

Tiden er inde til at sætte hårdt ind for at lukke Obamas krig ned.

LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 8. juli 2016

Lyndon LaRouche (lydklip): »Vil Obama bombe verden, eller vil Obama opgive? Eller vil han gøre noget andet, midt imellem? Pointen er, når man ser på kendsgerningerne, på de samme personer, så ville jeg sige, at spørgsmålet her er: Luk det her ned! Luk denne krig ned! Luk krigen, og alt, hvad den repræsenterer, ned, nu! Vi har denne ting fra Storbritannien, vi har andre ting i Europa, og ting i andre dele af verden. Jeg tror, at tiden er kommet til at sætte hårdt ind, og effektivt, for at lukke denne krig ned! Luk denne form for krigsførelse, luk det ned!

Hvilket betyder, at vi må skabe et økonomisk system, der vil bidrage til befolkningens behov, både i USA og andetsteds. Spørgsmålet er derfor ikke krig; spørgsmålet er: Er befolkningen i USA parate til at samle sig og genoverveje deres skæbne? Er de villige til at skabe et system, hvor mennesker skaber rigdom, og sørge for, at dette bliver svaret, alternativet til det, der f.eks. finder sted i USA – alle de mennesker, der er ved at uddø eller lider, osv., som de gør nu?

Derfor, vil vi finde alternativet til denne og lignende former for nonsens? Det er spørgsmålet. Jeg mener, at vi virkelig må være meget hårde med dette og få en virkelig solid fremgangsmåde og sige, at, nu gør vi det her for at redde civilisationen, på basis af, hvad Manhattan (projektet) kan tilbyde.

Vi har USA. USA kan vendes omkring, noget langsomt nu, men vi har evnen til at vende tingene rundt, med vores teknologi, der også er i en forfærdelig forfatning. Men vi har nok til at stille uret tilbage, til at gøre en ende på denne evindelige frygt og ondskab. Vi må forsvare USA, dvs. befolkningen i USA, ved at genoprette den form for system i USA, som behøves omgående, for folk i hele USA, og vi må tilskynde andre nationer til at acceptere det samme valg. Jeg mener, det kan gøres.«

WE MUST REALIZE WHAT IS TRUE AND THEN ACT ON THAT BASIS

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, July 8, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's July 8th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast with larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio today by Megan Beets, from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and I'm joined via video by two members of our Policy Committee, Diane Sare, from the New York City Manhattan Project; and Kesha Rogers, from Houston, TX.

We're going to begin our webcast tonight with a very hard-hitting and important clip from a discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche yesterday. This is an audio recording of some remarks that Mr. LaRouche had, and I think this is going to inform the discussion that we'll be having here tonight.

LYNDON LAROUCHE (audio clip): Is Obama going to bomb the world, or is Obama going to give up? Or is going to do something else, in the middle? The point is, I would say that the issue here, when you look at the facts, the same people, the question

would be: shut this thing down! Shut this war down! Shut down the war and what it represents, now! You've got the thing from Britain, you've got things in Europe otherwise, you've got the things in other parts of the world. I think the time has come to {push hard}, and effectively, to shut this war down! Shut this kind of warfare, shut it down!

Which means there's an obligation to create an economic system which will contribute to the needs of the population, both in the United States and elsewhere. Therefore the question is not war; the question is: Are the people of the United States prepared to reassemble themselves, and reconsider their destiny? Are they willing to create a system of creation of wealth by people, and have that thing become the answer, the alternative, to what's happening, for instance, in the United States—all the people who are dying out or suffering, and so forth, as now?

Therefore, are we going to find the alternative to that kind of nonsense, and similar kinds of nonsense? That's the question. I think we've really got to go hard on this thing, and get a real solid approach to say we are now going to do the thing to save civilization, on the basis of what Manhattan has to offer.

