

Helga Zepp-LaRouche-interview på kinesisk TV, med udgivelsen på kinesisk af EIR's rapport »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen.«

Zepp-LaRouche: » For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; ... Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret.«

2. oktober 2015 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, var en af tre panelister på CCTV's show »Dialogue: Ideas Matter« (Dialog: Ideer er vigtige), den 28. september. Vært for showet var Yang Rui, og deltagerne var prof. Jin Canrong fra Kinas Renmin Universitet, der var i studiet sammen med fr. LaRouche, og prof. M.D. Nalapat, formand for UNESCO Peace ved Manipal Universitetet i Indien, over video.

Showet, der varede en halv time, var helliget spørgsmål, der er blevet rejst under det nylige sammentræde af FN's Generalforsamling. Her følger fr. LaRouches interventioner:

Spørgsmålet om udvikling

Da værten Yang Rui bad fr. LaRouche om at kommentere præsident

Xi's forpligtelse til at yde 2 mia. dollar til fattige nationer i hele verden, svarede hun:

»Jeg mener, at det bør ses i lyset af **den fremragende tale, han holdt i FN**, der var den mest optimistiske, mest opmuntrende tale af alle lederne, efter min mening, fordi han understregede den lovede udvikling for hele verden som en del af Kinas win-win-politik. Han understregede f.eks. innovation. Så disse 2 mia. dollar er blot en slags gestus for den langt bredere politik med win-win-politikken og den kinesiske model, som Kina netop nu tilbyder.«

[... Prof. Nalapat bemærkede, at Kina har bragt 500 mio. mennesker ud af absolut fattigdom i løbet af den seneste generation, samt har fremmet kvinders rettigheder.]

Værten Yang Rui spurgte fr. LaRouche, om Xis og Modis oplevelser af fattigdom tidligt i deres liv har haft, og i hvilken grad, en indflydelse på deres politik.

Zepp-LaRouche: »Meget, tror jeg. Jeg mener, at begge de to ledere virkelig er exceptionelle ud fra et standpunkt om at kere sig om deres befolkning. De har begge givet udtryk for en enorm optimisme for fremtiden. Narendra Modi har f.eks. sagt, at BRIKS-landene er den første alliance af lande, som ikke defineres ud fra deres nuværende kapaciteter, men af deres fremtidige potentiale.

Jeg mener, at de begge, med deres egne erfaringer om fattigdom, og om vanskelige tider – i Xi Jinpings tilfælde var perioden under kulturrevolutionen meget vanskelig ... «
[afbrydes]

Efter nogen diskussion om den internationale flygtningekrise, spurgte værten Yang Rui alle de tre paneldeltagere om Millennium Udviklingsmålene, der erklærer, at fattigdom på nuværende tidspunkt efter planen angiveligt skulle have været halveret, samt om Pave Frans' holdning til den ukontrollerede grådigheds voldsomhed. Prof. Nalapat rejste spørgsmålet om

præsident Clintons ophævelse af Glass-Steagall og antydede, at dette førte til krakket i 2008 og til store uligheder i indkomster.

Yang: Er Kina et »udviklet« land eller et »udviklingsland«? Værten bemærkede, at der eksisterer et nyt niveau af aftaler mellem Kina og USA, inklusive løfter fra Washington om at støtte AIIB's indsats. Vil Kina yde store bidrag til folkeslagernes udvikling?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Det mener jeg, Kina allerede har gjort. For, i BRIKS-politikken, og i Xi Jinpings win-win-politik, har Kina bidraget til eller taget lederskabet for at skabe en totalt alternativ, økonomisk model; og det på et tidspunkt, hvor det transatlantiske finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at nedsmelte i et krak, der er større end det i 2008.

Jeg mener, at hele verden har tilsluttet sig AIIB, f.eks., fordi den er en mere attraktiv model, fordi den er målrettet mod reel investering, infrastruktur og andre aspekter af realøkonomien, mens den transatlantiske verden står umiddelbart foran en bankerot. De europæiske banker er totalt bankerot; Wall Street er mere end bankerot. Og da nu herren fra Indien nævnte Glass-Steagall – der er i øjeblikket en stor bevægelse for at genindføre Glass-Steagall, hvilket ville betyde at erklære de bankerotte Wall Street-banker bankerot. Det ville være en meget god ting.

Så det er virkelig en gave fra himlen, næsten, at Kina er begyndt at skabe dette alternative system, som en redningsbåd netop, som Titanic er ved at gå ned.

Så alt imens det er godt, at der nu er en bedre forståelse mellem USA og Kina, så løser det ikke problemet med, at USA's tilbøjelighed stadig går i retning af en unipolær verden.

Jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en periode med enorme forandringer. Europa er ved at forandres; der er stor respons på flygtningekrisen, for det har 'prikket hul på boblen' om,

at vi lever i en verden, hvor krige, der begynder i én del af verden ... « [afbrudt]

Yang: De er også forfatter til rapporten, »**Fra Silkevejen til Verdenslandbroen**« [viser den frem], en fantastisk, meget imponerende rapport.



Se også: "Silkevejen bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk præsenteres på pressekonference i Beijing, 30. sept.

De ser »Dialog« med fr. LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, og prof. Jin Canrong og prof. M.D. Nalapat. Vi diskuterer spørgsmål fra FN's Generalforsamling New York.

Spørgsmålet om kvinders rettigheder

CCTV-værten Yang rejste spørgsmålet om angrebene på Kina for sin tilstand mht. kvinders rettigheder, og beder om alle paneldeltagernes mening. Efter at de andre havde talt, sagde fr. LaRouche:

Zepp-LaRouche: »Jeg mener, at den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan overvinde kvinders underprivilegerede stilling, er, hvis begge kønnene lever et kreativt liv; for kun, når alle mænd og kvinder opfylder deres skabende potentiale fuldt ud, kan der blive ligestilling.

Og i denne henseende mener jeg, at der i hele verden er behov for at gøre mere, uden tvivl. Men jeg mener, at Kina promoverede kvindelige taikonauter – kvindelige astronauter –

og dette er et godt tegn. Vi har i Tyskland udgivet en bog, hvis forside viser et foto af en kvindelig, kinesisk taikonaut, der kommer tilbage fra rumfartøjet – det er fuldstændig optimistisk.



Det er denne form for rollemodeller, vi har brug for. For det er ønskeligt med et image, hvor kvinder befinder sig i avantgarden af videnskab og kultur: og det mener jeg er meget godt. Det er meget bedre end i mange dele af USA ... «

Repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd

Efter en drøftelse af kravet fra flere lande, inklusive Japan, Indien, Tyskland og Brasilien, om at have en permanent repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, spurgte Yang fr. LaRouche: Bør Tyskland blive permanent medlem af Sikkerhedsrådet?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Ja, det mener jeg, men spørgsmålet rækker ud over dette. For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; men også, at jeg ikke nødvendigvis er enig i, at ideen om en multi-polær verden skulle være særligt meget bedre end en unipolær verden, for det indeholder stadig ideen om geopolitik. Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret. Så jeg mener, at vi må finde en modus operandi, hvor Afrika, Latinamerika og Asien er repræsenteret på en passende måde.

Men jeg mener, at hovedspørgsmålet er, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme, i hvilket hele menneskehedens interesser, menneskeheden som den udødelige art for fremtiden, må være

det, der er vejviser for, hvad alle lande gør. Jeg mener, at tiden er inde til, at et folks legitime interesse, eller endda en gruppe af folkeslags legitime interesse, som et modsætningsforhold til en anden gruppe af folkeslag, nu må tilsidesættes, og at vi i stedet må definere, hvad menneskehedens fælles problemer er, hvilket vil sige at fjerne sult og indføre sikkerhed for energiforsyning og forsyning af råmaterialer.

Her igen mener jeg, at Kina har taget føringen med sit Måneprogram. Kinas Måne missioner viser virkelig, hvordan videnskab og teknologi kan håndtere spørgsmålene om sikkerhed for forsyning af råmaterialer og energi. For, Kina arbejder hen imod at udvinde helium-3 på Månen til brug for, at der i fremtiden endelig kan komme produktion af fusionsenergi på Jorden.

Jeg mener, at det mere er et spørgsmål om en vision for fremtiden. Det er mere et spørgsmål om at definere menneskehedens fælles mål, og dernæst bør repræsentationen reflektere denne holdning.«

[Video med CCTV's program Dialogue kan ses her.](#)

LPAC Fredags-webcast 2.
OKTOBER 2015:
Verden er et bedre og

tryggere sted uden Wall Street

Helga Zepp-LaRouche-pressekonference i Kina: "Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk. Wall Street er dømt til snarlig undergang, færdig; Indfør omgående Glass-Steagall, forebyggende! LaRouche om koalitionen mod ISIS: Gør det! Der er en global, strategisk alliance: En Geneve III-politisk løsning på krisen i Syrien vil nu være mulig. Engelsk udskift.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 2, 2015

[proofed against the audio]

The World Is a Better and Safer Place Without Wall Street:
Dump Wall Street, Get Glass-Steagall, Bring Back Hamilton

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's October 2, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here

from larouchepac.com. We are recording here a few hours before live show time, just to let you know, in case anything drastic changes, but we are fresh from a discussion which we had with Mr.

LaRouche earlier today. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Scientific Team.

Obviously, we're convening here at a very momentous time in history. This is a week which began with the events at the United

Nations General Assembly meeting, most significantly, the speeches on Monday by both Vladimir Putin and President Xi Jinping of China. Now that was happening on the inside of the United Nations building. On the outside, and in the entire general area of Manhattan, the LaRouche movement was making a very significant intervention which had a significant impact

on

the proceedings of the United Nations, and the discussions around

that. And those of you who listened to, or had the opportunity to

listen to the 20th Fireside Chat with Mr. LaRouche that occurred

last night, Thursday night, you heard a short report by one of the LaRouchePAC activists about what those interventions have been. [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=imkd4v0hiiY>]

Now, simultaneous with the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York City, another significant leader of the LaRouche movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, was in China. She was participating in a series of meetings, and very significantly, got to participate in a press conference announcing the publication of the {Executive Intelligence Review} Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," which

was now published in Chinese, and is available in the Chinese language, and we can be sure is already beginning to circulate widely in China.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20150930/eirs-silk-road-report-chinese-presented-beijing-press-conference>]

In the days subsequent to the beginning of this week, we've seen a very significant, dramatic shift in world events, and I know this is something which will be elaborated a little bit later in our broadcast. But obviously we've seen the Russian air

strikes against ISIS in Syria, and this has created really a chasm, a schism, inside the United States, where Obama himself is

finding himself completely edged out, and isolated, whereas significant leadership inside the senior leadership of the United

States, including John Kerry and others, and also other members

of Obama's own Democratic Party—Congressman Tulsi Gabbard is one significant example of this—have distanced themselves, and distinguished themselves, from Obama, and have said, this is a necessary action on the part of Vladimir Putin, and one that should be supported.

Mr. LaRouche was also clear to point out that Europe is beginning to realign itself as well vis-à-vis these actions by Russia.

Now, the primary point that Mr. LaRouche wanted us to begin tonight's broadcast with, was the implosion of the Wall Street-based financial system. And this is what I'm going to ask

Jeffrey Steinberg to elaborate on, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

Let me just paraphrase a little bit of what Mr. LaRouche had to say in our meeting earlier, before I ask Jeff to come to the

podium. What Mr. LaRouche emphatically stated was that this financial system is on the verge of a total implosion. It's not

just a crash, but the entire thing is about to cease to exist. And that means the entire system must be changed. What do we say?

Dump Wall Street! We need a total reorganization of this entire

bankrupt system, because we're experiencing a general breakdown

of both the U.S. and the European financial systems. Therefore,

action must be taken to shut this thing down. Nothing can be done

to save it, he said.

The United States, as a nation, isn't bankrupt, but Wall Street is, and there's no solution within the current form of this financial system. The entire system must be put into receivership. He said, either way, Wall Street is finished.

Either finished on its own accord, or finished because of a decisive action that's taken by patriots within the United States

government. It's intrinsically bankrupt, according to any rational physical economic standard of measurement, and all you

have to do is look at the facts. It's happening now, and that's

not a bad thing. It's actually good, and we should make the point

that Wall Street disappearing is good for the future of the American people. It should have happened a long time ago; it just needs to be cleaned up. The garbage has to be taken out, so

that we can get our people back to productive work.

So that was a short paraphrase of what Mr. LaRouche had to say. I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium, elaborate a little bit more on the context of this, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

JEFF STEINBERG: Last week a number of leading figures in both Wall Street and the City of London were bracing themselves,

waiting to see whether the Federal Open Market Committee at the

Fed was going to begin the process of normalizing interest rates,

by raising them for the first time in seven or eight years by one-quarter of 1%. There was {absolute} panic and pandemonium over the prospect of that taking place, and statements were issued from the City of London, the IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde, saying that if the Fed raises rates, it may very well trigger a blowout of the entire system, and then the Fed will be holding the bag, taking the blame for a financial blowout.

Well, the simple fact of the matter is that the Wall Street system is bankrupt, and by Wall Street system, I mean the

extended system of gambling that exists on Wall Street, that dominates the City of London. You would get around the globe. You've got Frankfurt. You've got Paris. You've got Dubai in the Middle East. You've got Macao and Hong Kong in the Pacific region.

These are all centers in which there is virtually no connection any more between the activities in the real economy, and the gambling and churning of gambling money that's going on in the financial sector.

So there is nothing that can be done to avoid the fact that at some point very soon, there will be a trigger incident. It could be virtually anything. And it could be the beginning of a

very rapid, total evaporation of this entire mountain of debt, and what Mr. LaRouche has also been emphasizing, is that the danger in this situation is that if there is not immediate pre-emptive action, before that blowout occurs, then what you're

likely to see is a period of total chaos, in which the bankruptcy

of the financial bubble creates a system of chaos in the real economy, where you wind up with very destructive developments, with social chaos, in which the real people of the United States

and other parts of the world become once again, but on a much more dangerous scale, the victims of this kind of chaos.

So the point is very simple. There's got to be pre-emptive action now to put Wall Street in its entirety out of its misery.

And the simple first step to be taken in that direction is to reinstate Glass-Steagall. By reinstating Glass-Steagall, and making it clear, that this mountain of gambling debt will never

again be bailed out by taxpayers' funds.

The simple fact of stating that means, that the entire Wall

Street system will immediately blow out. Someone is going to panic; someone is going to make a margin call, because so much of this gambling debt, is built on borrowed money that the whole thing will evaporate. But the crucial thing is that you've got to first create a clean and total separation between commercial banking, which does impact on the real economy and this gambling debt; this mountain of gambling debt that's sitting there as a parasite on the real economy. If you make that separation by passing Glass-Steagall in the United States, this will be the basis for immediate action in other parts of the world. So in effect, by acting here in the United States, we will create the conditions for a global Glass-Steagall separation, and then all of this gambling debt can just evaporate.

Now, an illustrative case of this: Back in 1998, when you had the beginnings of a whole sequence of debt blow-outs, in Japan, you had a large number of Japanese banks that were basically bankrupt and were going to have to be put through bankruptcy reorganization. Under those conditions, those banks posed a systemic risk, not just in Japan, but globally. There were some people in the Japanese Finance Ministry who understood, and still had a memory of the difference between productive investment, legitimate commercial banking activity, and the gambling activities that had infected the whole international banking system.

