

Vi nærmer os opgørets time

21. juni 2016 (Leder) – En intens række af diplomatiske engagementer er planlagt for de næste to uger, som kunne være bestemmende for, om verden tager en tryk kurs hen imod et Nyt Paradigme for udvikling – som det klarest er blevet fremlagt i præsident Vladimir Putins forslag til »en plan for Stor-Eurasien« på Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum den 16.-18. juni, og ligeledes i den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings program for 'Ét bælte, én vej' – eller, om verden går i krig, med udslettelse til følge, sådan, som det promoveres af London og dets skakbrik Obama.

På torsdag afholder Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO) sit årlige topmøde i Tasjkent, Usbekistan. Indien og Pakistan skal indføres som nye medlemmer, og Iran vil få en højere status over observatør nu, da FN's sanktioner er blevet ophævet i kølvandet på P5+1-aftalen. Fra Tasjkent vil den russiske præsident Putin rejse til Kina for et officielt statsbesøg hos præsident Xi. Den russiske vicepremierminister Dmitry Rogozin er allerede i Kina, hvor han forbereder mødet med Kinas vicepremierminister Wang Yang. Man er allerede i gang med at udarbejde aftaler om samarbejde om rumteknologi, om det mulige salg af en \$11 mia. stor andel i Ruslands statslige olieselskab, Rosneft, samt en mulig kinesisk investering i højhastigheds-jernbanelinjen Moskva-Kazan, som sluttelig kommer til at løbe hele vejen til Beijing.

Torsdag den 23. juni vil den længe ventede Brexit-afstemning finde sted i Storbritannien. Den 28. juni træffer de europæiske statsoverhoveder beslutning om, hvorvidt de skal forlænge sanktionerne mod Rusland over Ukraine i yderligere seks måneder. Den franske udenrigsminister gjorde det i mandags klart, at han forventer, at sanktionerne forlænges, men han indikerede, at Frankrig vil gennemtvinge en debat for en tidsramme for sanktionernes reducering og fjernelse. På et eller andet tidspunkt, måske før afstemningen den 28. juni,

forventes Normandiet-4-gruppen (Putin, Merkel, Hollande og Poroshenko) at mødes for at forsøge at kickstarte Minsk II-processen, der er gået i stå, og som er et nøglespørgsmål mht. sanktioner mod Rusland.

NATO's krigsprovokationer imod Rusland forårsager tydeligvis dybe rifter i de europæiske regeringsinstitutioner. Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeiers skarpe angreb på NATO i søndagens *Bild am Sonntag* er tydeligvis en indikation på sådanne splittelser. Den italienske premierminister Renzi og EU-kommissionens præsident Junckers tilstedeværelse i Skt. Petersborg er en anden.

En mere dybtgående undersøgelse af NATO-forsvarsministrenes møde i Bruxelles i sidste uge, som en forberedelse til NATO-statsoverhovedernes topmøde i Warszawa den 7.-8. juni, demonstrerer det vanvid, der har grebet Alliancen. De deltagende ministre aftalte at tilføje cyberspace som et yderligere militært domæne – i tillæg til luft, land, vand og rummet. Hvad dette rent konkret betyder, er, at et angiveligt cyber-angreb imod et NATO-medlemsland kunne udløse en anråbelse af den fælles forsvarsklausul (artikel V) i NATO's charter, som kunne føre til et militært NATO-angreb på det land, der får skylden for cyber-angrebet. Dette er topmålet af galskab og kan blive en ny, hårfin udløsermekanisme for krig med Rusland og Kina – to lande, der gentagent er blevet beskyldt for at føre cyber-krig imod USA og Europa (sidste uges hackerangreb ind i det Demokratiske Partis database, som det oprindeligt var blevet »bevist« var blevet udført af den russiske stat, fandtes senere at være blevet udført af en hacker uden forbindelse til Rusland).

Som en kommentar til denne række af diplomatiske begivenheder fastslog Lyndon LaRouche den basale pointe: Vi ved endnu ikke, hvad der vil komme ud af disse begivenheder. Vi ved imidlertid, at Putin har sin egen, klare strategi og dagsorden, og han vil handle på det. Alt imens vi ikke specifikt ved, hvad Putin vil gøre, så ved vi, at det vil

blive en faktor, der vil forme den globale situation.

Foto: Et amerikansk Air Force B-52 Stratofortress anfører en formation af fly, inklusive polske, tyske og svenske styrker, over Det baltiske Hav, 9. juni 2016. NATO-allierede udfører en række realistiske øvelsesmissioner på Ruslands grænser. (U.S. Air Force photo)

USA: Michelle Rasmussen fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark rapporterer om Instituttets seneste interventioner imod NATO under Folkemødet på Bornholm; se video.

Michelle Rasmussen, Schiller Institute of Denmark, reporting on the recent intervention of the Institute against NATO at 'Folkemødet på Bornholm' @ 9:02 in the video,

Asking question about prevention of nuclear war to Diane Sare.

USA: Senator Feinstein og kongresmedlem Tauscher langer ud efter planerne for nye atomvåben

20. juni 2016 – Senator Dianne Feinstein og tidligere kongreskvinde og viceudenrigsminister for våbenkontrol og international sikkerhed, Ellen Tauscher har sammen skrevet en ledende artikel, der blev bragt i *New York Times* d. 18. juni, og hvori de krævede et stop for den planlagte produktion og indsættelse af det nye 'Long-Range Standoff Weapon' (LRSW), en ny generation af kernevåben, der stærkt øger faren for termonuklear krig. Forfatterne advarede:

"Luftvåbnet er bestemt for, til næste år, at accelerere udviklingen af dette nye nukleare krydsermissil. Det vil fremføre et opgraderet W-80 atomspræghoved, og være i stand til at penetrere verdens mest avancerede luftforsvarssystemer ... fremstilling af nye kernevåben som dette kan imidlertid være unødvendigt, kostbart og farligt."

Feinstein og Tauscher citerede tidligere forsvarsminister Bill Perry, som for et år siden advarede om, at deployeringen af LRSW-våbensystemet ville øge risikoen for atomkrig ved at udviske linjen mellem konventionelle våben og kernevåben (LRSW kan bruge både nukleare og konventionelle spræghoveder). De to forfattere af *New York Times*-artiklen forlangte, at forsvarsminister Ashton Carter frembringer en detaljeret offentlig redegørelse for planerne om LRSW, inklusiv, hvorvidt det ville blive betragtet som et potentielt offensivt våben, snarere end en tilføjelse af et element til den amerikanske

atom-afskrækkelse. De citerede estimer fra Føderationen af Atomvidenskabsfolk (FAS) er, at det nye våbensystem vil koste \$30 milliarder:

“På et tidspunkt, hvor Forsvarsministeriet har besluttet at modernisere hvert ‘ben’ af den nukleare triade (strategiske bombefly, interkontinentale ballistiske missiler og ballistiske missiler fra undervandsbåde, -red.), er det uansvarligt at investere \$30 milliarder i et unødvendigt og farligt nyt atomvåben.”

De understregede også, at

“Vi ønsker at eliminere enhver uklarhed om, hvorvidt dette nye missil er et offensivt våben.”

Forfatterne bemærkede, at revurderingen ‘holdningen til atomvåben’ i 2010 (2010 Nuclear Posture Review) opfordrede til en reduktion af det amerikanske atomarsenal og en øget afhængighed af konventionelle systemer, som luftvåbnets ‘Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile’ og flådens Tomahawk-krydsermissil, der ikke indebærer risiko for nuklear optrapning.

Foto: Long Range Stand Off Krydsermissil.

Putin langer ud efter sanktioner, NATO's udvidelsespolitik og driften mod kold krig

20. juni 2016 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin talte i flere timer på den sidste dag af Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum. Han konfronterede direkte realiteterne omkring den nuværende strategiske krise, der bliver smidt efter det nye paradigme, som er under skabelse af Rusland og de andre BRIKS-nationer. I et interview med Fareed Zakaria efter topmødet, vred han sig behændigt ud af udtalelser om, at han støttede Donald Trump, ved at påpege, at han var blevet fejlciteret af journalister såsom Zakaria, der ikke er analytikere, og idet han understregede, at vi "er rede til at arbejde med USA," uanset, hvem der vælges til ny leder. Han påpegede, at "Trump har udtalt, at han er parat til at genoprette det fulde format af russisk-amerikanske relationer ... det hilser vi alle velkommen."

I sin udtalelse på topmødets sidste dag sagde Putin, at USA kunne være til gavn for verden, inklusiv Rusland, så længe USA ikke blander sig i andre landes anliggender:

"Vi behøver [USA]. Men vi har ikke brug for, at de konstant blander sig i vore anliggender, fortæller os, hvordan vi skal leve, og hindrer Europa i at opbygge relationer med os."

Putin påpegede, at Obama-administrationen gav sine europæiske partnere besked på at tåle sanktioner mod Rusland, sanktioner, der havde ødelæggende konsekvenser for Europa, men ikke for USA.

Putin sagde, at europæiske erhvervskredse i Frankrig, Tyskland og andre steder har udtrykt villighed til at samarbejde med

Rusland, og nu er det op til politikerne "at udvise visdom, forudseenhed og fleksibilitet."

"Vi bærer ikke nag og er rede til at møde vore europæiske partnere på halvvejen," sagde Putin til forummet. Han pegede på, at det ikke var Rusland, der begyndte det nuværende "nedbrud" i relationer mellem Europa og Rusland, forårsaget af sanktionerne. "Alle vore handlinger har været, og forbliver, alene gengældelse."

Putin fortsatte, "Vore seneste møder med repræsentanter for tyske og franske erhvervskredse har vist, at europæisk erhvervsliv er villigt og parat til at samarbejde med vort land. Der er behov for, at politikere møder forretningsfolk på halvvejen, og udviser visdom, forudseenhed og fleksibilitet. Vi har brug for at styrke tilliden i russisk-europæiske relationer og genetablere niveauet af interaktioner.

Putin tog, hvad angår NATO's udvidelsespolitik, ligeledes tyren ved hornene og sagde, at det ikke giver mening: "Sovjetunionen er der ikke mere, Warszawapagten [mellem Sovjetunionen og de østeuropæiske lande] er ophørt med at eksistere, så hvorfor behøver NATO konstant at udbrede sin infrastruktur og bevæge sig mod Ruslands grænser? Nu tager de Montenegro ind. Hvem har truet Montenegro?" spurgte Putin, leende over absurditeten i det.

Han hævdede, at NATO har "en absolut ligegyldig og tankeløs attitude i forhold til vores position på alle områder," og noterede, at det var USA, der ensidigt afsluttede missilforsvars-traktaten, der til at begynde med var underskrevet for at "bringe strategisk balance ind i verden." Putin fortsatte med at berolige verdenssamfundet med, at han ikke ønsker at gå videre til en ny kold krig, som "ingen ønsker". "Uanset, hvor dramatisk tankegangen i udviklingen af internationale relationer måtte se ud udefra, er det ikke en global konfrontations-tankegang."

Putin udtalte, at det amerikanske missilskjold i Østeuropa udgør en trussel mod magtbalancen. "Vi vil perfektionere vores kapacitet for missilangreb for at opretholde balancen, alene på grund af det."

Putin påpegede, at problemer i verden kun kan håndteres, som det i øjeblikket sker i Syrien. I det tilfælde, sagde han, arbejder nationer i verden, inklusiv Rusland og USA, sammen om at hjælpe med at løse krisen i Syrien. Han konfronterede regimeskifte-politikken, idet han insisterede på, at Syriens integritet må opretholdes som topprioritet. Putin sagde ligeud, at disintegrationen af Syrien ville blive en "destabiliserende faktor, ikke kun for regionen, men for hele Verden".

Han udtalte, at fred i Syrien kun kan nås ved en politisk proces: "Hvis vi ønsker at fremme princippet om demokrati, så lad os gøre det med demokratiske instrumenter," sagde han til forummet.

Han anførte, at den ukrainske krise blev skabt med overlæg af Obama-administration, for at tilvejebringe en grund til NATO's eksistens, og at det ikke er sådan, at situationer i den internationale arena burde håndteres: "Efter det Arabiske Forår sneg [USA] sig op til vore grænser. Hvorfor havde de behov for at støtte et kup i Ukraine? Det er sandsynligt, at oppositionen, der er ved magten nu, kunne have opnået det ved demokratiske valg, og vi ville have arbejdet med dem, netop på samme måde, som vi arbejdede med dem, der var ved magten før præsident Janukovitj ... Men nej," fortsatte Putin, "de skulle nødvendigvis føre det til et blodigt kup med ofre, skulle absolut forårsage borgerkrig."

Putin sagde, at den udvikling "arrede" Ukraines russisk-talende befolkning i det sydøstlige Ukraine og på Krim, og ikke gav Rusland andet alternativ end at tage forholdsregler "for at beskytte visse grupper af folk."

Grunden, sagde han, er, at: NATO "har brug for en fremmed fjende, hvad skulle grunden ellers være til eksistensen af en sådan organisation?" Putin sagde, at hele konflikten blev påtvunget Ukraine "for at underbygge selve eksistensen af den nordatlantiske alliance.

Det er Putin, der bestemmer, hvad der skal ske med 'Planen om Stor-Eurasien'

20. juni 2016 (Leder) – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin brugte Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum den 16.-18. juni som anledning til at fremlægge det eksistentielle spørgsmål, som nu konfronterer menneskeheden: Gå enten med i det, han kalder 'Planen om Stor-Eurasien' for økonomisk udvikling og sikkerhed, eller også, stå over for den umiddelbart overhængende fare for det transatlantiske systems kollaps og en meningsløs global krig, som kunne udvikle sig til en udslettelseskrig.

Under en to timer lang dialog, der blev præsideret af CNN's Fareed Zakaria, med deltagere, annoncerede Putin, at den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union (EAEU) nu vil indlede forhandlinger i denne måned med Kina om fuld integration i 'Ét bælte, én vej'-projektet, og han understregede, at 40 lande søger handelsforbindelser med EAEU, og at Rusland hilser Vesteuropas fulde deltagelse i dette ambitiøse program velkomment.

I den samme dialog talte han åbenhjertigt om USA's og NATO's »blodige kup« i Ukraine, samt indsatsen af nyere dato for at inddæmme Rusland med NATO-styrker.

Putins handlinger, samt det vanvittige, anglo-amerikanske krigsfremstød mod både Rusland og Kina, har udløst et voksende oprør blandt vesteuropæere, der ser krigsfaren mere og mere klart. Ikke alene deltog flere europæiske ledere i Skt. Petersborg-forummet, imod Obamas og Londons udtrykkelige krav. Den tidligere franske præsident, Nicolas Sarkozy krævede en afslutning af sanktioneerne mod Rusland og opfordrede Putin, som, sagde han, befinder sig i en stærkere position, til ensidigt at afslutte de russiske gengældelses-sanktioner mod Europa. Putin responderede positivt til Sarkozys krav, så vel som også til udtalelser, som den italienske premierminister Matteo Renzi kom med, men han advarede om, at Rusland ikke er indstillet på igen at lade sig bedrage.

Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier gav et interview til det meget læste *Bild am Sonntag*, hvor han angreb de netop afsluttede NATO-øvelser langs den russiske grænse for at være en krigsprovokation, og han krævede et stop for de »krigshyl«, der kommer fra NATO. Steinmeiers handlinger har udløst et totalt skænderi mellem grupperinger i den tyske, politiske klasse, lige så vel som, at Sarkozys tale i Skt. Petersborg har udløst en seriøs debat i Frankrig. Steinmeiers intervention er blevet støttet af den ledende militæranalytiker fra CDU, Michael Stürmers nylige angreb på NATO's provokationer, samt af udtalelser i denne uge fra tidligere tyske kansler Gerhard Schröder, der også har fordømt tendensen hen imod et nyt våbenkapløb og en Kold Krig med Rusland.

Alle disse fundamentale skift i det politiske landskab kommer blot få dage før Brexit-afstemningen i Storbritannien den 23. juni, og blot få uger, før topmødet mellem NATO's stats- og regeringsledere finder sted i Warszawa i begyndelsen af juli, hvor NATO's deployeringer ind i De baltiske Stater og Polen

efter planen skal ratificeres. *Sunday Telegraph*, en flagskibs-publikation fra Tory-grupperingen i Storbritannien, havde en barsk formuleret lederartikel til fordel for britisk exit af den Europæiske Union. Lederartiklen konstaterede åbenlyst, at EU er død.

