækken fra Obamaregeringen den 27. okt. til *Washington Post*, Reuters og andre medier om, at hans regering har en operationel plan på bordet om at sende amerikanske specialtropper og andre tropper ind i Syrien – en total overtrædelse af USA's Forfatning og af International Lov – der blot venter på grønt lys fra præsidenten. Dette kunne føre til en direkte militær konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland på den mellemøstlige arena.
- Det amerikanske militærs overlagte bombing den 3. okt. af et Læger uden Grænser-hospital i Kunduz, Afghanistan, der resulterede i over 30 dødsfald, til trods for, at der på forhånd var udgivet fuld information om koordinaterne for dette hospital. Dette udgør en krigsforbrydelse, der berettiger til retsforfølgelse. Obamaregeringens skamløshed opmuntrede tydeligvis Det saudiske Kongerige til at udføre en lignende grusomhed imod et LuG-hospital i Yemen den 26. oktober.
- Det løbske, illegale droneprogram for drab, under hvilket Obama personligt udvælger og ved sin underskrift godkender det koldblodige mord på mistænkte terrorister og uskyldige tilskuere over en kam, som det for nyligt er blevet afsløret af websiden The Intercept.
- Obamas fortsatte og ubøjelige engagerende forpligtelse til at redde (bailout) det bankerotte Wall Street-system ved at tage livet af Amerikas fysiske økonomi og Amerikas befolkning – et system, der i stedet bør fjernes og erstattes med LaRouches økonomiske program med Verdenslandbroen.
- Obamas principielle ansvar for at skabe den flygtningekrise, der har bragt Europa til den yderste klippekant, gennem de illegale krige, som han og hans forgænger George Bush lancerede i hele regionen, og senest i Syrien.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede i sine bemærkninger ved konferencen i Washington den 27. okt. med fhv. senator Mike Gravel, så har denne flygtningekrise nu nået kogepunktet og

har konfronteret Europa med en knald-eller-fald-situation for sin blotte eksistens. Hele den Europæiske Union er ved at smuldre, stedt over for krisen, der er meget mere end en flygtningekrise: det er en massemigration og en eksistentiel krise. Den eneste løsning, understregede Zepp-LaRouche, er at bringe reel udvikling ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika ved at forlænge Verdenslandbroen ind i disse områder. USA og Storbritannien bør deltage i at sikre denne løsning, erklærede hun. Eftersom det var Det britiske Monarki, og i USA Bush- og Obamaregeringerne, der var årsag til krisen.

I går understregede LaRouche:

*»Denne karl Obama må holdes tilbage, og hvis han ikke bliver det, er I alle døde, det er den risiko, vi løber. Og jeg mener, at vores fremgangsmåde må defineres ud fra disse referencerammer. Jeg mener, at vi må gøre dette drone-spørgsmål til det absolutte topspørgsmål. Hvis der er nogen, der siger, at det kan retfærdiggøres, er det en løgn – du narres til at godtage en løgn. Når man myrder folk, så myrder man dem! Og man siger 'du myrder dem'.*

*Og Obama er grundlæggende set en morder; han er en masse-morder. Den aktuelle præsident for USA er en masse-morder! Hvis man vil redde USA, så må man sige dette. Hvis man ikke siger dette, ja, så kunne du være den næste, der ryger.«*

Med hensyn til dem, der har været så bange for Obama, at de har været paralyseret til handlingslammelse og til at tolerere hans nazistiske forbrydelser, erklærede LaRouche:

*»Sandheden er af afgørende betydning: Obama er en morder, punktum. Hvis man ønsker, at civilisationen skal overleve, må man lukke ned for Obama. Ikke på længere sigt; lige nu.«*

---

# NATO-luftstyrker øver atomkrig

13. oktober 2015 – NATO påbegynder en atomvåbenøvelse i dag, der fortsætter frem til 16. okt., og udgår fra luftbasen i Büchel, Tyskland. Med navnet »Steadfast Noon« øves der i nedkastning af atomvåben fra bombefly, inklusive tyske Tornado jetfly. Luftrummet over Büchel vil blive afspærret for al civil flytrafik frem til 16. okt. Sammen med atommagten USA vil otte andre NATO-medlemsstater, der ikke er atommagter, deltage med deres luftstyrker i øvelsen: Tyskland, Italien, Holland, Belgien, Polen Tjekkiet, Grækenland og Tyrkiet.