And so, those banks were basically audited, and all of the derivative contracts, all of the international gambling contracts that those banks had were simply cancelled. The counterparties were contacted and given the option, of netting

out those contracts; or facing the consequences of losing those funds, those gambling debts that nobody had sufficient funds to be able to even remotely cover. So, in the case of Japan, the gambling debts were cancelled, and then the banks were put through reorganization; there was no systemic risk. At the same time, in the Summer of 1998, Alan Greenspan – who was in the final phases of the elimination of Glass-Steagall as the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and formerly a senior partner at JP Morgan when the plan was hatched in the mid-'80s to wipe out Glass-Steagall. Instead what Greenspan did was, he called in all of the counterparties of Long Term Capital Management [LTCM], a relatively small, offshore hedge fund located in the Dutch Antilles. But they had derivative contracts tied to the Russian debt, which the Russians defaulted on, the famous GKO scandal of 1998. And so, LTCM, rather than being put through an orderly reorganization by netting out those derivatives contracts; Greenspan called in all of the counterparties, and wouldn't let them leave the room until they bailed out LTCM. So, on the one hand, you had a cancellation of the derivatives; on the other hand, you had a hyperinflationary bail-out. Really just the beginning of a hyperinflationary process that went off the charts a year later, when Glass-Steagall was repealed. And then it was really off to the races; with everything invested in gambling and virtually nothing going into the real economy. So now here we are, it's October of 2015. We had a shake-out of the bubble in 2008, and now it's back once again with a vengeance, because there was no change in policy. The

Dodd-Frank bill with the Volcker Rule was a sick joke; it did nothing to change anything. So now, the too-big-to-fail banks have accrued a greater amount of gambling debt than they previously had. That debt cannot and will not ever be paid. So, by any scientific measurement, all of Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt; and so long as you remain in the trap of the current system, nothing can be done about that. And we're headed very soon – perhaps in a matter of days or weeks or months – to a point where the entire system blows out; the entire trans-Atlantic system evaporates, literally overnight. And then you've got social chaos on a very, very broad and dangerous scale.

So, there is no money. Your money, your personal investments in mutual funds or Wall Street stocks, or anything like that; there's nothing there to protect. It can't be protected; and in fact, what's going on right now on the eve of the annual Autumn meeting of the IMF, scheduled to take place in the next few weeks in Peru, are calls all over the place for a new surge of hyperinflationary quantitative easing. You've got the European Central Bank about to extend its QE program towards the end of 2018; in other words, a massive hyperinflationary bail-out that will further erode the real economy.

So, Wall Street is dead; the funeral should have already taken place long ago. And now we're at a point where that system must be completely shut down. Cancel out all the derivatives; separate the banks under Glass-Steagall, into commercial banks and let everything fall off the edge of the cliff. Because it's

unpayable, it's illegal, it's commingled with massive amounts of criminal money; it serves no purpose whatsoever. The world is a better and safer place without those Wall Street activities; without the City of London, without the activities in Frankfurt and Paris and these other parasitical financial capitals. Glass-Steagall right now, immediately. And we've got a political context in which President Obama, although he is not down all together, is greatly weakened. And you can put a {fait accompli} on his desk and force the signing of Glass-Steagall. If he refuses to do that, then he's out under the 25th Amendment; because to not do it, in the face of this imminent blow-out of Wall Street, would be an act of criminal insanity that warrants his removal from office. So, that's the story. Wall Street is doomed. If you listen to idiots like Christine Lagarde, or Ambrose Evans-Pritchard over at the London {Daily Telegraph}, they're saying, "Gee, we're not sure if this is a systemic crisis, or some minor cyclical problem that we can just weather by printing a bit more money." They're either idiots, or criminal liars, or both. The fact of the matter is, Wall Street is dead; it's dead in the water. Nothing can be done to save it. And the question is, do you want that doom to spread to the real economy; to the real population that's already suffering enough? Or, are you prepared to fight to insure that the right preemptive measures are

taken

now? Because a week from now may be too late; we don't know how

close we are to the edge. Well-informed insiders from London and

Wall Street thought that we were about to blow out a week and a

half ago, had the Fed gone through the small step of simply raising interest rates and shifting the directionality.

There's

a million and one potential small triggers out there, but the triggers are not the real issue. The real issue is that the entire system is doomed; and we've got to take the right remedial

action before the doom spreads into the real world of real people, and then it's too late.

Franklin Roosevelt had an understanding of the kinds of measures that have to be taken. On the one hand, the Glass-Steagall Act and other measures that secured depositors funds in the commercial banks; shut out the gambling debt.

But

then Franklin Roosevelt also moved on for massive credit emissions into the real economy. He did the TVA; he created a massive number of jobs through various public works programs, much of which became the kind of infrastructure-building projects, major dam projects, municipal buildings, roads; all the kinds of things that were the necessary preparations and foundations for what became the "arsenal of democracy," the enormous economic surge that occurred, when the United States was

on the verge of entering into war, against Nazi Germany and Japan. So, Roosevelt had the formula.

The situation today is far more dangerous, far more severe, than it was at the time of Roosevelt. But the principles, the American System principles, that Roosevelt understood and acted

on, are the recipe for success today. But the starting point

is
to simply face the reality and act preemptively on the fact
that
Wall Street's dead. Give it a decent funeral, but pay no
respect
whatsoever to this quadrillions of dollars, of strictly
gambling
debt that have been built up since the repeal of Glass-
Steagall
in particular.

What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that this process goes
back—really the beginning of the decline in actual
productivity
in the U.S. economy, started with the death of Franklin
Roosevelt. It accelerated tremendously after the assassination
of

John Kennedy, and particularly after Nixon took the world off
the
Bretton Woods fixed- exchange-rate system. That was the era
when
people like George H.W. Bush and his underlings began to come
in
and greatly accelerated the process of take-down of the real
economy.

So, we're at the point now: Wall Street's doomed; it's
finished. So, let's do the right thing.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jeff. Now for the second element
of our show today, I'm going to shift to the dramatic and
ongoing
change in the world strategic framework, specifically with the
situation in and around Syria, as the major focal point for
this
shift.

Now, this is the subject of the institutional question which
has been posed to Mr. LaRouche this week. But before posing

that

question and asking Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, I'd

like to add just a little bit of background.

Over the recent few weeks, we have been seeing the development of a very clear and decisive break with Barack Obama.

This has been coming from, really, around the entire world, coming from Russia, coming from China, coming from Europe, and as

Matthew mentioned in the opening, as well as from within institutions of the United States. And I think it's important to

recall, that it was just a few months ago, in late July, that the

former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, Gen. Michael Flynn, in an interview with Al Jazeera, had said that for

years President Obama has been willfully ignoring the DIA's warnings about the growing threat of radical jihadist-terrorist

networks in Iraq and Syria, the forces which have subsequently become what we now call ISIS. General Flynn made it absolutely clear that this was not just negligence or a failure, but this has been the conscious policy of the Obama White House, in effect

protecting and supporting the growth and the solidification of ISIS.

Now, at the same time, in this recent period, there's been an increasing recognition that this massive surge of refugees fleeing into Europe, are actually running from the effect of Obama's policies; that Obama's policies have been responsible for

driving this refugee crisis.

In this context, just this past Wednesday at the United Nations Security Council, there was a meeting to discuss how to

combat the growing threat of terrorism. And both the Chinese and Russian foreign ministers have made very clear, that in this fight against terrorism—what’s happening in the Middle East—the sovereignty of the Syrian nation must be respected, obviously in direct contradiction and conflict with Obama’s calls for regime change in Syria, and the removal of the government there. Also this week, we saw more signs of support of this shift, also coming from Europe, with the Swiss foreign minister saying that the Syrian government needs to be included in a broad dialogue to settle the conflict there, and the president of the European Parliament calling for the inclusion of Russia and Iran in an international coalition to resolve the conflict in Syria. Perhaps most dramatic, as, again, Matthew referenced in the beginning, and as I’m sure all of you have seen, Russia has now initiated a series of coordinated air campaigns and strategic bombings against ISIS and other terrorist elements which have been otherwise, frankly, operating under the protection of Obama’s policies. So, in this context of a whole array of moves indicating a shift in the world situation, around this pivot in Syria, the following institutional question was posed to Mr. LaRouche: “At the special UN Security Council session on terrorism this week, China’s Foreign Minister Wang Yi called for the convening of a Geneva III conference on Syria, with no preconditions, and with participation of all interested parties. What are your thoughts on China’s proposal at the UN Security Council?”

I'd like to invite Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response to this question.

STEINBERG: The short answer that Mr. LaRouche gave to the question, was two simple words: "Do it!" I'll elaborate a bit. You've had a policy, as Ben just indicated, of tolerance for the growth and expansion of the Islamic State, of the Nusra Front, of other similar jihadist-Salafist organizations; you've got the so-called Army of Conquest, of which Nusra is now a part—all of them operating inside Iraq and inside Syria. Despite the fact that there's a supposed coalition of 60 countries waging combat against these organizations, they seem to miraculously continue to expand their territorial holds. Despite the fact that they're under attack and under surveillance and scrutiny, they keep managing, somehow or other, to get new recruits slipping across the international borders, into Syria, into Iraq, to the point, that several months back, the CIA estimated that the Islamic State had 15,000 fighters total; and just in the last several weeks, they've revised that number up to at least 25,000, perhaps 30,000. In other words, if you factor in the fact that some of them are being killed, through the bombings, through combat operations, — particularly the Kurds have been quite effective against ISIS—they've obviously been swelling their ranks, with very little to stand in the way. Now, here you have a coalition. Some of the leading players in the, quote, "U.S.-led coalition," are Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait; and it's well-known, that the major entrée point for foreign fighters coming into Syria, is across the border

from

Turkey. There's a very lucrative black-market smuggling route, that runs between Turkey and Raqqa , which is the capital city of

the ISIS area in northern Syria. The Turkish government, the ruling party, the AKP, and particularly, the immediate circles around President Erdogan, are making money hands-over-fist through these black-market dealings with the Nusra Front, with the Islamic State, and with these other Salafist terrorist networks.

So, a simple question is: What coalition against ISIS? It doesn't exist! It's been a fraud from the beginning.

So now the Russians have stepped in, and they've done it within the framework of international law. There was a formal authorization for the use of military force, that the Russian Federation Council voted up unanimously to President Putin.

So,

in other words, unlike President Obama, who never went to Congress, the Russian state structures have given authorization.

The Syrian government of Bashar Assad formally invited Russia to

participate. Russia has established an information-sharing center

that will be up and functioning within a matter of days or weeks

in Bagdad, with Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Russia participating.

So,

in other words, all the elements are being put in place for an actual serious assault against this terrorist infrastructure.

And

last night overnight, Russian bombers carried out 18 sorties against Raqqa, which is the province and the capital city of the

entire ISIS-controlled area inside northern Syria and Iraq.

So, in other words, you're seeing a serious military operation for the first time. And the Syrian armed forces have

been depleted dramatically by four years, four and a half years,

of combat against a force that's been continuously beefed up, armed, supplied with new recruits, from an entire jihadist apparatus from around the world.

And the Russians know, by the way, that there are now an estimated 5,000 Chechen fighters in the ranks of the Islamic State, fighting inside Iraq and Syria. And so this poses an immediate serious, really grave security threat to Russia. So Russia is not sitting back, is not running a phony war. Russia is in there. They're serious, and this is a strategic game-changer.

The reason that the White House is hysterical over this is that there is this so-called coalition. The United States is protecting Saudi Arabia, and by extension, protecting the British-Saudi Arabian dirty deals that have created this jihadist problem in the first place. Qatar, Turkey, all supposed members of the Obama-led coalition, are all on the other side. They're all actively supporting the spreading of the Islamic State and the Nusra Front.

General David Petraeus, the so-called hero of the surge, who is now an official adviser to the Obama White House and the National Security Council, has called for the United States to openly support the Nusra Front. That's to say, openly support al-Qaeda, the same al-Qaeda that did 9/11; the same al-Qaeda that

in 2012 killed the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, and three other American diplomats. But fortunately, that noise, that policy from

the Obama White House, has been substantially suppressed.

There are other elements in the U.S. military that are prepared very much to work with the Russians. Secretary of State

John Kerry has become the point person for a different U.S. policy, a policy that he's been working out for months in

coordination with the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, and back

during his meeting in the spring in Sochi, directly with President Putin. So Kerry in a CNN interview several days ago, made it clear: He said, there is a new policy. And the new policy

is, we are not insisting on instantaneous regime change. We're not going to go there. We're not going to do a Saddam Hussein. We're not going to do a Muammar Qaddafi. There's going to be a transition. The governing institutions are going to be preserved.

We're going to be patient. We're not going to allow Syria to fall

into chaos, and we'll work with the Russians militarily.

So the Russians are making it clear. They're carrying out real combat operations, and they are out for blood. They're going

to wipe out the Islamic State, and increasingly, China, India, Germany, France, many of the countries in Europe that are now overwhelmed by the refugee flow from ISIS, from Nusra, they're onboard.

So you have a global strategic realignment, which means, yes, the prospects of a Geneva III political solution to the Syria crisis is now viable, and feasible. You've got China, Russia, India, Germany, France somewhat more reluctantly, all ready to go on this, and you're got Iran, Syria, and elements within the United States who have basically sidelined, but not yet eliminated the Obama presidency, who are ready to go with this.

Again, as Mr. LaRouche said very simply, "Do it!"

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. So with those two elements of the current strategic picture presented to you here,

before I conclude this webcast, I just want to go back and re-emphasize what Mr. LaRouche asked us to open this broadcast with. And I want to do so by reading a short passage from what

Mr. LaRouche had to say last night on the National Activists' telephone call, the so-called Thursday night Fireside Chat. And

this is what Mr. LaRouche said about Wall Street:

"The United States economy is about to collapse, and it's a real collapse. All of Wall Street is bankrupt, and worthless. If

the United States were to try and go along, and try to do business with Wall Street, and Wall Street institutions, that would be a disaster. Because Wall Street would itself collapse,

since it's already in a state of collapse. If we let Wall Street

go ahead, and do its own collapsing, the result would be a disaster for most of the people of the United States on a very large scale.

"So we have to get rid of Wall Street, immediately. We have to junk it. Point out the fact that it's worthless, that it's only a complete fraud. It has no economic value whatsoever, except that of trash. And so therefore, we're going to have to get a radical change in the organization of the financial system

of the United States for two reasons: first of all, to maintain

an economy that will function for the United States population;

second of all, to protect the United States {against} the influence of Wall Street. Because if Wall Street goes on its own,

and takes the dive that it will take, automatically, under those

circumstances the people of the United States may be starving all

over the place. Because if the United States collapses, then the

U.S. economy will itself be in a disastrous condition. That is,

the financial system will collapse.

“And therefore, we have to get rid of the Wall Street system, and {we} have to collapse it in a controlled way. And then use that method of controlled action against Wall Street, in order to make the kind of re-organization that Franklin Roosevelt did in dealing with Wall Street in an earlier period. And that’s what has to happen.”

So, with that said, I’d like to encourage everybody, if you haven’t heard it yet, go back and listen to this discussion with

Mr. LaRouche last night. This is the 20th Fireside Chat. Mr. LaRouche will also be engaging in his weekly discussion with activists in New York City tomorrow, and the intervention of the

LaRouche movement on the streets of Manhattan is continuing, as

we come out of this week, and into the following.

So, I’d like to thank you for joining us here tonight, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Amerikansk senator Warren: Glass-Steagall »Er præcist det, vi burde gøre«

Senator Elizabeth Warren holdt den 28. september en tale i Edward M. Kennedy Instituttet i Boston, hvor hun svarede på et spørgsmål om at genindføre Glass-Steagall:

»Tilbage i 30’erne, da vi have den store depression, skete der

noget bemærkelsesværdigt i dette land... at, som et folk sagde vi, at vi ikke behøver at leve i en op- og nedturs-økonomi.«

»Og således gjorde vi tre ting. Vi gjorde det sikkert at sætte penge i banken. Det hedder FDIC [Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] forsikring... Og vi satte en betjent til at holde øje. Det er SEC [Securities and Exchange Commission] for at sikre, at de ikke solgte falske aktier og sådan noget.

»Og det tredje var, at vi adskilte... lønkonti og opsparingskonti fra Wall-Streets høj-risiko, høj-profit, høj-tabs handelsverden; og det var Glass-Steagall.