We've got the United States. The United States can be turned around, somewhat slowly now, but we've got the ability to turn, with our technology, which is also in terrible shape. But we've

got enough to {turn the clock around}, to end this perpetual fear and evil. We've got to defend the United States, in the sense of the people of the United States, by restoring the kind of system, {in the United States}, which is needed for the people {immediately} throughout the United States, and to encourage other nations to accept the same option. {I think it can be done}.

OGDEN: Wonderful! Thank you very much for playing that clip. We also have a few other very significant things that happened this week. Obviously, Mr. LaRouche just responded, in the remarks that you heard, to the developments that are occurring in Britain. There's a rejection of the entire status quo, which can be seen very clearly from the Brexit, and then the {unpredictable} fallout that's happening around that. But also you have the release of the Chilcot Inquiry Report, which really just confirms that [former British Prime Minister] Tony Blair is, in fact, a war criminal, and everybody else who went to war in Iraq based on false premises, deserves to be prosecuted along those lines.

Elsewhere in that discussion, Mr. LaRouche laid out a very clear continuity of the process, beginning with the Al-Yamamah deal, the decision by [Saudi] Prince Bandar and [then British Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher and George Bush, Sr., at that time, to initiate this irregular warfare operation. In that case, it was against Russia, proceeding through to the September 11th

attacks, the cover-up of those attacks, (which is what the 28 pages is concerning), and then the entire process of "regime-change warfare" that was premised on that lie: Tony Blair's Iraq War operation; Obama's overthrow of the government of Libya; and then the attempted overthrow of the government in Syria. That is the next phase in that process. The Bush/Cheney phase, the Tony Blair phase, the Obama phase; and now you have the escalation to the point of the danger of World War III – the doubling down by Obama this week on his aggressive warfare operation against Russia, in terms of the build-up of the NATO troop presence in Europe, and also the confrontations in the South China Sea, which risk the outbreak of World War III in that region of the world as well.

There was another very significant event that occurred in Washington, DC this week. Very unique, in the "belly of the beast," which was sponsored by a Chinese organization, the Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies and the National Institute of the South China Sea Studies. It also included very significant, prominent participation, by Bill Jones, the Washington Bureau Chief for {Executive Intelligence Review}, who was on the speaking panel. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute, was also present, and made a very crucial intervention.

We would also like to play a very short video clip from that event, to give you a little bit more of a sense of the context for our upcoming discussion.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE (video clip): My name is Helga

Zepp-LaRouche. I'm the President of the Schiller Institute. I have two questions. One I would like to ask [U.S. Naval Academy]

Professor [Brian] Mulvaney. The United States itself has recognized the historical rights of China in the past. For example, there's several State Department memorandums, from 1943

and 1944, which clearly say that the United States and the Philippines have no claims to the islands, and, basically, that

they were China's historical territory – a position that was then reversed at the [1951] San Francisco Peace Conference. But

that is clearly the source of all this trouble. Why is the United

States not recognizing the historical rights of China? That's my first question.

My second question is more general. There are many military experts internationally who are warning that the situation today

is more dangerous than during the height of the Cold War.

Furthermore, we are about to experience another financial crash

worse than 2008. I think the terrorist activities, especially of

the last two weeks, in Bangladesh, Turkey, Indonesia, European countries, clearly shows terrorism is out of control. Actually with the Brexit, the European Union is in a process of disintegration, very rapidly.

My question is: Can mankind not rise to a higher level of

cooperation and go for a new paradigm, where geopolitics is overcome, and replaced by the common aims of mankind? The world

is in dire need for the United States and China to work

together,
because I think without the two countries joining hands, the world is in trouble. So, the question is: Can the world move to a new paradigm of peaceful cooperation for the future tasks of all humanity?

PROF. BRIAN MULVANEY: I totally disagree. I don't think we are anywhere near large-scale conflict. This is not the Cold War. This is not the Cuban Missile Crisis. China and the United States are not about to go to war. At the absolute very worst, there may be some sort of crisis that erupts, and it's contained, in the South China Sea. It will be small, if at all. I think it will be completely, it is completely, avoidable, and I personally believe it will be avoided, and that, hopefully, cooler heads will prevail. So, I disagree with the premise of the fact that this is a more dangerous time than we've seen in a long time.

