

Glass-Steagall vil gøre en ende på WallStreet, City of London

og, endelig, det Britiske Imperium, og hermed faren for krig;

Et nyt paradigme med den Ny Silkevej, for genopbygning af hele verden!

LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast 8. januar 2016, dansk udskrift.

Vi har altså en situation lige nu, hvor tingene, over hele planeten, befinder sig på den yderste rand. På et hvilket som helst tidspunkt – mandag morgen, f.eks. – kunne vi vågne og finde, at hele det europæiske banksystem er gået ind i et kaotisk kollaps, der omgående vil spilde over til USA. Der vil være en indvirkning på Asien, men samarbejdet mellem Kina, Rusland, Indien og andre lande, i det asiatiske Stillehavsområde og i det eurasiske område, vil tage af for virkningen. Og krisens epicenter vil således være det transatlantiske område. Og det er grunden til, at briterne vil gøre fremstød for en krigsprovokation, en »bluff«-konfrontation, med Rusland og Kina for at få dem til at kapitulere og udplyndre dem, for at holde deres eget yndelige, døende imperium gående i endnu et par dage. Der er vi kommet til i de globale anliggender.

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

LPAC Fredags-webcast, 18. december 2015: Kasinoøkonomien er i færd med at kollapse

Kasinoøkonomien er i færd med at kollapse. Skiferolie, junk-obligationer, Italien ... WALL STREET. Er der en gruppe af ledende demokrater og republikanere, der er villige til at fortælle sandheden om Wall Street, og lukke det ned? Engelsk udskrift.

The gambling economy is collapsing. Shale oil, junk bonds, Italy... WALL STREET. Is there a leading group of Democrats and Republicans willing to tell the truth about Wall Street, and shut it down?

TRANSCRIPT

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's December 18, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly LaRouche PAC webcast here on larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, as well as Jeffrey Steinberg from *Executive Intelligence Review*. And the three of us had a chance to have extensive meetings with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier this morning, and early this afternoon.

Now, those of you who have been watching the LaRouche PAC website over the course of this week, especially starting with the Policy Committee discussion which Mr. LaRouche held this past Monday, you'll know that we are in a week of heightened mobilization as an organization, and as a national movement with the LaRouche PAC; because of Lyndon LaRouche's analysis

of the proximity of a total meltdown of the Wall Street-centered, trans-Atlantic speculative financial system. Mr. LaRouche has made very clear calls every single day of this week, for a very explicit program of a return to Franklin Roosevelt, a complete shutting-down of the Wall Street speculative so-called assets, and a revival of the kind of emergency mobilization that Franklin Roosevelt enacted in his first days in office.

Many of you might have participated in the Fireside Chat which Mr. LaRouche held yesterday with activists nationwide, and many of you also may have seen that a leaflet has now been posted on the LaRouche PAC website titled, "The New Policy for the USA Now". Now this leaflet contains a transcript of remarks that Mr. LaRouche made during an emergency meeting with his associates on Wednesday night, and if you haven't gotten a chance to read through the text of it yet, I wish to read just a few short excerpts to give you a flavor of what Mr. LaRouche's analysis of the current situation is. What Mr. LaRouche had to say during this discussion is the following:

"We are on the edge right now. We're on the edge of a totally uncontrolled global process of self-accelerated collapse. In other words, the acceleration accelerates the rate of acceleration. There is no existing solution to this problem," he said, "and it is on a global scale, or at least a trans-Atlantic scale immediately, and will of course affect Asia as well, and Russia also. And the only thing you can do is Franklin Roosevelt's policy. You have to say, 'Declare Franklin Roosevelt's policy now against Wall Street.' That's the only way we can solve this problem. Otherwise, you've got something that's going to accelerate and there's nothing that you can do about it. And what you have to do, is pose the fact that there will be no solution unless Wall Street is put out of business right now. That's what Franklin Roosevelt did in effect; he shut down Wall Street, which ended the inflation that was going on at the point before his election. And the

only way you can do this, is to shut it down.

"What you do is you cancel all the so-called assets that are not appropriate for this role, and you simply say: 'Look buddy, you don't get any money at all. You get no compensation whatsoever. You're shut out of business. You don't exist.' And that's what Franklin Roosevelt did, in effect, in his operation to shut down Wall Street."

Now later in the discussion, Mr. LaRouche came to the question of what the necessary solution must be. And he said:

"If you realize that this is reality time, none of the rules that have been pushed along recently have any merit whatsoever. They're canceled. And the first thing we cancel is Wall Street. Then what we're talking about, is the Franklin Roosevelt-style of a new system of the creation of a new system of government, of financial management by government. And it has to be that way, because a lot of these categories are things that are put up as well - will we bail this out, will we bail that out-forget it," he said. "It's dead. It's a dead issue. What you're talking about is the practical activity of creativity, productive creativity, and you have to define it as such. What is actually productive creativity, which is actually what we will have to defend.

"And that's what we have to do, and that's what Franklin Roosevelt did. He managed this thing by going through the whole process about these emergency bail-outs of people, who were jobless, who were without hope. And what we have to do is now, with the background of the experience of Franklin Roosevelt's work, you simply say, 'We're going back to Franklin Roosevelt's policy, while we still have a chance to do it.' |"

So, Mr. LaRouche said, we have to make the announcement, and this is what we're doing over the course of this week. We make the declaration that we have come to a conclusion, a solid

conclusion; and we have to get more and more people to jump in onto this policy that we're presenting. And very rapidly, you will find that this will become the trend of policy-making inside the United States, in particular. And if you just consider the crucial evidence that we have here at hand, if you just consider the developments that have broken out in the recent period, when Mr. LaRouche said, you just have to say, "This is the greatest Christmas present that we could possibly give you – the opportunity to shut down Wall Street, and save the United States."

Now, let me, in that context, present the institutional question that we got in for this evening, and ask Jeff Steinberg to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response. It reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. In recent weeks four Italian banks have collapsed, along with a number of U.S. hedge funds. There's a \$3 trillion junk bond exposure in the U.S. domestic shale oil and gas sector, with prices continuing to fall, even in the winter period of maximum demand. How do you assess the financial and economic situation in the trans-Atlantic region going into 2016, and how do you propose to address these problems?"

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. We're at a point right now where tomorrow morning, Monday morning, almost at any given moment going forward from today, we could experience the complete collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic financial and monetary system, which would in turn have repercussions on a global scale. There is nothing within the internal features of the current situation that can avoid this outcome. And look at some of the elements of this picture.

As the question indicated, we've seen four Italian banks go under in the recent weeks, and we've seen bondholders and stockholders in those banks wiped out through bail-in – in other words, the grabbing up of their assets as a first stage towards a bail-out of those banks. And this has already resulted in widespread protests in Italy. It resulted in a

suicide that is now being investigated by Italian authorities. You've got Ukraine facing a \$3 billion unpayable debt to the IMF that comes due very soon; and the IMF has indicated, because of the geopolitical significance of Ukraine, despite the fact that Ukraine is a failed state, it is thoroughly bankrupt – that the IMF is going to pony up a bail-out of Ukraine that violates all of the IMF's rules.

On Jan. 1, Puerto Rico has a billion dollar debt due – it's part of an overall \$35 billion in debt. They've made clear that they cannot make payments on that \$1 billion debt due at the start of the new year. A number of U.S. hedge funds have already gone under, because of their exposure to that Puerto Rican debt.

The shale oil and gas sector, which has been touted by President Obama and others as the great driver for the U.S. so-called economic recovery, is in a state of complete collapse. Normally, going into the winter months, you would expect a substantial increase in oil and gas prices, because of the increasing demands, both for transit and also now for home and business heating. In contrast to that, the price in this past week has collapsed even further. Every time some of the major shale oil producers bring a barrel of oil out of the ground, and put it on sale on the market, they lose \$30. There is a total of a \$5 trillion amount between junk bonds and major bank lending into this shale oil and gas sector, that is about to blow up.

In the case of Canada, in the area around Alberta, in the western part of Canada, this blow-up has already occurred; and Canada is in a state of severe economic crisis. Obviously, on a scale of things, the United States going through the same process will have a far greater impact into Europe, into Asia, around the entire globe.

So, in other words, we are at a moment of reckoning, where the entire financial system is hanging by a thread, and will most

certainly blow. There's no way to predict a date certain, but, as I say, it could happen at any moment from now on; which means that you've got to basically shut down this entire system. The system that's been in place and growing as a cancerous factor on the real economy of the world, going back for the last 40 years and more. You could go back to end of the Bretton Woods system in 1971, carried out by people like George Shultz, Henry Kissinger, on behalf of the British. You could go back to 1999, when under the impeachment blackmail, President Bill Clinton signed into law the repeal of Glass-Steagall. And, of course, it goes back much earlier than that.

Mr. LaRouche made the point in our discussion today, that you've got to look at the degeneration of the entire world system that began at the outset of the 20th Century, when Bertrand Russell launched a tyranny against the kind of scientific breakthroughs that characterized the work of people like Bernhard Riemann in the 19th Century, the work of Leibniz in the 17th and early 18th Century, the work of Kepler in the 17th Century, going back to Brunelleschi and the height of the Italian Golden Renaissance, when modern science was first launched. All of that has been effectively negated and wiped out through a tyranny of mathematics that has been characteristic of Bertrand Russell's takeover of modern science at the very onset of the 20th Century.

It's manifested itself in a cultural deterioration. The only major 20th Century scientist to stand up in the face of Russell was Albert Einstein. In a different way, President Franklin Roosevelt stood up against that tyranny. He was confronted from his first moment in office as President, with a population that had been brutalized, had been beaten down, was living through a Great Depression that was already ongoing for a number of years. You had rampant illiteracy in rural America, and he carried out a revolution; a policy revolution that was based on the principles of the founders of the American Republic, the principles of Benjamin Franklin,

particularly the principles of Alexander Hamilton. Those same principles were adopted by President Lincoln, and it carried even beyond his assassination by the British.

At the beginning of the 20th Century, end of the 19th Century, you had the British overthrow of Bismarck in Germany; you have the assassination of Sadi Carnot, the president of France; and in 1901 you had the assassination of President William McKinley in the United States. Those British actions, those assassinations, laid the basis for what Bertrand Russell did, wreaking havoc on all of the principles of previous scientific discovery, and the 20th Century, with very few exceptions, has been a total wasteland.

So, that's the backdrop to the crisis that we are facing today. You not only have a Wall Street-London system that is thoroughly, hopelessly bankrupt. All of the bail-in, and all of the bail-out in the world, cannot come close to dealing with the multiple quadrillions of dollars in purely speculative gambling debt, that have been built up as a cancer that's eaten away at the real productive economy. You have, in reality, today the Bureau of Labor Statistics is claiming that unemployment has fallen to 5%. This is total rubbish. By using their own statistics, and looking at the entire working age population, rather than just what they call the labor force, you see that real unemployment is more than double the number they claim. And furthermore, 40% of those employed workers in the United States are earning \$15,000 a year or less. That is minimum wage, full-time employment.

Half of that number are earning below \$5000 a year. If you work one day a month, you are considered to be part of the labor force. So the real conditions of life here in the United States, across Europe, are collapsing at an accelerating rate, as Mr. LaRouche indicated in his discussion with us on Wednesday.

The fact of the matter is that to understand what's going on

to the American people, and to the European population, you've got to look at some other statistics. You've got to look at the fact that there is a persistent rise in the rate of deaths among middle-aged people in the United States, from the ages of 45 to 54. It's gone up precipitously. It started in 2001 – not coincidentally when Bush and Cheney came into office. It's accelerated at an accelerating rate since 2009, when Obama came into office.

The Centers for Disease Control has declared that the United States is experiencing an epidemic increase in heroin addiction, and there has been in the last four years, a 60% increase in heroin addiction among households earning \$50,000 a year or more. In other words, the middle class itself is going into a psychological breakdown. So this is the consequence of toleration for Wall Street.