»Bankerne hadede det, fordi de ville have profitten fra storhandelen. Du kan få de høje CEO lønninger og mere afkast til aktionærerne.«

»Og Wall-Street hadede det, fordi de ville have adgang til pengene på bedstemors opsparingskonto, fordi det er billige penge, og de kræver ikke samme slags afkast.«

Warren benævnte 1930'erne til 80'erne som perioden, hvor Glass-Steagall brandmuren var solid og 1980'erne til 90'erne som den periode, hvor der blev introduceret huller i den, indtil den blev slået ned. »Hvad der skete, var, at i de største finansielle institutioner blev der en større og større koncentration af penge og magt, og det var sådan vi endte op i 2008 med banker, der var for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned, og \$700 milliarder i TARP bankredningen og bogstavelig talt billioner af dollars i bankredningspakker under bordet fra Federal Reserve.«

Mens hun hævdede, at Dodd-Frank siden da har »gjort en masse,« sagde Warren, at genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall vil gøre reguleringen af de store banker »meget lettere... Det ville nedbringe størrelsen på bankerne. Det ville gøre det finansielle system mere sikkert. Men det vil betyde, at de folk, der gerne vil handle med høj risiko, ikke kan få adgang til jeres opsparingskonti, og jeres banker vil ikke lave den slags profitter mere – hvis det er en af de store banker – som de ellers kan lave.«

»Og det er nøjagtigt, hvad vi skulle gøre. Så ja, Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede hele vejen. Hele vejen.«

Foto: Senator Elizabeth Warren

Rusland udsender et nyt udkast til en resolution for FN's sikkerhedsråds bekæmpelse af terrorisme

1. oktober 2015 – Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov begyndte i går ved FN's sikkerhedsråds møde at sende et udkast rundt til en resolution, der er baseret på Ruslands tidligere resolution i FN's sikkerhedsråd for bekæmpelse af terrorisme, som USA har afvist.

□ Lavrov understregede, at krisen i Syrien kan løses gennem en koordineret indsats mod ISIS ved at understøtte Staffan de Mistura, Ban Ki-moons FN-udsending, og ved at involvere andre nationer i bestræbelserne, inklusiv Saudi-Arabien, Rusland, Jordan, Katar, Kina og USA. Syriens udenrigsminister Walid al-Moallem sagde til sikkerhedsrådet, at koalitionen anført af USA havde fejlet i at dæmme op for ISIS i Syrien, og at deres indsats var i strid med international lovgivning, eftersom de trænger ind i syrisk territorium uden regeringens godkendelse. Dette rapporterede avisen Newsday i dag.

□ Under mødet advarede Lavrov om, at Islamisk Stat er i besiddelse af dele til masseødelæggelsesvåben, og opfordrede til, at ISIS blev inkluderet som et selvstændigt emne på FN's liste over sanktioner mod terrorisme. »Indenfor store områder af Irak og Syrien har Islamisk Stat faktisk skabt en ekstremistisk semi-stat, som råder over et effektivt,

undertrykkende styre, stabile indkomstkilder, en veludrustet hær og dele til masseødelæggelsesvåben,« sagde han ifølge RT. Lavrov understregede, at situationen i området er blevet forværret i løbet af det sidste år, og tilføjede, at »ophobningen af krisepotentiale er kommet tæt på det punkt, hvor vi kan tale om ødelæggelsen af det politiske kort i området.«

□Den russiske leder sagde til forsamlingen: »Jeg præsenterer i dag medlemmerne af sikkerhedsrådet for et udkast til en resolution. Den er baseret på dokumenter, der tidligere er blevet godkendt af rådet, og lægger vægt på konsekvente handlinger mod terrorisme baseret på normer og principper, der følger international lovgivning.« Ifølge en kopi af udkastet, som Associated Press er i besiddelse af, opfordrer det landende til at »koordinere deres aktiviteter med tilladelse fra de stater, på hvis territorier disse aktiviteter finder sted.« Lavrov sagde med henvisning til flygtningestrømmene ind i Europa, at krisen ikke kan løses uden at lave »en fast barriere mod Islamisk Stats bestræbelser på at underlægge området et middelalderligt diktatur. Det er ikke flygtningene, som skal stoppes, men terroristerne, krigene og konflikterne, som afføder dem.«

Kerry bekræfter, at USA har ændret politik overfor Syrien og Assad

30. september 2015 – I et interview med CNN, hvoraf første del blev sendt tirsdag og anden del i dag, gjorde udenrigsminister John Kerry det klart, at USA og den USA-ledede koalition har ændret politik og ikke længere kræver Assads omgående

afsættelse. Kerry indrømmede, at Obama-regeringen »dengang, for længe siden« udtalte, at Assads afsættelse måtte være første skridt. Dette er ikke længere politikken. Nu er USA kommet frem til, at det er nødvendigt at forhandle sig frem til en glidende overgang for at undgå »et vakuum eller et kollaps«, som det skete i Irak, efter USA invaderede landet og væltede Saddam Hussein.

»Vi har brug for en ordnet overgang, en organiseret overgang, så man ikke behøver at frygte oprør, mistede liv, hævn,« sagde Kerry og tilskyndede til en ændring af lederskabet over en »rimelig tidsperiode.«

Kerry gjorde det i interviewet klart, at han ser Ruslands indgriben i Syrien som en »chance« så længe, at russerne erkender, at sunni-muslimske kræfter i området skal have del i overgangen.

I tirsdags gjorde Kerry klart i et interview til MSNBC, at han forestiller sig, at Syrien i fremtiden skal være en samlet og sekulær stat. Kerry udtalte, idet han refererede til USA og Ruslands fælles indsats for at nå til en overgang i Syrien, »så jo, omkring de mest grundlæggende principper, som vi kunne blive enige om, burde vi være i stand til at finde frem til noget.«

New York Times bemærkede i dag i en profilering af Kerrys diplomatiske indsats omkring Syrien, at Kerry altid har bibeholdt en dialog med Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, selv mens præsident Obama aldeles havde afbrudt kontakten med Ruslands præsident Putin. New York Times rapporterede, at Kerry ofte ville tale flere timer med Lavrov, nogle gange flere gange om dagen.

Kilder fra den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste noterede sig i denne uge, at mødet mellem Obama og Putin ansigt til ansigt i mandags i New York var frugten af Kerrys og Lavrovs vedholdende indsats, der nåede et nyt niveau efter Kerrys besøg i foråret til Sotji, hvor han mødtes med Putin og Lavrov. Putin lavede i juni et telefonopkald til Obama, som yderligere åbnede mulighederne og førte direkte til mødet i New York, og til, at diplomatiske og militære kanaler er

blevet genåbnet mellem de to lande.

Leder, 2. oktober 2015: Gør nedlukning af Wall Street til en integreret del af alt, hvad vi gør!

Torsdag den 1. oktober, 2015 – Lavrov og Kerry, der holdt deres fjerde møde torsdag på sidelinjen af FN, må holde momentet ved lige gennem uophørlig kontakt, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. Der er nu en udvikling i gang, og det må tilskyndes gennem deres fortsatte dialog og arbejde. Meningsdannere må fastholde et uophørligt fokus på amerikansk-russisk samarbejde, mens Obama må holdes ude af billedet så meget som muligt. Hold det russisk-amerikanske samarbejde i gang, og bloker Obamas muligheder for at indlede indirekte handlinger imod det. Obama gør stadig sit beskidte arbejde, selv om han nu er tvunget til at gøre det fra bag scenen; se nøje på, hvad Obama indirekte gør. Han er gået i skjul, men han fortsætter med at operere, som under forklædning. Obama er blevet slået tilbage, men han er ikke helt færdig endnu. Presset på Obama må ikke lempes et eneste øjeblik. Forøg presset på Obama.

Alt imens fokus på det amerikansk-russiske samarbejde er vigtigt, så må der være presserende nødvendig opmærksomhed på det sårbare svælg, som er økonomien. Lige siden Franklin Roosevelts død har der foreligget et forbud mod enhver stigning i den amerikanske produktivitet. Dette udgør stadig en dødbringende trussel. Låget blev især lagt på, efter Reagan

blev skudt den 30. marts 1981, 69 dage inde i hans præsidentembede. Derefter optrappede George H.W. Bush som vicepræsident, og dernæst som præsident, nedturen. Men der var allerede en dyb fordærvelse i begyndelsen af 1970'erne, som det reflekteredes i reaktionen på Lyncs sejr over Abba Lerner i den berømte debat på Queens College i december 1971. Bagefter leverede Sidney Hook truslen mod LaRouche. Ikke alene sagde han, »du vandt, men vi vil aldrig igen lade dig deltage i en offentlig debat«. Han sagde, at de ville gå til modangreb, og det gjorde de. LaRouche blev aldrig tilgivet for det, han havde gjort. Alle må forstå implikationerne af dette fra 1971 og fremefter.

Vi må lancere en generel kampagne omgående, med højeste prioritet, og gøre nedlukningen af Wall Street til en integreret del af alt, hvad vi gør. Obama er blevet slået tilbage – presset på ham må ikke lattes. Vi må nedlukke Wall Street, ellers får vi en katastrofe for USA og andre nationer. Vi må have en energisk og aggressiv fremgangsmåde. Wall Street er død og må begravnes, for stanken er overvældende.

FDR havde øje for problemet, men situationen går langt, langt ud over noget, han var konfronteret med i 1930'erne. Wall Street må nedlukkes, så en effektiv fysisk-økonomisk genrejsning af USA kan lanceres.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 1.
oktober 2015:**

Putin tager lederskab i Syrien, Obama er fortid

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: (tilgængelig senere i dag, den 2. oktober)

Lyd:

Leder, 1. oktober 2015: Lyndon LaRouche: Wall Street må nedlukkes, før det krakker

I går advarede Lyndon Larouche medarbejdere om, at hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er på randen af totalt kollaps, og Wall Street må lukkes ned gennem lovmæssige handlinger, med præsident Franklin Roosevelts nedlukning af Wall Street som model.

»Hvis Wall Street kollapser i en gældspanik, så kan denne kaotiske, destruktive kraft føre til død og ødelæggelse i USA og i hele verden. Wall Street-systemet må erstattes – før det slår dig ihjel«,

erklærede LaRouche.

Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putins nylige handlinger i Syrien har skabt muligheden for sådanne nødhandlinger. Obama er ved at blive skyllet ud, selv om denne proces endnu ikke er fuldført. Selv her i USA allierer fornuftige kræfter sig med Putin, modsat Obama. Putins handlinger er ved at få en positiv

effekt. Saudierne har store vanskeligheder, som det reflekteres i et brev, der cirkulerer i kongefamilien, fra en højtplaceret, saudisk prins, der sætter spørgsmålstegn ved tronfølgen og den skrantende Kong Salmans og hans ansvarsløse søns, vicekronprins Mohammad bin-Salmans, fejlslagne politik.

Der finder betydningsfulde ændringer i den globale, strategiske situation sted.

Under disse omstændigheder kan narcissist-chefen Barack Obama forventes at tage desperate, onde forholdsregler, selv på trods af sin stærkt svækkede position. Fjernelsen af Obama er fortsat en hovedprioritet, og muligheden for hans afsættelse er nu større end nogen sinde. Skulle Obama tage initiativ til at fremme krig eller forsøge andre provokerende handlinger, må han omgående fjernes under bestemmelserne i det 25. forfatningstillæg. Dette må have en fremtrædende plads på bordet, som et konstant sværd, hængende over Obamas hoved.

John Boehners fald som formand for Repræsentanternes Hus er i sig selv både en klar påmindelse om, hvor hurtigt Obama også kunne være ude, lige så vel som det peger på Kongressens disintegration som et effektivt instrument i vores Føderale Forfatningssystem. Den præsidentielle institution har et presserende behov for forandring, begyndende med fjernelsen af Obama.

Wall Street må nedlukkes ved hjælp af Glass-Steagall og relaterede forholdsregler, der med held blev anvendt af FDR. Putins handlinger i Syrien har skabt mulighed for, at sådanne nødforanstaltninger kan vedtages, før Wall Street-krakket og det efterfølgende kaos. Obama er svag, han er ude i tømmerne, men der må nu komme effektive handlinger for fuldt ud at udnytte den mulighed, der er blevet skabt. Wall Street er et stinkende lig, og lugten alene kan slå dig ihjel. Luk det ned nu.

Tema: Lpac Videnskabsteam afslører CO2-svindlen: Global opvarmning dækker over befolkningsreduktion

Igen, grunden til, at vi diskuterer dette, er spørgsmålet om denne kommende konference i Paris (i december måned i år). Der er et fornyet, desperat forsøg på at forsøge at få en juridisk bindende traktat på plads, hvor nationer ville aftale at begrænse deres CO₂-udledning, begrænse deres økonomiske udvikling og rette sig efter disse vanvittige ideer.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**EIR's rapport »Den Nye
Silkevej bliver til
Verdenslandbroen«
oversat til kinesisk bliver
præsenteret ved en**

pressekonference i Beijing

Den 29. september 2015 – Ved en pressekonference i Beijing, som var sponsoreret af EIR og Renmin Universitets Chongyang-institut for Finansstudier, holdt Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, og William Jones, EIR's kontorchef i Washington, i dag hovedtalerne ved offentliggørelsen af den kinesiske oversættelse af EIR's banebrydende rapport »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«.

Der var omkring 70 personer til stede, inklusiv 15 repræsentanter fra kinesiske medier, nogle repræsentanter fra regeringsinstitutioner samt flere tænketanke. Derudover kommenterede ni ledende kinesiske videnskabsmand på rapporten og dens vigtighed for det kinesiske projekt »Et Bælte, En Vej«. Chongyang-instituttet har også indvilget i at være medsponsor af rapporten.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche beskrev, hvordan Schiller Instituttet har udviklet projektet omkring Den Nye Silkevej/Verdenslandbroen over de sidste 20 år og skitserede de bestræbelser, der var fortsat i årtier for at realisere rapporten. Hun sagde, at udbredelsen af rapporten repræsenterede en enestående mulighed for at ændre verdenshistoriens kurs: »Vi skal væk fra geopolitik og bevæge os over til et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden,« sagde Zepp-LaRouche.

Kommentarerne til rapporten fra videnskabsmændene var fuldkomment overstrømmende. En videnskabsmand sagde, at han har kendt Schiller Instituttet i lang tid og lært meget fra dets ideer. »De har meget enestående økonomiske ideer og lægger vægt på fysisk økonomi. Lyndon LaRouche har udviklet ideen om negentropi for at forklare økonomiens love. Vi kan ikke tillade, at kapital kontrollerer alt. Vi skal kontrollere kapital,« sagde han.

En anden videnskabsmand bemærkede, at Schiller Instituttet har en anden tilgang til økonomi end de fleste andre, ved at lægge vægt på infrastrukturens grundlæggende vigtighed. Han sagde,

at »Helga Zepp-LaRouche har gjort store fremskridt med sine ideer«. En videnskabsmand bemærkede, at Kinas politik »Et Bælte, En Vej« danner grundlag for begyndelsen af en ny verdensorden, og at vi skal finde ud af, hvordan den er forskellig fra den USA-ledede verdensorden. En videnskabsmand fra Kinas Nationale Udviklings- og Reformkommission (NDRC) understregede, hvor enestående rapporten var, priste det bagvedliggende arbejde og tilskyndede kinesiske eksperter til at tage notits af analysemetoden brugt i EIR-rapporten.

Yderligere en videnskabsmand, som lige var blevet færdig med at læse rapporten på kinesisk aftenen før, sagde, at den åbenlyst var skrevet med et globalt perspektiv og bemærkede, at den handler om at se ind i fremtiden og ikke blot forklare fortiden.

Der opstod en livlig diskussion i spørgetiden, og mange deltagere kom efterfølgende op til autorerne for at få deres kopi underskrevet. Chongyang-institut har allerede købt 1000 kopier af rapporten til fordeling i dets netværk og til videnskabsfolk i Kina.

Leder 30. september 2015: Obama – udmanøvreret, skubbet af scenen, kørt ud på et sidespor, men ... Stadig i embedet

I den nye lederskabsdynamik, der demonstreredes på FN's Generalforsamling, og som anføres af præsident Putin, præsident Xi og andre BRIKS-nationer og samarbejdspartnere, er

præsident Obama og hans herrer på dramatisk vis blevet udmanøvreret og skubbet af scenen. Faren består i, at Obama stadig er i embedet. Dette definerer amerikanernes fortsatte opgave, som den blev gentaget i fuld offentlighed under et livligt gademøde, der blev afholdt af **aktivister fra LPAC's Manhattan-projekt mandag ved FN Plaza**, med det klare budskab på deres bannere, som dette: »Obama: Hjælp med Verdensfreden: Gå af i dag!«

Et foto af denne planche, samt et andet: »Putins stopper Obamas Holocaust; Smid Obama ud«, blev sendt ud i hele verden af Sputnik News i løbet af de seneste 48 timer. Sputnik-Amerika dækkede fhv. senator Mike Gravel i går, under overskriften, **»Obama burde tilslutte sig Putin i en forenet indsats i Syrien – fhv. amerikansk senator«**.