Vi er nået til et *punctum saliens*-øjeblik, hvor menneskeheden enten går fremefter med det nye paradigme, som bedst kommer til udtryk i ideen om Verdenslandbroen, eller også styrter den ud i en udslettelseskrig. Der er ingen steder at gemme sig, for menneskehedens fremtid ligger i vægtskålene. Putin har totalt fod på dette opgør, og man kan forvente, at han vil gøre det, der er uventet, i de kommende dage og uger, for at vinde kampen om menneskehedens fremtid.

Her i USA består den største fare i, at disse voksende kræfter, der klart ser faren for en atomkrig, vil holde sig tilbage fra at bringe Obamas præsidentskab til fald – før han starter en krig. Ledende røster i den Amerikanske Komite for Øst-Vest-aftaler, inklusive dr. Stephen Cohen og Gilbert Doctorow, er noget forsinket ved at indse, at Obama ikke er en person, man »overtaler« til at gøre det rigtige. Han har begået forbrydelser, der klart berettiger til en rigsretssag, inklusive hans afvisning af at arbejde sammen med Rusland for at knuse Islamisk Stat, al-Nusra og andre anglo-saudisk sponsorerede, jihadistiske bander. Hvor mange uskyldige liv er gået tabt, fordi Obama nægtede at samarbejde med Putin og de russiske tjenester – der ved, hvordan man fører en kontra-terrorist-operation?

I takt med, at denne kamp når nye dimensioner i Europa, fortsætter den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping sin turne i Central- og Østeuropa, hvor han indgår betydningsfulde aftaler med Serbien, der er et afgørende omdrejningspunkt for den Eurasiske Landbro.

Frem for alt andet pålagde Lyndon LaRouche sine kolleger i søndags, nøje at overvåge Putins træk. Han vil tage skridt til

flankeoperationer, baseret på hans opfattelse af hele den globale situation. Han stoler ikke på andre, i særdeleshed ikke Obama og briterne. Han vil handle på overraskende måder, som på bedste måde vil reflektere virkeligheden i dette øjeblik med et globalt opgør. Han er, understregede LaRouche, det bedste referencepunkt for handling.

Foto: Den russiske præsident Putin under et møde med lederne af verdens førende nyhedsagenturer, på sidelinjen af det 20. Internationale Økonomiske Forum i Skt. Petersborg (SPIEF 2016), Rusland, 17. juni 2016. Mikhail Metzel/TASS

Supplerende materiale:

Putin langer ud efter sanktioner, NATO's udvidelsespolitik og driften mod kold krig

20. juni 2016 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin talte i flere timer på den sidste dag af Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum. Han konfronterede direkte realiteterne omkring den nuværende strategiske krise, der bliver smidt efter det nye paradigme, som er under skabelse af Rusland og de andre BRIKS-nationer. I et interview med Fareed Zakaria efter topmødet, vred han sig behændigt ud af udtalelser om, at han støttede Donald Trump, ved at påpege, at han var blevet fejlciteret af journalister såsom Zakaria, der ikke er analytikere, og idet han understregede, at vi "er rede til at arbejde med USA," uanset, hvem der vælges til ny leder. Han påpegede, at "Trump har udtalt, at han er parat til at genoprette det fulde format af russisk-amerikanske relationer ... det hilser vi alle velkommen."

I sin udtalelse på topmødets sidste dag sagde Putin, at USA kunne være til gavn for verden, inklusiv Rusland, så længe USA ikke blander sig i andre landes anliggender:

"Vi behøver [USA]. Men vi har ikke brug for, at de konstant blander sig i vore anliggender, fortæller os, hvordan vi skal leve, og hindrer Europa i at opbygge relationer med os."

Putin påpegede, at Obama-administrationen gav sine europæiske partnere besked på at tåle sanktioner mod Rusland, sanktioner, der havde ødelæggende konsekvenser for Europa, men ikke for USA.

Putin sagde, at europæiske erhvervskredse i Frankrig, Tyskland og andre steder har udtrykt villighed til at samarbejde med Rusland, og nu er det op til politikerne "at udvise visdom, forudseenhed og fleksibilitet."

"Vi bærer ikke nag og er rede til at møde vore europæiske partnere på halvvejen," sagde Putin til forummet. Han pegede på, at det ikke var Rusland, der begyndte det nuværende "nedbrud" i relationer mellem Europa og Rusland, forårsaget af sanktionerne. "Alle vore handlinger har været, og forbliver, alene gengældelse."

Putin fortsatte, "Vore seneste møder med repræsentanter for tyske og franske erhvervskredse har vist, at europæisk erhvervsliv er villigt og parat til at samarbejde med vort land. Der er behov for, at politikere møder forretningsfolk på halvvejen, og udviser visdom, forudseenhed og fleksibilitet. Vi har brug for at styrke tilliden i russisk-europæiske relationer og genetablere niveauet af interaktioner.

Putin tog, hvad angår NATO's udvidelsespolitik, ligeledes tyren ved hornene og sagde, at det ikke giver mening: "Sovjetunionen er der ikke mere, Warszawapagten [mellem Sovjetunionen og de østeuropæiske lande] er ophørt med at eksistere, så hvorfor behøver NATO konstant at udbrede sin infrastruktur og bevæge sig mod Ruslands grænser? Nu tager de

Montenegro ind. Hvem har truet Montenegro?" spurgte Putin, leende over absurditeten i det.

Han hævdede, at NATO har "en absolut ligegyldig og tankeløs attitude i forhold til vores position på alle områder," og noterede, at det var USA, der ensidigt afsluttede missilforsvars-traktaten, der til at begynde med var underskrevet for at "bringe strategisk balance ind i verden." Putin fortsatte med at berolige verdenssamfundet med, at han ikke ønsker at gå videre til en ny kold krig, som "ingen ønsker". "Uanset, hvor dramatisk tankegangen i udviklingen af internationale relationer måtte se ud udefra, er det ikke en global konfrontations-tankegang."

Putin udtalte, at det amerikanske missilskjold i Østeuropa udgør en trussel mod magtbalancen. "Vi vil perfektionere vores kapacitet for missilangreb for at opretholde balancen, alene på grund af det."

Putin påpegede, at problemer i verden kun kan håndteres, som det i øjeblikket sker i Syrien. I det tilfælde, sagde han, arbejder nationer i verden, inklusiv Rusland og USA, sammen om at hjælpe med at løse krisen i Syrien. Han konfronterede regimeskifte-politikken, idet han insisterede på, at Syriens integritet må opretholdes som topprioritet. Putin sagde ligeud, at disintegrationen af Syrien ville blive en "destabiliserende faktor, ikke kun for regionen, men for hele Verden".

Han udtalte, at fred i Syrien kun kan nås ved en politisk proces: "Hvis vi ønsker at fremme princippet om demokrati, så lad os gøre det med demokratiske instrumenter," sagde han til forummet.

Han anførte, at den ukrainske krise blev skabt med overlæg af Obama-administration, for at tilvejebringe en grund til NATO's eksistens, og at det ikke er sådan, at situationer i den internationale arena burde håndteres: "Efter det Arabiske

Forår sneg [USA] sig op til vore grænser. Hvorfor havde de behov for at støtte et kup i Ukraine? Det er sandsynligt, at oppositionen, der er ved magten nu, kunne have opnået det ved demokratiske valg, og vi ville have arbejdet med dem, netop på samme måde, som vi arbejdede med dem, der var ved magten før præsident Janukovitj ... Men nej," fortsatte Putin, "de skulle nødvendigvis føre det til et blodigt kup med ofre, skulle absolut forårsage borgerkrig."

Putin sagde, at den udvikling "arrede" Ukraines russisk-talende befolkning i det sydøstlige Ukraine og på Krim, og ikke gav Rusland andet alternativ end at tage forholdsregler "for at beskytte visse grupper af folk."

Grunden, sagde han, er, at: NATO "har brug for en fremmed fjende, hvad skulle grunden ellers være til eksistensen af en sådan organisation?" Putin sagde, at hele konflikten blev påtvunget Ukraine "for at underbygge selve eksistensen af den nordatlantiske alliance.

USA: Senator Feinstein og kongresmedlem Tauscher langer ud efter planerne for nye atomvåben

20. juni 2016 – Senator Dianne Feinstein og tidligere kongreskvinde og viceudenrigsminister for våbenkontrol og international sikkerhed, Ellen Tauscher har sammen skrevet en ledende artikel, der blev bragt i *New York Times* d. 18. juni, og hvori de krævede et stop for den planlagte produktion og indsættelse af det nye 'Long-Range Standoff Weapon' (LRSW), en ny generation af kernevåben, der stærkt øger faren for termonuklear krig. Forfatterne advarede:

"Luftvåbnet er bestemt for, til næste år, at accelerere udviklingen af dette nye nukleare krydsermissil. Det vil fremføre et opgraderet W-80 atomspræghoved, og være i stand til at penetrere verdens mest avancerede luftforsvarssystemer ... fremstilling af nye kernevåben som dette kan imidlertid være unødvendigt, kostbart og farligt."

Feinstein og Tauscher citerede tidligere forsvarsminister Bill Perry, som for et år siden advarede om, at deployeringen af LRSW-våbensystemet ville øge risikoen for atomkrig ved at udviske linjen mellem konventionelle våben og kernevåben (LRSW kan bruge både nukleare og konventionelle spræghoveder). De to forfattere af *New York Times*-artiklen forlangte, at forsvarsminister Ashton Carter frembringer en detaljeret offentlig redegørelse for planerne om LRSW, inklusiv, hvorvidt det ville blive betragtet som et potentielt offensivt våben, snarere end en tilføjelse af et element til den amerikanske atom-afskrækkelse. De citerede estimer fra Føderationen af Atomvidenskabsfolk (FAS) er, at det nye våbensystem vil koste \$30 milliarder:

"På et tidspunkt, hvor Forsvarsministeriet har besluttet at modernisere hvert 'ben' af den nukleare triade (strategiske bombefly, interkontinentale ballistiske missiler og ballistiske missiler fra undervandsbåde, -red.), er det uansvarligt at investere \$30 milliarder i et unødvendigt og farligt nyt atomvåben."

De understregede også, at

"Vi ønsker at eliminere enhver uklarhed om, hvorvidt dette nye missil er et offensivt våben."

Forfatterne bemærkede, at revurderingen 'holdningen til atomvåben' i 2010 (2010 Nuclear Posture Review) opfordrede til en reduktion af det amerikanske atomarsenal og en øget afhængighed af konventionelle systemer, som luftvåbnets 'Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile' og flådens Tomahawk-

krydsermissil, der ikke indebærer risiko for nuklear optrapning.

Lyndon LaRouche: Intet kan standse krakket – Putins rolle, samt en økonomisk vision efter Hamiltons principper, er afgørende

Det transatlantiske finansielle system vil nedsmelte. Intet kan standse det. Det vides ikke præcis, hvornår krakket kommer, men vi må være forberedt til denne uundgåelige eksplosion. Systemet er uigenkaldeligt ude over et punkt, hvor det kan håndteres eller reformeres. Vi befinder os på randen af et uforudsigeligt krak. Vi må have en ny fremgangsmåde, der må baseres på rationelle kræfter i det transatlantiske område, der kan tage de nødvendige, radikale skridt.

18. juni, 2016 (Leder) – Under en indledende diskussion som

forberedelse til LPAC's fredags-webcast, kom Lyndon LaRouche med følgende kommentarer (parafrase):

Det transatlantiske finansielle system vil nedsmelte. Intet kan standse det. Det vides ikke præcis, hvornår krakket kommer, men vi må være forberedt til denne uundgåelige eksplosion. Systemet er uigenkaldeligt ude over et punkt, hvor det kan håndteres eller reformeres. Vi befinder os på randen af et uforudsigeligt krak. Vi må have en ny fremgangsmåde, der må baseres på rationelle kræfter i det transatlantiske område, der kan tage de nødvendige, radikale skridt.

Putin forstår denne krise, og hans perspektiv, som det reflekteres i hans bemærkninger ved Det Økonomiske Forum i Skt. Petersborg, er uforligneligt. USA og Storbritannien er de mest upålidelige. Det mest risikofyldte væddemål på denne planet udgøres af Obama. Obama vil tabe, punktum. Et helt nyt finanssystem er den eneste mulighed.

Folk, der vil kalde sig intelligente, må indse, at spekulation ikke vil virke. Hele hasardspilssystemet må annulleres. Al hasardspilsgæld må annulleres, og vi må begynde helt forfra – baseret på principper, der er totalt forskellige. Det Britiske [økonomiske] System må bringes til ophør. Det samme er tilfældet med det franske system, efter de Gaulle-perioden. En total, global genopbygning kræves; ingen studehandler. Det amerikansk-europæiske finanssystem er umuligt. Sig »Nej!«. Vi må vende tilbage til et system, der er baseret på fysiske værdier, ikke pengeværdier. Vi må begynde forfra, med Hamiltons økonomiske principper som udgangspunkt.

Foto: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin taler til plenarforsamlingen på Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum, 17. juni, 2016. Foto: kremlin.ru

Supplerende materiale:

Uddrag af Putins tale til plenarforsamlingen på Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum, 17. juni 2016

I øvrigt er de aktuelle, geopolitiske spændinger, til en vis grad, relateret til økonomisk usikkerhed og udtømmning af de gamle kilder til vækst. Der er risiko for, at det vil stige, eller endda blive kunstigt fremprovokeret. Det er i vores fælles interesse at finde en kreativ og konstruktiv vej ud af denne situation.

[Der findes] et enormt og voksende potentiale inden for digitale og industrielle teknologier, robotics, energi, bioteknologi, lægevidenskab og endnu andre områder. Opdagelser inden for disse områder kan føre til sande teknologiske revolutioner og til en eksplosiv vækst i arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Dette sker allerede, og det vil uundgåeligt ske ...

Vi kan faktisk allerede i dag se forsøg på at sikre eller endda monopolisere fordelene ved næste generations teknologier. Dette er, mener jeg, motivet bag skabelsen af afgrænsede områder med opsatte regler som en barriere for at reducere udvekslingen af banebrydende teknologier ...

Man kan kontrollere spredningen af visse teknologier i en vis tid, men i nutidens verden er det nærmest umuligt at holde dem tilbage i et inddæmmet område, også selv om det er et stort område. Men denne indsats kunne føre til, at grundforskning,

der nu er åben for den fælles udveksling af viden og information gennem fælles projekter, også indelukkes, hvor der opstilles afspærrende barrierer.

... vi kan kun udvikle os effektivt sammen, ved at opbygge et samarbejde. Vi er overbevist om, at et sådant samarbejde faktisk kan opbygges som en del af et fleksibelt og åbent integrationsmiljø, der opmuntrer til konkurrence inden for videnskabelig forskning og et bredt udvalg af teknologiske løsninger, der gør det muligt for de deltagende lande fuld ud at bruge deres kompetence og deres potentiale ...

Vi er bevidste om de imponerende udsigter i forbindelse med samarbejde mellem EAEU [Eurasisk Økonomisk Union] og andre lande og integrationsforbindelser. Flere end 40 stater og internationale organisationer har udtrykt deres ønske om at etablere en frihandelszone med den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union. Vi og vore partnere mener, at EAEU kan blive et af centrene i et større, fremvoksende integrationsområde ...

Sammen med vore kinesiske kolleger har vi planlagt at påbegynde officielle forhandlinger så tidligt som i juni måned, om skabelsen af et omfattende handelspartnerskab og økonomisk partnerskab i Eurasien, med deltagelse af staterne i den Europæiske Union og Kina. Jeg forventer, at dette vil blive et af de første skridt hen imod skabelsen af et betydeligt, eurasisk partnerskab. Vi vil helt bestemt genoptage diskussionen om dette betydningsfulde projekt på det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok i begyndelsen af september ...

Venner, det projekt, jeg netop har omtalt – projektet for det større Eurasien – er selvfølgelig åbent for Europa, og jeg er overbevist om, at et sådant samarbejde kan blive til gensidig fordel. På trods af alle de velkendte problemer i vore relationer, er den Europæiske Union fortsat Ruslands hovedpartner inden for handel og økonomi ...