Members of Congress. I was up on Capitol Hill yesterday for a good part of the day. Members of Congress know we're on the verge of a major junk bond blow-out. They know about the looming crash. They know about the Glass-Steagall opportunity. Yet they're showing cowardice in the face of the greatest threat that mankind has faced ever. Because this kind of collapse, under the conditions of Obama remaining in office, means that we are also simultaneously on the very edge of potential thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China. And that would be a war of extinction of mankind.

So the question is: Is there a combination of leading citizens, of Democrats and Republicans, who are prepared to come together and show the courage to simply declare that Wall Street is finished. It's shut down. No money in. It's doomed. So shut it down; and if we shut down Wall Street in a timely fashion, that opens the door for the kinds of measures and actions that were taken by Franklin Roosevelt, in the very first days of his Presidency. Massive infusions of Federal investment into real job creation, into vital infrastructure. And we've got to then set our sights on the Galaxy. We've got

to begin a revival of our space program because man doesn't belong stuck here on Earth. At this point, we have the ability, by coordination and cooperation with other leading nations, like China, for example, in particular – to explore where our Solar System stands in the larger Galaxy. That's where man's future. That's where the discoveries lie that will define and guarantee a bright future for mankind.

But if you don't start by facing the fact that Wall Street must be shut down totally right now; then there is really no chance.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, when you consider what Mr. LaRouche declared the policy must be, and take a look at the Franklin Roosevelt precedent, you begin to ask yourself the question that Franklin Roosevelt asked himself: When you have a completely broken-down population, when you have a nation in chaos and in desperation, when you've had multiple previous administrations which have been disasters, if not traitors, to the people of the United States, how do you have an immediate turnaround from Day One?

And Roosevelt had to ask himself, how do you distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate value? How do you distinguish between something which has a productive, creative effect – as Mr. LaRouche said in the remarks I read earlier—versus something which has a destructive cancerous effect. And how do you protect what is legitimate and valuable, while cancelling and writing off everything which is illegitimate and destructive?

And this is exactly what Franklin Roosevelt enacted from the very first day that he was in office with his national bank holiday; shutting down all of the banks, sending in an army of auditors, and not allowing them to reopen again until they reopened under his terms. And this is what he enshrined in the Glass-Steagall Act. There is a bill in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate, as many of

our viewers know, ready to be cosponsored, ready to be passed into law, to reinstate Glass-Steagall. And this is obviously urgently what is needed.

When you look at the fact that since the 2007-2008 crash, rather than having the biggest Wall Street banks broken up, the ones that were responsible for the crash in the first place, and having their chief executive officers sent to prison; instead they were bailed out, and now the four largest banks in the United States have accumulated an ever-greater share of the financial bubble, holding, between the four of them, assets of almost \$6 trillion concentrated in just these four biggest banks.

With all of the quantitative easing that has been sent nominally into the economy, all of this money has gone into propping this bank gambling financial bubble, while the lending to the real economy has steadily collapsed, showing you exactly what the administration of Barack Obama has been all about.

Now, if you look at Franklin Roosevelt's actions on the other side, taking a population that was idle, depressed, uneducated, unskilled, wasting away, and immediately putting them to work: this is the precedent for what has to happen right now. Franklin Roosevelt – one of the very first things that he did was to get his adviser from New York State, Harry Hopkins, with whom he had previously worked to enact many of these New Deal measures in the laboratory, in the incubator, of New York State itself, the hometown of Alexander Hamilton, whom Franklin Roosevelt saw himself directly in the tradition of. Even through the lineage of his great-great grandfather Isaac Roosevelt, who worked directly with Alexander Hamilton to set up the first national bank [Bank of New York]. Franklin Roosevelt immediately ordered the large-scale, mass employment of millions and millions of idle and out-of-work Americans.

He did this with the PWA. Later he did it with the WPA for

much larger-scale projects. This was done through the TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which absolutely transformed the entire Southern states of the United States, and created the possibility for the United States to fight and win World War II. And emphatically he did it with the CCC, the Civilian Conservation Corps, which was one of his very first programs that he enacted from the very first day that he was in office. Taking young people from the streets of the cities and from the backwards rural countryside, who were uneducated, many of them completely illiterate and completely unskilled; enrolling them in the CCC program; sending them to camps that existed in every single one of the states of the United States at that time, as well as the territories. And ultimately employing over 3 and a half million young men, and young Americans, in the CCC program over the course of its entire existence – from 1933 until it was disbanded in 1941-42, for the war effort.

These are the precedents that can be taken right off of the shelf, and enacted immediately if we are able to take the Wall Street administration of Barack Obama, shut it down, shut down Wall Street. So, what we've done here at LaRouche PAC is, we've put together a programmatic sort of outline of exactly what has to be done along these lines in today's terms, with an eye towards what is being done currently by countries such as China, such as their ally Russia, other nations of the BRICS, other countries in southern Asia – for example, India – and the program which is now become the official policy of the most populous nation on Earth, the so-called Silk Road. What China calls, One Belt One Road, or what originally was called the Eurasian Land-Bridge, when the LaRouche movement conceived of it over 20 years ago.

So, here to present a little bit of the details of this upcoming, forthcoming pamphlet – "The United States Must Join the Silk Road" – is LaRouche PAC Scientific Team leader Benjamin Deniston.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Matt. So I think we've mentioned

this on a few of these broadcasts before, this new report. And to put it in context, we have the EIR full special report on the "New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," and about a month ago, in the process of her work organizing around that report internationally, Helga Zepp-LaRouche put out the call to develop somewhat of an addendum to that report, focused on the United States.

And her idea was that we have to move the U.S. population to fight for its future. And this is how we can do it. We have to give the American people a perspective for what it can mean for their own nation, their families, their legacy to join in this future orientation of the New Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge orientation. So we've been pulling together this addendum report as kind of a presentation of this thesis, to really try and give people a clear vision, a clear sense of what we can do with this country; if people decide to fight, if people decide to follow the actions we just heard. Especially now in this immediate day-to-day crisis conditions, we need to also bring to people a real positive conception, as Mr. LaRouche was actually saying emphatically earlier this week. We have to have a positive, – not just attacking the negative – but we have to have a new idea, a new concept, for what the future has to become. And that can give people the strength, the rallying point, to fight to win this fight right now.

So, I have a series of graphics here, and we can go to the first graphic, as a teaser for this report: some of the actual images directly from a draft version of this report, which will I think be available next week on LaRouche PAC. So here we have the cover – "The United States Joins the New Silk Road, a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance." [Fig. 1]

If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 2]: It's broken into a couple main sections, but after the introduction, which covers some of the material which we already discussed here today,

the first bulk section of the report is pretty much a reconstruction program for the United States. Something going along with what LaRouche has called for, for a return to true physical economy. We're seeing the end of this speculative Wall Street system, the end of this fantasy of money having intrinsic value, the end of this speculative insane system, and if we're going to survive, we need to return to a real conception of physical economics. How do we improve the physical capability to produce the goods needed for society? How do we increase our ability to more effectively, more efficiently produce what's needed to sustain society at ever higher and higher levels? These have to, again, become the metrics for economics. Wall Street's metrics are death; and we're seeing that right now. So, we have to return to a conception of physical production, the physical productive powers of the labor force. How do you increase the ability of the labor force to produce more goods at a higher value and a higher quality with less labor power? These physical economic conceptions. And how do you build up the infrastructure of the nation to most efficiently facilitate that process for the national economy as a whole, as a single, integrated territory?

So, this is some of what is dealt with in this first section; and here is kind of an opening spread, as you can see in this image of a development perspective for the United States. I'm going to go through how each one of these elements are treated in slightly more detail in the next section of this report.

So, if we go to the next image[Fig. 3], we have, in one sense, kind of a keystone for this whole project. Something that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been very much at the center of organizing for, for decades now. The long-standing proposal for a Bering Strait connection; connecting this relatively small gap between Alaska and Russia. Connecting that with a tunnel, perhaps a bridge, depending on whatever seems to be the best design; and connecting these two major land masses

with high-speed rail systems. And this, in a sense literally, but also figuratively, connects the United States and North America directly into this entire New Silk Road orientation, this entire Eurasian Land-Bridge development which is now ongoing, as Matt referenced; this is ongoing. China is leading the way in building the New Silk Road program; extending it into other nations in collaboration with other nations – Russia, India, other major players throughout Eurasia. They're pursuing this development of their interiors – high-speed rail, water projects, developing more power, more energy. And we can plug directly into this development orientation with the Bering Strait connection. A lot can be said on this project; it's been on the books for a century, in conception. Now we have the perspective to actually do it; we can extend the rail network of the United States up to Alaska. Russia can extend through Siberia. We can build the connection across the Bering Strait; and we can actually connect these two land masses with this grand project, which will be a keystone for this whole development perspective for the coming time.

If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 4], this would connect directly into what we would need to build as a new high-speed rail system for the United States. Here we have displayed one particular two-phase proposal for the development of an actual modern, high-speed rail network for the United States. Our rail system currently in terms of passenger transport is almost nonexistent; we have a disastrous transportation system. So, if we're talking about actually rebuilding the physical productive capabilities of the nation as a whole, this is going to be one critical element. Having an effective transportation system increases the physical economic potential of the national territory as a whole. Lowering the cost of transportation, increasing the speed of transportation, increasing the efficiency of transportation for goods and people as a medium to facilitate the increased productivity of the nation as a whole. So, this is going to be a major keystone project.

If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 5], we can see that this is not just about connecting the economy as it currently exists; but this will also open up the potential for the development of new territories. These rail lines you see here aren't simply a means for getting from point A to point B; but they can also become new corridors of development. Creating corridors of high density of infrastructure, high-speed efficient transportation, canals and water projects as needed, electricity, power, communications. So, we can bring a high density corridor of all the basic advanced infrastructure needed for the development of entire new regions of the country. And I don't have a graphic of it, but I'm sure many people are familiar with the distribution of population in the United States; and we have entire regions of the country which are virtually empty. Entire regions which have little to no development; so we have huge room and potential for the growth for the development of our territory, including the development of new cities – something that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been campaigning for in the United States. The idea of actually building new Renaissance cities is part of this whole perspective; cities actually organized around the understanding of mankind as a creative force on this planet. Cities as cultural centers actually embodying and reflecting the conception of mankind which we need to rise to. Cities which actually inspire the population and encourage the population and push the population to rise to a higher cultural level; recognizing mankind as a creative force. The type of cities you saw in certain parts of the great 15th Century Renaissance, for example. We can actually be looking at, instead of disbursing our population in this terrible urban sprawl; we can actually have centralized, highly efficient scientific cultural cities, centered around a high density of creative focus, scientific focus, cultural focus. That's the center of your city, your cultural process; and you build the city around that.

So, these are some of the things that – again, they're treated

in more detail in the report – but these are some of the basic elements that are just needed right now to save the United States. As Matt had referenced the historical precedent of Franklin Roosevelt, we're going to need very similar actions in terms of actually retraining and rebuilding our labor force to do this. Just with what's been put on the table already, this is going to be a major driver to force our nation, our people, to figure out how to re-industrialize our economy; to rebuild our productive capabilities. That means the physical productive capabilities themselves; but that also means the labor force itself, the actual skill set of the labor force itself. Things like a new CCC program to retrain an entire new generation with new skills, new capabilities; so they can become a part of this process of creating a new higher level for the economy for the United States. So, in a sense, this is going to force a driver program to rebuild an entire new generation as a highly productive, advanced section of the economy.

So, this is kind of the leading section of this addendum report, focused on rebuilding the United States. If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 6], we can see it is followed by a section on some of the science driver programs that are part of this whole perspective. Actually looking into pushing into the new frontiers beyond just rebuilding the nation with the available technologies, the available capabilities, and implementing what we have; but also looking into expanding the potential of the economy into new domains, into new levels.