Med hensyn til Syrien, så var den ene, umiddelbare og konkrete ting, der kom ud af det 90 minutter lange møde mandag aften mellem Putin og Obama, en bekræftelse på, at det amerikanske og russiske militær ville kommunikere med hinanden med det formål at fremme »de-konfliktion« i deres militære operationer. Det er ironisk, eftersom netop denne proces blev indledt den 18. sept. i en telefonsamtale mellem den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigu og den amerikanske forsvarsminister Carter, men kort tid efter blev afvist af Obamaregeringen. Dette er typisk, og farligt. Kerry og Lavrov skal også mødes onsdag for yderligere at gå i dybden med de russiske, diplomatiske initiativer. Ifølge en amerikansk kilde, så dominerede Putin diskussionen med Obama med konkrete forslag til en reel krig, med FN-mandat, for at udslette Islamisk Stat, og han fik for første gang fornemmelsen af, at Obama var blevet tvunget til at høre efter.

Men, som Lyndon LaRouche gentog tirsdag, så findes der ingen tryghed, før Obama er fuldstændig fjernet fra magten.

Efter Putin-Obama-mødet førte Putin omgående en lang, åben dialog med russiske journalister (**tilgængelig i fuld længde på**

Kremls webside).

Men Obama forlod mødet uden et ord.

Putin gentog til reporterne det, han tidligere på dagen havde sagt til FN's Generalforsamling: de amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, uden et mandat fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd eller en invitation fra den syriske regering. Vi må i stedet handle efter streng »overholdelse af normerne for international lov ... «

Putin opfordrer til samarbejde om Syrien for at bekæmpe terrorisme, og han opfordrede til, at der afholdes et møde mellem alle de berørte parter i oktober måned. Der har været flere russiske initiativer om dette, forud for denne uges møde i FN. Det fælles efterretningscenter i Bagdad (Rusland, Iran, Irak og Syrien) blev lanceret og vil være operationelt i oktober; der er en parallel, bilateral kanal mellem Rusland og Israel; og sluttelig mødtes Rusland, Kina og Indien for nogen tid siden i Beijing for at iværksætte et omfattende samarbejde om international terrorisme inden for rammerne af FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Midt i alle disse vigtige handlinger kommer et særligt, strategisk initiativ imod de grønne fascister. Under præsident Putins tale den 28. sept. til FN's Generalforsamling fremkom han med det tilbud, at Rusland, sammen med FN, ville ko-sponsorere en global konference om »biosfæren og tekno-sfæren« for at behandle nye, avancerede teknologier, der kan løse problemet med ressource-udtømmning og forbedre planetens miljø. Hertil kommer, at den indiske premierminister Modi har genoptaget sit angreb på den udviklede sektors intriger, der blev lanceret i København (COP15), og advarede om, at Indien ikke vil acceptere nogen såkaldte aftaler om klimaforandring, der udelukker nationerne i udviklingssektoren fra reel, videnskabsdrevet, økonomisk vækst. Under et møde på tomandshånd med Modi fik præsident Obama efter sigende et stilfærdigt vredesanfald over Modis modstand og vil sende

amerikanske regeringsembudsmand til New Delhi for at klemme Indien, forud for klimatopmødet i december i Paris (COP21).

Obama/Putin-mødet i NY: Vred Obama tvunget til at befatte sig med Ruslands Putin

29. september 2015 – Det 90 minutter lange møde mellem præsidenterne Obama og Putin, der endelig blev afholdt i går (mandag), var ikke et møde på tomandshånd, men en formel affære med fem eller seks regeringsfolk fra hver nation – her iblandt udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry – der flankerede deres præsident, som sad i hver sin ende af et langt bord.

Obama sagde intet om mødet bagefter og overlod det til en unavngiven »højtplaceret regeringsperson« at give en kort rapport senere samme aften om, at mødet havde været »produktivt« og »fokuseret« og mest omhandlede Ukraine og Syrien. Den unavngivne regeringsperson rapporterede imidlertid, at den amerikansk-russiske koordinering vedr. operationer i Syrien, som Obamas Hvide Hus tidligere havde skudt ned, vil blive etableret. Som nationale, statslige radiokanaler opsummerede regeringspersonens rapport, så »aftalte de to præsidenter, at deres militær skulle bevare kommunikation med henblik på 'de-konfliktion'« af operationer i Syrien.

Ulig Det Hvide Hus udlagde Kreml billeder af mødet, og præsident Putin afholdt en pressekonference med russiske journalister ved De forenede Nationer bagefter. Også Putin karakteriserede mødet som »meget konstruktivt, forretningsmæssigt og overraskende nok meget åbenhjertigt«, og han gav udtryk for sit synspunkt om, at det var meget nyttigt, men han var ligefrem om den fortsat farlige tilstand af de russisk-amerikanske relationer, og om hvem, der er ansvarlig for denne tilstand:

»Desværre befinder relationerne mellem Rusland og USA sig på et temmelig lavt punkt; dette er indlysende uden mine kommentarer. Men, det var ikke vores initiativ, der forårsagede en sådan lavkonjunktur i relationerne mellem Rusland og USA. Det er vore amerikanske partners holdning. Er det godt eller dårligt? Jeg mener, det er dårligt, både for bilaterale relationer og globale anliggender. Men det er det valg, USA har truffet.

Vi er altid parat til at udvikle kontakter og genoprette relationer i fuld skala«, tilføjede han. »Med hensyn til mødet i dag, så var det meget nyttigt, og, hvilket især er glædeligt, så var det meget oprigtigt. Jeg mener, at vore amerikanske partnere forklarede deres holdning ganske klart i mange spørgsmål, inklusive afgørelsen af situationen i Ukraine og Syrien, så vel som i Mellemøsten generelt. Vi har, selv om det kan synes overraskende, mange sammenfaldende punkter og meninger i alle disse spørgsmål. Vi er også uenige om nogle ting, som vi har aftalt at arbejde på i fællesskab. Jeg håber, at dette arbejde vil blive konstruktivt ... «

Putin understregede betydningen af Minsk-processen i Ukraine-spørgsmålet; med hensyn til Syrien gjorde han det klart, at Obamas politik for regimeskifte og hans insisteren på, at Bashar al-Assad må fjernes fra embedet før alt andet, fortsat udgør et centralt punkt i deres uenighed.

Putin gentog til de russiske journalister, at Rusland ikke vil

bøje sig mht. princippet om national suverænitet. Han rapporterede, at han med Obama havde drøftet den kendsgerning, at amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, da der hverken foreligger en resolution fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd, og heller ikke en invitation fra den legitime regering, der bakker disse handlinger op. Med hensyn til Assad: »Jeg har stor respekt for mine kolleger – både den amerikanske præsident og den franske præsident – men de er imidlertid, så vidt jeg ved, ikke borgere i Den syriske Republik, og bør derfor ikke tage del i at beslutte en anden stats fremtidige lederskab. Dette er syrernes anliggende.«

Rusland »vil ikke udelukke noget, men hvis vi handler, så bliver det i streng overensstemmelse med normerne for international lov«, sagde Putin.

Leder 29. september 2015: USA/New York: LaRouchePAC transformerer omgivelserne omkring FN

Et fænomenalt demonstrationsmøde i New York City på begge sider af krydset mellem 42. og 3. gade mandag morgen, da FN begyndte. Dynamikken i gaderne omkring FN har fuldstændig ændret sig. Substansen i det mobiliserende miljø er blevet en resonans mellem det, der siges inde i FN af Putin, Xi og andre, og så det, vi foretager os udenfor. Det er som om, de

delegerede har fået en mulighed for, for første gang, offentligt at sige højt, hvad de indtil nu har diskuteret eller tænkt bag lukkede døre. Dette skyldes, at vi offentligt har diskuteret den store indsats, hvor historien nu skal transformeres.



Gademødet startede tidligt på dagen – så tidligt, at alle, der gik på 42. gade, gik mod øst, hen imod FN's Generalforsamling. Resultatet var, at Obamas bilkortege kørte forbi vores møde med vores store skilt, der viste Obamas ansigt i en paddehattesky (»STOP WW3, AFSÆT OBAMA!«), der pegede direkte mod hans vindue. Hans profil kunne ses gennem den præsidentielle firehjulstrækkers rude. Man spørger sig selv, om hans silhouette rystede pga. virkningerne af alle de vejhuller, der er overalt på 42. gade, eller om det skyldes ren psykotisk raseri. Som dagen gik kom de, der havde passeret os om morgenen, tilbage samme vej. 2.000 flyvesedler blev uddelt, inklusive LPAC-flyvesedlen, »Obama søger krig«, med LaRouches vurdering af Obamas dræbertendenser.

Denne deployering spillede korets rolle – alle i området var opmærksomme på bilkortegerne, der kørte forbi – med Obamas som den første. Og vores »Obama, Hjælp Verdensfreden: GÅ AF!«-banner, der, med sine 12 fod lange stænger, kunne ses på næsten en husbloks afstand. Vi præsenterer ikke bare et budskab, vi handler på en proces, der er i færd med radikalt at skifte i øjeblikket. Så når vi sagde, Putin har ret, Obama er et r..h.., responderede mange af diplomaterne og andre følelsesmæssigt; de smilede, lo, nikkede, og de modigste kom hen for at tale ærligt med os. Lignende respons fik det spørgsmål, der blev stillet til mange: »Tror du, det er i dag, Obama siger op?«



Dette eksemplificeredes af et par afrikanske diplomater, der

fordømte den kendsgerning, at USA havde presset deres nation til at arrestere den besøgende, sudanesiske statsleder, mens denne var i deres land. »Han er en siddende regeringschef!«, udbrød de. Andre responderede på en lignende måde til den nye BRIKS-renæssance, som borgmesteren for en stor, afrikansk hovedstad, og som var blevet inspireret af ideen om, at **USA faktisk kunne tilslutte sig BRIKS**, gennem LaRouches indgriben.

Pressesekretæren for præsidenten fra en lille, men betydningsfuld, afrikansk nation var ekstatiske over at møde os og over at overbringe sin boss vores rapport om Global Opvarmning. Disse mennesker var måske mest bevæget over vores banner, hvor der stod **»Velkommen til præsidenterne Putin og Xi [’Velkommen’ på engelsk, russisk og kinesisk]; rigtige amerikanere ønsker et Win-Win-Paradigme!«**



Endnu mere morsomt end mødet med Obamas silhouette var det øjeblik, hvor David Cameron gik forbi vores bord. Han blev genkendt af en ledende, ung aktivist, som omgående spurgte ham lige op i ansigtet, »Hej, Cameron, hvor er din gris?«. Han lo en hul, britisk latter, mens vores andre aktivister holdt Obama-moustachen op i Camerons øjenhøjde.

Nye handlemuligheder har pludselig åbnet sig. Med lidt eksperimenteren fandt vi ud af, at enhver afrikansk diplomat kunne nærmes med ordene »Obama er en dræber. Han må standses. Og global opvarmning er en racistisk, britisk svindel for at dræbe afrikanere. Enhver afrikaner må forstå dette!« I løbet af de seneste dage har vi uddelt en pakke, der inkluderer **EIR's rapport om global opvarmning**, til mange, hvis ikke alle, afrikanske FN-missioner. Nogle af os sagde til hver person, vi så med et blå ID-kort, »Hvis du er med i en delegation, eller arbejder i FN, så er dette til dig« og gav dem **Helgas FN-appel**, samt anden litteratur.

Hvis vi forlænger vores følehorn ud i hele området, så finder

vi, at virkningen af vores opstilling på gaden kan materialiseres gennem forholdet mellem det, der finder sted i FN-GF, og det, vi foretager os. Folk, der arbejder i de lokale forretninger, tilmelder sig, efter at de gentagne gange har set os. Mindst 10 forskellige, tidligere LaRouche-støtter kom over til vores bord, af hvilke nogle meldte sig til for at hjælpe. Vores aktivister rekrutterer mange betydningsfulde mennesker – fra en højtplaceret, russisk finansperson til en ledende oversætter for den kinesiske delegation.

Ved en senere begivenhed ved NY-universitetet var Bill Roberts og Asuka Saito tilhørere til en tale, som blev holdt af Irlands præsident Michael Higgins, der talte om behovet for en ny måde at tænke på, et nyt paradigme, der var noget andet end det gamle paradigme fra Chicagoskolen for Økonomi, der har været dominerende. Bill gik op til præsidenten efter talen: »Jeg er helt enig med dig, vi må have et nyt paradigme. Det er det, Putin talte om i dag.« Bill henviste til **Rapporten om Verdenslandbroen**.

Higgins læste titlen på rapporten. Han sagde, »Åh, ja, jeg har talt med Xi Jinping om dette. Giv venligst min assistent rapporten, og så vil vi læse den.« Bill fulgte op, »Og denne her er mere kontroversiel« og gav ham **Rapporten om global opvarmnings-svindlen**.

Higgins responderede positivt til at læse den.

En russisk reporter fra et russisk statsmedie interviewede **Diane Sare** om gademødet. Hun gik i lag med spørgsmålet om Obamas dræbermentalitet og understregede Obamas forhold til sin stedfader. Reporterenes respons: »Uhyggeligt.« Der var flere interviews i dagens løb til freelancejournalister og andre, og der blev optaget filmklip af det lokale WPIX-II, som de forsikrede ville blive anvendt senere på dagen, og af RTR Vesti, en russisk Tv-kanal.

Dette er fantastisk!

**Jeg donerer 150 kr. til Schiller
Instituttets**

**mobiliseringsaktiviteter, seminarer
m.v. i Danmark**

**Giro: 564-8408 ● Homebanking:
1551-5648408**

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche tager
føringen i
diskussion på Kinas Radio
International
om relationerne mellem Kina
og USA**

Jeg mener, at, set ud fra det kinesiske standpunkt, så er det største problem, og samtidig det største håb, at USA responderer på dette – tilbuddet til USA er stadig på bordet, og jeg mener, at diverse kinesiske medier har gentaget dette tilbud: at europæerne, USA og Kina bør samarbejde.

28. september 2015 – Schiller Instituttets stifter, Helga

Zepp-LaRouche, blev interviewet over telefon som del af et ekspertpanel i en **55 min. lang diskussion om relationerne mellem Kina og USA i en nyhedsudsendelse på Kinas Radio International Show, den 25. sept.**, med Liu Kun og Brian Kopczynski som studieværter. Andre gæster omfattede tre akademiske eksperter i kinesisk/amerikanske relationer: prof. Tao Wenshao fra Kinesisk Akademi for Samfundsvidenskab; prof. Rick Dunham, Tsinghua Universitet, og prof. Mark Beeson fra Universitetet i Vestaustralien.

China Radio International er Folkerepublikken Kinas statsejede radiokanal.

Det første spørgsmål lød: »Hvad får de to, politiske giganter, Kina og USA, til at synes om hinanden, og hvad skiller dem?«

Zepp-LaRouche svarede:

»Det er ekstremt vigtigt, at de to mest betydningsfulde lande i verden, med hensyn til størrelse og magt, har et stabilt forhold til hinanden; den bedre del af USA ser på Kina ud fra dette standpunkt. Fra præsident Xis side, så har han gjort det meget klart, at han ønsker en åbning med »win-win«-politikken. Jeg mener imidlertid, at der netop nu består en total ulighed i den måde, de to lande bærer sig ad.«

Intervieweren bemærkede, at »kun USA Today havde en hovedoverskrift om præsident Xis besøg [i USA].«

»Hvad er Kinas plads i USA's nuværende, globale strategi, og vice versa?«, lød det næste spørgsmål.

Fr. LaRouche svarede:

*»Jeg mener, at de forskellige forslag, der kommer fra Kina, og som jeg mener, i høj grad er baseret på **den konfucianske opfattelse**, at verden kun kan fungere, hvis den er baseret på en harmonisk relation nationerne imellem, virkelig er*

nøglen. Dette kommer til udtryk i præsident Xis tilbud om win-win-samarbejde; han inviterede rent faktisk på APEC-topmødet sidste år præsident Obama til at samarbejde med Kina om den Nye Silkevej; om **politikken for »Ét bælte, en vej«**, sammen med ideen om at have en ny model mellem de store nationer. Det er en helt anden idé om internationale relationer mellem nationer, baseret på suverænitet, gensidig respekt og anerkendelse af forskellige samfundssystemer. Jeg mener, at denne model netop nu er meget attraktiv, og som er blevet vedtaget af BRIKS-landene; den rækker ud til ASEAN, og også til de latinamerikanske lande, der har gavn af denne form for win-win-samarbejde med Kina.

