

# **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-deprived 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).