In the next graphic [Fig. 7], we have a section on power, on energy, on energy-flux density. And the longstanding need to finally push for the development of fusion power; the longstanding need to explore, implement, and develop the domain of the nucleus – the nuclear economy. This is something that has been denied and suppressed for decades already now; we're long past the time where we need to fully develop the capabilities of the nuclear domain for mankind. Giving us

dramatically higher levels of energy-flux density; enabling us to power all these programs we're talking about here, and many more programs. But also opening up a whole new domain of mankind's ability to interact with the very nature of the universe itself. Moving man beyond just being limited to the domain of chemical reactions, and chemistry on a chemical domain; but moving into a nuclear domain. Not dealing with just the interactions of chemical elements; but dealing with being able to control the very chemical elements themselves on a nuclear level, which opens up whole new potentials for mankind.

This includes areas that are still anomalous – low-energy nuclear reactions, so-called “cold fusion”; hot fusion, advanced fusion power. There's an entire new domain of potential that is just lying in wait for mankind to develop with this nuclear economy.

If you go to the next graphic [Fig. 8], we have the issue of water; the development of the water supply. And a lot can be said on this issue; there are many available options to develop the water resources needed: water transfer projects, along the line of the original NAWAPA project; proposals for desalination, the processing of ocean water to create new freshwater supplies. Those are available to us. We also need to look into the new frontier areas of being able to control the water cycle on a higher and more fundamental level; and this goes to what we've discussed with new methods for controlling the weather, controlling precipitation patterns.

As I said at the beginning, this was called for by Helga out of the need to move the US population; we have to give people a sense of what their potential future is. Not just getting jobs for people; there's all this talk about jobs, the insanity of Green jobs. You have a bunch of these Presidential candidates still talking about Green jobs as if that would do something for the economy. What we're talking about here, is giving people a sense of an actual higher level of the economy

that we can build; a higher state of existence for the nation; that we can organize society around creating. And we can actually inspire and move our population to fight for this future; to fight for their own ability to have access to creating this new future.

And I think just to round it off, we were talking with Mr. LaRouche about this whole perspective earlier today; and I think what he had to say was also very important as a concluding point in this whole discussion. He said, we have to really go at the core issue; that in essence, underlying, we have these projects; we have the perspective for rebuilding the United States. We have to do this if we're going to exist as a nation; there's no ifs, ands, or buts about that. This is the future of our nation if we're going to exist; returning to this orientation towards a physical economic approach to rebuilding our nation at a higher level. But in a sense, that is just an effect of something more fundamental; which is understanding mankind as the only species which can really do this. Understanding that this process, this ability to change the state of your species from state A to state B, to a higher order existence; is the most fundamental expression of what makes mankind unique as a living form on this planet.

And that, I think, gets at some of what Mr. LaRouche was saying earlier today about what's happened over the past century; the disaster of the past century. That you had a fundamental attack on the economy, on the population, but also a fundamental attack on this most fundamental principle; the principle of understanding of human creativity. That there is something that the human mind can do uniquely that is the cause, that is the reason we can have these types of changes. That's the reason we can have a higher population with a higher standard of living, higher population density, than we had before. Because mankind has the ability to create his own future; to create a higher level of existence for society. But where does that come from? You go to education today, people

are taught that the human mind, the human brain is just an advanced computer; that thinking is just a deductive process, that the way that human beings think and discover things is essentially just an advanced form of a computer process. That even a basic understanding of human creativity as a distinct potential, as a distinct capability has been not just attacked, but virtually eliminated from society today. That the understanding that the human mind acts in a unique way which I think we don't really understand yet, in a non-deductive, non-mathematical fashion to generate a new conception, a new discovery which didn't come from the lower-order understanding; but is a new generation, but it's that new generation which comes from the human mind itself which is the substance which enables mankind to move to a higher level.

I think that's what we have to put up front; and this is part of a longstanding fight. If you just look back to the work of Kepler himself, the great genius who completely revolutionized mankind's existence in the universe by discovering that we're part of this higher order Solar System. And you look at Kepler's own understanding of his own discovery process; and if you go to his works – go to the *Harmony of the World* – go to Book 4 of the *Harmony of the World*, where he says this is really the essence of my entire discovery process. Where he discusses the actual process of thought of discovery; and he, himself, roots his whole investigation in the continuity of the fight going back to the fight of Plato against Aristotle. The fight over whether the human mind actually generates new discoveries, or is just merely a product of sense perceptions. Kepler right then and there himself declares the evil of Aristotle's view that the human mind is just a blank slate; that sense perceptions are just written on the human mind as a blank slate, and that's all you are. That's the nature of knowledge, is just the impressions upon you through your sense perceptions; which Aristotle posed as an attack against Plato's idea of recollection, that discovery is more of a process, it's almost as if the mind is remembering something

it had within it. That discovery doesn't come from sense perceptions from the outside, but there's a potential in the human mind to generate something for which the potential was already there in the mind itself.

But then you have the fact that what the human mind can do in that regard, actually enables mankind to come to a higher state of coherence with the universe as a whole. And this is what Kepler himself, I think, developed in a new, higher order way in his conception of harmonics, of harmony; that he himself explicitly sided on the side of Plato and Socrates in this understanding of the human mind. He said quite frankly, Aristotle shouldn't be allowed in the Christian religion; because his views are evil, his views deny this creative capability of the human mind. Kepler himself recognized that Plato was much closer to the truth, and that you have this ability of the human mind itself, of its own potential, to generate new conceptions which are not deductions, which are not mathematical processes; but as a creative process of the human mind. And the amazing thing is that those productions of the human mind itself, of itself and from itself, are the substance of what allows mankind to move to a higher state of organization of the universe; a higher state of coherence with the universe. And that, for Kepler, was the highest sense of harmony, of harmonics. And that's the current of understanding of real human creativity that Einstein was coming out of; and as Mr. LaRouche has said, was the last hold-out against the attacks against this true understanding of human creativity.

So, I think this is the highest challenge we have in this whole process; that we have to rebuild our nation, we have to move society forward. We have to do it premised most fundamentally on the recognition of human creativity per se as the real force, the real substance of mankind's ability to exist in the universe. And if we don't win that fight, then the evil legacy of Russell will just continue to reign. So, I think that's a challenge that we all have before us.

OGDEN: Thank you, Ben. Now let me just say in conclusion, just to reiterate the point that Mr. LaRouche made in the remarks that I read in the beginning, and what Jeff went over; what's preventing this vision from becoming an actuality, is the slavish capitulation and acquiescence of the majority of our elected leaders – Congress and otherwise – to Wall Street, and to the wishes and the demands and the frankly extortion that representatives of Wall Street hold as their power over Washington. Now when you examine that though, it's a ridiculous proposition, because Wall Street is bankrupt; Wall Street has no power. We're in the midst of a total meltdown of the entire Wall Street-based system. And the only solution for the future of anybody in this country is to take the Franklin Roosevelt precedent and say, "You're bankrupt; we're shutting you down." That's done through Glass-Steagall and the entire program that's laid out in this pamphlet, as was just reviewed by Ben.

Now, the other point I'll make is that Mr. LaRouche has emphasized that the pivot point, the leverage point around which we can move and transform the entire country, is what he's called the so-called "Manhattan Project". The highly focused activation over the last 12, 13, 14 months of our association's activities in Manhattan and the broader Manhattan region. Now one thing about this that many of you may be aware of, is that in addition to the regular Saturday afternoon discussions that Mr. LaRouche holds with a live audience in Manhattan, also this weekend, there will be a series of concerts which are going to be presented by the Schiller Institute Community Chorus of Manhattan, as well as co-sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture; which will be presenting a large excerpt of Handel's *Messiah*. The entire Part I, and much of Part II and Part III. The performance of this piece – which includes participation from a large array of activists and other volunteers from the New York area, as well as professional soloists and a very highly skilled orchestra – is that this performance will take

place at the natural, scientific so-called “Verdi tuning” of A=432. And this is a very significant aspect of what Mr. LaRouche’s association’s intervention into a revival of true Classical culture in the United States and worldwide, is built around. So, one of the performances will be at a church tomorrow afternoon, Saturday afternoon in Brooklyn near the Park Slope area; and the other performance will take place early on Sunday afternoon in downtown Manhattan. So, if you are in the area, and you have not yet gotten the details about that, please make sure that you contact our representatives in the New York region.

So, with all of that said, I thank everybody for joining us here today. I especially thank Jeff and Ben for the presentations that they’ve made here; and I would implore you to keep your eyes glued on the LaRouche PAC website, as the updates on a regular basis over the next coming days and hours. So, thank you very much for joining us here tonight; please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

**LPAC Fredags-Webcast 6.
november 2015:
Obama beordrer mediecensur af
Drone-papirer –
Læger uden Grænser udgiver
egen rapport om Kunduz –**

Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina tilsligter 3. Verdenskrig. 0.m.a.

Dette webcast: Obama beordrer mediecensur af dækning af afsløringer af Drone-papirerne. Seneste afsløringer om bombning af LuG's hospital i Kunduz – LuG udgiver egen rapport. Hundrede tusinder af flygtninge pga. Obamas ulovlige krige i Sydvestasien og Nordafrika. Faren for global udslettelse i 3. Verdenskrig vokser, pga. Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina. 0.m.a. Engelsk udskrift.

TRANSCRIPT:

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 6, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly broadcast here from larouchepac.com of our international Friday night webcast. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*, as well as Megan Beets of the LaRouche PAC Science and Research Team.

Now, the three of us did have a chance to meet with Helga and Lyndon LaRouche just a few hours ago; so that has definitely informed the content of the broadcast that you'll hear tonight. What you will hear tonight is a thorough exposition of the continually building case for immediate legal action to be taken against the murderous policies of the Barack Obama Presidency. The case against him continues to snowball. You'll hear about the media censorship that was ordered directly from the Obama White House to eliminate any coverage in the leading newspapers of record of the United States, including the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, of the damning story that was broken by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill in *The Intercept* of the so-called "Drone Papers"; which exposes

the lurid details of Obama's weekly kill sessions, which have routinely resulted in innumerable innocent civilian deaths. You'll hear about the most recent revelations in the case of the bombardment of the Doctors Without Borders hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan; in which it is now being revealed that doctors and other medical personnel who were fleeing the hospital, fleeing the bombardment of this medical facility, were systematically gunned down by US military gunships. [This is] further building the case that this is indeed an intentional targetting of a medical facility, and amounts to nothing less than a war crime. You'll hear about the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been fleeing the illegal wars that have been perpetrated by the Obama administration in the Middle East and northern Africa, resulting in the massive social displacement of entire portions of these populations as well as widespread death and destruction, as Obama continues to lend his support to the overthrow, by radical jihadists, of sitting sovereign governments in this region. You'll hear about the shocking statistics of the rise in the death rates, rising dramatically throughout the United States; particularly among the former skilled, industrial and manufacturing labor force, who were sacrificed at the altar of the bail-out of the bankrupt Wall Street banks by first the Bush and now the Obama administrations. One of the leading causes of this increase in death rates across the United States, and especially in this formerly productive sector of the American labor force, is an unbelievable surge in deaths from heroin and related drug overdoses; not only among the inner city minority populations, but also now among suburban middle and upper class white populations, surpassing automobile and firearms rates of mortality and now reaching an epidemic level as characterized by the Centers of Disease Control.

And finally, you'll hear about the continuing mounting danger of global extinction warfare as the Obama administration continues to attempt to provoke World War III confrontations with both Russia and China. Now, this final item was the

explicit discussion at a landmark event that occurred earlier this past Wednesday on Capitol Hill; which I personally had the opportunity to attend and to be an eyewitness to. This extraordinary event was set up as an informal hearing by Representative John Conyers, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee and the dean of the House of Representatives – the longest serving member of Congress on the House side. Also in attendance were a number of other Congressmen, including Representatives Barbara Lee, Alan Grayson, Charlie Rangell, Sheila Jackson Lee, and Congressman Walter Jones among others. The distinguished members of the panel at this informal hearing were all founders of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord, including: former US Ambassador Jack Matlock, who was ambassador to the Soviet Union under President Ronald Reagan; NYU Professor Steven Cohen; and John Pepper, a leading businessman and former CEO of Proctor & Gamble. The subject of this hearing was none other than the fact that the Obama policies are on the verge of provoking a thermonuclear confrontation with Russia; a subject which was explicitly presented in those terms, and the fact that without a drastic change in US-Russian relations which must be induced, there is no way that this World War III confrontation can be avoided.