I mellemtiden rapporterer Sputnik, at den britiske forsvarsminister Michael Fallon og Storbritanniens udsending til NATO, Sir Adam Thomson, i respons til en imaginær, russisk trussel, ønsker, sammen med deres NATO-allierede, at afholde massive øvelser, der skulle inkludere Storbritanniens ubåde, der medfører Trident atomvåben. Faktisk ville et missil blive prøveaffyret for første gang siden 2012.

Sputnik skriver: »Storbritannien anvender den samme strategi med at skabe overdrevent ståhej over en ikkeeksisterende, russisk trussel for at presse atomvåbenøvelserne igennem.«

Storbritannien kontrollerer fire Vanguard-klasse ubåde, udstationeret på Clyde flådebasen i Skotland, og som medfører 16 Trident II-missiler.

Dernæst citerer Sputnik en rapport fra februar 2015 af Henry Jackson Selskabet, der hævdede, at russisk efterretningstjeneste søger at finde den »akustiske signatur«, som ubådene af Vanguard-klassen udsender, med det formål at kunne neutralisere dem. Hvis Rusland kunne få fat i en

optagelse af 'signaturen', ville det få alvorlige følger for Storbritanniens atomafskrækkelse – Rusland ville blive i stand til at spore Vanguard-ubåde og potentielt sænke dem, før de kunne lancere deres missiler», lyder det i dokumentet.

Der er ikke desto mindre en betydelig opposition i Storbritannien, inklusive i højtplacerede militære lag, til eksistensen af den såkaldte atomafskrækkelse i det hele taget, og det på et tidspunkt, hvor Trident er ved at nå enden af sin livscyklus, og hvor dets efterfølgende program stadig skal godkendes.

En britisk ekspert i ikke-spredning af atomvåben sagde til *EIR*, at, hvis Storbritannien skulle træde ud af Den europæiske Union efter en folkeafstemning, udskrevet af premierminister David Cameron, vil fortalere for uafhængighed i Skotland, hvor ubådene er baseret, sandsynligvis kræve en ny folkeafstemning om Skotlands brud med Det forenede Kongerige, som meget vel kunne gå igennem. Det Skotske Nationalparti (SNP), der ville regere et uafhængigt Skotland, er forpligtet over for en atomvåbenfri politik. SNP er imod fornyelse af Trident.

Storbritanniens leder af Labour-partiet Jeremy Corbyn er også modstander af Trident. Men selv folk inden for det militære establishment er modstander af Trident, inkl. gen. major Patrick Anthony; gen. major Patrick Cordingley, tidl. øverstbefalende for 7. Panserbrigade ('Ørkenrotterne') i Golfkrigen i 1991; pensionerede general Lord Ramsbotham; pensionerede general Sir William Gerald Hugh Beach; og pensionerede feltmarskal Lord Bramall, der skrev et brev den 16. jan. 2009 til *The Times*, hvor han argumenterede: »Atomvåben har vist sig at være komplet ubrugelige som en afskrækkelse mod de trusler og det niveau af vold, som vi aktuelt står overfor, eller sandsynligvis vil møde – især international terrorisme; og jo mere, man analyserer dem, desto mere ubrugelige synes de at være.«



---

# LaRouche anklager, at Obama med overlæg bombede Læger uden Grænser-hospital

11. oktober 2015 – »Der er ingen tvivl om dette«, udtalte Lyndon LaRouche lørdag; bombningen af hospitalet under Læger uden Grænser i Kunduz, Afghanistan, den 3. oktober,

*»var et mord fra Obamas side, som var besluttet og fremført af ham, som følge af had til Putin. Han gjorde det med overlæg. Og han gjorde det i to faser. Først kom det første angreb. Så kom budskabet ud om, hvad man gjorde ved hospitalet, det berømte hospital på stedet. Og de fortsatte! Og Obama lod det fortsætte.«*

LaRouche kom med denne anklage i den bredere sammenhæng med diskussion med deltagere ved hans **dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 10. okt.** om »den nye tilstand af organisering«, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin har skabt i selve USA gennem sin flankemanøvre i Syrien. Putins handlinger har efterladt Obama og slige folk uden muligheder, og Obama, der i sig selv er en satanisk personlighed, »er gået amok«, sagde LaRouche.

