

Vi er kommet til punctum saliens – det springende punkt;

Vi må udøve lederskab nu!

Hvornår kommer nedsmeltningen?

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 17. juni
2016.**

Video, engelsk

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

Hr. LaRouche gik i dybden med nogle punkter tidligere på dagen, men jeg vil bede Jeff [Steinberg] foretage en hurtig gennemgang for at få en hurtig orientering om den globale situation, og vi vil dernæst i diskussionens forløb trække

mange af punkterne frem og følge flere af de ledetråde, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fastslog i deres bemærkninger tidligere på dagen.

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

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

LaRouche Friday Webcast, June 17, 2016

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

We're obviously in a very fast-changing situation, worldwide. We've had extensive discussions over the past few days with both Lyndon LaRouche and Helga LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche was very concise in his advice when he said yesterday, "Stay

alert.

Things are going to change very rapidly. It's a dangerous period." We still have a very proximate threat of global thermonuclear war, but we also have a lot which is changing, as can be seen very clearly by the changing attitudes in Europe, the visit by Xi Jinping to Central Europe right now, to push the New Silk Road, and the events at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum.

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

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

Mr. LaRouche had a much more fundamental point that he wanted to make to us today, which is that regardless of these short-term factors, the entire trans-Atlantic financial system is

really about to blow. We don't know exactly when it's going to happen, but we know it's absolutely inevitable, and therefore the

critical question is: what kinds of plans will be in place; what

kinds of reasonable players here in the United States, in Europe,

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

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

There was a commentary earlier this week by an economist

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

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

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

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

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

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

the existing gambling debt on the books.

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

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

now reached. President Putin spoke yesterday during the opening

plenary session of the St. Petersburg International Economic

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

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

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

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

OGDEN: Absolutely! Right in the midst of that, you have a very important initiative from Congressman Walter Jones, who has taken the next step beyond what he has already done, around the campaign to release the 28 pages, which would expose the entire

Anglo-Saudi apparatus behind what led to 9/11 and what continues

to be the threat of terrorism, world-wide today.

He had 70 co-sponsors on H-Res. 14, but this week he has

introduced a new resolution, which says, Look, we don't have to

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

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

who read the Pentagon Papers into the Congressional Record; and

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

That continues to be a very critical element in this fight

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

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

the discussion out from there. It reads as follows:

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

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

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

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

'religious-industrial complex' as the source of spreading

Wah'habi ideology. Hillary Clinton recently rebuked Saudi Arabia and two other U.S. allies – Qatar and Kuwait – by name, for their support of terrorist networks and ideology. Mr. LaRouche, in your opinion, what types of religions reform must Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait, and other Wah'habi-oriented nations, need to enact, to deal with Salafi-inspired jihadi terrorism?"

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

STEINBERG: Well, let me just start by saying that I think the idea of any kind of near-term reform of Saudi Arabia or these other countries that subscribe to Wah'habism, is a very unlikely phenomenon. We've got to take the approach that this whole apparatus has to be exposed, top down, and completely dismantled. It's going to have to come from the outside.

A very, very interesting discussion took place earlier this week [on June 14] on the John Batchelor [radio] show in New York, where Dr. Stephen F. Cohen, a Russia specialist, professor emeritus of Russian studies, history and politics at New York University, for the first time touched on the issue of Obama's removal from office. He said one of the greatest crimes that Obama has committed, has been the breaking of the cooperation with Russia, that basically the U.S. has no understanding or

no capacity for dealing with this threat of Salafist terrorism, but Russia does. Therefore Obama's demonization of Putin, refusal to cooperate with Russia, is piling up the body-count around the globe.

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

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

The 28 pages make it clear that Prince Bandar was a source of funding to the 9/11 hijackers at a time that he was getting upwards of \$2 billion wired into that account from the Bank of England, as the result of his sponsorship of Al-Yamamah. If you talk about the Saudis without talking about the British and without talking about Bush, and now Obama, then you're never going to solve the problem.