The invitation to this event, which was published by the Committee on East-West Accord and was circulated by the office of Congressman John Conyers, read in part as follows: "The Ukrainian crisis represents a low in US-Russia relations not seen since the fall of the Soviet Union. And the recent Russian involvement in the Syrian situation is now making the danger even worse. American and Russian jets flying bombing missions in close proximity to one another, raises the possibility of a military accident between two nuclear-armed powers. As the *New York Times* warned, the complicated and shifting landscape of alliances leaves us 'edging closer to an all-out proxy war between the United States and Russia.' The majority of Americans never lived through the Cuban Missile

Crisis of 1962 or the darkest days of the Cold War. They have led lives without the looming specter of nuclear war, but the areas of conflict between our nations are growing. The conflict in Ukraine, the expansion of NATO, Russia's involvement in Syria, and other lesser issues are driving a new wedge between the US and Russia. While most would agree that conflict between the United States and Russia benefits no one, the likelihood of such a conflict, as well as the serious consequences that it would bring, is not being discussed on Capitol Hill."

In the interest of fostering more robust debate on US-Russia relations, Representative Conyers has convened an informal hearing featuring four eminent American experts on this subject, and those four members were the members that I named: the members of the board of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord.

Now each member of this panel, and a number of the Congressmen, each in their own way referred to the darkest days of the Cold War, which they all remembered as members of the senior statesmen of this country. John Conyers being the dean of the House of Representatives, Jack Matlock being a former ambassador and a close collaborator of President Ronald Reagan – they referred to the Cuban Missile Crisis. They recalled the experience of duck and cover, hiding under one's desk, nuclear air raid drills, underground bomb shelters, nuclear bunkers, and stated that although the situation at that time seemed bad, the situation today is as bad, or worse; and that unless the direct provocations against Russia are halted, there is very real possibility which exists of open nuclear warfare breaking out, and exterminating the human race.

Ambassador Matlock echoed much of what he had stated previously during previous appearances in Washington, D.C., but also especially during his recent appearance on the same dais as President Vladimir Putin at the Valdai discussion club

in Sochi, Russia two weeks ago. Matlock elaborated the 20-year process of broken promises and outright lies and deceptions that resulted in the Eastward expansion of NATO all the way up to Russia's borders, which has an immediate and calculated threat to Russia's domestic security, worse than, in fact, as Matlock pointed out, the Berlin crisis of 1961. The fact that Berlin was not directly on Russia's borders, but now you have the immediate proximity of Ukraine, and other countries right on the borders of Russian territory.

Steven Cohen underscored Matlock's remarks and warned point-blank, in no uncertain terms, that the placement of one more base on Russia's borders, or the incorporation of one more country in Eastern Europe into the NATO security alliance, military alliance, would mean war between the U.S. and Russia, and everything that entails. He pointed out that Michael McFaul's blog has shifted from what he called "Mickey Mouse democracy promotion" to now, all-out strident calls for outright warfare and regime change provocations. Cohen emphasized that the danger of war today is far worse than at any time during the Cold War, mostly because of this cross-partisan 100% close-to-consensus when it comes to the demonization of Putin, and Russia, and the lack of any substantial pushback from among the corridors of power in Washington, against this narrative, especially from within Congress – although this was something which, he noted, was changing with this historic event, changing in front of the eyes of all those who attended this event, over a packed audience, standing room only, with this hearing that was sponsored by John Conyers and other members of Congress: the first open discussion of this kind in a forum such as this by anyone on Capitol Hill.

And finally, John Pepper made a very impassioned call for a completely new paradigm in U.S.-Russia relations, one which is founded on a concept of common security, and a creation of a mutual common security architecture, against what he

identified as the *real* enemies, as opposed to the made-up enemies: the real enemies of both the United States and of Russia. Number one: international terrorism, and ISIS, in specific. And number two: what he identified as the greatest enemy of all mankind, which is thermonuclear warfare itself. He stated, the true enemy that we must guard ourselves against is the enemy of nuclear annihilation, and I think we can all find common cause in that.

So, as I said, this was really an extraordinary event, especially when you juxtapose it to another event which was happening literally simultaneously on Capitol Hill, just a few doors down from this hearing room. And this was a hearing featuring none other than Victoria Nuland herself, and that counterposition was pointed out very clearly by numerous participants in this event, both members of the panel, and members of the audience, as representative of the two stark choices that are facing the American people right now: Obama's World War III and thermonuclear annihilation, or a new international policy of cooperation and partnership with Russia, as well as with China. Which means the immediate end of the murderous and deadly policies of the Obama administration.

So, with that said, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to come to the podium for the next segment of tonight's broadcast, to elaborate a little bit more on what I've just covered.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. There was obviously some important things that were said during that John Conyers event on Wednesday afternoon up on Capitol Hill, but I think it's critical to recognize that there was one thing that was *not* said, and that was that the only viable solution is the removal of President Obama through either impeachment, or invoking of the 25th Amendment, or some combination of actions, as happened with Richard Nixon, to force his immediate resignation.

The fact of the matter is that you had prominent American diplomats, prominent American scholars, leading members of Congress, standing there, and saying to the American people that the President of the United States is pushing the world towards thermonuclear annihilation, and yet nobody took it to the logical conclusion, which is that we've got to get this guy out of office.

Now in our discussion earlier today with Lyn and Helga LaRouche, Mr. LaRouche really was reflecting on where we stand, in terms of the dangers represented to, really, the survival of the entire trans-Atlantic region. Because that's really what's on the table right now. Assuming we even avoid the immediate threat of thermonuclear war and annihilation, the simple fact is that if the current trendlines continue, without a reversal, in a very short period of time the entire trans-Atlantic region will be doomed, will be finished, will not resemble anything like what Europe and the United States historically represented, particularly the United States.

Parts of South America may very well survive, because they're already aligning themselves with the Asia-Pacific region, and with Eurasia more broadly, where countries like China, India, Russia are doing relatively well compared to the complete breakdown process that's inflicted the entire trans-Atlantic region.

Now the problem of not directly addressing the clear and obvious solution to the this crisis, namely the constitutional removal of President Obama from office, is in fact indicative of a much deeper problem, a problem that very few people other than people like Mr. LaRouche think about constantly. The bottom line is that since the very beginning of the 20th Century, since the intervention by Lord Bertrand Russell and others around him to destroy Classical science, and to replace it with mathematics and with the disease of pragmatism, since that process began at the beginning of the 20th Century, we've been on a steady downward trajectory – culturally,

economically, philosophically, morally. We've been, throughout the trans-Atlantic region, in a slow but now intensifying complete collapse of society, and when you broach the issue of a President who has committed atrocities, such as his drone kill policy. All you need to do, is go back on the LaRouche PAC website, and review the last three Friday evening webcasts. You'll have all of the details you need to know about that.

The fact that there has not been a move to remove this president from office, is because the disease of pragmatism has infected our political institutions to such a great degree, and has infected our general population to an even greater degree, that the only measure that can prevent the possible annihilation of mankind, is considered to be "unpractical, it's not pragmatic, there's no guarantee that this process will succeed." So, we've been on this long trajectory downward. It's very much like the principle of how you boil a frog. If you put a pot of water on the stove, and get that water boiling to a full boil, and try to throw the frog in the boiling water, the frog's going to jump right out. He'll run away and you'll never find him. If you put the frog in a pot of warm water, comfortably warm water, and have a low flame, then, gradually, that water will reach a boiling point, and the frog won't notice it, because the incremental changes are gradual. That's why you've got to look back and consider where we are as a trans-Atlantic civilization today, and ask yourself, from that standpoint: can we survive by continuing to cling to pragmatism and avoid taking the necessary urgent measures that can save us from otherwise certain doom?

The drone policy, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion today: it's emblematic of Obama. He's a mass killer. He *boasted* to White House staff, back in 2011, that he was really good at killing. Coming into the office of the Presidency, he had *no idea* how good he was at targeting people to be killed by others. But that's the character of it; that's

what the “Drone Papers,” like the “Pentagon Papers” earlier, brought down [president] Richard Nixon. The “Drone Papers,” alone, are more than sufficient to bring down President Obama. But it has not yet happened, because a few phone calls from the White House to the *New York Times*, to the *Washington Post*, got the word out: this story is taboo; it’s not practical to tell the truth about this mass murderer, because we might get cut off from access to the White House. So, you’ve got this phenomenon.

You have the new reports that Matt just mentioned, that, at the bombing of the Doctors Without Borders [msf] hospital in Kunduz [afghanistan], more and more evidence is coming out that it was a pre-meditated assault on an international medical facility under the lamest of excuses, and that as doctors and nurses and patients were fleeing, they were being shot, on the grounds that anybody who was there was automatically, *de facto*, Taliban and fair game for another mass kill.

But there’s many, many more things to consider. You have the conditions of life of the American people, which have been destroyed, systematically, boiling-frog style, over a period of, really, the last 40 years, or you could say even the period going back to the death of [president] Franklin Roosevelt in April of 1945. It’s been a largely downward trajectory ever since then, and that is merely a slice of the process that began right at the turn of the 20th Century, with Bertrand Russell’s invasion and assault against science. If you look back at the sweep of the 19th Century, you had some of the greatest accomplishments in culture and in science – in real, physical science. You had [bernhard] Riemann, you had the great classical composers – Beethoven, Brahms. You had the work of Friedrich Schiller, branching over from the 1700s into the 1800s. You had a renaissance underway, particularly in Europe, particularly in Germany, during the end of the 19th Century, covering the whole sweep of that Century. And

suddenly, it came it came to a screeching halt, with the British top-down intervention, personified by Bertrand Russell. And we've been on a cultural downslide ever since. If you destroy the culture, you destroy the moral fabric of a society.

So, where are we now? Earlier today, as I'm sure many of you are aware, a series of propagandistic lies were put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, saying that 271,000 jobs were created last month in the United States, and that the unemployment rate is now officially down to 5%. Five percent unemployment is considered to be tantamount to full employment.

Well, those figures are an absolute lie, and I think if any of you think about it, any of you watching this broadcast now, think about whether your conditions of life are better or worse than they were at the start of the Obama presidency, or, even more so, at the end of the Clinton presidency, when Bush and Cheney came in. If you say, "My conditions are better, my prospects for my children and grandchildren are better," then you are in an extremely small minority. The simple reality is that half of the 271,000 jobs claimed to have been created, are *purely fictitious*. They're the result of a mathematical slight-of-hand trick, projecting, on average, death and life rates and starts of new businesses and bankruptcies. But there's nothing normal about the current economy. So, forget that number! If you take the fact that 94 million working-age Americans, qualified to be in the labor force, are *not* counted as part of the labor force, because they are either chronically unemployed or have never been able to find a job, then if you add those 94 million people, working-age people, in, you find that the actual unemployment rate in the United States, is 23%! That number is on a par with the worst, darkest, days of the Great Depression in the 1930s, before Roosevelt put people back to work.

We have statistics that have come out. A study came out just

this past week from Harvard University, indicating that for the first time in a long time, there are more and more Americans dying during their middle-age – their 40s and 50s. And this is due to a combination of job loss, of lack of access to adequate medical care, addiction to drugs and alcohol – again, a reflection of a process of chronic unemployment or under-employment. In rural United States, according to a report in the *New York Times* earlier this week, the rate of suicides is rising astronomically.