*»Obama lancerede dette angreb på hospitalet og myrdede folk! Slet og ret myrdede dem.«*

Læger uden Grænsers internationale præsident Joanne Lius krav fra 7. okt. om, at den Internationale Kommission til Undersøgelse af Kendsgerninger (IHFFC) skal undersøge denne krigsforbrydelse, blev publiceret i går som en kronik i *Sunday*

*Independant* i Sydafrika, bakket op af data, der forklarede kendsgerningerne i det 80 minutter lange angreb, der ikke alene dræbte 22 mennesker, læger såvel som børn, men som også delvis ødelagde det eneste akuthospital i det nordøstlige Afghanistan, der var i stand til at yde behandling på højt niveau til akut redning af liv og lemmer; hospitalet er nu ikke længere operationelt.

IHFFC blev oprettet under artikel 90 i et første protokoltillæg til Genevekonventionen og udstak procedurer til sikring af respekten for, og ærlig implementering af, international humanitær lov.

I et eksklusivt interview med Tysklands Deutsche Welle, der skal sendes i sin helhed den 14. okt., sagde NATO's øverstkommanderende og firestjernet amerikanske general i Luftvåbnet, general Philip Breedlove, at han støtter den undersøgelse, som Læger uden Grænser kræver gennemført af IHFFC. Det er »deres absolutte ret at kræve denne undersøgelse«, sagde Breedlove, og »vi vil støtte det«.

Og hvad er Obama-teamet kommet frem med for at lægge en dæmper på sagen, for denne krigsforbrydelse? Det vil få Pentagon til at tilbyde penge (»kompenserende betalinger«) til ofrene for dets luftangreb, inklusive mod Læger uden Grænser, og hjælpe med at reparere det ødelagte hospital.

*Foto: Læger uden Grænser kræver en uafhængig, international kommissionsundersøgelse af den dødbringende, amerikanske bombing af deres hospital i Kunduz, Afghanistan. Formand Joanne Liu ses i midten.*

---

# Britiske piloter får tilladelse til at nedskyde russiske fly over Syrien

11. oktober 2015 – En artikel af Romil Patel i *International Business Times* fra 11. okt. rapporterer, at britiske

*»piloter fra Royal Air Force (RAF) har fået grønt lys til at nedskyde russiske militære kampfly, når de flyver missioner over Syrien og Irak, hvis de er i fare for dem.«*

Patel citerer en artikel i *Londons Sunday Times*, der citerer en unavngiven kilde fra Det forenede Kongeriges Permanente Fælles Hovedkvarter (PJHQ), som beskrev den nye kampordre:

*»Det første, en britisk pilot vil gøre, er at forsøge at undgå en situation, hvor et angreb i luften kunne tænkes at finde sted ... man undgår et område, hvis der er russisk aktivitet. Men, hvis en pilot bliver anskudt, **eller mener, at han vil blive det**, må han forsvare sig. Vi har nu en situation, hvor en enkelt pilot, uanset nationalitet, kan få strategisk indvirkning på fremtidige begivenheder«*

[fremhævelse tilføjet].

For at muliggøre en sådan potentiel hændelse vil RAF Tornadofly nu blive bevæbnet med varmesøgende luft-til-luft-missiler, der kan flyve ved Mach-3. Dette, skriver Patel, ville »gøre det muligt for RAF-piloter at nedskyde fjendefly uden selv at blive mål.«

Endnu en britisk militærkilde sagde til *Sunday Times*:

*»Vi tager et skridt nærmere til krig. Kun ét enkelt fly*

*behøver blive nedskudt i en luftkamp, og hele landskabet vil ændres.»*

---

## **Leder, 12. oktober 2015: Briterne og deres agent Obama går amok**

*'Vi tager et skridt nærmere til krig ...' The Sunday Times.*

Det folkemorderiske Britiske Imperium er, både i USA og internationalt, kommet til undsætning i forsøg på at redde deres marionet Barack Obama, der er blevet totalt udmanøvreret og overlistet af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin og har således anbragt selve det britiske systems eksistens på huggeblokken.