Jeg mener, at, set ud fra det kinesiske standpunkt, så er det største problem, og samtidig det største håb, at USA responderer på dette – tilbuddet til USA er stadig på bordet, og jeg mener, at diverse kinesiske medier har gentaget dette tilbud: at europæerne, USA og Kina bør samarbejde.

Jeg kan blot håbe, at USA, som er i store vanskeligheder netop nu – jeg mener, dets finanssystem er i en forfærdelig forfatning; mange mennesker siger, at det er værre end i 2008; der kunne komme en alvorlig nedsmeltning af finanssystemet, hvad øjeblik, det skal være. Og den eneste måde, hvorpå USA kunne komme ud af det, ville være, hvis USA ville se chancen i dette tilbud netop nu; der er en stor splittelse; nogle mennesker siger, at det absolut ville være i USA's interesse, og at USA bør samarbejde; andre siger, nej, vi er verdens eneste leder – verdens eneste stormagt; Rusland er blot en regional magt, og Kina bør holdes tilbage ...

Selv chefen for Generalstabscheferne, general Martin Dempsey, har advaret om, at USA ikke bør gå lige ind i en Thukydides-fælde[1] og se Kina som en trussel, og forsøge at gå i krig. Og hvis USA's chef for Generalstabscheferne advarer om dette, så må han have en god grund.«

Dette efterfulgtes af en diskussion om Kinas økonomi mellem de tre professorer, med prof. Dunham, der sagde: »Det bekymrer mig noget, at USA besluttede ikke at tage del i AIIB og i stedet går ind for den konkurrerende idé med TPP.« Prof. Tao bemærkede, at mange amerikanere, Henry Kissinger og andre, hilser AIIB velkommen og kritiserer Obama for ikke at gå med.

Intervieweren spurgte Zepp-LaRouche: »Kan økonomiske forbindelser og handelsforbindelser stadig fungere som den faste klippegrund for generelle relationer mellem USA og Kina?«

Hun svarede:

»Det mener jeg absolut, at de kan. Hvis der består stærke økonomiske bånd, er det en måde, hvorpå alle de nuværende spændinger kan overvindes. Af alle indgåede aftaler ville jeg understrege, at USA og Kina har aftalt at bygge et højhastighedstog mellem Los Angeles og Las Vegas; det er ikke min yndlingsrute, for den fører til et kasino, men kendergerningen er, at Kina leverer den meget, meget avancerede teknologi til fremme af handel – af hvilken 18.000 kilometer er blevet bygget internt i Kina, og som er af fremragende kvalitet. Enhver ved, at USA's infrastruktur har et presserende nødvendigt behov for forbedringer; vejene; og der er ikke noget effektivt togsystem.

Jeg har foreslået, at USA tager imod tilbuddet om win-win-samarbejde. Der kunne blive et samarbejde om at udvikle togsystemet i hele USA. Hvorfor ikke bygge disse tværs over USA, fra Vestkysten til Østkysten, og på selve Østkysten; det ville blive langt mere overlegent end det nuværende system med fly. Hvis blot USA ville tilslutte sig initiativet med den Nye Silkevej, ville det betyde, at USA kunne genopbygges.«

Dernæst diskuterede professorerne faldet i den kinesiske økonomi og citerede en statistik fra Moody's Analytics om, at,

for hvert fald i den kinesiske økonomi på 1 %, falder USA's vækst med 2 %, som et eksempel på den kinesiske økonomis bølgeeffekt på verden.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche afbrød:

»Jeg vil gerne kommentere på dette; der er en meget stor forskel, for den amerikanske økonomi drives hovedsageligt frem af værdipapirsaktiver – det drives meget frem på basis af værdipapirsaktiver; meget Wall Street; meget monetaristiske værdier, hvor den kinesiske økonomi derimod for det meste er baseret på realøkonomi. Kina har en utrolig vækst i industrien; det er engageret i industriprojekter med lande i hele verden.

Så selv om der var en lille problem med aktiemarkedet i Kina, så har det langt mindre betydning. Wall Street er fuldstændig bankerot. Jeg ville ikke foretage en sammenligning af disse to økonomier på denne måde. Kendsgerningen er, at Wall Street er totalt bankerot. Den amerikanske realøkonomi befinder sig i en absolut forfærdelig forfatning. Den kendsgerning, at den kinesiske økonomi er begyndt at forgrene sig til mange dele af verden, giver den kinesiske økonomi mere substans og gyldighed.«

Det endelige spørgsmål til Zepp-LaRouche lød: »Hvad kan man forvente vil blive opnået ved dette besøg mellem disse to ledere?«

Hun svarede:

*»Jeg har skrevet en **appel til de politiske ledere**, der i løbet af de næste par dage skal tale på FN's Generalforsamling, om, at de ikke må forpasse den måske sidste mulighed for at skabe et nyt paradigme for verden. Vi har så mange problemer; vi har faren for en finansiel nedsmeltning; krig, terrorisme, flygtningekrisen i Europa, der virkelig er ved at komme helt ud af kontrol, så jeg mener, vi behøver en ny æra for civilisationen. Og jeg*

mener, at præsident Xis »win-win«-tilbud er den bedste model hertil på dagsordenen.«

[1] Gr. Historiker, ca. 460-400 f.Kr.; advarede republikken Athen, der var blevet et Imperium, om, at det ville forårsage sin egen undergang ved at indlede imperie-krige.

Tysk fjernsyn og Kreml reagerer på trussel om genoprustning med atomvåben i Europa

23. september, 2015 – Frontal21, et tysk nyhedsmagasin på ZDF, Tysklands TV2, stillede i går spørgsmål ved de nye taktiske atomvåben, som skal stationeres i Tyskland. Det er første gang, at en udsendelse i den bedste sendetid har taget spørgsmålet op om faren forbundet med USA's genoprustningspolitik med atomvåben i Europa. Udsendelsen har allerede udløst en udtalelse fra Kreml og vil eventuelt have indflydelse på stemningen omkring emnet i Tyskland.

Frontal21 slog alarm: Ifølge en officiel skriftlig udmelding fra Pentagon vil tyske »Tornado«-jagerfly på militærbasen i Büchel begynde at blive »tilpasset« de nye B61 målstyrede atombomber i tredje kvartal af 2015. De nye bomber, der skal erstatte de nuværende B61 bomber, besidder nye evner som taktiske atomvåben. Det betyder, at en genoprustning med atomvåben allerede er begyndt.

(NB: »tilpasset« betyder ikke, at bomberne er monteret på flyene: Det betyder, at flyene er ved at blive forberedt til, at bomberne kan monteres på dem. Det er begyndelsen på en procedure, som betyder, at bomberne vil blive leveret på et tidspunkt.)

Udsendelsen konfronterede på en pressekonference Angela Merkel med spørgsmålene (i omvendt rækkefølge): »Støtter regeringen genoprustning med atomvåben her i Tyskland«?

Merkel: »Vi vil tale med USA om det. Måske har forsvarsministeriet allerede indledt samtaler, jeg ved det ikke. Jeg vil undersøge det for mig selv, hvorefter I vil blive informeret på et passende tidspunkt«.

ZDF spurgte også Merkel om, hvorfor hun havde brudt aftalen med regeringskoalitionen fra 2009, da CDU og FDP blev enige om at gennemtvinge tilbagetrækningen af USA's atomvåben fra militærbasen i Büchel.

Merkel: »Min opfattelse af koalitionsaftalen fra 2009 har hele tiden været, at vi skulle overveje konsekvenserne. Vi må indse, at hvis der udstationeres atomvåben andre steder, og der ikke er nogen i Tyskland, bør man spørge sig selv: Tjener det til bedre sikkerhed og balance«?

Merkels svar dækker over den kendsgerning, afsløret af Frontal21, at hun har bedraget sine koalitions partnere. I november 2009 mødtes hun med den amerikanske ambassadørs sikkerhedsrådgivere på den amerikanske ambassade. Efter mødet blev der sendt en melding til Washington: Merkel ønsker ikke tilbagetrækning af atomvåben. »Aftalen om tilbagetrækning af atomvåben blev påtvunget kanslerens kontor af daværende udenrigsminister Westerwelle ... det giver ingen mening ensidigt at tilbagetrække de 20 taktiske atomvåben«.

Et andet fokus i TV dokumentaren var Natos såkaldte »atomvåbendeling«, en praksis, der fører til, at tyske »Tornados« fløjet af tyske piloter vil blive udstyret med B61-

bomber og beordret til at deltage i et eventuelt angreb.

Tidligere viceforsvarsminister Willy Wimmer fortæller, hvordan han var involveret i den sidste Wintex-Cimex øvelse før Berlinmurens fald, hvor det på et tidspunkt var meningen, at han skulle trykke på knappen, der ville have sendt bombefly med atomvåben af sted for at udslette Dresden og Potsdam i det daværende Østtyskland. Han rådførte sig med kansleren og nægtede at gøre det, hvilket afbrød øvelsen.

Med atomvåbendeling kan tyske piloter i dag blive beordret til at affyre den nye B61-bombe.

En fredsaktivist, der bor i nærheden af Büchelbasen, hvor de gamle bomber befinder sig og de nye skal installeres, citeres for følgende: »Man kunne gå ud fra, at de gamle B61-bomber aldrig ville blive taget i brug, fordi deres formål var afskrækkelse. Men de nye, planlagte våben er bygget på en måde, så de kan bruges. Og dette forøger i mine øjne risikoen for en atomkrig.«

Frontal21 beskrev med rette den nye B61 som et nyt våben. Derfor er der her tale om et brud på Aftalen om ikke-spredning af atomvåben. De interviewer så en talsmand fra det russiske udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, som siger: »Vi er bekymrede for, at lande, der ikke er i besiddelse af atomvåben, under Natos atomvåbendeling træner til at bruge atomvåben. Dette er et brud på ikke-spredningsaftalens artikel 1 og 2.«

I dag offentliggjorde Kreml et svar: talsmand Dmitry Peskov citeres af Sputnik for at have sagt: »Dette er endnu et skridt, og desværre et meget alvorligt skridt, mod en yderligere optrapning af spændingerne på det europæiske kontinent. Hvis disse planer bliver realiseret, hvor man jo må tage den tyske Forbundsdays beslutning osv. i betragtning, må man desværre sige, at de urokkeligt bevæger sig i retning af at gøre dette. Dette kan naturligvis føre til en strategisk

ubalance i Europa, hvilket selvfølgelig vil få Rusland til at tage de nødvendige modforanstaltninger for at genoprette balancen, for dette er naturligvis ikke et skridt mod at forøge stabiliteten, tilliden eller sikkerheden i Europa.«

»Dette er skridt, som Rusland nødvendigvis må tage for den nationale sikkerheds skyld«, tilføjede Peskov.

Hele ZDF's rapport kan læses på tysk på <http://www.zdf.de/ZDF/zdfportal/blob/40229212/1/data.pdf>

Titelfoto: Forbundshærens flybase i Büchel, 6 dage siden.

Xi Jinping: Kina vil give yderligere to milliarder dollars til fattige nationer og bygge 600 projekter med hjælp fra udlandet

27. september 2015 – Xi Jinping fremlagde lørdag – først i en tale til FN's konference »Sustainable Development Summit 2015« (Topmøde om Bæredygtig Udvikling 2015), og dernæst til et møde i Syd-Syd-samarbejdet (SSC) – flere store kinesiske udviklingsprojekter i hele verden, ud over Silkevejsprojektet, AIIB, BRIKS Udviklingsbank, de særlige udviklingsfonde osv., der allerede er sat i værk.

Han startede med at love en »foreløbig investering« på to milliarder dollars i den internationale fondspulje til

bekæmpelse af fattigdom i de fattigste lande. Dette øger Kinas andel i denne FN-fond til tolv milliarder dollars over de næste 15 år.

Xi sagde ved SSC-mødet, at Kina vil starte 600 udviklingsprojekter i udviklingslandene over de næste fem år, 100 i hver af følgende kategorier: landbrug, reduktion af fattigdom, handel, beskyttelse af miljøet, sundheds- og uddannelsessektoren. Han udtalte i den forbindelse, at »samarbejde og fællesskab med udviklingslandene er og bliver det urokkelige grundlag for Kinas udenrigspolitik«.

Han sagde, at disse projekter er baseret på et princip om »retfærdighed over gevinst« (på ironisk og ynkelig vis påstod dækningen i *New York Times*, at Kina har været en dovendidrik mht. udviklingshjælp!)

Xi revsede ved topmødet om bæredygtig udvikling Vestens nuværende undertvingende, politiserende model for hjælp. Han fremlagde Kinas håb for fremtiden: at alle nationer og alle folkeslag ville modtage retfærdig bistand; at bistanden ikke kun går til »nogle nationer, men ikke til andre«, og at mindre og fattigere nationers stemmer skal blive hørt, »når nye, internationale regler udformes«. FN's »2015-mål« (MDG's) fra de sidste 15 år, der skal overtages af Målene for Bæredygtig Udvikling, var af en komplet undertvingende natur – hvis et fattigt land var »godt«, og gjorde alt, det fik besked på, ville det få nogle håndører.

Xi bekendtgjorde også etableringen af et »Center for Viden om International Udvikling« i Kina, som skal hjælpe udviklingslandene.

Han fremlagde også gældssanering for de fattigste lande og sagde, at Kina vil tilbyde 270.000 legater til studerende fra udviklingslande, som kan komme til Kina og få enten en højere uddannelse eller en erhvervsrettet uddannelse, mens han tilbød uddannelse til yderligere 500.000 studerende i deres eget

hjemland.

Præsident Putins fulde tale i FN 28. sept. – video, engelsk voice over

Obamas tale i FN afslører ham – rapport og video

I dag, den 28. sept., udspyede Obama sit krigsgale snavs over de samlede repræsentanter for verden på FN's Generalforsamling. Blot få minutter senere fastslog Putins fremlæggelse med syvtommersøm den usminkede sandhed: at Obama er færdig.

Mens han på hyklerisk vis nævnte »regering ved international lov« og ondskaben i »magt er ret«, gjorde Obama Putin og Syriens Bashar al-Assad til direkte målskive for anklager om,

at de var roden til alt ondt i verden i dag og hævdede endda, at Assad er årsagen til ISIS-rædslen i Irak og Syrien. »Lad os huske på, hvordan det begyndte«, fantaserede han.

»Assad reagerede på fredelige protester ved at optrappe undertrykkelse og drab, som igen skabte vilkårene for den aktuelle strid. Og Assad og hans allierede kan således ikke simpelt hen pacificere det store befolkningsflertal, der er blevet brutaliseret af kemiske våben og hensynsløse bombardementer.«

Han sagde, at »visse stormagter hævder sig på måder, der er i modstrid med international lov«, hvilket må have fået tilhørerne til at gispe efter vejret; dernæst klagede han over, at disse samme magter fremfører, at, for at bekæmpe terrorisme,

»må vi støtte tyranner som Bashar al-Assad, der kaster tøndebomber for at massakrere uskyldige børn, fordi alternativet sikkert er værre«.

Han skød dernæst brystet frem:

»Jeg er leder for det stærkeste militær, verden nogen sinde har kendt, og jeg vil aldrig tøve med at beskytte mit land eller vore allierede, ensidigt og ved hjælp af magt, om nødvendigt.«

(Senere fremdrog Putin ødelæggelsen af Libyen og Irak, lande, der bestemt ikke truede nogen, samt Obamas ensidige tilsidesættelse af FN's charter og international lov.)

Obamas diskussion blev mere direkte med hensyn til Ukraine:

»Se på Ruslands annektering af Krim og yderligere aggression i Ukraine ... Vi kan ikke passivt se til, når en nations suverænitet og territoriale integritet åbenlyst krænkes.«(!)

Idet han tydeligvis følte presset, sagde han klagende:

»Det er ikke en sammensværgelse af amerikansk-støttede NGO'er, der afslører korrupsion og sætter befolkningens forventninger op i hele verden; dens teknologi, sociale medier og ønsket, der ikke kan indskrænkes, hos folk overalt om at træffe deres egne valg om, hvordan de ønsker at blive regeret.«

Rusland har, sagde han hysterisk, startet en ny kold krig, og er nu ved at kollapse.