As far as humanity goes, I am hopeful. Hopefully, Truth, Liberty, and Democracy can brave throughout the world, and everyone can come together in great harmony. Unfortunately, the history of mankind doesn't seem to bear that out, but we do keep getting better, and, probably not in my lifetime, but perhaps down the road.

BILL JONES: When they talk about the "rule of law," you have to ask, "Whose law, and who sets it?" The United States sends the thing, as President Obama said it, with regard to the

TPP [Trans-Pacific Partnership Treaty], "We've got to make the rules!" But the world is much different now. There are many different countries. Other countries also have a say in making the rules. As long as, I think, the idea is, what is for the good

of the people, this is what should determine the rule of law. I

think China is completely consistent with that in their attitude, if they reject this arbitration.

Let me also say something on that. It's very important that

these dialogues occur, because it's the only way that each side

can really understand what the other is talking about. It doesn't

necessarily change people, but over the long term, I think it has

a positive effect. Here in the United States, the mainstream, I

would agree; that is, I would consider it somewhat "hard line."

The mainstream is influenced by the mass-media, by the press. You

read the {New York Times}. Look, I read the {New York Times} every day. I have not yet found, over the last ten years, an article in the {New York Times} which was positive towards China.

[laughter] Of course, almost every day, there are articles on China. [Responding to the audience laughter] I read it pretty closely. I don't think I have missed any article.

So, that a lot of what goes on between the discussion of

experts, is not effective, because of what I said, that the media

really distorts China's actual view. But, I'll also say, in the

United States, there has generally, throughout the years, been

positive attitudes towards China, among the general population.

The United States was not a colonial power. We had the Philippines, and Franklin Roosevelt gave them their independence.

We were an anti-colonial power. This is why we were, over 200 years, very good friends with China. And it's only recently, I would say in the post-Cold War period in particular, where the United States remained the major military power; that a new attitude was adopted, away from Franklin Roosevelt's Dialogue of

Nations, which he tried to create in the last days of his life and didn't quite succeed because he died so early; and that it had become more and more like what I call a British Imperial attitude: we are the Lords of the Seas, and therefore we control

it, because we've got the guns and the boats and everything else.

That has affected I would say the "think-tank class," or the "intellectual class," [which] is permeated with this; whereas the

general population is not. So, I think what has to be done is there has to be more of this "meeting of dialogues," not at an experts' level so much, but at the people-to-people level, so that people here in the U.S. who are reading the {New York Times}

can go to China and say, "Boy, the {New York Times} really has a wrong foot, entirely! They don't get it!" And they would see it.

I think also what China's doing with the Belt and Road, if it were done here, if we would agree, if they would build high-speed

rail here, people would have a different attitude toward China.

OGDEN: I think that provides a very good foundation for a productive discussion. The very first point that Mr. LaRouche made in the beginning was, "Are the citizens of the United States willing to re-assess themselves, re-assemble themselves, and re-consider their destiny? Are we going to allow this war to happen, or are we going to shut it down? Are we going to save civilization?" I think that's the question on the table.

DIANE SARE: Well, he did put a particular – as we heard – very strong emphasis on Manhattan; and I think there are a number of aspects to that. One, perhaps the biggest, is the question of Alexander Hamilton. And I was just reflecting as we heard these comments from these people, this character from the US Naval War College, who was somewhat hostile in the way he pounced on Mrs. LaRouche's question; and then you hear his view of mankind. It indicates a lack of ability to think of the future or to be creative, because if you think about Einstein or you think about Kepler, or you think about Hamilton, for example. What does Hamilton come from? He was on a British-colonized, Dutch-colonized plantation place in the Caribbean, where he saw the real evils of slavery and usury firsthand. He comes to the United States, which is a colony of the British Empire, and nonetheless, has a very clear vision of how mankind {should} live without ever having actually experienced it himself. And that

is
really unique.