In a few moments, Megan will give you a detailed readout on the fact that we're in the midst of a heroin epidemic in the United States, and it's mostly afflicting middle class and upper middle class households all over the country. You have all of the signs there, as if anyone out there needed to be reminded or told about the actual collapse of the conditions of life.

So, this has occurred during the period of the Bush-Cheney administration and during the period of Obama. There's nothing that we can do right now, in particular, about Bush and Cheney, from the standpoint they're out of office. They should have been impeached for a whole range of reasons, and they were not impeached. Yet President Obama is the current President. And he stands guilty of crimes that even go beyond the scope of what Bush and Cheney did. The drone killing policy is a policy of mass murder. In effect, you should be thinking about President Obama from the standpoint of somebody who is a bigger mass murderer than Charles Manson. How would you feel about having Charles Manson in the White House? Well, guess what? Maybe you do. So, the question is, and this is addressed to the outstanding individual who did appear at that Congressional forum, and it's also addressed to you, the American people. When are you going to shed the disease of pragmatism and face the reality of the situation that you are now living through? This is not something you watch on television, or read about in the newspapers or on your

personal computer. This is the life that you are being subjected to; and there's no reason for it.

The trans-Atlantic region is dead; the US economy is dead. The European economy is even more dead in many areas than the US economy is. Yet, Asia is not thriving because of the impact of the trans-Atlantic crisis; but Asia is doing vastly better. There's growth going on. China, India, even Russia; there's growth going on in the entire region. There's a perspective of optimism, about space exploration, about extending the high-speed links from the Asia-Pacific coast on to the Atlantic coast of Europe. The United States and Europe are living as if on a different planet with a different mindset; and that can and must be broken. And one of the first steps that must be taken is that there's got to be a genuine outpouring that says that this President's got to go. That Wall Street has got to be shut down; because one of the greatest crimes that President Obama has committed has been to be a lackey of Wall Street and the City of London. To put their interests above those of the American people.

So, it's time to wake up to your own condition and do something about it, and as I say, there are leading political figures who are scared to death that we are on the cusp of thermonuclear war; they're now talking about it more openly. Don't get me wrong, it's not insignificant that leading American diplomats and members of Congress talked about the fact that we're on the edge of thermonuclear war at a public forum on Capitol Hill. But how many of you even knew about that before you heard this broadcast tonight? I can assure you, you did not read it on the front page of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*; you didn't hear about it on the six o'clock news. So, it's time to wake up; and those people, who are in responsible leading positions, have got to stop being pragmatic and pulling their punches. And they've got to join us and join Mr. LaRouche in saying "We've got an immediate mission. We've got to bring

down this Presidency, and we've got to bring down Wall Street." If you don't do that, then you're not serious about stopping thermonuclear war, and you're not serious about turning around the collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic region.

So, that's the issue on the table. And it was a wonderful event on Wednesday, but this missing ingredient is deadly if it's not actually picked up.

MEGAN BEETS: So, on the topic of Obama being very good at killing, let's take a closer look at what's been done to the working population of the United States over the course of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. As Jeff mentioned, on November 4, the Drug Enforcement Administration released their 2015 National Drug Threat Assessment Report, which paints a similar report released by the CDC in August; a staggering picture of the drug use and drug overdose increases in the United States, which has risen to epidemic levels under the regimes of Bush and Obama. The document reports that drug-related deaths, as Matthew mentioned in the opening, drug-related deaths have risen to become the leading cause of injury death in the United States. More than firearms; more than car accidents. And in 2013 alone, the United States lost 46,470 people to drug overdoses; 46,000 people. That's more than 120 per day. Now among drugs, controlled prescription drugs – mainly opioids and heroin – account for the largest type of drug by far; and the slight decline of the use of prescription drugs is being steadily replaced by the use of heroin, as people shift over to what's a much more deadly drug. But what's also much cheaper and much, much more widely available.

Now, to illustrate that a little bit, in 2013 there were 169,000 new users of heroin; many of them very young. Between 2013 and 2014, the rate of current heroin use – in other words, people who have used heroin in the past 30 days – rose by 51%. Between 2007 and 2013 – or in other words, during the course of Obama's Presidency – the addiction to heroin rose

150%; and the deaths by overdose of heroin more than tripled.

Now the primary area where this increase of death has occurred, is in the Midwest; the formerly industrial centers that LaRouche took the spear point to save over the course of 2005 and the following years, when under the Bush-Cheney administration the auto industry and related machine tool sectors were gutted and crushed. Now it's the Midwest, followed closely by New England and the New York/New Jersey area; all of these the formerly productive industrial centers of the country which have suffered in every way under Bush and Obama. Now the increase, as you might guess, for the most part is not concentrated in the inner cities; although I will mention that in the city of Baltimore, one in ten people is a heroin user. It's not centered among the poorest people in the country; it's centered in the middle class, the working class. For example, families with an income of \$50,000 or more, for families of that income rate, heroin addiction has risen by 60% in the last 4 years. These are working class, upper class families and their children.

But this picture of the epidemic use of drugs is just part of a broader picture. Death is on the rise under President Obama. A study was released just a few weeks ago in September, which is this week receiving wide coverage, which states that since 1999, over the course of the four terms of Bush and Obama, the death rate among middle-aged white Americans in the age range of 45-54 has risen dramatically; in an unprecedented way. 10 % overall, and 20 % among the poorer, less educated strata. This increase of the death rate of middle-aged people is not a natural shift in demographics; it's not due to some overall change in disease mortality rates. In fact, for comparison, in comparable industrialized countries around the world, the mortality rate for exactly this class of people has *fallen* by 25 % to 30 %. So, this is purely the result of a conscious policy in the United States by Bush and Obama.

The leading cause is not disease. The leading causes are signs

of the complete degeneration and despair among the American population: drug abuse; alcohol abuse. And in fact, the authors of the report note particularly, heroin and other opioid overdoses; suicide. And as Jeff referenced, in rural areas of the United States, the suicide rates since 2004 have risen by 20%.

So here you have an overview of the stark reality of the Obama death policy, so clearly seen in the attack on the hospital in Afghanistan, turned against the American people. When presented with some of these figures the other day, LaRouche responded with this: He said, "Why didn't we, as a nation, respond years back, and take action to stop this from happening? How did people get set up to accept the economic policies of destruction of science, of industry, along with endless bail-outs of Wall Street? How were we induced to submit to do this to ourselves?" So, I'd like to ask Jeff to come to the podium to respond and elaborate.

STEINBERG: I think it goes back to what I said earlier. Slowly, the level of culture, the level of real science that had permeated our culture even here in the United States in the 19th Century has been under steady and constant assault; largely coming from the British, particularly reflected in people like Lord Bertram Russell, who wrote books professing to be about science. He wrote a book in 1951, *The Impact of Science on Society*; he didn't talk about science. He talked about methods of destruction of young minds by turning the education system into a system that basically drives people into accepting their subservience to be trained, to be submissive, to be non-inquisitive. And again, the disease that Russell imposed from the beginning of the 20th Century, was the disease of replacing physical science with mathematics. Everything comes down to a formula; everything comes down to a probability. If it's not highly probable, then it's not practical, and therefore, don't go there.

So, you've had an assault on education, both from the

kindergarten level on up, all the way to the major universities professing to be the great halls of advanced education. You've had a culture that has been destructive in the most unbelievable and egregious way. And the net effect is that even compared to the early 1970s, people have lost a certain sense of fight. They'd rather watch reality television. Our leaders have accepted the idea that there are boundary conditions on what they can even dare think about.

Last week on this broadcast, we talked about former Senator Mike Gravel, who, as a lowly first-term Senator from Alaska, had the audacity to put the Pentagon Papers in the Congressional record. That act in 1971 led to the demise of President Nixon, and contributed mightily to the end of the Vietnam War. So, there are glimmers of recognition among some of our elder statesmen that things used to be different. And so, we've got an enormous challenge on our hands right now. Do we continue to tolerate, even knowing that the President of the United States is sitting down every Tuesday afternoon with a small group of White House advisors and basically ordering the murder of individual citizens from nations all over the world, some of them American citizens, without any kind of oversight, and without any accountability for his actions?

As Megan just said, he's presided over an invasion of drugs, whether it's over the counter, prescription or black-market illegal drugs; we have 94 million citizens of working age who are not working in the real economy. Clearly not every one of those people is sleeping under a bridge somewhere. How many of them are directly involved in the black market economy that's shoving heroin at a record rate into the arms of American citizens? It's all of a package.

And again, as I said earlier, and as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion this afternoon, Obama's got to go, and the book of evidence is absolutely there. It's comprehensive, it's irrefutable. Some of the crimes that he is documented to be guilty of are crimes that go beyond simply the question of

impeachment. They may wind up being the basis for criminal prosecution, because the immunity afforded to elected officials does not extend to outright criminal action.

So, we've got Wall Street, that's a parasite sitting on top of and destroying the U.S. economy. There are straightforward measures that could be taken to eliminate Wall Street, starting with the idea of simply re-instituting Glass-Steagall. There are many things that could be done. We could issue credit to rebuild our infrastructure. We could be adopting the model of Franklin Roosevelt from when he first came into office, setting up training programs for young people to give them the necessary skills and to also give them the sense of optimism that they've got a constructive role to play in society, and that they've got a bright future ahead of them.

All of these things could be done. They're all right there. If you go to the LaRouche PAC website, you will see there's a massive amount of material spelling out chapter and verse exactly what kinds of measures can and must be taken to turn this situation around. But ultimately it starts with a very subjective question: Are you prepared to fight for your own vital interests? Are you prepared to hold elected officials to a constitutional standard, and to hold them accountable if they fail to live up to it? These are the issues. These are the questions that are really right now staring us in the face, because we don't have much time left. We don't have a great deal of time to solve these problems, to tackle these issues, and the question is, are you prepared to give up your pragmatism, to turn off your television, and to do something constructive for your country, for your family, and for your future generations?

That's really the issue and that's the question that should be the burning issue on everybody's mind at this moment.

MATT OGDEN: Now, our final question for this evening is our institutional question, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche,

the Russian-operated Airbus A321M crashed last Saturday shortly after taking off from the Red Sea resort of Sharm al-Sheikh, on its way to St. Petersburg, killing all 224 people on board. There are strong but unconfirmed reports that the plane had been downed by a bomb, a claim contested by both Egypt and Russia. British Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond, however, said that Britain had weighed the whole information picture, including the Islamic State's claim of responsibility after the crash, and had concluded that there *is* a significant possibility. If these reports are substantiated through examination of the plane wreckage, what actions do you suggest the Russian government should take against the perpetrators of this tragic crime?

STEINBERG: First of all, I think the actions taken by the British Foreign Secretary were obnoxious and egregious. The British have no role whatsoever in this investigation. If they had communications intercepts suggesting that terrorists were planning such an attack, then the obvious question is why didn't they inform the Egyptian and Russian authorities, if they knew this was happening? The fact of the matter is that the British basically staged an ambush for Egyptian President el-Sisi, because it was upon his arrival in London for a long-scheduled state visit that Hammond made these comments, and basically announced at the same time that British Airways was suspending flights into Egypt.

So, you've got a British game being played here, and an Obama game, because an unnamed Obama Administration official immediately came out and told Reuters that the U.S. is in agreement with the British in terms of jumping the gun, and drawing these hasty and perhaps completely false conclusions.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said is, first of all, you've got to let the Russians conduct the investigation. The Russians are perfectly capable of conducting a thorough and honest and comprehensive forensic investigation to determine what happened. And because of the nature of the area where the

crash occurred, namely, in the Sinai desert, all of the remains of the plane have been recovered. The black boxes have been recovered, with a little bit of damage to one of them. All of the bodies by and large have been recovered. And therefore, because you're dealing with people who have competence, and who have a vested interest in finding out what really happened, Mr. LaRouche emphasized, let the Russians do their job. Don't jam them. Don't try to speed it up. Patiently wait for the investigation to be concluded.