Obama vendte gentagne gange tilbage til situationen i Syrien, men omtalte aldrig russernes flanke-initiativ, hvorved de intervenserer militært og skaber en ægte, international koalition for at knuse ISIS, hvilket er årsagen til Obamas forstillelse foran hele FN.

Se hele Obamas tale i FN her:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e3V9I2Dx7vk>

Leder, 29. september 2015: Putin har netop demonstreret princippet om flanken

“Vi kan ikke længere udholde verdens tilstand” – Vladimir Putin i De forenede Nationer.

Indenfor, udenfor og i stor afstand fra FN på Manhattans østside var det i dag åbenlyst, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin er i færd med at ændre den strategiske form af verdensbegivenhederne, og også har betydelig støtte blandt amerikanere for en reel, international koalition til bekæmpelse af terrorisme.

Putins tale i FN, hvor han forsvarede denne organisations charter, der havde Franklin Roosevelt som sin oprindelse, var ligefrem og effektiv. Han sagde, at der var blevet skabt en terrorisme, der hastigt bredte sig, og skabt forarmelse og tab af respekt for livet i hele Mellemøsten, Nordafrika og Sydasiens, gennem krige for regimeskift, eller »demokrati-krige«, der krænker dette FN-charter og international lov, og at denne ødelæggelse ville brede sig, indtil den blev standset.

»Vi kan ikke længere udholde verdens tilstand.«

Et heldags demonstrationsmøde uden for FN med 40 aktivister fra LaRouchePAC oplevede en usædvanlig modtagelighed for sit banner-budskab: »Obama: Hjælp verdensfreden. Gå af.« Den totalt falske krig, som Obamas »60-nationer stor koalition« angiveligt skulle udkæmpe imod ISIS-terroristerne, er gået ned til at være et par luftangreb om dagen, mens tilfangetagne amerikanske våben og USA's »allieredes« støtte til ISIS/al-Qaeda har fået terroristernes kamprækker til at svulme op til 30.000 alene i Syrien og Irak.

Som »ud af den blå luft« er en ny koalition, der rent faktisk vil bekæmpe terroristerne, imidlertid hastigt ved at vokse frem omkring Putins russiske initiativ ind i Syrien, med støtte fra Kina. Også hen over Europa, såvel som i Mellemøsten, fejer der et skift med hensyn til accept af dette initiativ.

EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche blev af medier bedt om at kommentere Putins 2 timer lange CBS-interview. Under

diskussioner med **LaRouchePAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi mandag** sagde LaRouche, at der er ved at fremkomme et fundamentalt skift, som er revolutionært, i den politiske strategi. Wall Street kollapser også. Verden vil snart repræsentere noget andet for menneskeheden, sagde han. Og dette i en periode, hvor man ikke længere tror på opdagelsen af fundamentalt nye principper – fysiske, økonomiske eller politiske!

Putin, sagde han, har netop demonstreret princippet om flanken – imod et afgørende punkt for den totale fiasko for Obamas politik, og har kastet Obamas Hvide Hus ud i forvirring og vrede.

I mellemtiden bekendtgjorde Kinas præsident Xi endnu en forpligtelse til 100 mia. dollars, gennem FN, til international infrastrukturudvikling. Kinas »win-win«-politik, eller konfucianske politik for økonomisk udvikling, er en integreret del af det globale skift, der er i gang.

Obamas mest effektive bidrag hertil? Gå af.

Leder, 28. september 2015: Krig eller fred står på spil i Manhattan i dag

I dag, mandag den 28. sept., er en afgørende mærkedag i historien, med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der kommer til Manhattan for at fremlægge sin flankemanøvre imod

præsident Obama og hans herrer i London og på Wall Street. Det er et opgør mellem kreativitet og sindssyge, mellem global udvikling og global disintegration; mellem krig og fred. Putin er allerede begyndt at deployere ekstensivt militærudstyr i Syrien, på anmodning fra den legitime, syriske regering under præsident Assad. Som han sagde til Charlie Rose i et interview, der skal sendes i afsnit mellem søndag nat og tirsdag, så er han forpligtende engageret til at forsvare denne legitime regering, eftersom »alle andre handlinger i modsat retning« ville skabe en katastrofe, »som vi nu ser det« i Libyen. Han påpegede, at denne deployering var helt i overensstemmelse med international lov, ulig tilsvarende deployeringer fra præsident Obamas side, hvis

»levering af militær støtte til illegale strukturer er i modstrid med principperne i moderne, international lov og De forenede Nationers Charter«.

Der er panik i Det Hvide Hus under Obamas forberedelser til at mødes privat med Putin, efter at de begge taler til Generalforsamlingen i dag. En afvisning af Putins forslag om en international koalition mellem nationer for at beskytte den suveræne stat Syrien, og verden, mod det barbariske ISIS, vil afsløre Obama som en åbenlys støtte af præcis disse terroristnetværk – nøjagtig som general Michael Flynn, den tidligere chef for det amerikanske Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA), sagde den 31. juli til Al Jazeera, hvor han anklagede Obama for »bevidst« at støtte al-Qaeda for at opnå et regimeskift i Libyen og Irak.

TASS rapporterede søndag, at Irak, Iran, Syrien og Rusland allerede har etableret et center i Bagdad for koordinering af efterretninger og operationer imod ISIS, og som skal ledes af repræsentanter for disse nationers generalstabe. Vil Obama modsætte sig denne indsats?

Præsident Xi Jinping sendte yderligere chokbølger gennem FN i lørdags, hvor han fremlagde kinesiske planer om yderligere

flere store udviklingsprojekter i hele verden, med en alvorlig kritik af den eksisterende politik, hvor der kun gives hjælp til de lande, der lydigt følger de vestlige magters ordre. Kina, sagde han, vil, i sine udviklingsprojekter, sætte »retfærdighed over interesser«.

Og den tredje leder af Rusland-Kina-Indien-trekanten, der anfører BRIKS-nationerne i skabelsen af et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling, sprængte hul i den grønne fascistdagsordens planer om at bruge svindelen med global opvarmning til at nedlukke udvikling over hele verden. Den indiske premierminister Narendra Modi sagde til FN's generalsekretær, Ban Ki-moon, at der bestod et »tillidsunderskud« over for de udviklede lande, der bruger klimaspørgsmålet til at afholde udviklingslandene fra at forbedre deres befolkningers levestandard, under påskuddet om kontrol af CO₂-udledning. Det var Indien og Kina, der førte an i den heldige afvisning af tvungen nedbringelse af CO₂, og som ødelagde Klimakonferencen i København i 2009, »COP15«, og det er sandsynligt, at vi kan vente det samme ved »COP21«, Klimakonferencen i Paris i december måned.

EIR's nye Specialrapport, *Skræmmekampagne om 'Global Opvarmning' er Befolkningsreduktion, ikke Videnskab[1]*, må læses og distribueres for at sikre netop et sådant resultat.

I lørdags blev **Lyndon LaRouche, under en konference i Manhattan**, spurgt, hvilken fremgangsmåde, man skulle anvende for at mobilisere folk på et tidspunkt, hvor faren, som nu, er så alvorlig. Han svar var, i uddrag:

»Obama var på randen af at lancere en atomkrig fra selve USA. Det var, hvad han var helliget til. Og Putin blokerede det! Hvordan blokerede han det? Han gik over til en anden kæde og ændrede spørgsmålet og kom ind i et helt område, som ikke var det europæiske område i den almindelige forstand. Og hele dette område, fra Tyskland, og fra andre dele af Europa, begyndte at respondere til det, Putin havde gjort!

Pointen er derfor, at vi på alle punkter altid må søge menneskehedens fremskridt, i den forstand, at vi søger efter menneskelig udødelighed i de mennesker, der vil tage vores plads, når de skal tage vores plads, ud fra den antagelse, at de vil være i stand til, som en gruppe mennesker, som et samfund, at skabe evnen til ægte menneskelighed i fremtiden, eller i nutiden og ind i fremtiden.

Og det er denne optimisme, der giver folk inspiration til at hellige deres liv til det, der ligger forude, selv, hvis de skulle stå over for en trussel om døden. Og de inspireres af den kendsgerning, at de har folk, der bidrager til udviklingen af en mere fremskreden grad af udvikling af samfundet, end de nogen sinde tidligere har kendt.»

Titelbillede: St. Georg dragedræberen

[1] Se: [Rapport fra pressekonferencen i anledning af rapportens udgivelse](#)

Samt også: [Introduktion til EIR's rapport v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche, »Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur«](#)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
september 2015:**

Optakt til Obama-Putin møde ved FN/ Xi Jinpings statsbesøg i USA

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Modi forklarer Ban Ki-moon, at fattigdom, ikke CO2-udslip, er vigtigst

Den 27. september 2015 – Da Indiens premierminister Narendra Modi d. 25. september diskuterede med FN's generalsekretær Ban Ki-moon under FN's møde om mål for bæredygtighed, bragte han emnet om manglende tillid op. Ifølge talsmanden for Indiens udenrigsministerium Vikas Swarup bruger industrilandene tilsyneladende klimaemnet til at holde udviklingslandenes befolkningers levestandard nede, med påskud om at kontrollere CO2-udslippet, rapporterede Indo-Asian News Service (IANS) i dag.

Modi sagde, at udviklingslandene skal have mulighed for at udvikle sig, og at industrilandenenes politik om at indføre restriktioner og kontrol af udviklingen ikke var vejen frem. »Der var brug for positive foranstaltninger, som f.eks. lempelser af finansieringen for projekter relateret til klimaforandringer, samt overførsel af teknologi, for at fremme bæredygtig udvikling, frem for negative foranstaltninger, der fokuserede på at begrænse CO2-udslippet«, sagde han ifølge IANS.

Senere på dagen, da han talte til et særligt FN-topmøde, betonedede Modi, at lande som Kina, Indien og Brasilien huser millioner af mennesker, der lever under ekstrem fattigdom (mindre end \$1.25 om dagen) – hhv. 80, 280 og 10 millioner. Det handler ikke kun om at opfylde de fattiges behov og om at opretholde deres værdighed eller tage moralsk ansvar, men at indse, at målet for en bæredygtig fremtid ikke kan opnås, hvis ikke dette fattigdomsproblem bliver adresseret, sagde han ifølge BRICS Post. Næsten 60 % af landbefolkningen i Indien lever i »afsavn« ifølge en måling, der måler syv socialøkonomiske forhold fremlagt i en regeringsundersøgelse fra tidligere i år, skrev BRICS Post.

Tema-artikel: Begynd med Franklin Roosevelts helhedsidé.

FN for fælles, økonomisk opbygning af verden, ikke Det britiske Imperium

EIR, 22. september 2015 – Verden vil snart forsamles i Manhattan til den sidste uge i september til De Forenede Nationers Generalforsamling. Obama vil tale den 28. september, en måned før 70-års dagen for ratificeringen af FN's Charter i oktober 1945. Verden vil imidlertid ikke længere lytte til

Obamas diktat, der fremsættes på vegne af hans herrer i Det britiske Imperium. I stedet vil verden samles, idet et nyt paradigme er i færd med at blive konsolideret, anført af BRIKS-udviklingen, der har et særdeles reelt potentiale for at lancere en Renæssance for hele menneskeheden, stedt over for Det britiske Imperiums smuldrende bygningsværk. Som Lyndon LaRouche for nyligt erklærede, så er den onde Bertrand Russells verdensøkonomiske system dømt til undergang.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Præsident Xi og Obama fortsatte diskussionsrunder med nedtonede udtalelser; I slutningen af presse mødet bragte Xi »Et bælte, en vej« og AIIB på banen

Den 25. september 2015 – Mellem den pompøse reception i Det Hvide Hus denne morgen og den officielle middag i aften var mødet og presse mødet mellem Kinas præsident Xi Jinping og USA's præsident Barack Obama karakteriseret af en tilsyneladende tendens til kun at snakke om forudsigelige emner og til nedtonede udtalelser. Det handlede om internetsikkerhed, adfærd i Det sydkinesiske Hav, det kinesiske aktiemarked, fremme af turisme, nogle andre emner

og, især, den opreklamerede klimasnak.

Nogle få aftaler blev skitseret – deres detaljer er endnu ikke offentliggjort – f.eks. en hensigtserklæring om samarbejde om udvikling i forhold til katastrofehjælp, sikkerhed for fødevareforsyning og andre formål. Der kommer en fælles erklæring omkring klimaforandringer. Der er et nyt adfærdskodeks i forhold til møder i luftrummet, som skal supplere et eksisterende kodeks for marinefaretøjer osv.

Under den 57 minutter lange fælles pressekonference ved middagstid i dag i Rosenhaven i Det Hvide Hus blev disse emner gennemgået på nedtonet vis, indtil Xi i svaret til det sidste spørgsmål fra People's Daily lavede en bemærkelsesværdig ændring. Han hev, uden at skjule det, en seddel frem og læste beskeden meget hurtigt. Spørgsmålet lød, »Vil Kinas vækst udfordre USA?«.

Xi: Kina bygger nationale systemer

Xi sagde, at den kolde krig er slut. Landene må opgive tanken om, at »jeg vinder, du taber«, som om det var et nulsumsspil. Hvis Kina udvikler sig, og hvis USA udvikler sig, vil det være til fordel for hele verden. Vores fælles interesser vil veje tungere end enhver uenighed.

Han sagde, at vi ved fælles indsats må udvikle »en ny model for de store nationers fællesskab«. Det skal være ikke-konfliktorienteret, ikke-konfronterende, baseret på gensidig respekt og samarbejde. Kina har initieret programmet med »Et bælte, en vej« og Den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, og alle disse initiativers mål virkeliggør målet for fælles udvikling. Han sagde, at Kina er en nation, der bygger nationale systemer.

Xi betonedede, at vi må forsvare de mål, der blev opnået med den sejr, der blev vundet ved krigens slutning for 70 år siden.

LPAC Fredags-Webcast, 25. september 2015:

Hvad er Lyndon LaRouches råd til præsidenterne Obama og Putin forud for deres møde på tomandshånd i New York?

Mandag i denne uge markerede den officielle begyndelse af FN's Generalforsamlings sammentræde i New York City, hvor en stor del af verdens ledere vil være samlet for de næste to uger, midt i en meget usikker, og også meget farlig og omskiftelig, global strategisk situation. Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i en erklæring, hun udstedte for et par uger siden **»En hasteappel til FN's Generalforsamling«**, så kunne dette være menneskehedens sidste chance for at droppe systemet med geopolitik og indvarsle et nyt paradigme, der bygger på menneskehedens fælles mål. I erklæringen siger hun: »Kun på denne måde vil vi overleve som art. Og efter denne standard vil statsoverhovederne på Manhattan blive målt.«

Af denne grund vil der være meget fokus på de første dage i næste uge, hvor statsoverhovederne vil samles på Manhattan for at holde taler og mødes; disse statsoverhoveder inkluderer Kinas Xi Jinping, Ruslands Vladimir Putin og USA's Barack Obama.

Engelsk udskrift.

We're coming to you LIVE tonight! We have plenty to update you on, so tune in LIVE at 8pm Eastern.

Transcript

MEGAN BEETS:

It's Friday evening September 25, and I'd like to welcome you all to our regular weekly webcast. My name is Megan Beets, and I'm joined tonight in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*, and Jason Ross and Ben Deniston of the LaRouche PAC science team.

Monday of this week marked the official start of the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York City, where much of the leadership of the world has convened for the next two, in the midst of a very precarious, and also a very dangerous and rapidly transforming global strategic situation. As was said by Helga Zepp-LaRouche in a statement that she released a couple of weeks ago, "An Urgent Appeal to the United Nations General Assembly," this could be mankind's last chance to dump the system of geopolitics, and to usher in a new paradigm built around the common aims of mankind. She says in the statement: "Only in that way will we survive as a species. And by that standard will the heads of state in Manhattan be measured."