Jeg forstår også vore europæiske partnere, når de taler om de komplicerede beslutninger for Europa, som blev truffet under forhandlingerne om dannelsen af det transatlantiske partnerskab. Det er indlysende, at Europa har et enormt potentiale, og en satsning på kun én regional forbindelsespartner indsnævrer tydeligvis dets muligheder. Under de omstændigheder er det vanskeligt for Europa at opretholde en balance og bevare et rum for en udbytterig manøvre.

Som de nylige møder med repræsentanter for tyske og franske erhvervskredse har vist, så er europæiske virksomheder villige og rede til at samarbejde med dette land. Politikere bør møde virksomhederne på halvvejen ved at udvise kløgt, samt en vidtskuende fleksibel fremgangsmåde. Vi må atter oprette tillid til de russisk-europæiske relationer og genoprette vores samarbejdsniveau.

Vi husker, hvordan det hele begyndte. Rusland igangsatte ikke det aktuelle sammenbrud, afbrydelse, problemer og sanktioner. Alle vore handlinger har udelukkende været i besvarelse. Men vi bærer ikke nag, som man siger, og vi er rede til at komme vore europæiske partnere i møde på halvvejen. Men dette kan under ingen omstændigheder blive en vej med ensrettet færdsel.

Lad mig gentage, at vi er interesseret i, at europæere går med i projektet for et storslået eurasisk partnerskab. I denne sammenhæng hilser vi den kasakhstaniske præsidents initiativ, med at afholde konsultationer mellem den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union og EU, velkommen. I går diskuterede vi dette spørgsmål ved mødet med præsidenten for den Europæiske Kommission.

Det vil yderligere være muligt at genoptage dialogen mellem eksperter på et teknisk niveau, om en bred vifte af spørgsmål, såsom handel, investering, lovgivning inden for teknik og toldadministration. På denne måde kunne vi skabe fundamentet for yderligere samarbejde og partnerskab ...

Vi anser det naturligvis for vigtigt at fortsætte samarbejdet omkring betydningsfulde forskningsprojekter, såsom ITER-forsøgskraftværket og den frie elektron-røntgenlaser, for blot at nævne nogle få. En fælles indsats vil gøre det muligt for os virkelig at forøge både Europas og Ruslands teknologiske konkurrencedygtighed. Det rækker at sige, at, i 2015 investerede Rusland 1,2 mia. euro i fælles højteknologiske projekter med Europa ...

Et præsidentielt råd for strategisk udvikling og prioritetsprojekter vil blive skabt i den nærmeste fremtid. Deres ydmyge tjener vil stå i spidsen, mens rådspræsidiets vil blive ledet af premierminister Dmitry Medvedev ...

Verden har brug for et så magtfuldt land som USA, og det har vi også, men vi har ikke brug for, at det konstant blander sig i vore anliggender, fortæller os, hvordan vi skal leve og forhindrer Europa i at opbygge en relation til os.

FRA SPØRGSMÅL & SVAR:

Jeg ønsker ikke at tro på, at vi er på vej hen imod en ny Kold Krig, og jeg er sikker på, at ingen ønsker dette. Vi gør ganske bestemt ikke. Det er ikke nødvendigt. Hovedtankegangen bag udviklingen af internationale relationer er, at, uanset hvor dramatisk, det kan synes at være, så er det ikke tankegangen bag en global konfrontation. Hvad er problemets rod?

Det skal jeg sige jer. Jeg må bringe jer lidt tilbage i tiden. Efter Sovjetunionens kollaps, havde vi en forventning om generel fremgang og generel tillid. Desværre måtte Rusland konfrontere flere udfordringer, for at tale i moderne vendinger: økonomisk, samfundsmæssig og intern politik. Vi fik udfordringer som separatisme, radikalisme, aggressiv international terror, for det var utvivlsomt al-Qaeda-militante, som vi bekæmpede i Kaukasus, det er en åbenlys

faktor, og det kan der ikke være to meninger om. Men, i stedet for støtte fra vore partnere i vores kamp mod disse problemer, fik vi ulykkeligvis noget andet – støtte til separatisterne..., efterretningsstøtte, finansiel støtte og regeringsstøtte ...

Sovjetunionen eksisterede ikke længere; Warszawa-pagten eksisterede ikke længere. Men af en eller anden grund fortsætter NATO med at udvide sin infrastruktur hen mod Ruslands grænser. Det begyndte længe før i går. Montenegro er ved at blive et NATO-medlem. Hvem truer Montenegro? For vores position bliver totalt ignoreret.

Et andet, lige så vigtigt, eller måske det vigtigste spørgsmål, er den ensidige [fra USA's side] opsigelse af ABM-traktaten. ABM-traktaten blev engang indgået mellem Sovjetunionen og USA af en meget god grund ... Traktaten var udtænkt til at skabe en strategisk balance i verden. Men de droppede imidlertid ensidigt traktaten og sagde venligt, Dette er ikke rettet imod jer. I ønsker at udvikle jeres offensive våben, og vi antager, at det ikke er rettet imod os.

Ved I, hvorfor de sagde sådan? Det er simpelt: der var ingen, der forventede, at Rusland i begyndelsen af 2000, da landet kæmpede med sine interne problemer, var revet itu af interne konflikter, politiske og økonomiske problemer, tortureret af terrorister; at Rusland da ville genopbygge sin forsvarssektor. Der var tydeligvis ingen, der forventede, at vi var i stand til at opretholde vore arsenaler, for slet ikke at tale om at få nye strategiske våben. De tænkte, at de ville opbygge deres missilforsvarsstyrker, mens vore arsenaler skrumpede.

At dette blev gjort under påskud af at bekæmpe den iranske atomtrussel. Hvad er der så blevet af den iranske atomtrussel nu? Der er ikke nogen; men projektet fortsætter. Og sådan er det, skridt for skridt, det ene efter det andet, og så fremdeles.

Så begyndte de at støtte alle mulige former for 'farvede revolutioner', inklusive det såkaldte Arabiske Forår. De støttede det ihærdigt. Hvor mange positive syn hørte vi om, hvad det var, der foregik? Hvad førte det til? Kaos.

Jeg er ikke interesseret i at give nogen skylden. Jeg vil ganske enkelt sige, at, hvis denne politik med ensidige handlinger fortsætter, og hvis skridt i den internationale arena, hvor disse skridt er meget følsomme for det internationale samfund, ikke bliver koordineret, så er sådanne konsekvenser uundgåelige. Og modsat, hvis vi lytter til hinanden og taler ud fra en balance mellem interesser, så vil dette ikke ske. Ja, det er en vanskelig proces, processen med at nå til enighed, men det er den eneste vej til acceptable løsninger ...

Af hvilken årsag, støttede de kuppet i Ukraine? Jeg har ofte talt om dette. Den interne politiske situation dér er kompliceret, og den opposition, der nu sidder ved magten, ville efter al sandsynlighed være kommet til magten på demokratisk vis, gennem valg. Sådan er det. Vi ville have arbejdet sammen med dem, som vi havde gjort det med den regering, der sad ved magten før præsident Janukovitj.

Men nej, de skulle absolut gå frem med et kup, med tab, med udløsning af blodsudgydelser, en borgerkrig, og med at skræmme den russisktalende befolkning i det sydøstlige Ukraine og i Krim. For hvad? Og efter at vi var nødt til, simpelt hen nødt til, at tage forholdsregler for at beskytte visse samfundsgrupper, begyndte de at optrappe situationen, at ophidse til spændinger. Efter min mening, så gøres dette, bl.a., for at retfærdiggøre eksistensen af den Nordatlantiske Blok. De har brug for en ekstern modstander, en ekstern fjende; i modsat fald, hvorfor skulle denne organisation i det hele taget være nødvendig? Der er ingen Warszawa-pagt, ingen Sovjetunion – hvem er det rettet imod?

Hvis vi fortsætter med at handle i overensstemmelse med denne

tankegang, med at optrappe [spændinger] og fordoble indsatsen for at skræmme hinanden, så vil det en dag komme til en kold krig. Vores tankegang er fuldstændig anderledes. Den fokuserer på samarbejde og søgen efter kompromis. [Applaus]. (Udskriftet af Putins tale er ikke komplet.)

Putin præsenterer vision for fred og udvikling ved SPIEF

Præsident Vladimir Putin henvendte sig til plenum-sessionen ved Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum (SPIEF) (17. juni 2016) med en slagkraftig politisk og økonomisk vision for Eurasiens fremtid, og som konsekvens deraf for Verden, idet den imødegår Obamas aggressive krigsforberedelser. Han fremførte, at de geopolitiske spændinger i virkeligheden drives af den økonomiske krise. Han appellerede stærkt til EU-nationerne om at afslutte det destruktive sanktionsregime, idet han identificerede det faktum, at de er et resultat af Obamas manipulation. Han pegede på de tyske og franske erhvervsledere, som har åbnet op for en genetablering af relationerne med Rusland, og opfordrede politiske ledere til at mødes med dem på halvvejen, for at reetablere tillid mellem EU og Rusland.

Putin sagde, at Verden, og Rusland, behøver et stærkt USA, men ikke et USA, der blander sig og forhindrer Europa i at bygge bånd. Om TTIP sagde han, at Europa ville blive alvorligt begrænset, hvis det blev bundet til et enkelt regionalt tilknytningsforhold. Han gentog adskillige gange, at hans vision for et 'Stor-Eurasien' sammen med specielt Kina, var åbent for alle – og i særdeleshed for EU-nationerne.

Han gennemgik i detaljer sin plan for genopbygning af den russiske økonomi, baseret på fremstillingsvirksomhed, anvendelse af teknologier i industrien, 3 millioner nye jobs i små og mellemstore industrivirksomheder i år 2020, og endnu

mere fokus på videnskab og teknologi inden for uddannelserne.

Dette er, hvad Obama kalder sin succesfulde "internationale isolation" af Rusland.

Schiller Instituttet mobiliserer danskerne på Folkemødet på Bornholm: Rejser spørgsmålet om Atomkrig og Udmeldelse af NATO!

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark mobiliserer i disse dage på Folkemødet på Bornholm for at stoppe atomkrig. ... En vigtig begivenhed, hvor vi fik mulighed for at intervenere, var ved det Danske Forsvarsakademi. Titlen på deres begivenhed var "Det danske Forsvar i det nye NATO – henimod Topmødet i juli!" Blandt talerne var det danske militærs repræsentant ved NATO, den permanente danske ambassadør til NATO og en militærforsker

fra Københavns Universitet. Der var kun ét eneste hovedbudskab, nemlig, at 'Rusland må inddæmmes på grund af sine "aggressive" handlinger, og Kina er ligeledes en problemnation, der skal håndteres. Vi stillede det første spørgsmål og sagde, at NATO bør opløses; at Danmark bør forlade NATO og undgå atomkrig, og at vi i stedet bør samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, samt acceptere en multipolær verden.

18. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark mobiliserer i disse dage på Folkemødet på Bornholm for at stoppe atomkrig. Folkemødet er en stor politisk begivenhed, hvor alle partier, ministerier, hovedmedier, universiteter, dansk industri, militæret og mange andre institutioner er samlet til 4 dages debatter, diskussioner m.m. Omkring 30-40.000 mennesker fra hele Danmark kommer til dette Folkemøde.

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark deltager med 4 personer. Vi bærer kropsplakater, der siger "Atomkrig? Danmark ud af NATO nu!" på den ene side og "Win-Win med BRIKS, ikke krig og økonomisk kollaps" på den anden. Vi uddeler vores danske Nyhedsorientering og vores internationale NATO-folder til folk, og vi taler med folk, vi møder på gaden eller ved interventioner!

Der var en begivenhed med den britiske og den polske ambassadør til Danmark, om betydningen af NATO. Vi uddelte vores litteratur ved begivenheden og skabte en hel del opmærksomhed om atomkrig med vores kropsskilte. Debatten var styret på forhånd, og man kunne ikke stille spørgsmål. Den britiske ambassadør gik så langt som til at sige, at Rusland udgjorde et truende imperium, der må stoppes! Vores litteratur blev godt modtaget af publikum, og vi havde mange diskussioner.

En vigtig begivenhed, hvor vi fik mulighed for at intervenere, var ved det Danske Forsvarsakademi. Titlen på deres begivenhed var "Det danske Forsvar i det nye NATO – henimod Topmødet i juli!" Blandt talerne var det danske militærs repræsentant ved

NATO, den permanente danske ambassadør til NATO og en militærforsker fra Københavns Universitet. Der var kun ét eneste hovedbudskab, nemlig, at 'Rusland må inddæmmes på grund af sine "aggressive" handlinger, og Kina er ligeledes en problemnation, der skal håndteres. Vi stillede det første spørgsmål og sagde, at NATO bør opløses; at Danmark bør forlade NATO og undgå atomkrig, og at vi i stedet bør samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, samt acceptere en multipolær verden.

Mere rapportering fra Folkemødet er på vej.

Se: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1634726746777458/?fref=ts>

Storbritannien i totalt oprør over Brexit-afstemning og mordet på Cox

17. juni, 2016 – Brexit-afstemningen den 23. juni, der nu er sat i forbindelse med attentatet på parlamentsmedlemmet for Labour Jo Cox, holder hele Storbritannien i en tilstand af total tumult. Den sidste redelige meningsmåling viser meget tæt løb i Brexit-afstemningen, med 15 -18 procent af vælgerne, som stadig ikke har besluttet sig, og hvoraf de fleste ikke er tilknyttet de to store partier. De britiske myndigheder spiller med kortene meget tæt på kroppen vedrørende mordet på Cox, så det er stadig uklart, hvorvidt det blev udløst af højrefløjsforbindelser til morderen, der også gennem længere

tid har lidt af alvorlig mental sygdom.

Alle de britiske nøgleinstitutioner er, ifølge en ledende amerikansk kilde, splittet over Brexit-afstemningen. Det inkluderer City of London, Club of the Isles (internationalt netværk af britiskkontrollerede virksomheder og banker, -red.) og Monarkiet. Nogle, selv inden for City, argumenterer med, at en Brexit vil befri Storbritannien fra den evigt ekspanderende indtrængning af EU-kommissionens bureaukrati i Bruxelles, mens andre frygter, at tabet af bånd til kontinentet i høj grad vil svække City's position som verdens finanshovedstad. Ifølge kilden er krigen bag scenen brutal. Hvis Cameron taber afstemningen og Storbritannien forlader EU, vil han næsten omgående være ude. Han er desperat og har forskertset muligheden for at gå sammen med Corbyn, der også støtter Storbritanniens forbliven i EU. Hvis Brexit vinder, er det også sandsynligt, at Skotland og Irland i løbet af de næste få år begge vil tage skridt til at forlade det Forenede Kongerige, og rette ind efter kontinental-Europa og EU.

Mordet på parlamentsmedlem Jo Cox passer ind i mønstret med mentalt forstyrrede personer, der fremstilles som noget andet – præcis som Omar Mateen (gerningsmanden ved Orlandoskyderiet, -red.) fejlagtigt portrætteres som en ISIS-agent, snarere end den britisk/saudiske/FBI-agent, som han var. Verdenspressen gav genlyd med historien om, at den mordmistænkte Tommy Mair havde råbt "Britain First", da han dræbte Cox, med reference til en stærkt højreorienteret organisation i UK. Britiske kilder fortalte i dag *EIR*, at der kun var én kilde til den historie – Maria Eagle, en forsvarsminister, der er tilhænger af Blairs politiske ideologi, i Labourpartiets skyggekaabinet (den officielle oppositions skyggekaabinet, -red), som kun få minutter efter mordet tweetede, at Mair havde råbt "Britain First." Hun befandt sig ikke engang på drabsscenen! Hun slettede hurtigt opslaget på Tweeter, men på det tidspunkt var

det allerede i alle overskrifter i hele verden.

Jo Cox, mordofret, var en radikal anti-Assad fanatiker, der krævede krig mod Assad. Hun arbejdede med Obamas kampagne i North Carolina i 2008, men sagde, at Obama (og Cameron) begik en frygtelig fejltagelse ved ikke militært at gennemtvinge regimeskifte i Syrien, og forlangte nye sanktioner mod Rusland for dets handlinger i Syrien.

Foto: Medlem af det britiske parlament for Labour, Jo Cox, myrdet i en alder af 41.