And if we think about Einstein and the question of gravitational waves, similarly he was able to think through, without the measuring instruments that we've had only recently, but in his mind he said, no, this must be the principle of ordering of the universe; and similarly Kepler's thinking. And it's not different from the question of human economics and the development of mankind as a species that it is the natural state that we become better, more intelligent, live longer, healthier, and you have more of us with a higher standard of living; that is actually the natural state of human affairs. Many people today have trouble thinking of this because the entire system has been geared against creativity, and has been set up to crush the ability to actually think of unthought-of thoughts; to think of something new. Instead, people go with a Bertrand Russell algebraic approach that everything has to follow in a sequence of what it's been doing. And I would say it's that outlook that has led us to have a record number of suicides, a record number of heroin overdoses, and a collapse; and people seemingly lacking the vision to actually solve it. And I think it's just so crucial that people take note of what just occurred at this conference organized by Mrs. LaRouche, that she and her husband were at in Berlin. They actually don't operate in the way that

you may have been thinking that they do for most of your life.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I had a similar thought, Diane, listening to the counterpoint between Helga's question and the answer by the gentleman on the podium there. The question raised – maybe not in these words – but the question before us all now is, is mankind capable of rising to the level of reason? Is society capable of assuming a state of existence as we're seeing and calling for in this New Paradigm which has never happened before.

If you look back in history, people like Friedrich Schiller was

facing the same question with the failure of the potential and the opportunity of the French Revolution which failed. And he's

looking at the question of can mankind actually educate itself to

be rid of the characteristic of barbarism within society for good. Can there actually be a perpetual renaissance? And two other people who obviously contemplated this and had a certain optimistic vision of this, are Helga Zepp-LaRouche herself, and

also Krafft Ehrlicke, who had a completely optimistic view of the

future of mankind in space; and knew that it would only come about through an aesthetical education of society. I think it is

a very challenging view for people today to contemplate the notion that it is possible to move beyond this childishness of mankind into a state where warfare and geopolitics are things of

the past, and are no longer part of human society. I think that

does require exactly what you said: the tapping into the

creativity of the population, as Hamilton recognized was the basis of economics, and what LaRouche has based his economic discoveries on – the human mind's ability to create that which never existed before.

KESHA ROGERS: I think it's important to look at what Mr.

LaRouche laid out a few years ago in June of 2014, as the alternative and the only option for saving the United States and

the survival of mankind. Which now really has to be looked at in

an even greater context in terms of the role of the United States

in cooperation with nations such as Russia and China, around meeting the common aims of mankind as Mrs. LaRouche indicated.

Mr. LaRouche has laid out four fundamental principles – really scientific principles and Constitutional principles as he named

them – which are governed by our US Constitution and were reflected in the policies of people such as President Franklin Roosevelt, John F Kennedy, and President Lincoln before; and really were centered around the foundation of our Constitution as

Diane said, with the Hamiltonian conception of a credit system.

More importantly, it gets to the question of what is your

conception of the nature of human beings. Do you think that human beings are just animals or beasts; or do you see human beings as superior and having mental capacity over lower forms of

life? When he put these four laws out, which state – I'll just

go through them; and I think we should have a further discussion

about it. The first law was that we must re-enact Glass

Steagall

in the precise form that Franklin Roosevelt put into effect.
2.

Return to a system of national banking, as Alexander Hamilton had intended, and was described under Abraham Lincoln's greenback system. 3. Institute a Federal credit system to generate high-productivity improvements in employment. 4. Adopt a fusion driver crash program.

Now, on this fourth point, it was encompassing of the entire program that Mr. LaRouche put forward; because it wasn't just about nuclear power or building nuclear power plants and so forth. It really got to this conception of what is our human destiny; how do we view the nature of mankind as acting to remove any limitations that are put on human progress? It reminded me that these four laws were very in tune to the laws of Krafft Ehrlicke in his three laws of astronautics, that he put out in 1957; because when you think about this, the fourth law of Mr. LaRouche's fusion crash driver program was very much in line with what Kennedy had intended when he made his address on May 25, 1961, calling for landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth. This program was actually exemplified by this very question of what is mankind's mission in participating in the creative process.