And I should say that the head of the Russian FSB, their intelligence service, Alexander Bortnikov, issued a statement today. I'll just read it—it's brief—but it goes very much to the point that Mr. LaRouche just made. Bortnikov said, and it was publicized on Channel 1 TV in Russia today:

"We need to obtain absolutely objective and verified data on the reasons for the crash of the plane. This is necessary for purposes of investigating the cause of this disaster, and for informing the public. This work must be done in the most meticulous fashion, taking as much time as may be required, and I want to state that until we determine the actual causes of what happened, I think it is appropriate to halt Russian civil aviation flights to Egypt. This chiefly involves tourism. At the same time, we find it necessary to cooperate actively with the Egyptian authorities in joint work on the investigation of the causes of this disaster. Now, Russia 1 then quoted the official spokesman for President Putin, Mr. Peskov, who said the President concurred with Bortnikov's recommendations; and he added "Halting the flights does not yet mean that the version that it was an act of terrorism is being viewed as the main one in the investigation of this air disaster. Experts continue to exclude nothing, including the possibility of a bomb explosion onboard the plane." So, this is the beginnings of an investigation into a serious tragedy; 224 people were killed in it. And it's not known yet; we don't have the results of that forensic investigation.

Now as the question of what the Russians should do, I think the answer is, pretty obviously, that they're already doing it. The Russians, as of September 30, are carrying out a systematic, targeted campaign against the terrorist networks that are operating inside Syria. They are, at the same time, aggressively pursuing a diplomatic track to try to bring an end to this 5-year horror inside Syria; and that will obviously have major implications for the situation next door in Iraq, in Lebanon, in other parts of the entire Middle East region. So, in effect, Putin already made a command decision and launched the flanking operation against the Islamic State and allied jihadist groups and their sponsors in countries like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Turkey. So, it would be a mistake to veer off what is already an extremely effective and ongoing flanking operation. If it turns out – and again, it's premature to make any judgement on this – but if does turn out that the Islamic State or some affiliate or spin-off was involved in planting a bomb on that plane, then that's another story; and you've got to carry it several steps further. What was the infrastructure through which that operation was conducted, if it proves to have been a bomb rather than a mechanical failure? Now, if you're talking about the Islamic State, if you're talking about Nusra, if you're talking about al-Qaeda, then ultimately, face it; you're talking about operations that were allowed to grow and allowed to fester as a result of the policies of the Bush and now Obama Presidencies, and the Blair and Cameron governments in Britain.

So, ultimately, all roads lead back to what we've been discussing throughout the entire evening broadcast tonight; namely, as the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [dia], General Mike Flynn, told al-Jazeera, and has subsequently repeated in interviews with American and Russian media; the President, the administration were warned that the actions that the US was taking in places like Benghazi, was fueling the growth of jihadist organizations. And it was not

an oversight, or that the warnings were ignored, as General Flynn said, it was in pursuit of the ongoing current policy that they made a willful decision to keep doing what they were doing, having been fully informed that this was fueling the growth of not just al-Qaeda. But back in 2012, DIA was already looking at the prospects of the creation of a jihadist caliphate in the area on the territory of parts of Iraq and Syria.

So, in other words, the head of the DIA has said openly and publicly President Obama willfully pursued a policy that created ISIS. So, let me ask you, if – and we're not there yet by any means – but if it turns out that this was a bomb; if it turns out that the Islamic State was involved in it, then let's go higher up the political and logistical chain of command. Are we not talking about the consequences of Bush and Obama administration policies and certainly the policies of the parallel British government? So, that's another dimension of what I want you to think about this evening. And I hope that you've been disturbed enough by what we've discussed tonight that you'll lose a bit of sleep and think about what's required to end the tyranny of pragmatism. To end the tyranny of basically "go along to get along"; and what it will take to actually solve these crises before they bring the entire trans-Atlantic region down, or may ultimately lead to thermonuclear annihilation.

OGDEN: So, as I said at the outset of this broadcast, the evidence has continued to accumulate. The case against Obama has now begun to snowball; the avalanche is ready to begin. It is now incumbent on those who are in responsible positions of leadership to take the legal and Constitutional actions which must be taken to protect the American people and to protect the people of the entire world from the deadly consequences of the continuation of the policies of the Obama Presidency.

So with that said, we want to thank you for joining us here tonight. Please, stay tuned to larouchepac.com, and please

circulate this video and the discussion that Mr. LaRouche continues to have with activists in Manhattan and with people across the entire nation in his weekly Fireside Chats, as widely as you possibly can.

Thank you for joining us, and good night.

Leder, 27. oktober 2015: Ruslands og Kinas verdenslederskab er afgørende nu, hvor Det britiske Imperium står for fald

En nyligt deklassificeret rapport fra 1990, der blev udfærdiget af Præsidentens Efterretnings-Råd (eng.: PFIAB) viste, at truslen om en atomkrig i 1983, ud fra et sovjetisk perspektiv, var blevet drastisk undervurderet af den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste, hvilket skabte en meget reel fare for atomkrig på daværende tidspunkt. Lyndon LaRouche henviste til denne rapport som værende en afgørende markør for det amerikanske lederskabs forfald efter dette tidspunkt, baseret på LaRouches eget kendskab til den situation, som rapporten omhandler – selv om der ikke blev henvist til disse kendsgerninger i selve PFIAB-rapporten.

Kendsgerningen er, at daværende præsident Ronald Reagan den

23. marts 1983 havde vedtaget det forslag, som LaRouche havde udarbejdet, om et fælles udviklingsprojekt mellem USA og Sovjetunionen om at bygge et rumbaseret, anti-missilsystem, baseret på nye, videnskabelige principper (partikelstråle- og laserstrålesystemer), som ville have gjort en ende på den ekstreme fare, der hidrørte fra politikken med »Gensidigt Garanteret Ødelæggelse« (Mutually Assured Destruction, MAD), en politik, der er baseret på at fastholde verden opdelt i Øst og Vest, og hvor begge sider retter massive arsenaler af atomvåben, der kan udløses ved mindste varsel, mod hinanden.

Mordforsøget på Ronald Reagan, der blev udført af en bekendt af Bush-familien kort tid efter Reagans indsættelse, havde nær afsluttet dette historiske samarbejde mellem Reagan og LaRouche, men Reagan overlevede og annoncerede programmet under navnet Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) (Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ). Men britiske interesser i både USSR og USA saboterede indsatsen – en proces, der reflekteres i PFIAB's indrømmelse af efterretningsfiaskoen fra 1983 vedr. truslen om atomkrig.

Siden denne sabotage af SDI og Reagans erstatning med den forræderiske Bush-familie i tre embedsperioder og Obama i to perioder, har der i USA været et udtalt forfald ned i økonomisk og strategisk vanvid, der har muliggjort Wall Streets og City of Londons bankinteressers dominans over regeringen, og som har lanceret den ene krig efter den anden i kolonialistisk stil over hele planeten og drevet den vestlige verden ud i kaos, som det nu reflekteres i flygtningekatastrofen i Sydvestasien og Europa.

SE »den fulde historie om SDI«

Med skabelsen af BRIKS og dettes nye finansinstitutioner, der er helliget international infrastrukturudvikling, samt præsident Putins fremragende flankeoperation i Syrien, er verden nu i en position, hvor Det britiske Imperium langt om længe kan blive stedt til hvile. Obama, og Hillary Clinton

(der underkastede sig Obamas ondskab), er blevet afsløret som støtter af terrorisme med det formål at opnå »regimeskift« over for nationer, der nægter at underkaste sig, og som beskyttere af de morderiske finansfyrster på Wall Street ved at afvise den nødvendige genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der skal underkaste Wall Street en konkursbehandling.

De interventioner, som talsfolk fra LaRouchePAC i løbet af de seneste uger på Manhattan og andre steder i hele USA har gennemført, har fået repræsentanter fra Imperiet til at søge dækning med den voksende bevidsthed om sandheden af deres forbrydelser, der er blevet offentligt udtalt og har ødelagt deres evne til at hjernevaske og tvinge godtroende amerikanere. Tiden er inde til at lukke Wall Street ned, fjerne Obama og til, at solen endeligt må gå ned over Det britiske Imperium.

Se: En kort gennemgang af historien om LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ, fra LPAC (Jeff Steinberg)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r0pVhtVdS7A>

LPAC Fredags-webcast 23. oktober 2015: Benghazi-høring med Hillary Clinton.

Implikationerne af 'Dronepapirerne'. v/Jeffrey Steinberg m.fl.

Jeffrey Steinberg og Matthew Ogden gennemgår intrigerne bag torsdagens Benghazi-høring med Hillary Clinton og den fortsatte uenighed og implikationerne af offentliggørelsen af Intercepts »Dronepapirer«. ... American Civil Liberty Union har krævet officielle Kongresundersøgelser, især af de utallige civile, der er blevet dræbt som en del af dette program – dette målrettede dræberprogram – der alle er klassificeret under fjendtlig kæmperstatus til trods for det faktum, at der ikke engang er nogen, der kender identiteten af det store flertal af disse mennesker, der blev dræbt.

Jeffrey Steinberg and Matthew Ogden reviewed the machinations behind Thursday's Benghazi hearing with Hillary Clinton and the continued fall out and implications of the publication of the Intercept's "The Drone Papers."

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's October 23, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to welcome you to our weekly broadcast here of the LaRouche PAC Friday night webcast. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from *Executive Intelligence Review*, and we're here to deliver the message that Mr. LaRouche had to deliver when we met with him earlier this morning; only a matter of hours ago. Now, last week, for those of you who watched this broadcast, we discussed in depth the content of the so-called "Drone

Papers," which were published by Glenn Greenwald's publication, The Intercept, along with Jeremy Scahill last week. And based on documents that were leaked or were provided to The Intercept by a whistleblower, a second Edward Snowden, from within the drone program itself. The content of those papers is horrifying, to say the least; but the implications of the release of the Drone Papers are continuing to resonate. And the effect is continuing to grow; especially as pertains to Barack Obama, who has presided over this policy during the extent of his entire Presidency. The ACLU has called for official Congressional investigations, especially into the innumerable number of civilians that have been killed as a part of this program – this targeted killing program – who are all classified under enemy combatant status, despite the fact nobody even knows the identities of the vast majority of these people who were killed. And there's also a press release that has been published and released by former Senator Mike Gravel and also former Democratic Presidential candidate from the 2008 Presidential primaries. This press release was published on the LaRouche PAC website, as well as Executive Intelligence Review, and is available. And again, Senator Gravel takes this directly to the point; that this is the murderous policy of the current President, President Barack Obama.

Now, this is what the subject of our institutional question is for this week; and we're going to begin by reading the text of that question, and then I'm going to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, plus a little bit more additional background. So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, some officials within the Obama administration believe that the drone program is key to fighting the war against global terrorism. Others believe that the program is a clear violation of the US Constitution, and of international law. Please give us your assessment of the legal issues involved in the drone issue."

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. As Matt said, we had a very

extensive discussion with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier today; and I'll get into some of the more legal issues that are on the table here, but I first want to just read you some things that are not quite verbatim quotes, but very clearly reflect the major thrust of Mr. LaRouche's response to this question.

First, he said, were it not for the recent actions of Russian President Vladimir Putin, humanity as a whole may already have been lost. And this is clearly reflected in the British and Obama policies that came very close to triggering global conflagration, whether over the Ukraine situation or Syria. On the specific issues of the drone policy, what Mr. LaRouche said is if Obama is allowed to run loose, even on a reduced basis, it poses a grave danger to mankind. He gets by with murder; he's a satanic figure, and he's already been allowed to complete two terms in office. And furthermore, he is still killing people. The United States, under first Bush and now Obama, has become an unsafe nation with no competent leadership. Obama must be kicked out of office quickly, and Wall Street has to be shut down. If Wall Street is shut down, we can save the USA; but so long as Wall Street maintains its grip over the US economy, we're doomed.