NATO spiller hasard med 3. Verdenskrig: Skal Europa være kanonføde? Fred er kun mulig sammen med Rusland og Kina! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Klokken er, i bogstavelig forstand, ét minut i midnat. Elementær overlevelse vil kræve, at vi vågner op, før vi her i Europa ofres som kanonføde i en angiveligt begrænset atomkrig på alteret for det anglo-amerikanske imperiums geopolitiske interesser, et imperium, hvis krav om at herske over en unipolær verden ikke længere kan opretholdes. Hvis der under NATO-topmødet i Warszawa i begyndelsen af juli måned finder en yderligere opbygning af det amerikanske BMD-system sted – det

er bl.a. planlagt at forbinde systemet i Rumænien med krigsskibene, som er udstyret med Aegis-systemet, der kan affyre missiler – så kunne vi meget hurtigt nå det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen vej tilbage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Foto: Amerikanske soldater i et troppetransport fly.

**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 Ehrlicke 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 Ehrlicke; 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.

USA: Hvor meget af terroren efter 11. september-angrebene blev fabrikeret af FBI?

15. juni, 2016 – Ifølge AntiMedia (theantimedia.org), var FBI-angivere involveret i 243 af de 508 terrrorsager, som FBI har åbnet siden d. 11. september, 2001. Af disse FBI-angivere, hvoraf næsten alle var muslimer, og mange var diagnosticeret mentalt syge, var mange i desperat penge nød og derfor modtagelige for FBI-bestikkelse til at gå med i angivelige terrorhandlinger, som egentlig var 'stingoperationer' (komplerede, overlagte intriger for at narre 'forbrydere' til at gå i fælden, -red.). I nyhedsartiklen sættes der fokus på sagen om 'De fire fra Newburgh', og den er delvis baseret på en undersøgelse fra 2014, udført af 'Koalition til beskyttelse af civile rettigheder', med titlen: "At opfinde terrorister: 'Lawfare' ved brug af forebyggende retsforfølgelse." ('lawfare' er asymmetrisk krigsførelse ved brug af hjemlig eller international lov, -red.)

En af de fire sagsøgte i sagen, James Cromitie, var en tidligere stofmisbruger, der gentagne gange havde afslået tilbud om penge fra FBI's hemmelige agenter for at deltage i en hemmelig terrorplan. En anden sagsøgt, Laguerre Payan, var diagnosticeret med skizofreni, og en tredje, David Williams,

var i desperat pengenød, fordi hans bror behøvede en livreddende levertransplantation.

En anden sag, der involverer Rezawan Ferdaus, var et endnu mere åbenlyst tilfælde, hvor FBI udså sig en mentalt syg person. Ferdaus led af en alvorlig depression i en sådan grad, at han ikke havde kontrol over sin blærefunktion, men han blev af FBI presset til at gå med i en hemmelig plan om at angribe Capitol-bygningen (kongresbygningen i Washington D.C., -red.)

I endnu et andet tilfælde, der nævnes i dagens historie fra AntiMedia.org, meldte en far fra Boston til FBI, at hans søn lavede opslag på Facebook i ISIS' favør, og FBI trådte til og skaffede drengen våben, hvorefter de arresterede ham. Et andet vigtigt tilfælde var sagen med Sam Osmakac. Osmakac fik våben af FBI, blev styret af en FBI-angiver, forsynet med en bilbombe af FBI og ligeledes med penge til at betale sine rejseomkostninger til det sted, hvor han så sluttelig blev arresteret. En psykiatrisk undersøgelse beordret af retten afslørede, at han led af en skizo-affektiv psykose. Hans FBI-sagsbehandler kaldte ham "et retarderet fjols". Tidligere assisterende direktør hos FBI, Thomas Fuentes, beskrev dette som FBI's "Hold Frygten i Live"-politik, med det formål at sikre fortsat forøgelse af budgetterne. I virkeligheden er det langt værre end blot budget-motivering, som FBI's rolle i mørklægningen af d. 11. september klarest illustrerer.

Den samme profil, hvor FBI skaber terrorisme, hvor den ikke eksisterer, ved hjælp af 'stingoperationer', fremgik af en længere artikel i *New York Times* d. 7. juni, 2016, under overskriften "FBI optrapper brugen af stingoperationer i ISIS-sager." Journalist Eric Lichtblau fra *Times* rapporterede, at to tredjedele af FBI's anklager i terrrorsager er baseret på 'sting', en betydelig stigning over de seneste år. Historien i *Times* nævnte sagen om 'De fire fra Newburgh' og citerede dommer Colleen McMahon, der i retten erklærede, at "Jeg mener uden skygge af tvivl, at der ikke ville have været nogen forbrydelse her, hvis regeringen ikke havde iværksat, planlagt

og bragt den til fuldførelse.” En tidligere *New York Times*-artikel fra d. 28. april, 2012, med overskriften ”Hemmelige terrorplaner udklækket af FBI”, udgjorde en lignende sag, hvor FBI’s overlagte fælder skabte terrorisme, der ellers aldrig ville have materialiseret sig.

En anden FBI-stingoperation, der af Glenn Greenwald blev rapporteret i onlineavisen *The Intercept*, blev spydigt beskrevet som ”endnu en FBI-sejr over de mentalt syge.”

Foto: 'The Newburgh 4': Fra venstre: James Cromitie, David Williams, Laguerre Payen og Onta Williams. (Foto: J.B. Nicholas, Christopher Sadowski Splash News/Newscom)

Obama, Orlando og det anglo-saudiske terrornetværk. Kort video, engelsk

– Det masseorderiske voldsorgie i Orlando, Florida, er blot det seneste i en række forfærdelige terrorangreb, der, ligesom 11. september 2001, udspringer af den 30 år gamle Al Yamama olie-for-våben-aftale mellem de britiske og saudiske monarkier. En aftale, der skabte nutidens jihadistiske apparat som et dække for krigsoperationer, der har til formål at destabilisere rivaliserende nationer, med Rusland og Kina som hovedmål. Få hele historie her: lpac.co/orlando

Britisk, saudisk og FBI's medskyldighed i massedrab i Orlando, Florida, afsløret: Det er de samme, som gav os 11. september

16. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Det indledningsvis børneeventyr, der fortalte, at massedrabene i Orlando var Islamisk Stats værk, disintegrerer hastigt i takt med, at nye beviser peger på den selv samme kombination af magter, der udførte de oprindelige 11. september-angreb – briterne, saudierne og FBI.

Massemorderen fra Orlando, Omar Mateen, var en mangeårig ansat hos et af den britiske Krones største og mest modbydelige private sikkerhedstjenester – G4S, der har 620.000 ansatte i flere end 100 lande. G4S er det tredjestørste, private selskab i verden, og det er en afgørende del af det britiske monarkis »usynlige imperium«, bestående af private lejesoldater, mordere og hemmelige operatører. I USA har G4S sikkerhedskontrakter på 90 % af nationens atomkraftværker, er en hovedunderentreprenør for USA's Departement for Intern Sikkerhed (Homeland Security), og udførte endda sikkerhedsopgaverne for offshore olieplatformene fra British Petroleum i Den mexicanske Golf, hvilket er det sted, hvor Omar Mateen arbejdede i en årrække.

På trods af den kendsgerning, at kolleger krævede, at Mateen blev fyret pga. hans psykotiske og voldelige adfærd, beholdt firmaet ham og arrangerede en tilladelse til at få et hemmeligt våben for ham.

Mateen foretog to rejser til Saudi-Arabien, i 2011 og 2012,

hvor han boede på firstjernede hoteller og andre indkvarteringer i den dyre klasse. Det vides ikke, hvad han lavede der, men begge rejser fandt sted, mens han var ansat af G4S.

I næsten et helt år var Mateen genstand for en FBI-undersøgelse pga. mistanke om bånd til terrorister, men FBI droppede sluttelig sagen, og hans job hos G4S var på intet tidspunkt i fare. Faktisk gør nylige rapporter i *New York Times* og *The Intercept* det klart, at selve FBI har styret en hær af betalte »islamistiske« provokatører, der kørtes gennem de klassiske »sting-operationer«[1], der blev berømte gennem 1970'ernes og '80'ernes Operation Abscam og Brilab, hvor FBI-agenter forklædte sig som rige, saudiske prinser for at narre kongresmedlemmer og medlemmer af fagforeninger i fælder. Halvdelen af alle de såkaldte »terrorsager«, som FBI har indledt siden 11. september, involverer disse sting-teknikker, og i mange tilfælde var ofrene mentalt syge eller i desperat pengenød, eller begge dele.

Hvis man vil forstå, hvordan briterne kontrollerer og manipulerer amerikansk politik, skal man blot omhyggeligt studere denne anglo-saudiske-FBI-forbindelse. Det er dette apparat – der har været en dominerende faktor siden lanceringen af den anglo-saudiske Al Yamama olie-for-våben-aftale i 1985, med dens hemmelige offshore-konti til at finansiere global, jihadistisk terror – som må afsløres og knuses fuldstændigt, hvis USA nogensinde igen skal genvinde sin selvstændighed.

Dette er grunden til, at briterne og saudierne og FBI er rædselsslagne ved udsigten til, at de 28 sider [af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelses-rapport om 11. september fra 2002, -red.] skal blive frigivet til offentligheden. Beviserne, som indeholdes i disse sider – uagtet de løgne, der kommer fra John Brennan og Barack Obama – åbner vinduet for hele det Britiske Imperiums topstyrede kontrol over global terrorisme. Den netop indgivne Resolution

i Repræsentanternes Hus nr. 779 (H.Res.779), der kræver, at det hemmeligstemplede 28 sider lange kapitel fra den Fælles Kongresundersøgelses-rapport om 11. september omgående udgives i Kongressens protokoller, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/hres779/text>

uden indblanding fra Obama eller John Brennan, under den forfatningsmæssige opdeling af magten, er en magtfuld intervention. Det faktum, at lovforslaget blev fremstillet samme dag, som den saudiske vicekronprins og magten bag tronen, prins Mohammed bin Salman, ankom til Washington for at mødes med [udenrigsminister] John Kerry, [forsvarsminister] Ashton Carter, [chef for CIA] John Brennan, [efterretningschef] James Clapper, [formand for Repræsentanternes Hus] Paul Ryan og [tidl. formand for R.H, nuværende leder af mindretallet i samme] Nancy Pelosi, viser en perfekt timing.

Dette er et opgørets øjeblik, og alle mentalt raske kræfter må mobiliseres for at tvinge sandheden om det Britisk-Saudiske Imperium frem, og for at bringe dette imperium til fald én gang for alle.

[1] Et kompliceret undercover-spil, der planlægges og udføres omhyggeligt af agenter (især for at fange forbrydere)

Nyhedsorientering, maj/juni 2016:

Stop NATO's fremprovokation af atomkrig

Af Tom Gillesberg: Goldman Sachs fik sin kæmpebonus. Vil et britisk nej til EU lede til euroens kollaps, kaos i EU og udløse et internationalt finanskraak værre end i 2008? NATO er i gang med den største militæropbygning langs Ruslands grænse siden 2. verdenskrig. Kan vi forhindre en fortsat konfrontationspolitik, der vil føre til atomkrig? Putin åbner den asiatiske flanke, og Obamas plan for asiatisk NATO vendt imod Kina fejler. Terrorangrebet i Orlando viser, hvorfor de hemmelighedsstemplede 28- sider om terrorangrebet den 11. september 2001 må frigives. De netværk, der blev etableret og finansieret af Storbritannien og Saudi-Arabien gennem den såkaldte al-Yamama våbenhandelsaftale, og som blev beskyttet af FBI, stod ikke blot bag udåden i 2001, men står stadig bag blodige terroranslag. De er også kilden til Islamisk Stat og andre terrororganisationers store fremgang, for lande som Saudi-Arabien, Qatar og Tyrkiet har støttet dem i deres forsøg på at tage magten i Irak og Syrien. Læs mere på www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13111.

Dette er en redigeret udgave af et foredrag af Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg den 9. juni 2016. Se foredraget og den medfølgende diskussion på www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13061.

STOP 3. Verdenskrig: International terror. »Efter 'De 28 sider' – 11. september: Ti år senere«. Video, engelsk.

Følgende præsentation indeholder arkivoptagelser af angrebene på World Trade Center og Pentagon, den 11. september 2001.

Lyndon LaRouche, juni 2007: »Verden har levet under et system, som er 11. september-systemet – der allerede eksisterede, som jeg advarede om, i begyndelsen af 2001. FØR præsident George W. Bush blev indsat første gang, og hvor jeg sagde, 'Verdens system har nået et punkt, hvor et fremstormende kollaps af systemet nu er i gang. Og jeg sagde dengang, at faren består i, at noget lignende dette vil indtræffe, under de nuværende tendenser i USA, og det indtraf! Og det hed '9/11' – 11. september.'«

Se også: **USA: I har nøglerne til at standse terrorbølgen. Brug dem!**

Se også: **»Den anglo-saudiske baggrund for den aktuelle, internationale terrorisme: Frigiv sandheden, og lad os lukke imperiemagternes topstyrede terrorapparat ned, én gang for alle!«**

Leder: USA: I har nøglerne til at standse terrorbølgen: Brug dem!

**– Samt en kort gennemgang af det britiske og saudiske monarkis rolle i international terror gennem de seneste 30 år, inkl. video:
‘Beyond the 28 Pages – 9/11, Ten Years Later’**

13. juni 2016 (Leder) – Det masseorderiske voldsorgie i Orlando, Florida, angiveligt begået af en tilhænger af Islamisk Stat, Omar Mateen, er blot det seneste i en række af forfærdelige terrorangreb, der alle udspringer af den tredive år gamle »olieaftale« mellem det britiske og det saudiske monarki. Denne aftale har givet dem stor magt og store, skjulte ressourcer til at skabe nutidens globale jihadistiske organisation for angreb imod nationer.

Med mindre, og før, denne anglo-saudiske organisation afsløres – som vi kan gøre det med afsløringen af de dokumenter om 11. september, der er blevet hemmeligholdt i 15 år – og opløses, vil verden konstant stå over for blinde terrorangreb, over alt

og til enhver tid.

Præsident Obama blev en overlagt og villig agent for briterne og saudierne i sine evindelige krige, der har spredt kaos i hele Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og terror i hele verden.

Hvilket »sammenstræf«, at Obama skal mødes med den saudiske kronprins Salman i Washington, mens hans CIA-direktør, John Brennan, gør sit yderste for at »frikende« Saudi-Arabien for sin rolle i at arrangere angrebene den 11. september og drabene på 3.000 amerikanere. Både Obama og Prins Salman mødes med blodige hænder.

EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at han har været klar over denne britisk-saudiske magt for ondskab i årtier; og at dette bidrog til, at han den 2. januar, 2001, fremkom med en særdeles offentlig og publiceret advarsel om, at der forelå en trussel om et større terrorangreb mod USA, der ville finde sted i efteråret 2001.

»Det er stadig det samme, det drejer sig om, selv i gårsdagens masse mord i Orlando«, sagde LaRouche.

Den unge Orlando-drabsmand var rejst til Saudi-Arabien i 2011 og 2012, mens han var ansat i det britiske, internationale sikkerhedsfirma G4S; og han kom tilbage som en tilsyneladende meget forandret person.

LaRouche understregede, at, fordi Obamas krige nu umiddelbart fører til en konfrontation med Rusland, og truer med at blive til Tredje Verdenskrig, er det af afgørende betydning at afsløre de saudisk/britiske hænder bag – begyndende med 11. september – og at tvinge Obama ud.

'Aftalen', der lancerede 1000 angreb

I 1985 indgik Prins Bandar bin-Sultan, daværende saudisk ambassadør til USA, et langvarigt partnerskab med den britiske regering under daværende premierminister Margaret Thatcher. Under dække af en olie-for-våben-aftale ved navn Al Yamamah (arabisk for »duen«), etablerede de britiske og saudiske monarkier en offshore-fond, der voksede til enorme proportioner og er blevet brugt til at føre global terrorisme imod udpegede nationer.

I løbet af de mere end 30 år, siden Al Yamamah blev lanceret, har de britiske og saudiske monarkier ophobet langt over \$100 mia. i en kæde af hemmelige offshore-fonde, til finansiering af terrorisme, politiske mord, kupplaner og andre forbrydelser som den aktuelle saudisk/britisk/amerikanske invasion og bombing af Yemen.