What Krafft Ehrlicke brings up is just that; it is the question of the moral law of human beings that they are actually doing away with this conception that mankind is nothing more than beasts. It was interesting listening to this comment – as Diane

said it was pretty hostile. It was hostile because this gentleman has a very low conception of what the nature is of human beings. He has already made the determination that you can only allow something to happen that has already been determined and decided for you. As he was making the point, "Well, I would like to have a nation where we live in peace and harmony; but unfortunately that's not the world we live in." Well, the question is, how are we going to make the determination that we must create that world and bring that world about. That was the basis, and continues to be the basis of Mr. LaRouche's economics and what he means by the conception of these four laws. And what was defined also by Krafft Ehrlicke's laws of astronautics; that are not just the basis of how you go about into space travel, but more so the principle of what mankind must overcome to be able to create these breakthroughs which are necessary to define a future progress and a future human destiny. The idea, as we've stated on many occasions, that nobody and nothing under the natural laws of the Universe impose any limitations on man except man himself; that's something that really had to be defined in this discussion that was had at the Chinese press conference there.

But the key thing right now, as Mr. LaRouche said, is are

people going to prepare themselves to reconsider their destiny?

And reconsidering their destiny means we have to get rid of these

limitations; we have to now move immediately to shut down this war drive of Obama, and everything that he represents in terms of

this culture of death. Right now, we are seeing the escalation

towards all-out war, and we'll speak more on this in just a few

moments. But the fact that, as we speak right now, the NATO summit in Warsaw, Poland is happening; Obama is there, pushing more provocations against Russia. It is very clear that Americans do have to make the decision that we want to collaborate as human beings with other nations for the betterment

of mankind. We have to stop this killing and this war threat and

actually move toward a new conception of human nature.

So, I wanted to start with that, and then I'll come back

with more.

OGDEN: I think that is very significant, because the whole threat that Obama is making – and this is what Mr. LaRouche said

last week – this is a very empty threat. This entire system which Obama represents is completely bankrupt. Look at what's happening in Europe; the entire European system is splintering apart. Nobody has any idea how the consequences of the Brexit vote are going to pan out; the leadership of all the parties is

collapsing, it's crumbling, it's imploding. Then you have Obama

making these boastful threats.

The point is, Europe is bankrupt; you have an emerging

New

Paradigm; you have China and Russia; the Eurasian system could encompass all of Europe. You could have, finally, an integration

of this entire continent around a New Paradigm; a new system of

relations among nations, as Helga said at her intervention at that event in DC. This is a completely new concept of the relationship between nations. And yes, people within the think

tank class – as I think Bill Jones rightly called it, the pundit

class – are extremely pessimistic people; they don't have vision, they don't have imagination. That's why you have leadership like Helga at that event. Then, what happened?

You

had this Berlin conference which was incredibly good timing; two

days after the Brexit vote. So, one thing on that subject, because I think it ties together the question of the bankruptcy

of this trans-Atlantic system. What both Diane and you, Kesha,

brought up about what's the new system? This is Hamilton; Hamilton is back. We have the solution; the Four Laws are self-explanatory, they're on the table. They could be enacted overnight; and this really is, in effect, the United States joining the New Paradigm. So, this is I think an important comment by Mr. LaRouche; it came out of a discussion he had with

Jeffrey Steinberg earlier today. Jeff presented him with the institutional question that we got this week from contacts within

DC. The question was: "In your view, Mr. LaRouche, can the European member countries post-Brexit chart a constructive and viable economic course? And how can they reverse their economic

decline?" And I think Mr. LaRouche's remarks are very apropos.

He said, "The European Union must consent to end the system of trash nations." And by trash nations, he said [he meant] "nations in the EU like Italy, that are treated like trash. Other nations – Greece; that's obviously treated like trash. This is resulting in the destruction of the nations of Europe."

Mr. LaRouche said, "You are going to have to depend on cooperation between Putin and the right people in Germany; who are in a minority, but are tied to the real, productive economy.