And Mr. LaRouche made direct reference to the personal aspects of President Obama, which he's been identifying and actively discussing since the very early months of the Obama Presidency; precisely since April 11, 2009, when he delivered an international webcast and warned that the President had the personality of Emperor Nero. Someone, who had a severe narcissist disorder, and that this would pose a grave danger to the country and the world, if it went unchecked. Now, I think we briefly discussed last week, the fact that we know that one of the defining influences on President Obama during his early formative years when he was a preteen, was his stepfather in Indonesia; who himself was a real killer. He was brought back from graduate studies in Hawaii to participate in

the Suharto coup and the mass bloodletting that followed. And there was household brutality, both directed against Obama's mother and against young Barack Obama personally. These things have deep and enduring, scarring impact; and so much of the personality of the stepfather rubbed off on Obama. And we're seeing the consequences of that in this drone policy.

I call all of your attention to the fact that in 2012, two reporters – I believe from *Time* magazine – published a book-length account of the 2012 Presidential elections. The book was published in 2013. And what they recounted was a conversation that President Obama had with some senior White House aides; it was after one particular incident in his long line of drone killings, where Anwar al-Awlaki – a US citizen – was killed in Yemen in a drone strike. Now, one could debate al-Awlaki's role as a figure within al-Qaeda, and there are many things that could be said, but are not relevant to the topic here. The point is that an American citizen, by order of President Obama, was murdered in cold blood by a drone attack signed off on by the President; but as an American citizen, al-Awlaki was deprived of any due process. Now, mass murderers are subject to due process, to fair trials; but in this case, because he was on Obama's kill list, despite the fact that he was an American citizen, he was murdered. Several weeks later, his 16-year old son was murdered, along with yet another American citizen, in drone attacks in Yemen. And, while the administration claimed that the murder of the son was not intended, but was a consequence of targeting others, it remains the fact that at least three now – I'm sure many more – American citizens have been murdered overseas by President Obama.

So, in this incident that's recounted in the book by these two *Time* magazine reporters, Obama is quoted telling one of his close aides – boasting in fact – that it "Turns out I'm really a quite good, effective, killer. I never thought that I was going to emerge as a great killer, but here I am." In the

ensuing two years since the book was published, to my knowledge there have been no attempts by the White House to deny the accuracy of those quotes. They've attempted to explain it away, and complain instead about the fact that there are too many leaks coming out of the inner circle, but nobody has outright said that that was not Obama's statement, those were not his words. So, you're dealing with somebody, who clearly has the pathology of a killer.

Now, a week and a half ago, the German Bundestag, soon after the release of the "Drone Papers," held hearings in which they brought two American former drone pilots to testify, and those hearings were serious and substantial. And, yet, here we are, two weeks after the release of the "Drone Papers," and there's not been a public hearing; there has not been a word to speak of, from any members of Congress. We know that there's pressure from ourselves, from groups like the ACLU, for some kind of congressional hearings, but the fact of the matter is, that the dis-functionality of the two political parties, and the dis-functionality of Congress as the result of that, has meant that President Obama has literally been able to get away with murder, and continues to do so, right up to this moment.

So, the fact of the matter is, that the drone program, as we've now been given a very in-depth window into it, through the House Intelligence Committee's review of the Executive Branch procedures – of the various Obama guidelines on how to manage the drone program – we know that none of these things have actually worked; that this is a reckless, "Murder, Inc." operation, that violates a 1975 ban, signed by President Gerald Ford, against assassination. And the fact that these assassinations are simply referred to as "targeted killings," does nothing to mitigate the fact that President Obama has been guilty of mass-murder. And there's an entire structure of government that is complicit in that process. And the guilt spreads beyond the U.S. borders, and becomes clearly another clear bit of evidence that President Obama has been, from the

very outset and remains to this moment, a British agent. Mr. LaRouche pointed to the specific role of Valerie Jarrett as one of the key British agents within the Obama inner circle. But let's look a bit further at the testimony that was delivered before the German Bundestag. What one of the two drone pilots testified, was that there's an entire international network that has all been involved in working up the targeting information, and feeding in key data to facilitate the mass-murder operations that are carried out under this drone program. In particular, there is a working intelligence-sharing alliance, known as "Five Eyes." These are the national intelligence services, the technical intelligence services, of the United States – in this case, the National Security Agency – the services of Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. In other words, four countries: Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, which are not just simply members of the British Commonwealth, but are countries where Queen Elizabeth II *is the Sovereign*; where in each case, those countries are run by a privy council that is appointed by, and reports directly back to the British Monarchy, in this case Queen Elizabeth.

So, you have the United States and the British Monarchy participating as a single, seamless entity, in gathering the targeting data that has been used in this mass drone killing program which began right at the very outset of the Obama Presidency.

And, again, what we heard in the Bundestag testimony, and we're yet to see a moment of congressional hearings on this, up to this moment, is that those five agencies, with other assistance – the German Federal Intelligence Service (BND) was involved in this program as well. They've developed the technique to use the GPS functions on cell phones to track down the exact locations of where a particular cell phone is, at any given moment, and in fact, the drone kill program targets *cell phones*, which have been "associated" with people

on the kill list. But the ability to verify that the person holding that cell phone, at the moment, that the drone strike takes place, is the actual target, is something that doesn't function. There's very little evidence that there has been much consideration about whether or not they're even going after the right targets.

So, in effect, we're dealing with an even more out-of-control drone program, where all of the guidelines that were established by President Obama and the administration, at the very beginning, for how to conduct the drone warfare, fully implemented, it would not make any difference, from the standpoint that these are war crimes, and crimes against humanity, and represent instances of mass murder. The fact of the matter is, that even those limited guidelines – for example, if an individual can be captured and interrogated, rather than killed, that's preferable – well, throw that out the window right away. There's never been any effort, once you're on the kill list, you are a target, and, within a 60-day period, if feasible, you will be gone after, and you will be dead, or perhaps someone else at that moment carrying your cell phone, will be dead.

So, the program is absolutely unconstitutional, is a clear violation of the UN Charter, and is not only illegal and should be the basis for President Obama's immediate removal from office, but let's go one step further. There should be no presidential immunity from criminal prosecution, whether in U.S. Federal Court, or in The Hague, for these heinous crimes. Now, the bankruptcy of the U.S. governing institutions, the failure of Congress to instantly take up this issue, the failure of the federal courts to act against this drone program in a decisive way, has meant that the prospect of justice under this situation right now in the United States, is gravely impeded.

So, what do we find out? In Germany, Somali family members and Yemeni family members of individuals killed in the drone

warfare have filed lawsuits against both the German and American governments. There's no attempt to get at justice in the U.S. court system, because of how badly the whole structure's been corrupted since George W. Bush, and even more so under Obama. So, the situation is that families seeking justice are going to the federal courts in Germany, in Cologne, and are filing against the German and U.S. governments. The German government is clearly complicit in this. The Ramstein Air Force base is one of the major hubs of the U.S. drone operations, and it's being done with the complicity and cooperation of the German government.

How far does it go? When we looked at the Bush administration's illegal renditions and torture program, it took a long time to get to the bottom of it, and find out how many countries were complicit and were cooperating in this crime against humanity and war crime. So we're dealing here with a matter of a bankruptcy and a failure of institutions to live up to their Constitutional responsibilities. And that's where you, the American people, have an enormous amount of responsibility. The evidence against President Obama and the chain of command that he sits on top of in this drone mass-murder program is cut and dry. It's been known for a long time, but now with the release of this hundred-plus page House Intelligence Committee review of the program, which contains previously-unpublicized details, the book of evidence is there. This President should be immediately removed from office. The crimes that are evidenced in this documentation alone go vastly beyond the crimes of Richard Nixon, that resulted in his forced resignation. Nixon was facing impeachment, was facing the activation of the 25th Amendment at the time that he wisely decided to resign. We're in a situation, that is far more advanced and far more grave now, than we faced under Nixon back in the early 1970s. So it's up to you to make sure that our institutions of government begin to function, and if we can achieve *that*, then this President will be removed from office, and the dangers associated with

his continuing on the job, including the danger of thermonuclear war, will at last be removed.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Let me just follow up what we've begun to discuss here. As I'm sure most of you are aware of, the hearing of the Benghazi Select Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives took place yesterday, at which Hillary Clinton was called as a witness. This has certainly been a central focus of attention for a number of months now, leading up into this hearing. However, after literally hours upon hours of questioning of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, hardly any of the Congressmen, in either party, managed to get at the true issues. There were significant questions that were raised, certainly. However, even those who *did* raise those questions, for the most part failed to pursue their lines of questioning to the necessary and actually relevant conclusions.

First of all, why does Hillary Clinton continue to insist on covering up for Obama's role in directly ordering her, on the night of the Benghazi attacks, to lie about the events that occurred that night – even though it's been proven multiple times that she knew exactly what was really going on, that there was clearly, this was clearly a pre-meditated attack against a U.S. Government compound on the anniversary of September 11th, carried out by jihadist militants, as opposed to the made-up story that was then echoed several days later by Susan Rice, of a spontaneous demonstration in response to a video denigrating the Prophet Mohammed. Why does Hillary continue to cover up for the fact that Obama directly ordered her to lie?

And secondly and maybe even more significantly in a broad sense, where did the policy that led to the events that night in Benghazi even come from? As former Chairman of the House Permanent – or the House Select Committee on Intelligence, Congressman Peter Hoekstra, identifies correctly, in a book which he just released earlier this month, titled *Architects*

of Disaster – The Destruction of Libya, the entire thing ultimately is Obama's fault, in the continuing takeover of Libya, Iraq, and now parts of Syria, by these terrorist groups – ISIS and related – including those who attacked the compound that night in Benghazi, September 11, 2012, this is all a direct consequence of the decision that was made by Obama to invade Libya, to overthrow a sitting sovereign government, and to kill former President Muammar Qaddafi in cold blood. And, as Congressman Hoekstra makes the point, Qaddafi was *our ally* in the war on radical jihadist terrorism – very reminiscent of the policy now being carried out by Obama against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, today, exactly the same scenario. Makes you wonder where Obama's true allegiances lie.

Now, as I said, the majority of the members of Congress who had the opportunity to question Hillary Clinton during the Benghazi hearing yesterday completely failed to address these two crucial points. But, virtually simultaneously with the hearing taking place on Capitol Hill yesterday, in Russia, in Sochi, Russian President Vladimir Putin was addressing a gathering of the Valdai international discussion club in Sochi, and he *did* address precisely these issues, in very direct terms, denouncing Obama's policy in Libya and in Syria, of supporting and arming the very terrorists that we're supposed to be fighting against in the interest of using them to overthrow yet another sitting president, the government of Assad. And in addition, President Putin addressed the even broader question of the generally imperialistic outlook now being typified by Barack Obama, which is leading mankind right now to the very real danger of total self-destruction through global nuclear war.

What Putin started his speech by focusing on, was the question of the history of the fundamental notions of war and peace themselves. He said it's a proper subject for a Russian president to address, since Leo Tolstoy wrote a book

called *War and Peace*. But he said that for centuries, the concept of peace had been based on the notion of the balance of power, for better or for worse. But *now*, in a world of nuclear arms, and thermonuclear arms, he said, the traditional ideas of peace from this standpoint can no longer function. We need a new concept, a new paradigm, a post-war, at least, vision. He said any major war today would not bring victory to either party, but would only end in the guarantee of mutual total destruction. The only thing that's protected humanity from this terrible fate, he said, over the last 70 years, are the principles of international law that were established under the framework of the United Nations following the Second World War, as well as the general sobriety and self-control of those leaders who have found themselves operating on a global stage, such as during the Cuban Missile Crisis with President John F. Kennedy. However, he said, now we've reached a point where some powers are pursuing a model of unilateral domination of the planet, and the danger that a military situation may get out of control, and just such a mutually-destructive nuclear war be unleashed, has now become all too real. And the emergence of the doctrine of what he called the disarming first strike – be it nuclear or even non-nuclear – has further skewed this postwar balance of power and the system of international law, which has protected mankind since the end of World War II, and has further increased the possibility of the outbreak of a devastating global conflict. And he said, there are those who possess the illusion that there exists the possibility of victory in such a world conflict, without the irreversible, unacceptable consequences that would follow such a nuclear war. So for this reason, he said, you've seen a general weakening of the underlying psychological aversion to the idea of war itself, which has gripped previous generations; and the very perception of war has been changed, turned into an almost media entertainment. As if, he said, nobody actually dies in a conflict; as if people do not suffer and cities and entire states are not destroyed. But this is the reality of war.