Under Al Yamamah sendte den britiske våbenproducent BAE Systems for anslået \$40 mia. våben til det Saudiske Forsvars- og Luftvåbenministerium, og for anslået yderligere \$20 mia. i bestikkelser til saudiske prinser og regeringsfolk inden for forsvaret. Til gengæld sendte saudierne 600.000 tønder olie pr. dag til briterne. Gennem de anglo-hollandske oliegi-ganter British Petroleum og Royal Dutch Shell blev olien solgt på de internationale spotmarkeder og skabte profitter for hundreder af milliarder af dollars. En *EIR*-undersøgelse fra 2007 anslog, at, som et minimum, blev \$100 mia. i overskud ophobet og deponeret i hemmelige offshore bankkonti, til brug for hemmelige, fælles anglo-saudiske operationer.

I en officiel biografi pralede Prins Bandar med at bruge disse hemmelige midler og med den særlige natur af Al Yamamah-aftalen, som kun kunne have været gennemført mellem to absolutte monarkier, der kunne agere over loven og udviske

skellet mellem offentlige og private handlinger.

ISIS har, med andre ord, absolut IKKE været verdens rigeste, islamistiske terroroperation.

I 2007, da de britiske medier gennemførte en begrænset afsløring af Al Yamamah-bestikkelsesskandalen, lukkede den britiske premierminister Tony Blair den britiske Afdeling for Alvorligt Bedrageris (SF0) efterforskning, med den begrundelse, at det anglo-saudiske partnerskab var af afgørende betydning for den britiske nationale sikkerhed. Ordren til at lukke efterforskningen kom få timer efter, at den schweiziske regering havde besluttet at give SF0 adgang til de hemmelige bankkonti, tilhørende Wafiq Said, en stråmand for Al Yamamah-midlerne.

Al Yamamah-aftalen var en lukrativ transaktion for Prins Bandar, som fik en kommission for sin rolle i lanceringen af programmet på mindst \$2 mia. (amerikanske efterretningskilder anslår, at Bandar fik mere end \$10 mia. for aftalen).

Spørgsmålet om 3.000 dræbte amerikanere

Bandar er direkte indblandet i angrebene den 11. september på World Trade Center og Pentagon. Penge fra den personlige bankkonto tilhørende Bandar og hans hustru, prinsesse Haifa (søster til den mangeårige direktør for saudisk efterretning, Prins Turki-al-Faisal), blev videregivet til to af de oprindelige flykaprere fra 11. september, Khalid al-Mihdhar og Nawaf al-Hazmi, via de saudiske efterretningsofficerer Omar al-Bayoumi og Osama Basnan. Penge overførtes fra Bank of Englands konti fra det Britiske Forsvarsministeriums Støttekontor til Forsvarseksport (DESO) til Bandars konto i

Riggs National Banks. Desuden modtog al-Bayoumi og Basnan penge gennem en 'skygge'-ansættelse i et saudisk forsvarsfirma, Dalah Aviation, der var eneste entrepriseindehaver for det Saudiske Forsvarsministerium.

En føderal dommer (dvs. udpeget af præsidenten) i Sarasota, Florida, gennemgår nu flere end 80.000 sider af tilbageholdte FBI-dokumenter, der drejer sig om en celle bestående af flykaprerne den 11. september, og dennes forbindelser til en prominent, rig, saudisk forretningsmand med stærke bånd til det saudiske monarki. Nogle uger før angrebene den 11. september, forlod den saudiske familie, der opholdt sig i et indhegnet bosted i Sarasota, meget pludseligt landet. De efterlod sig ejendele, der indikerede, at de brød op med meget kort varsel. FBI gennemførte en uddybende undersøgelse af familien, fordi de husede tre af flykaprerne fra 11. september, inkl. ringlederen Mohammed Atta i mange tilfælde, iflg. sikkerhedslogs og videooptagelser, der viser Atta og de andre gå ind og ud af ejendommen.

FBI hemmeligholdt dokumenterne og det faktum, at de foretog en undersøgelse, for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse og 11. september-kommissionen. Tidligere senator Bob Graham, der var med-formand i den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, hævder nu, at eksistensen af forbindelsen mellem de saudiske royale og Sarasota-cellen, når dette ses i sammenhæng med beviset for den saudiske regerings støtte til San Diego-cellen, nu rejser yderligere spørgsmål om angrebene 11. september. Hvad med Herndon, staten Virginia, og Paterson, staten New Jersey, har senator Graham offentligt spurgt?

Et 47 sider langt dokument, skrevet af de to stabsmedlemmer af 11. september-kommissionen, der tidligere havde arbejdet for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, og som havde skrevet det 28 sider lange, undertrykte kapitel, identificerede i alt 20 saudiske regeringsfolk med beviselige bånd til de 19 flykaprere forud for angrebene 11. september.

Disse forbindelser gik fra det sydlige Californien til den Saudiske Ambassade i Washington og til den Saudiske Ambassade i Berlin, Tyskland. Tidligere flådeminister John Lehman, medlem af 11. sept.-kommissionen, sagde til '60 Minutes', at kommissionen ikke førte en uddybende undersøgelse af de ledetråde, der burde have været forfulgt, og som relaterede til det saudiske monarki og det saudiske regimes støtte til flykaprerne. Lehman, blandt andre kommissionsmedlemmer, har krævet en tilbundsgående, fra øverst til nederst, ny undersøgelse af 11. sept. – en undersøgelse, hvor alle de undertrykte ledetråde og åbne spor til de saudiske royale fuldt ud forfølges.

I løbet af denne trediveårige periode med Al Yamamah-programmet er der flydt penge fra disse hemmelige offshore-konti, så vel som også gennem saudiske velgørenhedsorganisationer, til finansiering af et globalt netværk af moskeer og madrasser (skoler), der har rekrutteret flere generationer til det ekstreme wahhabi/salafist-apparat, som udgør rekrutteringspuljen til sunni jihadistisk terror over hele verden.

Hvad der skal gøres

De beviser, der indeholdes i det stadig hemmeligstemplede, 28 sider lange kapitel af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelse af 11. sept., åbner døren til en optrevling af hele det anglo-saudiske terrorapparat. Uden en forståelse af den rolle, som det britiske monarki og de britiske efterretningstjenester har spillet i det jihadistiske apparat, er det umuligt at lukke dets evne til at operere ned.

CIA-direktøren fremførte i et interview søndag, at amerikanere »ikke burde tro på« dette 28-siders kapitel, som han nu frygter, vil blive tvunget til at blive frigivet, med en

ophævelse af hemmeligstemplingen. Men et republikansk medlem af Kongressen rapporterede i et tweet, »CIA-direktøren må referere til nogle andre 28 sider end dem, jeg har læst. Frigiv dem, og lad det amerikanske folk træffe afgørelsen.« I har i jeres hænder midlerne til at gå til modangreb mod denne britisk/saudiske operation. Brug dem. Fremtving en offentliggørelse af de saudiske beviser. Fremtving Obamas afgang. »Dette må gøres hurtigt«, sagde LaRouche i dag, »for at forhindre yderligere international ødelæggelse.«

Video: *'Beyond the 28-pages – 9/11: Ten Years Later'* – Otte måneder før angrebene 11. september, 2001, forudsagde Lyndon LaRouche, at USA havde en høj risiko for en begivenhed à la 'Rigsdagsbranden', en begivenhed, der ville gøre det muligt for dem, der var ved magten, gennem diktatoriske midler at styre en økonomisk og samfundsmæssig krise, som de i modsat fald ikke var kompetente til at håndtere. Vi lever nu i det ubrudte kølvand af dette stykke historie.

Titelbillede: Obama og Kong Salman bin Abdulaziz under et af præsidentens mange besøg i Saudi-Arabien samtidig med, at han opretholdt mørklægningen af 11. september. [flickr/whitehouse]

]

Barske ord; Hvem kan høre dem?

(Lyndon LaRouche) – Hovedtale ved konferencen i San Francisco (v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche)

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det

9. juni 2016 (Leder) – I går lykkedes det næsten indgriben fra FBI at forhindre Lyndon LaRouches deltagelse via internet i en stor konference i Nordcalifornien, arrangeret af hans medarbejdere. Hvis ikke lederskabet dér havde grebet ind i tide, ville LaRouche ikke have kunnet deltage.

Da LaRouche endelig kunne tale, var hans udgangspunkt den aktuelle, akutte trussel mod den menneskelige eksistens.

»Det væsentligste spørgsmål, jeg bekymrer mig om, er truslerne mod den menneskelige arts eksistens, i det totale område, lige nu. For, lige nu, på dette tidspunkt, står hele den menneskelige arts eksistens på den yderste rand, og vi må derfor være lydhøre over for at forstå, hvad det er for problemer, der er involveret i det her, og hvad det er for midler, der kan sikre en udvej for menneskeheden generelt.

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det.«

Men fra dette øjeblik og fremefter – lad os sige det ligeud – rev hovedindholdet i LaRouches bemærkninger slemme i nerverne på mange lyttere. Han blev ved med at komme tilbage til spørgsmålet om personlig identitet, men især spørgsmålet om hans egen personlige identitet. På et spørgsmål om, hvordan det individuelle sind overvinder forhindringer for at vinde en kamp for menneskeheden, svarede han:

»Lad mig sige, at jeg har temmelig gode levnedsegenskaber. Jeg er en aktiv person i samfundet, og jeg er en ældre person, og en erfaren, ældre person, en af de mest erfarne af alle personer i denne kategori. Så jeg tror ikke, nogen ville have nogen vanskeligheder med at forstå, hvem jeg er, hvad jeg er, hvor jeg kom fra og hvad jeg gør.

Andre personer holder måske fast ved en idé om en anden identitet hos en anden person, som jeg ikke kender, men sådan synes det at være.«

LaRouche drejede næsten hvert spørgsmål rundt på denne måde. Dette her irriterer dig måske, men det første spørgsmål, du skal stille dig selv, er: er det sandt? Er det sådan, at »tingene bare sker«, eller er det sådan, at »tingene bringes til at ske« af mænd og kvinder, der, som LaRouche sagde, er »kvalificeret til at skabe historie?« Da MacArthur blev tvunget ud af Filippinerne den 12. marts 1942, var det da rigtigt af ham at sige, »Jeg vender tilbage«, eller burde han have ændret det til »vi vender tilbage«? Ville mennesket have klaret at komme til Månen i 1969 – eller nogensinde – hvis det ikke havde været for den enlige skikkelse, den første og største tyske rumpioner, Hermann Oberth (1894-1989). Oberth var fattig det meste af sit liv. Efter at have kæmpet for rumrejser i årtier, havde han næppe mødt en eneste person, der både var enig i, og forstod, disses betydning. Men det er takket være denne »næppe en eneste person«, såsom Werner von Braun, at vi fik den revolution, som var rumprogrammet.

På et spørgsmål om, hvordan vi kan afgøre, hvorvidt vore

forestillinger er fantasteri eller er sandfærdige, svarede LaRouche:

»Hvorfor siger vi simpelthen ikke, lad os identificere et sandfærdigt eksempel, en sandfærdig identitet. Jeg er. Og enhver, der vil benægte dette, ville tage fejl, ville være tåbelig.

Jeg er kendt som, identificeret som en historisk skikkelse igennem det meste af det 20. århundrede, og de fleste mennesker fra det 20. århundrede bør vide, hvem jeg er, og de bør vide, hvad jeg gør. De kender måske ikke alle detaljer omkring, hvad jeg gør, men sådan er det: Jeg er en prominent, en særdeles prominent, skikkelse på denne planet, blandt de mest prominente.«

Den senere del af det 20. århundrede ville have været uigenkendelig, hvis det ikke havde været for LaRouches sejr over det britiske, økonomiske system i en debat i 1971 på Queens College, New York, som dernæst, ad indirekte veje, førte til hans sejr med det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i Reaganregeringen i 1983.**

Dette banede igen vejen for hans og hans hustru Helgas initiativ, som nu er blevet til den Eurasiske Landbro og den Nye Silkevej, og som er det 21. århundredes hovedudvikling frem til i dag.

Hvorfor er det så irriterende at lytte til det indlysende: at LaRouche er en hovedskikkelse i det 20. og 21. århundrede? Fordi vi i skolen lærte om demokratiets dyder? Er det den virkelige årsag, eller skyldes det snarere, at vi lukker ørerne, fordi vi finder det mere beroligende for os personligt at benægte, at nogen mand eller kvinde rent faktisk kan være ansvarlig for menneskets tilstand og menneskehedens skæbne?

Læs her Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedindlæg på konferencen i San Francisco, Californien, den 8. juni:

“Vi må atter blive sande amerikanere”.

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 10. juni
2016**

Jeg vil indlede vores diskussion med at påpege, hvad hr. LaRouche i de seneste dage meget klart har sagt: Vi befinder os i en ekstraordinært farlig periode i verdenshistorien. Det kan ikke ses tydeligere end af disse militærmanøvrer, der finder sted på de østeuropæiske grænser (Ruslands vestlige grænser). Disse kombinerede NATO-øvelser, der finder sted hele vejen op og ned langs Ruslands grænse, fra De baltiske Stater, ind i Polen og derfra mod syd. Dette er en kombination af fire forskellige, angiveligt uafhængige krigsspil, men det involverer live troppemanøvrer, af hvilke den største hedder "Anaconda 2016". Denne manøvre involverer 30.000 tropper fra 24 forskellige lande, inkl. 14.000 amerikanere, 12.000 polakker, 1000 faldskærmstropper og den virkelige krydsning af

nøglefloden dér, Vistuta-floden; samt træning af natlige angreb, tungt militærisenkram, 35 helikoptere, 3.000 militærkøretøjer, flådemanoøvrer osv.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST BECOME TRUE AMERICANS AGAIN!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast; June 10, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's June 10th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. As you'll notice, we're taking a little bit of a different format than customary today. We have a roundtable format, joined in the studio by Megan Beets and Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC basement science team; and also Kesha Rogers and Mike Steger are both joining us from the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee via video. So, we're going to have a little bit of a freer kind of roundtable discussion here.

I'd like to begin our discussion by just pointing out, what I think has been said very, very clearly in the recent days by Mr. LaRouche, that we're in an extraordinarily dangerous period of world history. This couldn't be made more clear than seeing these military maneuvers which are happening on the eastern border of Europe (the western border of Russia). These combined NATO maneuvers which are happening all the way up and down the border of Russia, from the Baltic States, into Poland, and then south from there. This is a combination of four different, supposedly independent, war games, but it involves live troop

maneuvers, the largest of which is called "Anaconda 2016." That one involves 30,000 troops from 24 different countries, including 14,000 Americans, 12,000 Polish soldiers, 1,000 paratroopers, the actual crossing of the key river there, the Vistula River; and the exercise of nighttime assaults, military hardware, 35 helicopters, 3,000 military vehicles, naval maneuvers, and so forth.

If you take that, together with the three other maneuvers that are happening right now, you have approximately 60,000 troops that are engaged in military maneuvers all along the border of Russia. As Helga LaRouche pointed out, this the greatest troop and military hardware maneuver that you've had on Russia's border since World War II – the mobilization by Hitler of the Nazi forces prior to the invasion of what was then the Soviet Union. Obviously, this many troops engaged in live military maneuvers, not only creates a very strong possibility for some accident occurring, which could trigger a rapid escalation towards a very hot war, which could escalate very quickly; but also it's very clearly a provocation, which is being taken by NATO with Obama in the leadership, directly towards Russia. And it's being seen as such in the context of other things, by the Russian President and other leading members of the Russian military. It's also being recognized as such by various forces within Europe. {Der Spiegel}, one of the leading news magazines in Germany, put out a story on Wednesday, saying these war maneuvers along the Russian borders, are "going too far", and

"are playing at real war". Clearly, any war that were to break out between NATO and Russia would very quickly lead to not a limited, not a tactical, but an all-out strategic, thermonuclear war.

If you combine this with Obama's upcoming trip to attend the NATO Heads of State Summit in Warsaw, Poland, while these war games are actively taking place, along with his refusal to sit down with President Putin to discuss the deployment of these AEGIS anti-missile systems along the Russian border, which have been characterized as a "Cuban Missile Crisis in Reverse," along with the trillion dollar allocation that Obama has recently signed off on, to modernize the U.S. military arsenal, including these B61-12 nuclear warheads, and the long-range LRSO [Long Range Standoff] cruise missiles; all of these, taken together, along with the simultaneous provocations that are happening by U.S. forces against China in the South China Sea.