You're going to have to rely on that cooperation between Russia

and Germany to make the needed shift. You have to return to principles of physical economy, or all of Europe will collapse very soon. The anchor is the Russia-Germany collaboration."

So, in reality, this is the path forward. And for all of

Obama's threats in Warsaw, and all of the bluster from NATO; yes,

this is a very dangerous situation. As Helga said, it is far more dangerous than at any moment during the Cold War. But, this

is the face of a collapsing system; and the only solution here is

the return to Hamilton. And I think the leverage is very clear,

Diane; we've got the leverage to do this in Manhattan, in New York City. With the necessary escalation that could be enacted

now, we have the leverage to lead the United States from our center in Manhattan, around the principles of Hamilton. And I think the other thing that we're going to get into, is in the months leading up the 15th anniversary of the attack on September

11th; we're going to get to the truth of who lied, who was

behind

these attacks, and who is covering up the truth about these attacks and for what reason.

ROGERS: When you brought up this question of the principles of physical economy, I think it's very important that we understand that this is the principle of the human mind. Mr. LaRouche's {Science of Physical Economy} gets at this question of how do you actually more creative and productive citizens in your society. When you think about these Four Laws, this is what we have to actually bring about; the adoption of these Four Laws is going to be done under the context that you are moving the population toward building a more productive society that's going to be able to create something better for their future and for the future of those not yet born. I think that we've lost sight of that in our society. Most people right now are – it's a dying culture, a dying – as you said, Matt – financial system that people are trying to hang onto. We cannot do that; we have to have a total reversal of the direction that this nation has been going in. And that reversal is really being led by China and Russia taking up this principle of what the embodiment of Hamilton represents; or the embodiment of what our American System has truly represented. I know Diane will say more on how the mission of the United States is going to come from – as we've stated – Manhattan to carry out that mission here in the United States.

SARE: Well, I'll just say that when Mrs. LaRouche spoke at

the

conference in Berlin, she made this point of the question of justice. That when Tony Blair launched his fake campaign about

the alleged weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and he launched

what has now been admitted to have been a war of aggression – which is a crime under the Nuremburg Statutes. She said that justice will be done in this case; sometimes it's not immediate.

The Universe will ensure justice is done; however it is better if

mankind can act on behalf of justice. Because if we let things

go too far, justice of the Universe may end up being the annihilation of ourselves. If we don't stop thermonuclear war,

if we don't stop our society from going down that path.

Similarly what we've had in the United States in the wake of these attacks on September 11th, is we've had two murderous regimes. We've had the Bush/Cheney administration, who were fully happy to collaborate with Tony Blair and his lies to enter

the war with Iraq. We've had Obama, who has been probably the most murderous President we've ever had in history. And I think

it's important to say this here, because I know many people are

very upset about the recent killings in Minnesota, New Orleans,

and then Dallas. I find it tragic. We've heard of lone assassins before from Dallas. We've also heard of what happened

in Orlando by supposedly one person. I think Americans are growing increasingly skeptical of these stories. What we see in

the case of 9/11, which I think gives us the ability to break

the whole thing open and end this train of abuses, is, for example, the role of the FBI in covering up and hiding evidence; the role of the Bush and Obama administrations in refusing to release the 28 pages. I haven't read them, of course, but from what I understand, they deal with how the hijackers were supported when they came into the United States. Obama said he would do various things, and did not; and there has now recently been an escalation coming from the US Congress. We have a clip which people should watch of a press conference given this week by Congressman Walter Jones, Stephen Lynch, and Massey, who are the co-sponsors of a new bill on the 28 pages; which addresses the fact that these 28 pages are actually the property of the Congress. I won't say more, I'll let them speak for this; but this is a very important flank. It's very important in Manhattan in particular, because thousands, millions of people in this area were very directly impacted by this; and they're not in a mood on the 15th anniversary of this to just let it go another year without the truth coming out. People had a very feisty response when the Saudis were threatening financial warfare in response to any legislation in the Congress against Saudi Arabia. I think this is something which could break this open and fundamentally change the United States, and emphatically destroy Obama's ability to wage the kind of war and destruction that he wants to

now. So, if you have that there, I think it would be useful to show that clip of this press conference.