Now for that reason, much attention is focused on the early days of next week, when the heads of state will be gathering in Manhattan to speak, and to meet, heads of state including Xi Jinping of China, Vladimir Putin of Russia, and Barack Obama. Now, this brings us to the subject of tonight's institutional question which reads as follows: Mr. LaRouche, President Obama is set to have a one-on-one meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin next week at the United Nations General Assembly in New York. According to a senior administration official: "Given the situation in Ukraine and Syria, despite our profound differences with Moscow, the President believes that it would be irresponsible not to test whether we can make progress through high-level engagement with the Russians. In particular, our European partners have

underscored the importance of a unified message about the necessity of fully implementing the Minsk agreements. President Obama will take advantage of this meeting to discuss Ukraine, and he will be focused on ensuring Moscow lives up to the Minsk commitments. This will be the core message of this bilateral engagement." What is your advice to presidents Obama and Putin?

So with that, I'd like to invite Jeffrey Steinberg to the podium to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response to that question, and also his views on the more general strategic situation.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Megan.

We had a lengthy discussion this afternoon with Mr. LaRouche, and we discussed this; and for the sake of precision, I want to briefly read you the pretty much exact comments that Mr. LaRouche made, and then I'll give some elaboration and set some context for what he had to say.

He said: Putin will handle the meeting with Obama fine. Let Obama get stuck. After nearly two terms, it is clear you cannot deal with him. You can only denounce him. He is no good, and never was. Only half-wits support him. Look at what he is. His step-father was the prototype. In essence, he is a nasty. Putin is fine. Obama is dangerous, after his step-father.

Now, I think it's important to realize that the statement, that was included in the institutional question from a White House senior spokesperson, is typical of what you get from Washington, D.C. today. This is true from the first day of the Obama presidency, and it was true throughout the presidency of George W. Bush, with Dick Cheney looking over his shoulder. There's nothing that is said in Washington that can be presumed to be truthful. There's nothing that is said in Washington that can be relied on as an accurate account of

what's actually going on.

The fact of the matter is that the only reason that President Obama, at the very last moment, agreed to this meeting with President Putin, is that he was boxed in to an absolute corner, and in fact, the proposal from Moscow for there to be just such a face-to-face meeting, was made over a month ago, and it took the White House just until the last 24 hours, to make the decision that they could not weasel their way out of this face-to-face meeting. So, when you get this high-falutin' language about, it would be irresponsible not to sit down with Russia, despite these tremendous differences, and the attempt on the part of Obama to turn the entire issue of the discussion around the situation in Ukraine, and to completely ignore what the Russians have done in Syria – and the opportunity that represents for actually defeating the Islamic State and these other Salafist jihadis – is sheer folly.

Mr. LaRouche's view is that if President Obama attempts to turn the discussion in that private meeting around Ukraine, his simple advice to Mr. Putin is to just say to Obama, "Mr. President, you made the decision, beginning in November of 2013, to support an outright neo-Nazi coup against a legitimately elected government because that government refused to sign on to a rotten deal that would have wrecked Ukraine, and would have led to the kind of crisis between Ukraine and Russia that we're seeing right now." And in fact, that's the simple truth of the matter. President Obama is committed to the idea of war with Russia. That commitment has been there from literally the very beginning of the Obama presidency, and in November [I think it's October–ed.] of 2011, when there was a decision made between President Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and then-French President Sarkozy to summarily execute Libyan leader Qaddafi, rather than capture him and put him on trial, and go through the prolonged process with all that would have come out during the course of that trial, Mr. LaRouche said, this is vectored

against Russia and China.

Now in the last days, just preceding the events now beginning to take place in New York City, the German national television network, ZDF, aired a news magazine – kind of their equivalent of 60 Minutes – which went through a detailed exposé of the danger behind the fact that the United States is in the process of deploying a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons into Western Europe, and in fact, the B61-12, this new generation, is in fact an intermediate-range weapon which is a clear violation of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force INF Treaty that was signed in 1988. These weapons, in fact, blur the lines of distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons. They are no longer simply deterrence against the old Cold War fears that the Soviet Army would come rushing through the Fulda Gap and would basically occupy half of Western Europe before anybody could do anything about it. The situation right now is that these new generation weapons are far more accurate, will carry a much-reduced payload, and can be fired from combat stealth fighters that will reach deep into Russian territory. The fact that the German national television network, a week before all these UN events, chose to put a very prominent documentary exposé of the danger behind this Obama decision, is indicative of the fact that it's not that there's unity between the US and our European allies over the situation in Ukraine.

There's been a decisive break led by Germany, now also including France; because they have come to the realization that Obama is a dangerous lunatic when it comes to Russia, and is jeopardizing the real possibility of a nuclear war on European soil. So, the Europeans have broken with Obama in a very demonstrable way. Germany, then France, then other European countries, have also come out fully supportive of the Russian military deployments into Syria; and have called for a much broader diplomatic initiative that does not exclude

Russia, that does not exclude Assad in Syria, and does not exclude Iran. So the idea that there's unity within the western nations is an absolute fraud. Obama has created the conditions where Europe, in many critical areas of security, is breaking with the United States and is moving – at least by natural impulse – towards seeking cooperation and an alliance with Russia.

So remember, when Russian President Putin a month ago began the deployment of significant military equipment into Syria, this was a strategic game-changer. The United States was in the advanced stages of reaching a rotten deal with Turkey and Saudi Arabia and Qatar and Kuwait, to establish a no-fly zone in the northern part of Syria that was to ostensibly be a safe haven against ISIS; but was in fact to be a zone where the jihadists could operate freely, because the Syrian air force was completely denied access to that. Now, you've got two squadrons of Russian advanced MiG fighter planes at a base just south of Latakia in northern Syria on the Mediterranean coast. This week, several thousand Russian engineers arrived in the port of Tartus to expand and modernize that port to be able to receive larger Russian battleships and supply ships. So the game has been dramatically changed in the Middle East, and it was not on the basis of President Putin seeking out a compromise with President Obama. It was based on taking a very clear political military calculation that by hitting Obama on this strategic flank in Syria, it would completely destabilize the White House; and it would create the conditions where Obama would make a series of significant political mistakes. If he mishandles the summit meeting next week on Monday with President Putin, this will be another indication of Obama walking into the kind of trap that has been set for him; first by his own behavior, and by his commitment on behalf of London and Wall Street to fomenting war against Russia.

And we've seen the same things in the case of China. President

Xi Jinping arrived in Seattle, Washington earlier this week; and had three days of meetings out there. And now, has been here in Washington last night and today for a summit meeting with President Obama. Preceding that summitry in Washington, the President sent Penny Pritzker, part of the Chicago mafia apparatus that put Obama in office; that created his political career. She's now Secretary of Commerce, and she was the finance chair of Obama's two Presidential campaigns. She was sent out to Seattle as a kind of a minder to sit in on all of the meetings that took place between top American business leaders and President Xi Jinping; to make sure that they toed the White House line of making accusations about China unfair business practices in dealing with American companies. So that kind of crazy behavior on the eve of a heads of state summit is another typical indication of how this President has tended to do business. So, again as Mr. LaRouche said, "Putin will handle the meeting with Obama fine; let Obama get stuck. After nearly two terms, it's clear you cannot deal with him; you can only denounce him." So that is, in all likelihood, the kind of approach with velvet gloves, that President Putin will take; and that certainly is Mr. LaRouche's recommendation of what he should expect out of this meeting with President Obama.

Now, I should say that there are elements within the US military – high-level people – who favor the idea of US-Russian military cooperation to genuinely go after and crush the Islamic State and the Nusra front. Their view is that: 1) there must be negotiations on what's called "de-confliction"; the US and Russia are going to be operating in the same theatres of activity over Syria, and it's very important that there be a level of coordination to avoid an accidental incident that could get out of control. There are those in the Pentagon and in the US intelligence community who wish to see direct intelligence sharing and ultimately coordinated operations against the Islamic State, involving the United States and Russia. There is a line of communication between

President Putin through Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, into Secretary of State Kerry; and it's very clear that there is both a diplomatic and a military initiative coming out of President Putin. And he's expected to present that in considerable detail Monday morning when he addresses the UN General Assembly. That'll be just several hours before his Monday afternoon meeting with President Obama.

So, the Russians have taken a number of bold and critical initiatives. They've created a series of strategic *faites accomplis*; that's why President Obama authorized Defense Secretary Ash Carter to engage in phone discussion with Russian Defense Minister Shoigu last Friday. There will be a working group at the Pentagon chaired by Carter, but with representation from the Joint Chiefs and CENTCOM [Central Command—ed.] that will be negotiating and talking on an ongoing basis with Russian counterparts. This didn't come from negotiating and compromising with Obama; it came from forcing his hand and creating a series of unavoidable options. So, Obama is shaken; he's furious at what's happened around the Syria situation. He's furious that the efforts to create a blockade of Russian air links into Syria failed miserably; they couldn't even get Iraq to go along with banning Russian over flights over Iraqi airspace. So, the corridor from Russia through Iran and Iraq into Syria has been wide open; and that's the basis on which the Russians have carried out a very rapid and very significant military build-up inside Syria.

So, that's the backdrop to what's going to be happening in New York beginning this weekend and extending into next week.

Now, I think that there's an over-arching message that my colleagues will be addressing throughout the duration of this webcast, but I just want to put it clearly on the table right now, which is that there has been so much compromise, so much "practical decisions" that have been made over such a long time. This long pre-dates Obama, long pre-dates Bush-Cheney,

really goes back *decades*, that the kinds of compromises on core principle have an erosive effect that is a grave danger. In fact, it's the single gravest danger to the survival of mankind, that there is a willingness to make compromises on fundamental issues of scientific truth. We've seen that with the Pope's compromise in the encyclical, that gave ground to outright British genocidalists on this concept of global warming and climate change. So these kinds of compromises, which are considered to be in good taste, or to be expected of honorable gentlemen and -women, is a flaw, a deep pragmatic flaw that right now has created the conditions for the crisis that the world is facing. So, in the case of the Putin-Obama meeting coming up on Monday: no compromise. Truth. And on that basis we can get through this crisis, and avoid the kind of thermonuclear war that President Obama is toying around with.

BEETS: Thank you, Jeff.

Now, as Jeff just referred to, leading into the heads-of-state meeting that is to begin Monday in New York, events at the U.N. this weekend have been co-opted by the attempt to shape the ongoing discussion in a major way around the rotten agenda, the fraud, of so-called sustainable development. Now, a major part of that was kicked off this morning by the speech of Pope Francis in front of the plenary session, where he again, very unfortunately, pushed the doctrine coming from the British, that man is destroying the Earth, and must shift to a mode of stewardship and living harmoniously with Mother Earth, and to face the threat of climate change. So this began a weekend full of meetings of the U.N. Sustainability Summit around their 2030 agenda for sustainable development, which was, as Jeff said, in terms of a real tragic concession, voted up unanimously by the session shortly after the Pope's speech.

Now, as we've documented thoroughly in these webcasts, and

also as is covered in great detail in the newly-released EIR Special Report, "Global Warming Scare Is Population Reduction, Not Science", the entire program of so-called sustainability is nothing new, and it's a fraud which has been pushed time and again throughout the twentieth and now the twenty-first centuries by the leading factions of the British Empire. So what I'd like to do now is invite first Ben Deniston, followed by Jason Ross, to come to the podium to address, number one, what is the fraud of the policy of sustainable development, and number two, what would a *real* policy for human progress look like?

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Megan.

I think I just want to start by referring to Mr. LaRouche's very clear and concise assessment of the situation around the Pope. You know, he's, I think, put this question in some terms that have important precision. The question we have, is, what convinced this Pope of all people to go along with this policy which is a genocide program. We may not know every aspect of *why* he's going along with this, for his personal motivations. Mr. LaRouche has made that clear a number of times, including in a discussion last night, his so-called Fireside Chat discussion, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website, but he's made that point a number of times. We may not know all of the motivation behind the Pope *himself*, but the facts are what they are, and we know that he's going along with the policy, which is a genocide policy, and we know *exactly* what forces have moved in on this Pope, and what they're characteristics are.

First and foremost, what we've identified and we've discussed on these shows, and we've discussed on the LaRouche PAC website, and one of the key individuals is this guy John Schellhuber, who has been for many years a leading operative and collaborator of the British Royal Family, very

specifically in their genocidal population-reduction program. He shares the view of Prince Philip, of the Queen, of this degenerate oligarchical faction, that the world is well beyond its carrying-capacity and needs – and world population must be reduced to around a few billion people. This is the view of Philip, and the other British Royals. This is the view of Schellnhuber. He's the one who's become a key advisor to the Pope on these environmental issues, on the so-called climate issue, including playing a leading role in this encyclical that the Pope released a couple of months back.

Now, you know, just to make this clear and put this on the table, just look at the guy's profile. In 2004, Schellnhuber was deployed along with Tony Blair's top science advisor at the time, Sir David King, together to go over to the United States to try and strong-arm the Bush Administration into going along with this climate change fraud policy. And apparently they were so egregious in their attempt to strong-arm the Bush Administration, that the Bush Administration issued a formal complaint to Tony Blair, complaining about the trip of Schellnhuber and the way he acted on it. It was later that same year, that Schellnhuber was named an official Honorary Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, by Queen Elizabeth, and it's been said that he very much is offended if you do not call him by his official title given by the British Royals. In 2005, he worked with Tony Blair to organize a conference for the G-8 Summit in Scotland at the time, on the issue of this climate change fraud. Schellnhuber edited the proceedings of that conference, and the introduction to the whole thing was written by Tony Blair. Since then, he became the key advisor to Angela Merkel in Germany, presiding over the, really, dismantling of the German economy, with their nuclear-exit program, their insane carbon-reduction policy, and their suicidal green energy program. 2009, in the buildup to the Copenhagen Climate Summit, Schellnhuber worked closely with Prince Charles to try and build support for this summit, including making another

trip to the United States to meet with then Obama as the President, to make sure the Obama Administration was in line with this whole program. So, you know, he's got a clear, very high-level track record of trying to recruit and strong-arm leading officials to go along with this population-reduction program of the British. Now, he is the guy who has moved in on the Pope, bringing this entire program into the Vatican. As Megan referenced, just earlier today in his address to the United Nations, the Pope clearly asked for support from the world population, from the leaders represented there at the U.N. Summit, to support the upcoming Climate Summit in Paris this December, where they're trying to get nations to agree to really a suicidal commitment to reduce carbon emissions in the name of this fraud of a so-called climate-change scare. This is a killer policy, but the point is, that's the *intention*. This is being pushed by these radical de-population fanatics. They don't care about the facts, they don't care about the climate, they don't care about the reality of the science between CO2 and the climate – their objective is this population-reduction program. You know, what are that facts we actually know on CO2 and climate? Well, number one: there's been no warming of the Earth's temperature on average, for the past nearly 20 years, now, despite the fact we've been putting CO2 in the atmosphere at a faster rate than ever. So there's no evidence that the climate is highly sensitive, or highly responsive, to CO2, and there's no evidence to show that mankind is going to have some catastrophic effect. It's just getting ridiculous.

There's been no increase in extreme weather, despite what you hear. There's no evidence that CO2 can be tied to any increase in sea level rise, according to the most accurate measurements we have available. And, as an added irony to the whole thing, we know that the planet is actually getting greener, because CO2 is a plant food; it's not a pollutant, despite the insane proclamation of the EPA. It's a vital component to the biosphere, and the higher levels of CO2 have actually led to a

greener planet overall.

But, the point is, these guys don't care about these facts. They don't care about the scientific arguments, because they're starting from their program of a Malthusian population reduction policy, not any scientific argument. And Schellnhüber is a leading example of this.

Now, Mr. LaRouche has also emphasized the importance of highlighting the role of another figure, another situation, expressing this exact same fight, which is Jerry Brown, over in California, the governor of California. Where yes, he's also pushing this insane idea for a murderous reduction in CO2 emissions, but that agenda is really no different than his water policy, or maybe better said, his no water policy. The facts are clear; the reality is clear. There's plenty of water for California. Jerry Brown doesn't want new water for California. He doesn't *want* to develop new resources. He wants to kill off sections of the population; he wants to reduce the population of California.

There's no shortage of water supplies for the state. They're being denied to the population by the policies of that governor. As we've covered on these shows, on this site, we can get all the water we need for California, and we can actually get it in new ways. We can get it more quickly. We can get it more efficiently than ever before, if we decide to actually act human, and move to higher levels, by understanding how our galactic system operates.