Any sane person should be asking themselves, "Why are we driving the world towards the point of a war of extinction, when we could be taking up Chinese President Xi Jinping's offer to engage in a new strategic and economic architecture for the planet, based on win-win cooperation?" This danger, and also the very real possibility of a paradigm shift, were both put on the table at a very significant seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institute that occurred on Wednesday in San Francisco, California. Both Kesha and Mike were participants. It was titled, "Will the U.S. Join the New Silk Road? Global Scientific

Development, or Nuclear War?" Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave an extensive and very thorough overview of this war danger in her keynote address; and Mr. LaRouche, in his remarks, said very clearly – this is the very beginning of what Mr. LaRouche said,

"The key thing I'm concerned about, is the threats to the existence of the human species in the total area right now; because right now, at this time, the existence of the entire human species continues to be on the edge of jeopardy. And therefore we have to attune ourselves to understanding what the

problems are that are involved in this, and what are the remedies

for which we can get an escape for humanity in general. Humanity

in general right now is under serious threat of jeopardy on a global scale." So, that's very clearly said by Mr. LaRouche.

Also, I consider very significantly, in response to a question which was posed from former United States Senator Mike

Gravel, who was also a participant, a speaker in this seminar. He

posed a question to one of the other participants, Sergey Petrov,

the Consul-General of the Russian Consulate in San Francisco, to

which Mr. Petrov said that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war, as some as some people would be delusional enough to

believe. What the Consul-General of Russia said at the Schiller

Institute gathering in San Francisco, is the following: "I share

the understanding that we are very close to a major conflict. And

I add that there is no possibility of a 'limited nuclear war.' If

that starts, it will be the end of the world."

I think the starkness of this statement, combined with what

Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche both had to say, really underscores the sobriety with which we have to approach the discussion which we will have here today. Since both Kesha and Mike were participants in that seminar, I'm going to leave a little bit of the further discussion of the proceedings of that

event until a little bit later in the show. The seminar also involved Mr. Howard Chang, an internationally renowned expert on water projects.

But before we open up the discussion, I would like to play a

short – approximately 10 minute – excerpt from the keynote speech that Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave. This is the concluding excerpt of her remarks. She asked two questions: (1) How did we

get here?; and (2) What is the solution to the crisis we now face? I just want to underscore, what you'll hear Mrs. LaRouche

say in this excerpt, is what Mr. LaRouche reiterated, and I think

is the subject that we have to pay attention to here today: that

both the LaRouche movement in general, and Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche

as individuals, {have played the crucial, central, historical role} in not only creating the possibility for a solution to this

crisis, going all the way back to their proposal for the Eurasian

Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, in the aftermath of the collapse

of the Soviet Union; but also continued to play the crucial role

in providing the possibility for humanity to escape this crisis.

This seminar in San Francisco was a crucial element of that, but it's part of an ongoing series of interventions internationally, which include a very prominent conference in Europe that the Schiller Institute is sponsoring, coming up within the next two weeks. So, we'll have more discussion on all of that after we hear this short except from Mrs. Helga LaRouche's keynote speech.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Okay, now, let me introduce the third [subject I want to talk about]. The solution to all of this would be a piece of cake. It is already there! A New Silk Road is integrated. We called it at that time, first, the Productive Triangle; in 1991 we called it the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, which was the idea that when the Iron Curtain had fallen, [to integrate] the populations in the industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. This New Silk Road program would have changed the world in the direction of a peace order already in '91, but, unfortunately, you had Bush, Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, you had François Mitterrand, who all had completely different ideas. They [wanted to reduce Russia] from a superpower into a Third World, raw-material-producing country, and they imposed the "shock therapy" in the Yeltsin period. They dismantled the Russian potential in three years , and they had no intention to allow Germany to have any kind of economic relation with Russia. So it did not happen.

You had the '90s, which were genocide against Russia. You had all of the consequences of the Bush period. You had the eight

years of Clinton, which was a certain interruption; but then with

Bush, Jr. and Obama, you went back to the old project of an American Century doctrine and the idea of a unilateral world.

Fortunately, in 2013, President Xi Jinping announced a New

Silk Road to be {the} strategic objective of China. In the almost

three years which have passed since, this idea to end geopolitics, to establish in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, a win-win cooperation among all nations on the planet, is

progressing extremely quickly. Remember, the ancient Silk Road was a fantastic cooperation in terms of exchange of culture, goods, paper, technology, porcelain, silk, silk-producing, and many other cultural manifestations. It led to a tremendous benefit for all the countries which participated, from Asia to Europe.

The New Silk Road, obviously, is doing exactly that. The

amount of projects which have been concluded between China and ASEAN countries, China and Latin American countries, China and Europe, China and African countries, China and East European countries, and now, in a very clear fashion, the economic integration between the Eurasian Economic Union, headed by Russia, and the New Silk Road, [is progressing very well. An alliance] has been formed between Russia and China, with India being the third factor in the situation. Many, many other countries have been joining.

Contrary to what you read and hear in the mass media, China

is not doing badly. They are shifting their economic orientation

from an export orientation, because the export markets in the trans-Atlantic sector are shrinking. They are now going more in

infrastructure investment in many countries in the world, and

to
develop the inner region of China. [To raise the] consumer [to
a]
higher standard of their own population, since they have
lifted
600 million people out of poverty, [into a] decent living
standard in China. This is indeed the absolute correct policy,
to
say we will uplift the remaining people who are still poor,
and
also make them participate in the Chinese economic miracle.

Xi Jinping has [offered] to President Obama that the
United
States [should] not only by helping to ,
which I think is the moral obligation of the United States,
given
the fact that they were the key reason why these countries are
now in such disarray; by participating in the building of
Africa,
which I think the West has an absolute moral obligation. The
reason why you have millions of people as refugees, not only
risking their lives, drowning in the Mediterranean, dying in
the
Sahara, which has even more victims than even the
Mediterranean.
Fifty years of IMF policy has denied economic development to
Africa! The reason why people are taking a risk of a 50%
chance
that they will die, to cross the Mediterranean, is because
they
are running from war, from hunger, from epidemics, and this is
the result of Western policy denying this continent economic
development! We have a moral obligation to join hands to
develop
southwest Asia, to develop Africa.

The United States also needs a Silk Road. If you look
at the

figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, productivity has collapsed over seven years in a row. All the indexes are going down. The United States population is in a terrible condition, or at least in the poorer parts; while the rich become more rich and Wall Street is having a heyday with cocaine parties and plotting destruction for the rest of the world.

The United States needs an infrastructure project. The roads are bad, the traffic is ridiculous. People spend hours and hours every day in commuting, risking to disappear with their cars into a pothole. They have no rail system. China has built 20,000 km fast train system up to the end of last year; they plan to have 50,000 km by the year 2020, uniting every major city in China through a fast train system, which are fantastic – they're smooth, they're fast, they're quiet. How many kilometers of fast train systems has the United States built? Zero!

So, for the United States to build its own Silk Road, to connect with the global development perspective is a question of its own best self-interest. We have to get the United States off this confrontation course, and simply say, we have to shift this policy and all this trillion-dollar investment in modernization of nuclear arsenals and the largest military budget in the world, trying to maintain an empire which is collapsing anyway.

Rather,
shift, get rid of Wall Street, impose Glass-Steagall, get back
to
a policy of Alexander Hamilton, a credit policy; invest in
infrastructure and go in the direction of a win-win
cooperation
with the other nations of the world – with Russia, China,
European nations, India; build up Latin America, build up
Africa
and Southwest Asia.

This is really the choice before the United States. I
know
this is very difficult for you to think how this should be
done,
but you know, think about Kennedy; think about the kind of
optimistic country the United States used to be. Think about
the
idea that America was built to be "a beacon of hope and a
temple
of liberty," where people from the whole world would go and
try
to be free. The U.S. singing the National Anthem, "the land of
the free." Is the United States the land of the free today? I
don't think anybody who is in their right mind would say that
today.

Go back to the values of the American Republic, as it
was
founded by people like Benjamin Franklin, or George
Washington;
go back to the policies of Alexander Hamilton, Franklin D.
Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. I think if the
United States could mobilize itself to bring back that nation,
the whole world would love to be friends of the United
States again. Right now, I can tell you, the rest of the world
has almost given up on the United States, and when they look
at
the election process, the choice between a very, very

irrational

Donald Trump and unfortunately a very, very predictable Hillary

Clinton, given her statements about confrontation against Russia

and China. I think you have to really mobilize now. And I think

the 28 pages, Glass-Steagall – these are flanks which can derail

the situation long before this election is going to take place.

We have to have a completely new world. Remember, mankind is

not a beast, and mankind is not bound to do what seems to be inevitable. Mankind is the only species capable of reason, capable of free will, of defining and designing a beautiful future, and then going to implement that. The last time was with

Kennedy, the Apollo Project. I think we can absolutely do it again! I think you have a great possibility in front of you. I would encourage you – be American! Be true Americans again, and

the whole world will be the most happy and embrace you!

OGDEN: So, that was a short excerpt from Helga LaRouche's opening remarks at the San Francisco seminar; and the full proceedings of that seminar will be made available as they are processed. The first panel is available on YouTube now. And as

I said, both Kesha and Michael Steger were participants in that

event; so maybe I can just throw the discussion open to one of the two of you guys right now, to follow up on what we just heard

from Helga.

MICHAEL STEGER: Sure, thanks Matt. One of the most

interesting, one of the key aspects of this whole process and what our organization does, was demonstrated at the discussion process in San Francisco on Wednesday. You have key people in their areas: Obviously, Senator Mike Gravel represents what is a

true American political tradition; to recognize that you fight for what's true, you go against popular opinion and peer pressure. And he was very clear on that question; you don't go

along to get along. As Lyndon LaRouche often says, "You can't fight politically and go along with the popular opinion."

Dr. Howard Chang is a leading civil engineer; obviously the Consul-General of Russia was someone who spoke on behalf of his

country. But the key question is that the standards our organization represents in this existential crisis is something

unique; it gives these individuals an opportunity to wage a political fight at the level necessary that inspires them towards

what mankind can accomplish, and also addresses the real crisis

in the world today. It's far too often that people who want to

address the economic crisis, people who want to address the increasing and escalating war danger, fall far short of the necessary to want to work with us. And two, to recognize the quality of method which is necessary to address these problems.

These problems are of great scope and magnitude; it's not fixing

a pothole, although we have many potholes to fix as Helga points

out. And apparently, the Chinese won't even be allowed to build

– they wanted to build a small segment of high-speed rail

between Los Angeles and Las Vegas; very easy. Actually, east of
of
Los Angeles in the desert. And I guess apparently they won't
even be allowed to build that in the United States. So, we
can't
build any high-speed rail; it's just been outlawed basically.
This just came out.

But the size and scope of these problems cannot be –
steps
cannot be taken that simply alleviate one's guilt; or the
tension
on one's own identity regarding the dangers of nuclear war, or
the increasing crisis that the economic collapse presents to
many
Americans. Too many people want to look for a quick solution;
an
easy mechanism that "Maybe I can vote for this person, or that
person." At this point, I think most people realize they
can't
vote for either of these people; yet you'll still find them
consumed to discuss "Well, who do you vote for, though?"
They're
not willing to recognize that there's a higher method which is
required to act to address this kind of crisis. And I think
if
you look at Lyndon LaRouche's comments at the discussion, he
makes this somewhat clear in his remarks. Because there is
something unique towards mankind's ability to advance.
Mankind
does not advance – unlike any other animal species on the
planet
– simply because it doesn't like the problems it sees. It's
able to advance and evolve because of a unique creative
capacity;
essentially to become more beautiful, to become more creative.
To
make the discoveries about the Universe that have not been

discovered before. And that commitment, that approach is oftentimes what's lacking; and as Helga said, we need real leadership in the United States, we need leadership in Europe today. The problem can be solved so easily.

The New Silk Road, the Eurasian development projects are so extensive, they're ongoing; there are collaborations between China, India, and Russia. And then the nations of central Asia, of Southeast Asia; the strategic intervention in the war domain in Southwest Asia; all of these are now being addressed in a fundamentally different way than they were by the United States and NATO for the last 15 years since the 9/11 attacks. Which has just been ongoing war and destruction.

So, there's a comprehensive picture that the United States and Europe could participate in. So, why aren't we? Why don't we take those steps? Simply raising red flags that we're near nuclear war, or simply complaining and trying to figure out which of the lesser evils you vote for, are just obviously insufficient. So, why does that remain the discussion? The discussion has to take on a higher standard; and I think that's what Lyn has already recognized over these 50 years. Because if you think of it, 50 years ago, there was a quality of leadership of this nature. John Kennedy recognized that the way you uplift and strengthen a country is to set out on a mission that's never been accomplished before; but it wasn't just the Moon. It was

the largest water projects, and the development of Africa.
John
Kennedy's view of the world and of the Universe had a great
scope
and magnitude to it, to help uplift the population; it wasn't
a
practical campaign. Someone like Martin Luther King had a
similar outlook; and you saw that inspire people like Bobby
Kennedy and Malcolm X, but there was a resonance. You saw the
same thing from the great scientists like Krafft Ehricke; the
visionaries in the space program didn't look at it as kind of
fun
engineering projects. They saw it as something of a cultural
advancement of the human species. And there was a resonance
with
this quality of leadership politically, that unfortunately, I
think what was made clear by the seminar, is that many people
are
attracted, they gravitate towards this quality of leadership
if
they have a sense of honesty; but that the ability to
demonstrate
this method, to act upon that quality of the human mind and
human
creativity is a challenge for much of the population in the
United States and Europe today. And the standard that they
have
to come up to, is not just acknowledging the dangers, but a
standard of operating to embolden and strengthen the
population
to solve these problems and to move our civilization upwards.

And I think that really was the culminating nature of
the
discussion on Wednesday at the seminar; and it really is to
bring
more people into this quality of an organization. Of what we
are

as a political organization, but that we must become what the nation is. And that requires our population must become better; they must become more courageous, more intelligent, and more beautiful if we're actually going to address these problems. Because they're not going to be addressed from any simple mechanisms; and I think that really was the fight we waged here for the seminar, and I think the only way to deal with the current crisis you presented at the beginning.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to continue with that theme, and add that I think what we have to look at is the unique role of Mr. LaRouche over these years to identify a science of physical economy; which characterizes him in a way that was the understanding of both Krafft Ehricke and other leaders from the standpoint of the rejection – shall we say people that Michael brought up, such as John F Kennedy, such as Lincoln, Martin Luther King. A rejection of a limits to growth policy. And this is what Mr. LaRouche has organized as the founding principle of his economic policy in terms of what is the essential role of the advancement of mankind.

During the presentation, I had an opportunity to actually work with Michael and others there for the conference that was just held in San Francisco. And I presented on the unique role of Krafft Ehricke, the German space pioneer; and what he represented from the standpoint of putting forth the epistemology

and the philosophy on human nature's identity in terms of creating an open world system. Which was this idea that you reject the Club of Rome meadows and foresters limits to growth population reduction; the Malthusian policy that human beings are nothing more than small lily pads, mindless beings. That they have no conception of advancing human creativity. And this is what was the unique role defining Krafft Ehrlicke from the standpoint that he knew that is was not just a matter of promoting technological advancements; but what do these technological advances do to improve upon the conditions of human life and the progress of mankind overall.

And this has been something that Mr. LaRouche understood is crucial in his science of physical economy, from the standpoint that you're not just looking at technological advancement from speaking of just one leap. But you're talking about a succession of leaps in economic progress in society. And during the relationship that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche developed with the identity and role of Krafft Ehrlicke as a scientist and genius of his time, is really exemplified in what Mr. LaRouche continued to develop around his policy for a Moon-Mars colonization program. I think that people who have not actually studied the significance of Mr. LaRouche and why he became a threat to this zero-growth policy, because he continued to push the limits, push mankind beyond the so-called limitations that have been put on mankind; just as Krafft Ehrlicke understood that our extraterrestrial imperative was to actually remove all limitations and barriers from the progress of mankind. And the best way to do this was

through the advancement of man into the colonization of space.

And I think it's important to note, that some people start

to put themselves into this smallness of thinking, in this mindless thinking. "Well, how are we going to travel into space

if we can't actually solve the problems here on Earth?" And Mr.