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

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

One thing that just developed out of this yesterday,

is front-page coverage in the {New York Times} of a "dissent channel," [a draft copy of an internal memo] by 50 mid-level State Department officials, "urging the United States to carry out military strikes against the government of President Bashar al-Assad to stop its persistent violations of a cease-fire in the country's five-year-old civil war," which is obviously a direct declaration of war against what Russia is doing in Syria right now.

STEINBERG: Absolutely!

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

Coming back to this point that what has been raised on the nature of the terrorism, going back to the Al-Yamamah deal, this was effectively the geo-political enforcement wing of what was ushered in at that time. We had some discussions earlier this week where this was coincident at the same time that Thatcher brought in the whole "Big Bang" program to have London be the center of global finance and this speculative offshore financial system, which was sort of the consolidation of what had come

in
in 1971, as Mr. LaRouche forecast, that when they broke with
the
Bretton Woods system, they turned their back on the real
economic
progress that we saw under Kennedy and, of course, Roosevelt
before then.

There was an explicit destruction of the American
System
that could have swept the planet, were it not for that
intervention by the British in '71. Mr. LaRouche was clear at
that point, that this would result in fascism. We've now seen
that come to fruition. But the point is, that's the bankrupt
system that is now collapsing; and what Mr. LaRouche said
today I
think is very important on the Obama question, and more
importantly what Obama represents. Because he represents the
British Empire, he represents this integrated financial
apparatus
which is funding itself through the dope trade, enforcing it
through terrorism, the whole migrant crisis; all of this is
part
of the integrated policy of the British Empire. And what
LaRouche said about Obama and that system is that they can't
win;
Obama is going to lose, period. The question is, will others
win? And what Lyn also said today I think is very important,
he
says that Putin has shown this leadership; he's straight on
this,
he's the best leadership we have so far. And I think that's
part
of this growing recognition that the BRICS nations and
specifically Russia, China, India, are now the world
leadership;
the British are having to react. And I think what we're
seeing

in terms of their reaction is, of course, increasingly dangerous; because they see what the writing on the wall is in terms of the imminent collapse of their financial system while this New Paradigm is being consolidated. Helga made the point on this question of the German bonds; their 10-year bonds are trading at negative interest rates, so that is a huge psychological shock to the German people. Anybody in business knows the implications of that.

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

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

instruments. The baton has given the signal"; and then Modi said, "Let me add to that if I might, there is a new symphony in play." And I think that's a perfect way of describing the new world system which is now breaking onto the horizon. And it really has, despite the attempts by Obama and his allies, to isolate this and to try to beat this back. It is continuing to take hold.

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

the U.S., can make all the difference in the world; and it's unfortunate that it comes to us from such a negative direction.

If we don't do something, the U.S. is blocking this and Obama is going to create a war to prevent it.

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

now of clash where the two systems are so irreconcilable that they can't both survive. That's also why the war danger is so pronounced at this point.

BEETS: Well, let me just add something in on this point about this newly forming world system being led by China and Russia. I was remembering that a couple of years ago, around the time of the BRICS summit in Fortaleza, Brazil, Mr. LaRouche said that this is the beginning of a world system; but it's not the final form. There has to be now a discovery process undertaken by peoples of the world to uncover and come to a point of discovery of what the human species ought to be. And I think is really the point that is missing from 99% of the discussion that goes on; most especially in the trans-Atlantic. But even – and I would put this out as a question – how self-conscious of a discussion is this in other parts of the world as well? And I think it's important, because Mr. LaRouche's emphatic point this morning was that the entire system has to be scrapped; we are at the point of blow-out. Any moves that are taken to try to save it are complete foolishness; because anything you try to save in the system is about to become completely worthless.