CONG. LYNCH: There is precedent; and the thing is, that if the President – and I hope he will keep his word to the people. But if not, we wanted this. And that's the reason we introduced this, so it would go to the Intel Committee; because again, Kevin Nunez says yes, he thinks it ought to be declassified, and so did Adam Schiff, the ranking member. So we want to give them an opportunity, if the President does not keep his word. And I hope that Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Trump, when they make their acceptance speech, that they will call on the President to keep his word. But if not, then we're going to be pushing this when we come back in September; and hopefully get a hearing and get the families back down here to listen to the justification for declassifying this information. There is precedent.

And on a finer point, if you look back during the Pentagon Papers, the Church Commission generated a report. While the White House refused to allow that report to be publicized, Congressman Gravel went to the well of the House and read the Pentagon Papers; and was protected – the Supreme Court ruled – was protected by the Speech and Debate Clause of the United States Constitution. So, even though they tried to prosecute him for reading that, the Supreme Court said that the Separation of

Powers gives Congress the right to speak and debate on issues that affect the American people. That Separation of Powers and the Speech and Debate Clause protected that member of Congress, who went to the Floor and actually read those papers. So, we believe we're protected. It may come to that; it may come to a point that myself and Walter and Mr. Massey go to the well of the House and read the text of the 28 pages, if we can get it released to us. That's the key; because when we go down to the Intel Committee room and read the 28 pages, they have people sit there in front of you. They take your phone away; no electronics; you're not allowed to take notes. You're allowed to read it and read it under the observation of either Intel Committee staff or other folks that are there for security purposes. So, we don't have the 28 pages. We can sit there as long as we want and try to memorize it and read it, and go over and over it. We have done that, each of us; but in order to release it, you have to have custody of it.

OGDEN: This is available on the LaRouche PAC website. It's very significant to watch that press conference in full. There were remarks from both Congressmen Walter Jones and Walter Massey in addition to what Congressman Lynch said. Also, Terry Strada and her daughter, Kaitlyn Strada, had extremely powerful statements making the point that the White House had promised

to
get back to them with the declassification review on June
17th;
and that date has come and gone, and they have still to hear
one
peep out of the White House. They are not returning the calls
of
the 9/11 families, they are not returning the calls of the
members of Congress. They are not returning the calls of
Senator
Bob Graham; who is the one who wrote, or who oversaw the
writing,
of the 28 pages. So, there is a stonewalling by the White
House.
The press corps should be asking these questions during the
press
briefings. Terry Strada said you've got Josh Earnest and Jim
Clapper basically reading right out of the Saudi Arabian
talking
points; the talking points of the government of Saudi Arabia.
Whereas, the people who wrote the 28 pages are contradicting
every single thing that the Administration says. So, it's
hugely
significant that House Resolution 779 has been introduced;
because it says, we are bypassing President Obama. We are
going
to go right to the floor; this is the property of the United
States Congress. And it's doubly significant what you just
heard
from Congressman Stephen Lynch. He said, it may well come to
the
three of us going to the floor of the House and having a
Senator
Gravel moment. We may very well read these papers into the
public record; which would be absolutely historic and
groundbreaking. So, I really encourage everybody to watch the
press conference in full. There's been some coverage, but not

enough. And to circulate this very widely.

Obviously, this is also feeding into some of the work that we're going to be doing in Manhattan in the coming months; especially around the commemoration of the 15th anniversary of these attacks. So Diane, maybe you want to say more about that.