LaRouche made it a priority to actually organize an understanding

of what real technological advancement is; this was exactly the

thinking of John F Kennedy in the progress of the commitment of

the Moon landing, of sending a man to the Moon and bringing him

safely back to Earth. That this was going to lead to technological advancements that would pay themselves off several

times over; but what was going to be essential for it, is that you had to have breakthroughs as Mr. LaRouche called for, in several categories of technology that was actually going to be essential for bringing about an increase in the productivity of

society. You take the example; you look at this massive undertaking of what Krafft Ehricke did in the design and development of what took men to the Moon, in terms of the Saturn

V rocket. It wasn't something that was just thrown together on

the cheap; you couldn't have just Wall Street and Elon Musk going

in there and saying, "OK, let us just throw a spacecraft up."

This took some real engineering; it was a total transformation in

terms of the economic conditions of society. Thousands, millions

of people were put to work; the spin-off technologies that went into it. Mr. LaRouche called for the advancement of four categories of technology, in thermonuclear fusion and related plasma technologies; or development of electromagnetic radiation of high energy density. Basically promoting new synthetic materials or the production of the colonization of Mars; that you were going to actually have to have flotillas in developing low-Earth orbit. And putting materials on the Moon to actually lead to the colonization of Mars. How are we going to get there?

We had to have engineers, we had to have astrophysicists.

The technical considerations are all laid out very prominently, but I think what it really represents is a transformation of the human species; and that's what Mr. LaRouche

was very crucial in, saying that you had to actually have a different identity of who we are as human beings. That we are actually distinct from the animal species; and that no limitations can be put on mankind to keep them in a state of bestiality. And the question of technological advancement is, are these advancements being made in a so-called barbaric society

that wants to keep human beings down and keep them enslaved; and

promote a policy of limitations on growth and population reduction so these policies would not be advanced. Or, are we talking about a cultural Renaissance, where these advancements are made as Krafft Ehrlicke understood, from the standpoint of a

new conception of mankind. This is what has really brought together the minds, and why Mr. LaRouche sees Krafft Ehrlicke as

extremely fundamental to how we overcome the threats facing us

today in society.

OGDEN: Well, I think that's something that certainly you elaborated very clearly in your speech at the conference, and I think as we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche yesterday; everybody who is on this show was engaged in that discussion. Mr. LaRouche put a very emphatic emphasis on the personality of Krafft Ehricke and his courage in fighting for a vision which was not a popular vision even among the people in the space community. And Mr. LaRouche asked that more research be done on this; and I know that both you, Ben, and Megan have been immersed in this a little bit in the recent few days and weeks. So, maybe you want to give people a broader idea of some of this.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I can say something briefly. I was just looking back at comments that were made by both Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the memorial conference that was held in honor of Krafft Ehricke in 1985, following his death in 1984. And both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche reflect something which I think really does go to the essence of the importance of the personality of Krafft Ehricke in what we were able to achieve in the space program. And what they both reflected was the fact that his life made a contribution to moving the species as a whole forward; but why? It's exactly because he was not motivated by the kinds of practical considerations that were impinging on most of the population at the time; and both Lyn and

Helga reflected the fact that Krafft Ehrlicke was motivated by a total cultural optimism. That not only was it necessary, but it was also possible to move mankind forward into the Age of Reason; to move man into a paradigm where we completely left the cultural vestiges of the beast behind us. And if you look at Krafft Ehrlicke's work, which ranges from extremely technical papers on the use of liquid hydrogen fuel to fictional stories which are envisioning the first manned mission to Mars; but all of them I think are motivated by this passion and vision for a better mankind as a whole. And he came to the conclusion himself as a young man, that the way to realize that had to be space travel; had to be space colonization.

Just to add one more thing, Mrs. LaRouche was reflecting on a speaking tour that Krafft Ehrlicke did with the Schiller Institute in the 1980s in Germany. And what she reported was, that at that time, the resistance from the Greenie movements was so intense at some of these meetings, the police had to be called in. What Krafft Ehrlicke reflected on at the time was that these Greenie movements were very reminiscent of the fascist movements of the 1930s; and that's why the only way to move forward had to be by addressing exactly what you just raised, Kesha. The essence of the cultural morality of mankind; is mankind a culture

of beasts, or is mankind actually representing a culture of what
Schiller would call beautiful souls?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think highlighting the fight for that;
he fought for that. He went against the opposition even within
the scientific community for that kind of idea; and I think that
also goes back to something that Michael was saying about what's
needed today. It's people like that; it's people who are going
to fight for what's true. Not because they think it's what their
neighbors will like, or because they think it's what will make
them popular; it's because they have an internal drive that they
know that's what's needed. You pulled up this quote – it's just
one thing among many – I just thought it was indicative; this
quote of Krafft testifying in Congress in, I believe it was in
1960, the early '60s. And really emphatically pushing the need
for nuclear power for space; he said, the Universe runs on
nuclear power. The stars are run by nuclear power; this nuclear
power is an inherent part of the Universe and mankind is going to
be obsolete in his attempt to be part of the Universe more
broadly – go beyond Earth, fulfill this extraterrestrial
imperative – if we reject nuclear power. That's one thing.
Already in the early '60s, he said, if we don't do this by the
end of the decade, we're going to be obsolete in terms of our
space efforts. Nuclear power is one issue; one critical
issue,

obviously, for mankind as a whole, for space development. But you see this visionary quality of fighting against the opposition

to these breakthroughs; and being the force that says, "No, this

is what's needed," against massive opposition. The tragedy is that the opposition has taken over.

We had, under the leadership of Krafft Ehricke and people

working with him, we had a nuclear rocket pretty much built by the early '70s; it was basically a few steps away from being ready to go, and it was just cancelled. It was not found to be

too difficult; it was not found to be some failure; it was not found to be too expensive; it was just cancelled. And we've had

this zero-growth policy take over at that crucial pivot point —

the late '60s, early '70s — when Lyn really came on the scene and started to continue this fight. Obviously, Krafft resonated

with that, and came to work with the LaRouches directly based on

that; but you see the failure of departing from this visionary quality and this fight to move into the future. But I think he

exemplifies what's needed from the US population right now; you're not going to find solutions from the existing cultural, social framework. It's failed; that's expressing the failure of society.

We heard at the beginning, one of the things that strikes me

in discussing this whole war danger and the fact that we're taking steps towards nuclear war, which I think it's important,

it was stated clearly. There's no limited nuclear war;

there's
no small nuclear war, you don't take small steps. If it happens,
everything's over; it's gone. But what's potentially even more
striking than that actually being a reality on the table?
Who's
talking about it? We have a Presidential election; are these
candidates raising this as an issue? Is there any discussion
about this? I think it just underscores the importance of
that
quality of leadership needed; and exemplified by what was done
in
San Francisco. We're going to be having, coming out of the
Schiller Institute conference in Germany coming up; and what
really this movement represents in the United States.

And I think this should also be an appeal to our
viewers.

Really, this is a time when we need escalation; we need
increase;
we need more support; we need more people to be these type of
creative leaders like Krafft Ehricke, like Lyndon LaRouche.
That's the only thing that's going to save the country at this
point.

OGDEN: Yeah, Michael made a point which I thought was very
significant. That, at a time like this, when it's very clear
how
huge the dangers are, you cannot allow yourself to be any less
than the magnitude of the crisis challenges one to be. And the
magnitude and scope of thinking which is necessary to solve a
crisis of this sort, of a civilizational scale, must be huge
in
those terms. And I think one thing out of this discussion
about
Krafft Ehricke, that occurred to me is, when you're thinking

about where the entire idea of the geopolitics of the last 70 years has been rooted; it is rooted in the zero-growth technology, no development kind of paradigm. The idea that there are limited resources that a growing population is fighting over, and these territories and so forth; that is the fundamental tenet of the geopolitics that has dominated this paradigm which has now failed. When you talk about a New Paradigm, when you talk about "win-win" as Xi Jinping says it, instead of winner take all, all are winners. That fundamentally requires, it begs a new attitude towards our concept of growth; that there is no idea of limits to growth, of fixed natural resources. But that you have an ever-expanding possibility of ever-increasing potentials of growth. I think as very demonstrated, China, in a certain way, does understand that in the way that Krafft Ehricke understood it; is a central element of their current policy, is not only the One Belt, One Road policy, but it is also this exploration of the Moon. Now just going to the Moon, as a sort of space race or setting your foot on a foreign body or something like that; but saying we're going to discover fundamentally new about the Universe. And as Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing, this Chang'e mission to explore the far side of the Moon and everything that is there to be discovered. We don't even know; we don't know the

extent to which we will discover brand new things about the structure of the Universe when we explore this new territory. That, I think, speaks to this idea that the idea of a New Paradigm, a new "win-win" system, is rooted in overturning the last 70 years of this Malthusian concept of zero-growth, zero technological development, and fixed resources.

And it's only natural that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it in those terms.

DENISTON: Anything else just goes to the longer legacy of the Zeus vs. Prometheus fight. You talk about this zero-growth paradigm; where did this come from? The British; the British royal family. People like Prince Philip; people like Prince Bernhard. This oligarchical mindset. These guys are so explicit, their view of mankind is just disgusting cattle to be managed. Zeus would just pal up with these guys; they wouldn't even need to introduce themselves. They would just get together like they've known each other for ages. That mentality of this imperial conception of the management of mankind as a bestial species; that's where this zero-growth paradigm came from in this recent period, but it stretches back through history. You look at the writings of Aeschylus on the Prometheus vs. Zeus fight; the attack on Prometheus. And you see that as a reflection of a true negative principle of society at the time, which is carried through to today. This hatred of human progress; this hatred of creative development; this desire to keep mankind suppressed

to
this lower level. What angered Zeus wasn't just that he had something stolen from him; it's that he had a whole class of people he was managing, that Prometheus then gave an ability to uplift and realize their own humanity. And for that, Zeus punished him.

It's the same fight today; but today, Zeus has thermonuclear arsenals at his fingertips. We're at a clear, and I think this was very well expressed even in the discussions back in the '80s that we're talking about, with the need to move to the Age of Reason. We're at the point where mankind has developed technologically to the point where if we allow that type of process to continue, you're talking about mankind annihilating himself; and that's what we're talking about right now, with these NATO deployments. It's complete insanity. But again, as we're saying, it's not going to be solved in the negative, by just saying, "Stop that. Don't do that." It's going to have to be resolved in the higher realization and actualization of the true nature of mankind as a Promethean force; as Krafft Ehricke represented. Today, as much as then, this need for an Age of Reason is the imperative; and space is emblematic of the Age of Reason, the age of mankind, really.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's important in the context of everything that we've discussed, also to note that we really are on the edge of a meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It was noted this week that now major European banks are beginning to

cease their investment into the ECB, because of the ECB's negative interest policy. They said, why should we be putting money into the ECB if they're just going to be charging us for putting our money there? So, Helga LaRouche said, there's a lot of European bankers who are sleeping with billions of dollars underneath their pillows in the current days. But this is, even without the instability of what could happen in the build up to the Brexit vote at the end of this month. I know our institutional question for this week, which we haven't addressed; was on the subject of the Brexit. And Mrs. LaRouche said, if this means that Ireland and Scotland are going to leave the UK, and the UK will break up; then sure, I welcome this. But in seriousness, we are on the verge of the meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system; the productivity of the United States is through the floor; unemployment in this country is unbelievable, especially youth unemployment. It's at levels that are unprecedented in the modern history of this country. And at the same time, you have the possibility of an entirely economic paradigm presenting itself in the form of the New Silk Road; everything that's coming out of the BRICS. We have the visit by Narendra Modi to the United States this week; he spoke to a joint session of Congress. There's a lot that could just happen; as Helga LaRouche said, it would be very easy. It would be a piece of cake for the United States to join this New Paradigm; and I think that's the ongoing of the LaRouche Movement

internationally, is making that possibility very, very real. It requires a policy revolution in the United States to bring that about; but as was clear from the seminar in San Francisco this week – and I think will continue to be clear in our interventions in New York City around the Manhattan Project that Mr. LaRouche has initiated; and then this upcoming conference that's being sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Europe in the coming weeks. The activities of the LaRouche Movement internationally are crucial; and it's very significant that we're at the breaking point in terms of several aspects of this.

Mrs. LaRouche also put a big emphasis on the continued fight around the declassification of the 28 pages, because of what this would imply in terms of the potential to bring down the entire Anglo-Saudi empire. And also everything that was contingent on the lies that were told in the aftermath of 9/11; and what that has led to in terms of the perpetual war policies, the refugees who are coming into Europe from North Africa and the Middle East.

So, all of these things taken together, represent a situation which is dynamic, it's changing very rapidly, and it is fertile ground for the types of interventions that the LaRouche Movement is making internationally right now.

So, let me invite Kesha or Mike, if you want to say anything more, in terms of reflections at the conclusion of this

discussion, you're welcome to.

STEGER: I'd say, let's get rid of Obama and join the New Paradigm.

ROGERS: Yeah. I think it's true; we are at the end of an era of representation of barbarism, war, and these limits to growth consequences that Krafft Ehrlicke was very well aware of. We're seeing the emergence of a new system of cooperation, a new collaboration and dialogue among civilizations that's being led by Russia and China. And I think the continued question being presented by our activity is, will people actually join with LaRouche and join with the nations who are representing this new direction for mankind? And that means doing what Krafft Ehrlicke did, and breaking with all practicality, and as you said Ben, popularity; and actually going out and doing that which is seemingly impossible. I think China gives us the light and the inspiration as to human beings; that is our mission, that is what we do. We do those things which seem almost impossible. And we do those things that actually help to bring about the solutions that are going to lead to a greater condition for mankind. So, I think that's what we're representing right now, and we're on the brink of a total breakthrough; unlike anything that's been seen.

But also, as Mrs. LaRouche said in her opening remarks, this breakthrough is going to come with rejecting the absence of any discussion on the threat of this thermonuclear war and what mankind really faces. Because the question is, what kind of society are we going to actually demand be brought into existence? What kind of future are we going to actually bring about for those generations not yet born? And Mr. LaRouche is committed to that, and many more people as we've stated, need to do the same.

OGDEN: OK. Well, thank you very much, Kesha. With that, I'm going to bring a conclusion to this webcast here this evening. I'd like to thank both Kesha and Michael for joining us; and also thank you to Megan and to Ben. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and as I think you can tell, we have a very busy few weeks ahead of us, and a lot of responsibility. So, thank you very much; good night.

**Rapport fra Schiller
Institut-seminar i San
Francisco, USA:
Vil USA gå med i Den Nye**

Silkevej?

Schiller Instituttets Strategiske Seminar i San Francisco den 8. juni tiltrak 70 gæster og eksperter for at diskutere det presserende nødvendige spørgsmål: »Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller atomkrig«. Denne plan går ud på at tilslutte sig en plan for infrastruktur i hele verden, med navnet Ét bælte, én vej, og som Kina har fremlagt, eller også blive sammen med de kollapsende, vestlige økonomier, hvis bankerot leverer ved til det bål, som er en global atomkrig. **Listen to the entire seminar on SoundCloud**

De højtplacerede talere inkluderede Lyndon LaRouche, berømt strategisk og økonomisk tænk; Helga Zepp-LaRouche, også kendt som »Silkevejsladyen« pga. sin verdensomspændende kampagne for at skabe den »Silkevejspolitik«, som Kina nu har fremlagt, og for at få denne politik vedtaget på verdensplan som alternativet til krig; den amerikanske senator Mike Gravel (senator 1969-1981), der indlæste de hemmeligstemplede »Pentagon Papers« ind i Kongresprotokollen i 1971; honorære konsul Sergei Petrov, generalkonsul for det Russiske Konsulat i San Francisco; dr. Howard Chang, internationalt kendt ekspert i vandsedimentering, samt Kesha Rogers, to gange demokratisk kandidat i Houstons 22. C.D. (kongresdistrikt) – hjemsted for NASA. De stedlige russiske, kinesiske, japanske og filippinske lokalsamfund var repræsenteret blandt publikum.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede tilhørerne for det faktum, at NATO's deployering på Ruslands grænser, med AEGIS-systemet i Rumænien, og krigsskibet USS Ross i Sortehavet, efterlader russerne i en position, hvor NATO-missiler kunne nå Moskva på fem minutter – hvilket nødvendiggør en politik med »Affyr ved varsel«. Ulig i 1980'erne, hvor tusinder af mennesker demonstrerede imod atommissilerne i Europa og Rusland, der var sat til »affyring ved varsel«, så har de neokonservative i Obamaregeringen genskabt denne fare, uden nogen protester i

Vesten. Faren for en konfrontation med Kina i Det sydkinesiske Hav er også til stede.