Mest spektakulært kom Bernie Sanders, der er demokratisk præsidentiel prækandidat, og som medierne har kørt frem som »den førende oppositionsfigur« til den aktuelle Washingtonregering, ud med en helhjertet støtte til Obama på nationalt fjernsyn søndag – umiddelbart forud for næste tirsdags debat mellem de demokratiske kandidater, der sendes på Tv. Sanders, der således viser sig som et totalt britisk aktiv, udtalte, at han har

*»en enorm respekt for Barack Obama ... han hjalp mig med at blive valgt, og jeg arbejder sammen med ham omkring mange, mange spørgsmål ... det er kun meget partiske folk, der nægter at erkende den virkelighed, at vores økonomi i dag er ikke så lidt bedre end den var, da George W. Bush gik af.»*

Dette, mens det brændende spørgsmål, som landet konfronteres

med, er en tilbagevenden til Glass-Steagall og udslettelsen af Wall Street og alt, hvad Bush- og Obamaregeringerne repræsenterer. Det bør ikke overraske nogen, at, iflg. velplacerede Washingtonkilder og nogle medieberetninger, en stor del af Sanders' fundraising-organisation blev overdraget ham af Barack Obama.

I går beskrev Lyndon LaRouche Sanders-udviklingen som »virkelig grimme, dårlige nyheder«, der reflekterer, at der er et skift i gang fra briterne globalt. Han advarede om, at vi bør forvente yderligere »djævelske« handlinger fra Obama og hans britiske sponsorer, inklusive mord på ledende personer fra lande, der arbejder sammen med den russiske præsident Putin. »Briterne har intet tilbage ud over sådanne handlinger«, understregede LaRouche. Det britiske Imperium står for at miste sin elementære eksistens, så hold øje med enhver tænkelig form for beskidte affærer, der kommer fra de kanter, der ellers ikke har været synligt aktive et stykke tid.

Når Obama har problemer, vender han sig mod briterne, udtalte LaRouche, så forvent beskidte handlinger, inklusive direkte britiske deployeringer i USA for at forsøge at forstærke Obamas ustabile psykologi.

Bemærkelsesværdig i denne henseende er også rapporten i denne weekend i Londons Sunday Times om, at den britiske regering har udstedt instrukser til sine piloter, der flyver missioner i Syrien, der giver dem tilladelse til at nedskyde russiske fly under visse betingelser:

*»Hvis en pilot bliver beskudt, **eller mener, at han vil blive beskudt**, må han forsvare sig«*

[fremhævelse tilføjet]. Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium anså rapporten i pressen for at være alvorlig nok til, at han udbad sig den britiske forsvarsattache i Moskvas fremmøde for at aflægge forklaring.

»Glem ikke, hvem Obama er«, advarede LaRouche. Han er en løgnagtig, morderisk, satanisk person. Hans journal er kendt. »Obama må knuses«, erklærede LaRouche i dag. Den eneste måde, hvorpå faren for Tredje Verdenskrig kan fjernes, er ved at fjerne Obama fra Det Hvide Hus.

## Supplerende dokumentation:

### Britiske piloter får tilladelse til at nedskyde russiske fly over Syrien

11. oktober 2015 – En artikel af Romil Patel i *International Business Times* fra 11. okt. rapporterer, at britiske

*»piloter fra Royal Air Force (RAF) har fået grønt lys til at nedskyde russiske militære kampfly, når de flyver missioner over Syrien og Irak, hvis de er i fare for dem.«*

Patel citerer en artikel i *Londons Sunday Times*, der citerer en unavngiven kilde fra Det forenede Kongeriges Permanente Fælles Hovedkvarter (PJHQ), som beskrev den nye kampordre:

*»Det første, en britisk pilot vil gøre, er at forsøge at undgå en situation, hvor et angreb i luften kunne tænkes at finde sted ... man undgår et område, hvis der er russisk aktivitet. Men, hvis en pilot bliver anskudt, **eller mener, at han vil blive det**, må han forsvare sig. Vi har nu en situation, hvor en enkelt pilot, uanset nationalitet, kan få strategisk indvirkning på fremtidige begivenheder«*

[fremhævelse tilføjet].

For at muliggøre en sådan potentiel hændelse vil RAF Tornadofly nu blive bevæbnet med varmesøgende luft-til-luft-

missiler, der kan flyve ved Mach-3. Dette, skriver Patel, ville »gøre det muligt for RAF-piloter at nedskyde fjendefly uden selv at blive mål.«

Endnu en britisk militærkilde sagde til *Sunday Times*:

*»Vi tager et skridt nærmere til krig. Kun ét enkelt fly behøver blive nedskudt i en luftkamp, og hele landskabet vil ændres.«*

## **LaRouche anklager, at Obama med overlæg**

### **bombede Læger uden Grænser-hospital**

11. oktober 2015 – »Der er ingen tvivl om dette«, udtalte Lyndon LaRouche lørdag; bombningen af hospitalet under Læger uden Grænser i Kunduz, Afghanistan, den 3. oktober,