You can ask the question: How do specifically the atmospheric components of our Earth's water system operate? How does the atmospheric aspect of the Earth's water cycle operate? Well, you can't actually understand that unless you understand how the Solar System as a whole is actually subsumed by the higher order system of the Galaxy as a whole. If you understand that, if we understand that, and we act on that; if we act on a galactic level, on a Galactic principle, then we can manage

the world's water supplies in a completely new way. We can bring water to where it's needed, by managing the atmospheric characteristics of the water system, in a way we haven't been able to do before.

But people like Jerry Brown – they don't want that. It's not that that's not an option; it's not that we don't have that available. They don't want that policy. The British Royal Family does not want that policy, because it's contrary to their Zeusian view of mankind. Because this shows us that mankind can go to qualitatively higher levels. We can create new resources. We're not limited by any finite amount of resources. We're limited by the boundaries of our knowledge at any given state, but what we can do as mankind is transcend to a higher state; go to a higher level of discovery, fundamentally transforming what the nature of the human species is in the Universe. Just like this galactic perspective is a clear demonstration of that, and that's what these people hate.

They want their Green program. They want a program of so-called sustainability. Not progress, not creation, not really truly human action, but sustainability, sustaining some prior earlier state of mankind as a fixed animal-like species.

So, this is the fundamental fight going on right now. And this is what's happening at the United States, with the so-called move to adopt some idea of a "sustainable" policy.

If you go to the fundamental principle of the matter, and Mr. LaRouche was very emphatic on this earlier today when we were meeting with him, sustainability is a Satanic policy. This is a scientifically defined Satanic outlook. Because this goes to a deeper issue, something quite frankly that the Pope should understand, but apparently he either doesn't understand it, or refuses to discuss. But the issue of what is the true nature of mankind. And Mr. LaRouche said this very clearly earlier today. He said: Sustainability is death. There is no such

thing as sustainability. Without progress, mankind will cease to exist. Because the issue is that mankind as a unique species on this planet, is uniquely characterized by a type of creative action, which does not exist in the domain of the animal world. Something that distinguishes our species as fundamentally unique. That *this* is what should be discussed at the United Nations right now. *This* should be the fundamental principle on which we discuss a new era of relations among nations, a truthful scientific insight and understanding of what mankind is as a creative species. Not a green program, not a sustainability program.

If you're starting from a green program, you're starting from a Satanic conception of mankind. Despite what the Pope said earlier today, despite what these crazy fanatics say, mankind is not a product of the natural biosphere, so to speak. We're not a product of animal life. We do not exist in any steady balance with nature that we have to maintain. It's not true.

Mankind, the existence of society today, is purely a product of mankind. We exist at the present state we're at right now, because of the creative contributions of prior generations that have created the current state of existence of our species. And that is what we need to focus on. That is what we need to understand.

We have to ask these questions: how is it that mankind uniquely creates his own future? And it's not just something that happened once, and then we've achieved that state and that's it. This is the substance of what makes us human: continual and unending progress. And I think the issue is that we have to treat – if we're going to treat individuals as truly human, we must recognize every individual's fundamental inherent right to participate in this process.

It's not just about biological life. It's not just about a lifespan per se. Sure, we need better living conditions. Much of the world needs better living conditions. We need longer

lifespans, we need better health care, we need better infrastructure. That's all true. But, for what purpose? Do those lives actually get a chance to mean anything? They can live out their life, you can live and you can die, without even having the chance to make a fundamental human contribution to the progress of society, without having the chance to really be truly human, and actually participate in a creative process to move society forward.

So, that's the principal issue. That is why a green program, a program focussed on sustainability, sustaining some magical, fanatical idea of balance with nature, some inherent balance that we should just maintain, is a Satanic conception. There's nothing truly human in it. There's no actual creation. And so this whole green program – it's not just evil because it kills people. That is evil; it's evil to kill people. But it's evil because it denies people access to their real nature as mankind as a unique species. It denies people access the right and the ability to contribute something unique and something meaningful to the progress of society. So, this is the issue that Mr. LaRouche was emphatic that needs to be put on the table; the actual principle of what mankind is. What is the basis on which we need to move the world forward on a positive conception of true human nature? But even this Green program that we're talking about here today, Mr. LaRouche emphasized, is only a recent expression of a longer standing fight; a longer standing issue. Today's Green policy is not really unique; it may have new clothes, it may have a more recent expression. But it's a much longer standing policy, longer standing fight. And I think Jason has some more to elaborate here on the deeper roots of this issue.

JASON ROSS: I do.

One of the other things that the Pope had brought up at the United Nations was, that in this speech he says that as human

beings, we have to follow certain laws of physics and chemistry and biology, because we have bodies. We need to talk about what it is that makes us human. And I'm going to do that tonight in two aspects. One is from the standpoint of the scientist Vernadsky; and the other is from the standpoint of Zeus or Bertrand Russell against the Promethean outlook of man, and talk about what a real human identity must be and what we need to hold on to today.

So, is it true what the Pope said, that we have to follow the laws of nature and biology and chemistry and physics because we have physical bodies? Well, ask yourself this: Are there any unique things about us as a species? Do we apply laws of morality to animals? Do we say that a lion is being immoral when it's catching, hunting down some animal and then only eating half of it; wasting the leftovers? Are there any rosebushes or orange trees that are going to be attending the Pope's mass on Sunday? I doubt it. The difference between human beings and animals is an obvious thing to everybody in the sense that it's not hard to tell if you see something in front of you; is this a human being, or is this an animal? It's not hard to figure that out. Just as in the study of biology or physics, it's not difficult to know whether something that you're seeing is part of a living process or not. Some people might say, "Well, viruses are an unusual case."

So, what does Vernadsky have to do with this? Vernadsky, the Russian-Ukrainian biogeochemist who regular viewers of our website will have heard about I think a fair amount, he looked at life as a phenomenon. He looked at human life as a phenomenon; and rather than focussing on the actions of individual organisms the way a biologist would, his focus was more on life as a whole. The impact of life, the inter-relationship between life and the non-living material around it, and the reshaping of the originally non-living material around life by the process of the biosphere over billions of

years. As a result of this process, we're going to compare life with non-life, and then look at the human. Because imagine if someone had said, "Well, life has to follow the laws of physics and chemistry." Imagine if you had gone back to the dawning of life on Earth, and said, "Wait a minute! Life, you're going to destroy the planet; you're going to alter everything. You're going to reshape the soils; you're going to change the atmosphere. Look at all that pollution you're making." This happened in life; the initial life on this planet lived off of chemical energy, such as deep sea vents, things in the crust, that sort of thing – chemical energy. The breakthrough invention in life of photosynthesis, where the light of the Sun became the fuel and power source for life; that was tremendous transformation [that] totally changed life's relationship to the rest of the planet. It also led to the production of a very dangerous chemical. Unlike carbon dioxide, which isn't going to hurt anything, oxygen is actually is toxic; you might have said life was polluting the planet. And indeed, the kind of life had to change to be able to live in an environment that had oxygen. New kinds of metabolic pathways were developed that used oxygen as part of metabolism; like we do, as animals.

So, there's been a dramatic change in life's presence on this planet. This is seen in the biogenic migration of atoms; of the flow of material from living organisms to the non-living – but almost undoubtedly shaped by life – surroundings. The flow back and forth between life and non-life. The development and growth of an increasing amount of biogeochemical energy. Vernadsky says that life increases its free energy; it colonizes the non-living. At this point, the whole crust of the Earth down to a certain depth, the atmosphere; it's all been shaped by life. Vernadsky points to other differences. Take, for example, evolution. Now, evolution has a direction to it. I'd mentioned earlier the transition from chemical energy only to having photosynthesis, to developing higher forms of life – animals, warm-blooded

animals. The process of cephalization, meaning moving towards the head, where in animal life, more and more of the senses, the neural systems developed into the head. That's a process that took place over time; making it possible for there to be human beings. Life doesn't respond the way chemical elements do in other respects. Life treats isotopes differently than can be explained by chemical or physical processes. It treats left- and right-handed isomers differently in a way that purely chemical processes don't.

So, there's plenty that distinguishes life from non-life. In a similar way, there's plenty that distinguishes human beings from life. Despite what you may have heard about lawsuits about chimpanzees or other such animals having human rights; they're not human. And this used to be an obvious thing. Let me read a section now from Vernadsky. This is from his paper "Problems of Biogeochemistry Two", and it's available in a Vernadsky anthology that we put together. (Anthology Book I Here) Vernadsky says:

"From the standpoint of the biosphere, the individual living organism is usually lost from view; in first place comes the aggregate of organisms – living matter. In biogeochemistry, however – in some strictly defined cases – at times it is necessary to pay attention to the discrete organism, to its individuality. It is indispensable to do this in those cases, where the activity of Man appears as a geological factor, as we see happening now, and the individual personality sometimes becomes vividly apparent and is reflected in large-scale phenomena of a planetary character. The human personality changes, accelerates, and causes geological processes of enormous significance, through its presence in the biosphere."

With human beings, individuals actually matter on a planetary scale; no individual animal matters on a planetary scale, no individual plant matters on a planetary scale, no fungus. With human beings, it's different; how is that? He said:

"We are living in a brand new, bright geological epoch. Man, through his labor – and his conscious relationship to life – is transforming the envelope of the Earth – the geological region of life, the biosphere. Man is shifting it into a new geological state: Through his labor and his consciousness, the biosphere is in a process of transition to the noosphere. [From the root noeses, or thinking.] Man is creating new biogeochemical processes, which never existed before. The biogeochemical history of the chemical elements – a planetary phenomenon – is drastically changing. Enormous masses of new, free metals and their alloys are being created on Earth, for example, ones which never existed here before, such as aluminum, magnesium, and calcium."

"Plant and animal life are being changed and disturbed in the most drastic manner. New species and races are being created. The face of the Earth is changing profoundly. The stage of the noosphere is being created. Within the Earth's biosphere, an intense blossoming is in process, the further history of which will be grandiose, it seems..."

Human beings aren't animals. Bio-behavior, by looking at human existence over time as a phenomenon; just looking at it a scientist, looking at it as something that occurred. We do things that animals have never done and never will. We transform biogeochemical processes; we create new states of existence in the universe on the Earth. We make new things happen that would not have happened by any means that was purely biological, physical, or chemical; we create.

Now this is a way of understanding the idea of human beings as being made in the image of God, for example. The distinction between human beings and animals used to be, this wasn't really much of a question. Religions that look to Genesis and the notion that human beings are made in the image of God; that's a clear distinction. Squirrels are not said to be so made. We see it in the indications that Vernadsky gives of the kinds of transformations we've made; so let's talk about

how that happens. And what that means about our identity, and what it means about how we have to approach the future. I want to read a response that Lyndon LaRouche gave last night on a call of activists that we have every Thursday evening. I'll read the question, too. The question was:

"How do you deal with strengthening the spiritual ability for mankind, or the person to deal with the problem of the world? You mentioned people are becoming disheartened of the fact that the crisis is becoming unbearable for some. But how do you strengthen the quality in defending mankind?"

LaRouche in his answer, said:

"We have the means, mankind has the means to understand mankind. And what I said in an earlier remark this evening, that at a certain point, we are able to understand mankind, how? We understand that, because we are all human, and we all know that we are going to die, sooner or later. And we know that the question is, what's the meaning of our life? And many people have a big problem, because they have never been able to resolve what has been and what will be, 'the meaning of my life.'

"So you start with what has been the meaning of your life; then you go to the really tougher question, and you say, what is the meaning of your future of your life? And that means you have think, now, of what you are, and shape what you are going to be, in such a way that you do not feel shame about having lived. That means that you devote your life to making contributions which lead mankind to improve mankind! That is to improve people, living people. And rather than simply taking care of your own greed, and so forth, you've got to think about what you can do to influence people, to make the next generation, a better generation than the one you're living in."

He says, "That is a short way of saying it; but I think it's

an adequately effective one.”

Now, on this subject, LaRouche – when we spoke to him this afternoon – was very emphatic about drawing the contrast between that outlook that he expressed and the outlook of mankind expressed by Zeus, or by Bertrand Russell, or by John Schellnhuber – sorry, I forgot your title there, John. You do it by not being practical. Now the story of Zeus and Prometheus is one of tyranny. Zeus the tyrant said that human beings were of a lower class than he; he was a god, human beings were these mere mortals. And that the power of fire was something reserved for him alone; it wasn't for human beings to have. If Zeus had his way, he'd exterminate the human race, as a matter of fact. Prometheus enters the story as the fire-bringer; as defying Zeus and bringing the power of fire to mankind, and in fact, creating mankind. Listen to this; you can understand the creation of the human species as a non-biological, non-animal – we're not animals. Here's Prometheus. He says: “Listen to the miseries that beset mankind. How they were witless before I made them have sense, and endowed them with Reason. First of all, although they had eyes to see, they saw to no avail. They had ears; but they did not understand.” Your cat, as much as you love it, probably doesn't understand a whole lot. “But just as shapes and dreams throughout their length of days, without purpose, they wrought all things in confusion.” He says, human beings didn't know how to build houses; didn't know how to use wood; didn't understand the seasons; didn't know when to plant crops; didn't know how to navigate using the stars; didn't have numbers; didn't have poetry; didn't have writing; didn't use animals to do their chores for them; and didn't have sailing. And didn't have metallurgy; he goes on. Prometheus, yes; the fire-bringer. The power of fire which no animal species uses; and creativity itself as a whole, defining the human race.

Now, against that idea of the human race, stood Zeus then and,

in our time over the past century, has loomed very large – Bertrand Russell. I'm not going to say a lot about Bertrand Russell; we've got a lot of material, we've gone through this a good deal in the past. But to give a short reminder, I suppose you could call it, in 1900, Bertrand Russell took up a task that was put down by David Hilbert about, in effect, killing science. The specific idea was about turning mathematics into a branch of logic; but what the whole pursuit meant to Russell was eliminating creativity. To turn science – instead of being something creative where new things could occur, where new discoveries happen; Russell sought to destroy it, and say, "We've really got it all figured out; and everything in the future can be derived from the past. We can take the model of Euclid; you derive from what you've already got, and that's all that we're going to have in the future." And that really has taken over science; modelling, curve-fitting, throwing in more parameters to explain anomalies in the way that Ptolemy or Copernicus did by adding in extra epicycles. Approaching things mathematically, rather than as a scientist in the tradition of Mendeleev, Kepler, Cusa, Fermat, Leibniz, or a great musician.

So, I'd like to actually at this point get to a short idea about this from Percy Shelley. Now, Percy Shelley wrote a poem, *Prometheus Unbound*. Aeschylus' play *Prometheus Bound* is only the first of a trilogy, and the other two plays have been lost; we don't have them. But let me read an epilogue to Shelley's poem, *Prometheus Unbound*. He's writing this to Prometheus. He says that

"To suffer woes which hope thinks infinite; to forgive wrongs darker than death or night; to defy power which seems omnipotent; to love and bear; to hope 'til hope creates from its own wreck a thing it contemplates. Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent. This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be good, great, and joyous; beautiful and free. This is alone life, joy, empire, and victory."

That the greatest power that we have lies in our minds; lies in the power to do new things; lies in the power to – as we understand it today through LaRouche's economics – to live our lives in such a way that not only can we feel good about ourselves, but that we can have access to a necessity. In other words, it's possible to live a life in such a way that you will have been necessary to the future.

And as Ben said, just as we must prevent people from being killed – murder is wrong; we can't have a SPCA approach to human beings. To develop the Third World like adopting a poor puppy from the pound, or something like that. That's not a human approach to our fellow human beings. The development that we need is one in which people are elevated to being able to play a role in that development process itself; and to be truly human. To know what means, to have an idea of what future must be; and as in that quote from LaRouche, to shape yourself, and live your life in shaping yourself to be able to bring that about. That is the highest form of freedom for an individual. And by bringing that to society as a whole, we can achieve the true highest sort of freedom; which is not only a freedom from want, oppression, tyranny; but it's freedom to express intelligence, a freedom to know. It's a very developed sense of freedom; the highest sense of freedom. And to make that something that people are able to participate in, is truly the highest work for us today.

BEETS: Thank you very much, Jason.

With that, I'm going to bring a close to tonight's broadcast. I'd like to thank Ben, Jason, and Jeff for joining me tonight; and I would like to thank all of you for watching.

Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.