I dette klima traf Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i 2013 beslutningen om at gøre en ende på geopolitik og at genetablere den Nye Silkevej, og at bygge infrastruktur for vand, elektricitet og transport i hele verden. Zepp-LaRouche påpegede Kinas 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer, som er bygget i løbet af 2015, hvorimod der ikke findes *nogen* hurtigtog i USA. Hun konkluderede: »Gå sammen med Kina i jeres egen interesse, eller stå over for atomkrig.«

Fr. LaRouche adresserede problemet med, at Obama fortsat er præsident, ved at påpege den presserende nødvendige frigivelse af de klassificerede »28 sider« af Den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, 2001, og Obamas afvisning af at frigive disse sider, der vides at indeholde bevis for saudernes finansiering og sponsorering af terrorangrebet 11. september, hvilket kunne sprænge hul i amerikansk politik og gøre det muligt at vælge en kvalificeret kandidat, af samme støbning som Franklin D. Roosevelt eller præsident Kennedy. Herefter fulgte spørgsmål fra tilhørerne.

Efter Helga Zepp-LaRouche kom et indlæg fra den russiske konsul i San Francisco, Sergei Petrov: »For et stort land som USA, er det gavnligt at se på verden.« På et spørgsmål fra senator Mike Gravel om, hvorvidt han (Petrov) var enig i Helga LaRouches vurdering, svarede han: »Jeg er enig i den forståelse, at vi er meget tæt på en storkonflikt. Og jeg tilføjer, at der ikke er nogen som helst mulighed for en 'begrænset atomkrig'. Hvis den begynder, bliver det verdens ende.«

Hr. Petrov beskrev USSR's opløsning i Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater, med alvorlige, økonomiske problemer, og trinnene i den lange proces med at opbygge den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union. EAEU søger nu at indgå aftaler med Mercosur, SCO og EU om økonomisk og humanitært samarbejde. Næste skridt

bliver at indgå forbindelse til Nordamerika. På denne dag, sagde hr. Petrov, »vil jeg føle, jeg har været en god diplomat«.

Show Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote and Q&A

Show Lyndon LaRouche Q&A

»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller atomkrig«; Helga Zepp-LaRouches åbningstale ved Schiller Institut- seminar i San Francisco, USA. Video, engelsk.

Jeg tror, at, hvis man ser på verdenssituationen, især på den amerikanske offentlighed, der næsten intet ved om situationen; folk i Europa ved lidt mere, men, hvis man sammenligner den umiddelbart forestående fare for en eskalering af konfrontationen mellem NATO, USA og Storbritannien og så Rusland og Kina på den anden side, så er viden om det så svag, at dette for mig står som det mest skræmmende aspekt; for,

fraværet af en offentlig debat om den mulige udslettelse af hele civilisationen, om det så skyldes mange folks ligegyldighed, fordi de simpelt hen er ligeglade, eller det skyldes, at de er for bange til at tænke tanken til ende, men manglen på en offentlig debat er det, vi må ændre.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 9. juni 2016: Fører NATO's provokerende øvelser til krig? Se også anden del (11 min.).

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: 2. del:

Lyd:

Menneskeheden står ved en skillevej, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Åbningstale (dansk) ved konference i New York, i anledning af Mindedagen for faldne soldater

Vi står på kanten af atomkrig.

Alt dette finder sted over for flere akutte, strategiske kriser: én på den russiske grænse i Østeuropa; en anden i Sydvestasien; endnu én omkring Korea; og atter igen en anden omkring Det sydkinesiske Hav. Hver af disse konflikter kunne blive udløsermekanismen for en global atomkrig. Og folk flipper virkelig ud, for det forestående NATO-topmøde, der vil finde sted i begyndelsen af juli i Warszawa, er planlagt til at manifestere alle mulige former for forandringer, som at flytte fire store bataljoner med 1000 tropeenheder i hver ind i de baltiske lande; som, på dagen, hvor dette julitopmøde finder sted, da at forbinde den nyligt installerede BMD-komponent (ballistisk missilforsvar) i Rumænien med krigsskibene af Aegis-klassen, som allerede er deployeret i det baltiske område og i Sortehavet og andetsteds. Og dette er nu i færd med meget hurtigt at nå til et punkt, hvor Rusland har sagt, at de ikke kan tolerere en fortsat opsætning af dette ballistiske missilsystem, fordi det tydeligvis er rettet mod Rusland, og det tilsigter tydeligvis at ødelægge Ruslands gengældelsesevne, og det har aldrig, hvad der ellers altid har været påskuddet, det har aldrig været rettet mod den angivelige missiltrussel fra Iran.

Allerede for to eller tre år siden har det russiske militær fremstillet videoanimationer, der viser, at de systemer, der nu er installeret i Polen, i Rumænien, i Bulgarien, i Spanien

og på disse krigsskibe, i virkeligheden er tiltænkt at skulle ramme Rusland. Men især efter, at man har indgået en aftale mellem P5+1, med Iran, og som hæmmer faren for missiler, der kommer fra Iran, findes et sådant påskud ikke længere. Det er nu blevet bemærket af sådanne personer som professor Stephen Cohen fra New Yorks universitet, at dette meget klart har til hensigt at lancere en krig. En anden, meget betydningsfuld taler fra Rusland, general Leonid Ivashov, sagde, at det, vi nu ser, er klare skridt som forberedelse til krig.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Stop 3. Verdenskrig: NATO's katastrofale atomare bluff imod Rusland: Du kan være med til at stoppe det nu

8. juni 2016 (Leder) – Fra Tysklands *Der Spiegel* her til eftermiddag kom en advarsel i sidste minut: NATO's »Anakonda« kombineret med krigsøvelser langs de russiske grænser i Polen og de baltiske stater »går for vidt« og »leger rigtig krig«, atomkrig. *EIR* har allerede advaret om, at disse massive

»krigsspil« kan udløse en meget virkelig Tredje Verdenskrig, og i dag har vi netop lært, at øvelserne er større endnu og involverer henved 50.000 NATO-tropper. Samtidig har Obamaregeringen afbrudt al diskussion med Rusland om de ballistiske missilforsvarssystemer, som NATO er i færd med at bygge rundt om Rusland i øst og vest; og piloter og fly fra det russiske luftvåben er nu i øjeblikket selv ved at træne angreb, der skal tilintetgøre de selv samme BMD-systemer rundt om Sortehavet.

På Schiller Instituttets seminar i dag i San Francisco, USA, responderede Ruslands generalkonsul i samme by på et spørgsmål fra den amerikanske senator, Mike Gravel:

Jeg er enig i den forståelse, at vi er meget tæt på en storkonflikt. Og lad mig tilføje, at der ikke findes nogen mulighed for en 'begrænset atomkrig'. Hvis den begynder, bliver det verdens ende.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremlagde ligefremt den eskalerende trussel om verdenskrig – hvis hensigt er at skræmme både Rusland og Kina til at underkaste sig Obamas regler og diktater – for seminaret i dag. Hun stillede også spørgsmålet, og svarede på det: »Hvordan er alt dette blevet til?« og »Hvordan overvinder vi det?«

Obamaregeringen og NATO bluffer virkelig – et bluff, der i sig bærer truslen om menneskets udslettelse, men et bluff ikke desto mindre. De transatlantiske økonomier er bankerot og har mistet ethvert produktionspotentiale, og er ved at opbygge det næste kollaps. Obamas amerikanske økonomi har nået vejs ende, hvis der ikke kommer en total genopbygning. Og de asiatiske magters »Nye Silkevej« og lignede aktiviteter, med ny infrastruktur og udforskning af rummet, udgør den eneste potentielle kilde til denne totale genopbygning.

NATO er i kun færd med at deployere »arrogance, og skinnets af magt«. Økonomisk bankerot får Obama til at se eurasisk

udvikling som en trussel, der retfærdiggør krig – og som gør hans trussel om global krig til et bluff.

Denne tragiske situation kan fuldstændigt ændres, sagde Zepp-LaRouche til dagens seminar, gennem nonlineære handlinger. Mobiliseringen for at fremtvinge sandheden om saudernes og briternes rolle i angrebene på Amerika den 11. september [2001] er nu oppe i højeste gear; hvis det lykkes i nærmeste fremtid, kunne det blive årsag til en ægte »katarsis«, sagde hun, og til en afvisning af hele politikken med evindelig krig, der udsprang – gennem løgne – af 11. september. Og jo flere amerikanske borgere og i landet boende personer, der bliver aktive i at gennemtvinge denne sejr, desto bedre er chancen for at genskabe den ægte, amerikanske republik.

Appellen »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig – Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«, udbredes ligeledes i hastigt tempo og cirkulerer i dag i nok et land, Ungarn.

Vær ikke bange for, at Ruslands lederskab ville starte en verdenskrig, men det vil afslutte den. Det er vores mission totalt at forandre Obamas og NATO's fremstød mod krig med et nyt paradigme, og det kan gøres.

Foto: Vil det amerikanske folk komme til fornuft, før en atomkrig udløses? [flickr/usnavy]

Stop 3. Verdenskrig:

NATO's Krigsspil i Baltikum kunne udløse en meget virkelig 3. Verdenskrig – Underskriv og cirkuler appellen: »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig – Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«

7. juni 2016 (Leder) – Hvis Obama får sin vilje, kan menneskeheden meget vel blive drevet ud over klippekanten i form af en fremprovokation af atomkrig fra USA's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, advarede Lyndon LaRouche i dag. NATO-manøvrerne i stor skala, der begyndte i går i Polen og De baltiske Stater, og som involverer 31.000 tropper fra 24 lande i en 10 dage lang øvelse, der simulerer en angivelig russisk invasion af området, udgør i sig selv en umiddelbar, potentiel udløser af krig. Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, Alexander Grushko, forklarede i går faren ligefremt, i bemærkninger, som hr. LaRouche vurderede i høj grad gik lige til sagens kerne:

»Det, vi i dag ser i De baltiske Stater, er rent faktisk ikke andet end forsøg på en magtudvikling, med den fjendtlige politik, som NATO har forfulgt i den seneste tid. Jeg ville ikke sige, at dette udgør en direkte trussel mod Rusland, men det skaber selvfølgelig alvorlige risici i takt med, at vi ser en absolut ny, militær virkelighed danne sig langs vore grænser.«

Grushko uddybede, at NATO-advarsler om non-eksisterende russiske trusler kan materialisere sig til handlinger.

»(NATO's) politik lever i en surrealistisk virkelighed, og det farligste er, at det nu begynder at tage form af militær planlægning og militære forberedelser, der finder sted på territorier langs vore grænser.«

LaRouche understregede, at Rusland under præsident Putin vil træffe sine egne beslutninger på sin egen måde, som respons til disse forsøg. Hvis briterne, Obama og NATO ønsker krig, får de det, og det vil blive forfærdeligt: en atomar 3. Verdenskrig – det er, hvad vi taler om.

Der findes en strategi, som LaRouche længe har identificeret, til at overvinde denne »surrealistiske« politik for folkemord, som udgår fra Det britiske Imperium. Den nødvendiggør den omgående fjernelse af Obama fra Det Hvide Hus, både for at få hans finger væk fra atomknappen, så vel som også for fuldstændigt at vælte det skakbræt, som er det vanvittige præsidentvalg i USA, der i øjeblikket tilbyder amerikanere valget mellem cyanid og stryknin. Og det kræves også, at USA og Europa går med i det Ny win-win-paradigme, med økonomisk udvikling med videnskab som drivkraft, og som forfægtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, og som fortsætter med at gå aggressivt frem i hele Eurasien.

Det spørgsmål, der ligger for os, indfanges af titlen på en stor Schiller Institut-konference, som LaRouche-bevægelsen vil afholde i San Francisco den 8. juni:

»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Et valg imellem global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller en atomar verdenskrig«.

Underskriv og cirkuler appellen:

**»Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig
– Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«**

Foto: Enhver af disse konflikter ville kunne udløse en global atomkrig.

Dump Obama nu – Verden er parat til at gå med i det Nye Paradigme

7. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Lederskabet af verden er, med rette, blevet overtaget af det voksende samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien, og med andre eurasiske nationer, der entusiastisk går med i de nye udviklingsplaner, der er legemliggjort i programmet med 'Ét bælte, én vej'. London, Wall Street og Obama er alle desperate over dette ægte, igangværende paradigmeskifte.

I sin kommentar til dette skifte advarede Lyndon LaRouche om, at Obama er ved at blive afsløret som intet andet end en svindler og et falsum. Faren er, at et sådant falsum kan detonere på en farlig måde. Udfordringen består i fuldt ud at konsolidere skiftet over til udviklingsparadigmet, der ledes af Rusland/Kina/Indien, uden at fremkalde, at Obama og kompagni flipper voldeligt ud. Det betyder, understregede LaRouche, at »Obama og kompagni må forkrøbles«, så de ikke er i stand til at leve deres desperation ud i handling.

Dette står mere og mere klart: Verden har ikke brug for Obamas, eller briterne, eller Wall Streets klovneshow. Det, der behøves, er en virkningsfuld, økonomisk organisering, der erstatter disse desperate svindlere og dræbere. Vi befinder os ved et punkt, hvor hele det britiske system er i færd med at gå ned, netop nu. Det er oprindelsen til krigsfaren, og intet andet. »Dump disse elendige karle«, erklærede LaRouche. »Giv disse ledende, eurasiske nationer, sammen med de sydlige nationer, lederskabet, og støt dem i deres udviklingsplaner.«

Frem for alt andet, som Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange har understreget i løbet af den seneste uge, så byg Kra-kanalen! Det ville markere en revolutionerende forandring for verden, der i enorm grad ville forøge handel og udvikling over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika og videre endnu. Kra-kanalen ville skabe et fuldstændigt nyt billede af verden som helhed.

Flere og flere nationer er parate til at deltage i denne fremtid. Japan er nu i færd med at genoplive koordineringen med de andre hovednationer – Rusland, Indien, Kina – for eurasisk udvikling, at genoplive programmer, der tidligere blev legemliggjort i Mitsubishi Global Infrastructure Fund (GIF), der arbejdede for Kra-kanalen tilbage i 1980'erne. Kina er hen over de næste seks år parat til at investere \$3,5 billion i store infrastrukturprojekter, der rækker langt ud over det umiddelbare asiatiske Stillehavsområde, iflg. en nylig undersøgelse fra Asia Society. Japan har annonceret sin egen, \$110 milliard store investeringsplan for det asiatiske Stillehavsområde.

Den russiske præsident Putin kommer til Kina senere i denne måned for at indgå de sluttelige aftaler om 52 rapporterede fællesprojekter; og russisk-kinesiske forhandlinger skrider nu frem om den planlagte bygning af en 7000 km lang højhastighedsjernbaneforbindelse mellem Moskva og Beijing. Indien er i færd med at udvide sine planer for handelskorridorer, der strækker sig fra Iran gennem Afghanistan, og med nyligt annoncerede planer om også at bygge

en dybvandshavn i Bangladesh, tillige med Chabahar-havnen i Iran ved Oman-golfen. Indien og Kina støtter alle disse investeringer, der vil udvide hele det asiatiske Stillehavsområdes produktive evner, hvor Kina og Indien alene udgør en tredjedel af verdens befolkning.

Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel skal besøge Kina i næste uge. Den netop færdiggjorte Gotthard Tunnel gennem de Schweiziske Alper, verdens længste jernbanetunnel, åbnede officielt den 1. juni, og projektet, som det tog 17 år at færdiggøre, har udløst entusiasme over hele Europa. Denne entusiasme for store projekter må videreføres til, at ledende, europæiske nationer går med i fremtiden med 'Ét bælte, én vej'-programmet, på en langt mere seriøs måde. Det betyder at bryde med de britiske royale og med Obama.

Projekterne, der fremmes af Kina og Indien, vil samlet set accelerere udviklingen og legemliggøre ideen om det »win-win«-samarbejde, der er et varemærke for skiftet væk fra geopolitikkens imperiekrige og til ægte, menneskelig udvikling. Vi har ikke brug for krig. Faktisk ville endnu en storkrig betyde udslettelse. Det ved og forstår Putin, lige såvel som også Kina.

Titelfoto: Premierminister Narendra Modi med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og førstedame Peng Liyuan, der fejrer deres nationers voksende samarbejde og løsning af tidligere konflikter. [flickr/narendramodiofficial]