*»var et mord fra Obamas side, som var besluttet og fremført af ham, som følge af had til Putin. Han gjorde det med overlæg. Og han gjorde det i to faser. Først kom det første angreb. Så kom budskabet ud om, hvad man gjorde ved hospitalet, det berømte hospital på stedet. Og de fortsatte! Og Obama lod det fortsætte.«*

LaRouche kom med denne anklage i den bredere sammenhæng med diskussion med deltagere ved hans **dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 10. okt.** om »den nye tilstand af organisering«, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin har skabt i selve USA gennem sin flankemanøvre i Syrien. Putins handlinger har efterladt Obama og slige folk uden muligheder, og Obama, der i sig selv er en satanisk personlighed, »er gået amok«, sagde LaRouche.

»Obama lancerede dette angreb på hospitalet og myrdede folk!  
Slet og ret myrdede dem.«

Læger uden Grænsers internationale præsident Joanne Lius krav fra 7. okt. om, at den Internationale Kommission til Undersøgelse af Kendsgerninger (IHFFC) skal undersøge denne krigsforbrydelse, blev publiceret i går som en kronik i *Sunday Independant* i Sydafrika, bakket op af data, der forklarede kendsgerningerne i det 80 minutter lange angreb, der ikke alene dræbte 22 mennesker, læger såvel som børn, men som også delvis ødelagde det eneste akuthospital i det nordøstlige Afghanistan, der var i stand til at yde behandling på højt niveau til akut redning af liv og lemmer; hospitalet er nu ikke længere operationelt.

IHFFC blev oprettet under artikel 90 i et første protokoltillæg til Genevekonventionen og udstak procedurer til sikring af respekten for, og ærlig implementering af, international humanitær lov.

I et eksklusivt interview med Tysklands Deutsche Welle, der skal sendes i sin helhed den 14. okt., sagde NATO's øverstkommanderende og firestjernet amerikanske general i Luftvåbnet, general Philip Breedlove, at han støtter den undersøgelse, som Læger uden Grænser kræver gennemført af IHFFC. Det er »deres absolutte ret at kræve denne undersøgelse«, sagde Breedlove, og »vi vil støtte det«.

Og hvad er Obama-teamet kommet frem med for at lægge en dæmper på sagen, for denne krigsforbrydelse? Det vil få Pentagon til at tilbyde penge (»kompenserende betalinger«) til ofre for dets luftangreb, inklusive mod Læger uden Grænser, og hjælpe med at reparere det ødelagte hospital.



---

# **USA: Rand Paul til GOP og Clinton: »Flyveforbudszone« betyder krig med Rusland**

8. oktober 2015 – I et interview med *Washington Post* fordømte Rand Paul kravet om en flyveforbudszone i Syrien som værende »en rædselsfuld idé«, der kunne »føre til Tredje Verdenskrig«, hvis der var nogen, der var dum nok til at gøre det. Flere af de republikanske kandidater ('GOP', 'Grand Old Party', -red.), såvel som også Hillary Clinton, har krævet en flyveforbudszone.

»Det er at trække en rød streg i luften«, sagde Paul. »Når man først trækker en rød streg, og folk overskrider den, hvad sker der så? Vi taler nu om en hændelse, der kunne føre til Tredje Verdenskrig. Vi klarede os i 70 år med åbne kommunikationskanaler med russerne i et forsøg på at undgå, at den ene side skød modpartens fly ned. Jeg mener, at de personer, der kræver en flyveforbudszone, er naive. I øjeblikket er Rusland faktisk blevet inviteret af to af nabolandene, af Irak og Syrien. Vi vil så sige, at vi vil forhindre Rusland i at overflyve området, når to af de lande, der bliver overfløjet, har inviteret Rusland til at gøre det? Dette stiller spørgsmålet, om vi ønsker at isolere os diplomatisk, eller om vi ønsker at engagere os diplomatisk.«

*WP* rapporterede, at Paul fortsatte med at angribe galskaben med at fremprovokere krig med Rusland i et interview med Fox

News: »Vil I drive Rusland ud af Syrien?« spurgte han interviewereren. »Vil I have en landkrig med Rusland? Der findes ikke noget scenario, hvor Amerika kan stille sig op og sige: Forsvind, Rusland!«