SARE: Well, I can say on that point, because it gets at what I

was thinking about, which is LaRouche's question of whether Americans will re-assemble themselves. I think the most important thing for Americans right now, is to not allow ourselves to be divided; which is clearly the intent of these operations and the news media coverage of them in such a way over

these last days, and the intent of our President, who perhaps wants us all to start shooting each other while he launches a nuclear war against Russia and we don't notice. What is planned

around New York City is a series of performances of the Mozart {Requiem}; and we have a number of choruses of the Schiller Institute in now Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, and New Jersey. We'll be doing a series of performances of the Mozart {Requiem}

on and around September 11th. The response to this is very deep;

people – as I said earlier – were profoundly affected. And what people in New York want is not revenge; people don't want to

go blow up some country like Saudi Arabia. What people want is

justice; and they should be able to rest assured that such crimes

will never be allowed to occur again. That, in turn, would give

profound meaning and immortality to the lives of all of those

people who have died in 9/11 and in the wake of 9/11.

So, I think this question before us about whether the American will re-assemble ourselves and reconsider our destiny is the pressing question of the moment. Not simply from the standpoint of abolishing evil; but from the standpoint of actually creating the good.

ROGERS: That brings to mind the very question and the important point that was made by President Franklin Roosevelt, because I think to accomplish this destiny, the question is also whether or not people will allow themselves, or continue to allow themselves to live in fear. When Franklin Roosevelt made his first inaugural address, and people recite these famous words all the time, of his call that "We have nothing to fear but fear itself. Nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to turn retreat into advance." The problem right now is that we have a culture that has numbed people to the point where the advance which is necessary, and the fear which must be overcome to actually demand justice now, is very dominant. And I think this what we have to overcome. The destiny that we have to create for ourselves requires that we're not just talking about implementing the 28 pages; but we're talking about doing away with this evil which creates this type of fear and this type of injustice that actually paralyzes people. To actually do away with that fear, and to be able to bring that destiny about. So, when you're thinking about – Diane, you had your discussion yesterday – you have to deal with this a lot, just in terms of the fear that people were

expressing. And I think that right now, we've been given a very unique and important opportunity that we don't have to live in fear. That – as was already stated – this Empire, their stooge Obama, this whole financial system has no power; it's disintegrating, it's collapsing right before their ugly faces. So now we have the power to finish that off and create something better for mankind.

OGDEN: I think one of the sources of the fear is that our fellow citizens are victim of a concerted propaganda war. The number of lies that Americans are told on a daily basis, the continuing lie of what was actually the truth of who financed and organized 9/11, which has been the overshadowing lie for the last 15 years. Then the lies in succession: Tony Blair's lies; George Bush's lies. The lies justifying these so-called regime-change wars, these regime-change operations. And now the lies that are being told to people about Russia, about China. Look at what China is doing: uplifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty; developing technologies that have not been developed before; bringing access to the modern world to the entire interior of the continent of Eurasia; exploring the dark side of the Moon. Is this what you're told about in the pages of the {New York Times}? No! People are victims of a propaganda war. One other item we've provided for our viewers this week on the LaRouche PAC website, is an extraordinary interview with a

state senator from Virginia, Richard Black, and another citizen of the US, who travelled to Syria and actually saw what the situation was on the ground in Syria. Met with President Assad, incredibly. The title of the video, I think is apropos – it's called "Breaking the Propaganda War Vis-À-vis Syria". This is a huge responsibility. People have to realize they have a responsibility to figure out what is true; and to then act on that basis.

And I think the re-assembling of American citizens, as Mr. LaRouche said, and the decision that we are going to change our destiny; and we are not going to allow Obama to carry us, in our name, into a Third World War, is a decision that has to be made by the American people. Again, the leverage to lead the rest of the nation comes from what is happening in Manhattan.

OK; well, I might give myself the final word. On that note, we've referenced and shown you little bits and pieces of several items that you can now immediately go and watch on the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel. You will subscribe to the YouTube channel and receive notifications every time we post a new item, such as that. So, I would ask you to subscribe to the YouTube channel and to circulate all of that material as widely as you can. If you haven't yet, please subscribe to the LaRouche PAC daily email

update; you will get the news as it really is happening, to
your
inbox every single day.

Thank you for tuning in, and please stay tuned to
larouchepac.com. Good night.