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

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

I think if we go back and look back to the United States and to our tradition, we see this expressed most recently – aside from the leadership taken by Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche in the recent decades – we see this expressed by the leadership of Krafft Ehrlicke and his role in establishing and fighting for the United States space program. Krafft Ehrlicke was completely committed to the idea, and it was a discovery in his own mind, that for human beings there are no limits to growth. There's no such thing as a fixed set of resources, for exactly the reason I cited, of man's

potential to always discover a higher principle. Krafft Ehricke fought for the idea that man must always progress; and therefore, man cannot be limited merely to the Earth. Man cannot be a species of a single globe. We have to move out into conquering space; becoming a species which is exerting power in an over the Solar System. Reorganizing, shaping, perfecting other planets in the Solar System, beginning with the Moon. Just to put it forward, that's the only legitimate basis for an economic system, is to organize the social activity of man to effect and promote that kind of activity; and to protect and promote that kind of capability which exists in potential in each and every human being. I think that we in the United States especially, have a responsibility to wake up, and to have a renaissance in the United States. Where we once again demand our space program, and demand that it represent the kind of principle expressed by Krafft Ehricke; and expressed by Mr. LaRouche's insights into the science of economics.

CHRISTIE: Just to follow up on that, I think that is probably also the place where geopolitics is – it's the symbol of the absolute end of geopolitics. And Mr. LaRouche has been discussing the idea of moving beyond nation-states. That doesn't mean a homogenized global McDonald's or something like that kind of approach to economy. What it means is, you're still going to

celebrate the cultural differences, you're going to still celebrate the fact that people have histories and shared languages and so on and so forth; but you're going to see that the core of what it is to be human. We're all human; there's only one species. And that's no better expressed than in space exploration.

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

So, all the Americans who are depressed about this crazy election process, should just flush it down the toilet where it

belongs; because it has no real bearing on what is actually occurring internationally. It is being defined by this new concept of thinking beyond nation-states; or at least beyond the manipulation that can occur under geopolitics where these nations are beginning to collaborate. That's the point of space exploration; that's also the point of Mr. LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative, which he raised today in discussions. This present war drive, which is why the British are trying to tear down this emerging New Paradigm, really began with the Bush crowd sabotaging the Strategic Defense Initiative of Mr. LaRouche. Had that gone through, we wouldn't be on the edge of thermonuclear warfare; we would have already begun that collaboration back then. So now is really our last opportunity to take up that initiative; but we've got to bring this New Paradigm into the United States.

STEINBERG: I was at an event in Washington when Prime Minister Modi was here, and one of the speakers was a former Indian ambassador to the United States. I thought he made some very important and pretty frank points. He said, first of all, the most important thing that came out of the meeting, other than the speech that Prime Minister Modi gave before the joint session of Congress, was the nuclear deal. The fact that Westinghouse had been contracted to build six nuclear power plants in India. So, he's viewing what remains of the actual technology base of the United States; of course, it's now a company that's working

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

On the question that Megan raised; Jason, you may want to say something about this. There was a very high-level dialogue that was going on 300 years ago between Western and Chinese scholars on this question of the nature of man. Leibniz was engaged in a tremendous exchange with China, via some of the Jesuit missionaries who were there in China for a period of more than 100 years. So, this common concept of the nature of man is

not something that is alien to leading thinkers in Asia; and I think what China and even Russia are doing now, is really reflective of at least an intuitive, if not completely self-conscious idea of this unique character of human beings as the only creative species.

ROSS: Xi Jinping – I forget the occasion of his making his speech – but in some recent remarks that he made, he had traced through the history of mankind. He was detailing all the big discoveries that made modern humanity possible; but he went all the way back. Fire, metallurgy; he talked about in the past 200 years, the incredible revolutions of steam power, of chemistry, electricity. So, there's definitely a recognition that something very special happened in a scientific way coming out of Europe from the period of the Renaissance; that's undeniable. The aspect of it that was universal, you bring up the work that Leibniz was doing about 300 years ago to try to maintain and have a dialogue with China; to have an opportunity for European science to make inroads into China, to uplift people's living standard there and to find more collaborators to work on things with. And also at the same time, his view that Chinese natural philosophy, or natural theology, or an outlook on the world and on social relations, that there was a potential for the rest of the world to learn a great deal about that from China. His view

was that if one were to ignore Christianity, which he saw as given as a revealed religion based on – in other words, it wasn't a discovery that anybody could have made. It occurred through a personality who was in the Western world. That leaving that aside, China was superior in its moral and cultural outlook.

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

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

OGDEN: Yeah, as Stephen Cohen said, Russia knows how to do

counter-terrorism; we don't know how to do it very well.

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

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

STEINBERG: The other thing that sort of begs that same question is, is it that we're not good at it? Or really on the other side? I think you've got to look at the case of this shooter down in Orlando – Omar Mateen; and consider the fact that he was employed for 7-8 years by a British company called G4S, which is the third-largest private corporation in the world,

behind Walmart and some Asian supermarket chain. It's a mercenary company; it's a "private security company". They're involved in mercenary activities all over the world. They were in Iraq as part of the so-called "contractors" involved in the occupation. In Israel, they man the checkpoints; they provide the technology. They are the security for the illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank. Here in the United States, they have the contracts to provide the security for 90% of the nuclear power plants in the U.S.. They're a major contractor for the Department of Homeland Security. And they had this ticking time bomb on the payroll; even when he was under investigation by the FBI for a period of a year, his job was never in jeopardy. You almost get the sense that these British companies maintain a small army of people who are severely mentally disturbed; who can be triggered at any time that there's a necessity for a pretext.

Remember that in January of 2001, Mr. LaRouche gave testimony in opposition to John Ashcroft's confirmation as Attorney General; because he said the character of the Bush administration was that they would look to create a Reichstag Fire incident to go for dictatorship. That was seven months before the 9/11 attacks that that warning was issued; and it was absolutely prescient. So, I think what Dr. Lin said in her article, that the U.S. and the British – although she focussed on the United States – have used these jihadists as tools in a policy of regime change that has destabilized the Middle East and a lot of other parts of the world. We are part of this jihadist structure; the British – pivotally so through things like

Al-Yamamah – but for the last 15 years with the Bush administration and now Obama, we've been part of that same equation. So, this is something that we've got to face the cold hard truth of if we're ever going to deal with this problem.

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

STEINBERG: And who did Obama meet with today?

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

means that the logistical support network that was in place before 9/11, which enabled the 9/11 attackers to do what they did, was not dismantled. And for all we know, is very well still in place; and a lot of the connections. The Sarasota aspect of the cover-up by the FBI of the 80,000 pages, this speaks to the fact that this attack happened in Orlando. Then, there's the entire southern California aspect, which was documented in the investigations that went into putting together the 28 pages. I know you've said a lot about this already, Jeff, but all of these points have to continually be touched upon.

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

discussed at the opening of the show – the question of vote on the Brexit on the 23rd, which is already having huge implications. Obviously, we don't know all the details, but it's highly likely that this assassination of the British Member of Parliament was related to this. You have the Brexit vote, you have the financial collapse; now admitted that they're going back to the crazy mortgage fraud that had threatened to bring down the system in 2007-2008. You have the German bonds trading at negative interest rates; Japan's central bank putting out negative interest rates. You just have all of this coming together. The war games and the desperation by the British. And what Mr. LaRouche said is that we have a situation that is unpredictable. And I think what that means for all of us and our fellow Americans, is to say that this really is open for what we decide to do.

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

this
moment of the {punctum saliens}; that this is the time to
exert
leadership.

OGDEN: I think that's a very well-stated point to
close our
show on. Again, the {punctum saliens} – the pregnant moment;
the moment of decision. As Jeff mentioned, by the time we
meet
here next week, the Brexit vote will have occurred; a lot is
changing very rapidly. We have a lot to watch from that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

YouTube channel, please subscribe to our YouTube channels to
be

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