It's very significant, as I think Mr. LaRouche has pointed out previously, for President Putin, whose family died and suffered in the siege of Leningrad, the realities of what war means are much more real than what are generally held by those such as the American generation of an Obama or some sort. But I just want to read one quote from what President Putin had to say, just to bring this to the point of what necessarily needs to be addressed when we look at the background of what has brought us to this point. This is a quote; he said, "Why is it that the efforts of say our American partners and their allies in their struggle against the so-called 'Islamic State', has not produced any tangible results? Obviously, it's not for lack of military equipment or capability. It goes without saying that the United States has a huge potential; the biggest military potential in the world. However, it is impossible to play a double game; to declare war on terrorists, and simultaneously try to use some of those same terrorists to arrange the pieces on the chessboard in the Middle East according to what you perceive as your own interests. It is impossible," he said, "to combat terrorism in general, if some terrorists are used as a battering ram to overthrow the regimes, that are not to one's liking. You cannot get rid of those terrorists. It is only an illusion that you can come in and get rid of them later; clean up the mess. To take the power away from them, or reach some sort of negotiated agreement with them. And the situation in Libya," he said, "is the best example of this."

So, as I said, this really goes directly to the point here. If you're serious about fighting to eliminate the danger of global terrorism, then perhaps you should stop arming and supporting the very same terrorists who you claim to be fighting against in the interest of using them to overthrow sovereign governments that are not to your liking. And to me this seems to be a somewhat more reasonable approach than running a drone program that ends up just killing a majority of innocent civilians; or perhaps releasing the 28 pages,

documenting the role of the Saudis in supporting the 9/11 hijackers would be a good place to start as well.

But while Putin has made it clear that Obama's policies in Libya were not exactly what they expected when they supported the UN resolution, this disastrous consequence that has taken place as a result of that invasion and that regime-change operation, is definitely not a mistake that Putin is going to let happen again in the case of Syria. And thus, we see the crucial and decisive actions that have been taken in the recent weeks in what's being characterized by some as President Putin's third Chechen war; because of the extent of the overlap and the interconnection between those whom Putin successfully fought against in Chechnya in 1999, and those who he is now fighting in Syria today, among the Islamic State and otherwise.

So, Jeff, I know that Mr. LaRouche has put significant emphasis on the importance of this historical view of the current situation during our discussion with him earlier today. And this is the type of background which he – Mr. LaRouche – has a very unique view of, due to his experience and his personal role that he played as a central figure that he played throughout much of this history. So, while many people have a tendency, including in the US Congress itself, to exhibit a very short-sighted and shallow insight into these types of questions – including even the questions concerning the current Benghazi investigation – maybe you could give a little bit of a deeper background and insight into what the true questions are that are at hand; along the lines of what President Putin was indicating in his speech.

STEINBERG: You've got to start from the standpoint of understanding the British factor, the British problem, and how that has impacted on the sweep of recent history. And it requires getting away from the idea that history is a string of successive events; these are processes, these are dynamics, and there are certain cardinal events that fundamentally alter

the direction of history. And these are the things that people really have to grapple with to be able to really sort out and make sense of the deep, profound crisis that we're going through right now. I think you've got to start from the fact – and this was a major subject of our discussion with Lyn and Helga LaRouche earlier today. You've got to start with at least a modicum of a sweep of recent history.

The fact is, that the last time that we had a viable and effective Presidency was with Ronald Reagan. And there were many caveats that have to be identified in terms of the Reagan Presidency. There was intention on the part of Reagan and on the part of an inner circle of close advisors and collaborators going into the 1980 Presidency – the elections and then Reagan's inauguration in January 1981 – to fundamentally change the direction of US policy. We had been through a turbulent period of the 1970s; the watergating of Nixon, the end of Vietnam, the emergence of a Trilateral Commission government that brought us to the brink of nuclear war in the 1970s. The policy of that government and of the Council on Foreign Relations to being a process of controlled disintegration of the U.S. and world economy.

All of these had already taken place; and this was the backdrop to the beginning of a critical collaboration between Mr. LaRouche and President Reagan. There was a convergence of thinking and commitment to restore the American tradition; and to do it by presenting Presidential leadership. And it was in that context that on a number of leading issues, the leading one in particular being the LaRouche-Reagan collaboration on what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative [sdi]. That was a shaping directionality for a sweeping change in the US Presidency and particularly in the major US global relations. There was a very real prospect with the LaRouche-Reagan-Edward Teller and other collaboration around the idea of a joint Strategic Defense Initiative between the United States and the Soviet Union, with allied countries from both

blocs involved, to bring an end to the threat of thermonuclear war. Reagan doggedly pursued that, even in spite of the fact that within his first 100 days in office, there was a serious assassination attempt against him. And of course, many of you may recall that that assassin, John Hinckley, came from a family that was intimately associated with the Bush family. So, right from the outset, within that first 100 days, Ronald Reagan was gravely wounded; he survived and, in fact, did continue in the Presidency. And the high water mark of that was the SDI policy. Reagan had also intended to make a dramatic break with Wall Street that was symbolized by the fact that he and some of his Kitchen Cabinet advisors were in depth involved in discussion with Mr. LaRouche over firing Paul Volcker and fundamentally changing the whole nature of the Federal Reserve System. And this became an issue that was a matter of outright warfare between Wall Street and London on the one side, and the Reagan inner circle on the other. The Reagan assassination attempt greatly weakened the Reagan Presidency and paved the way for George HW Bush to emerge as more and more of a dominant figure in the Reagan Presidency. They were never able to dissuade Reagan from pursuing the Strategic Defense Initiative that he had worked out with LaRouche; but nevertheless, Reagan was weakened, and many things that were promised at the outset of the Reagan Presidency were never able to materialize because of British interference. And that included the fact that British agent Yuri Andropov came into power in the Soviet Union and put the kibosh on the SDI collaboration. The entire effort against Wall Street and against the policies of the Fed, were basically shut down at the point that Reagan was shot, and had to go through a prolonged period of recuperation. So, you had a real Presidency with Reagan, despite the Bush factor, and despite the consequences of the assassination attempt. And there was a period of four years or so where on a number of policy issues, there was a Reagan-LaRouche cooperation; many of the details of which are frankly yet to come out in public.

We had the Bush 41 Presidency that was a disaster. LaRouche was railroaded into Federal prison; and for all practical purposes was expected to die in Federal prison. And that would have very likely happened had Bush been elected to a second term in office. What happened, however, was that Bush was defeated for re-election; and Bill Clinton came in. And there was a level of collaboration once again with the Presidency; there was potential with the Clinton Presidency to revive some of the core ideas that had been running through the Reagan Presidency, and reflected back earlier on the successful Presidencies of John Kennedy and before that, obviously, Franklin Roosevelt. But, Clinton ran up against a buzz saw. The British launched literally warfare against the Clinton Presidency; they manipulated the First Lady to be a factor that further disrupted. You had the factor of Al Gore as Vice President; which was as bad a choice as George Herbert Walker Bush was for Ronald Reagan. So, in effect, the Clinton Presidency never lived fully up to its potential; and towards its concluding year, at the point that Clinton was about to make a significant move against the preponderant system of London offshore global finance, he was gone after. He was set up; his Presidency was destroyed. He went through House impeachment, and at the end of the day, Clinton made the gravest mistake of his political career, by signing the bill that repealed Glass-Steagall.

Now, what's happened since that point, with the George W Bush Presidency for eight years, and then now with the Obama Presidency already for seven years, is that the British have been in the driver's seat in the White House throughout that 15-year period. And so, what President Putin identified correctly in his Valdai speech, needs to be fleshed out much further. It's got to be understood that there has been effectively a British-Wall Street takeover of the Executive branch of the US government. It's come to be completely dominant over the Republican Party and over the Obama wing of the Democratic Party.

So, if you step back and realize that the entire history of the United States has been a struggle against the British Empire, then you get an idea from a much deeper historical appreciation of how this process, how this dynamic has played out and brought us to the point that we've reached right now. Now, there are other examples that come up throughout history; even the history of the shaping events that established the American republic, its character, and the war against the British. At the very beginning of the 18th Century, you had a giant of a figure; one of the key figures who revived the entire Renaissance tradition in Europe, namely Gottfried von Leibniz. Leibniz was a key player in European political affairs. His interests extended to an extensive understanding and appreciation of China and of the commonalities between Confucianism and Western Christianity. He was moving to establish control over Britain to dismantle the empire system that was beginning to come into existence at that time. And it was with the death of Leibniz – and there were people waiting breathlessly to confirm that indeed he was dead. But with his confirmed death about 20 years into the 18th Century, that's when the British Empire took off. Leibniz had been instrumental as an adviser in the British court, to establishing some of the key players who shaped and framed the United States; some of the leading governors who were sent over as Royal Governors from England during the period of Leibniz's influence in London. You had Spotswood in Virginia; you had Hunter in New York. These were leading international republican figures, who were part of the Leibniz networks. Franklin was a student of Leibniz's writings, and traveled to Europe in the 1750s to obtain access to some otherwise difficult to obtain writings of Leibniz. But Leibniz's death was one of those cardinal moments in history that framed events that moved forward from there; just as there was a concerted move coming from the worst elements of the European oligarchy to crush the influence of the Golden Renaissance.

So, these kinds of critical historical events, which are

really reflective of long-term processes, are the big challenge to be understood. If you're going to shape history and define a viable future for mankind, then it's very helpful to know from an historical standpoint, who are your friends and who are your enemies. In January of 1981, in fact on the day of Ronald Reagan's inauguration, *Executive Intelligence Review*, Mr. LaRouche's flagship publication, issued a warning forecasting that there would be an attempt to assassinate President Reagan within his first 100 days in office. This was not based on some kind of footprints of would-be assassins; but it was based on an understanding that the Reagan election represented a potential break from British control over the US Presidency that had been a dominant factor since the assassination of John F Kennedy.

We knew that at critical moments, the British have assassinated American Presidents in order to prevent break-out of the United States as a proper republican leader of the world. You had it take place early on, not with a President, but with a giant of the American Constitutional republic, Alexander Hamilton; who was assassinated by an undisputed British agent, Aaron Burr. You had the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, which doesn't even need any further elaboration; it was a British assassination carried out by Confederate networks, but operating out of British intelligence centers, including Montreal, Canada. You had the assassination of President McKinley, who was reviving the Lincoln-Hamilton tradition at a critical moment; and was pushing back against British imperial operations. His assassination brought Teddy Roosevelt, the favorite nephew of one of the heads of the Confederate Secret Service – headquartered in London – into the Presidency. You had the assassination of Kennedy; a British assassination, for again, reasons that are too obvious to have to deal with in any detailed explanation here.

So, it was on the basis of that knowledge and understanding of

the sweep of the US fight against the British Empire forces in the world, that drove us to issue a warning that there would be an attempt to assassinate President Reagan because of what he represented as a best hope for a return of the United States to its historic mission and its historic tradition and policy. We were, unfortunately, correct. It was about the 90th day of the Reagan Presidency that John Hinckley carried out the assassination attempt; and while Reagan survived it, it weakened the potentiality of the Reagan Presidency.

So, you've got to look at those kinds of historical processes and dynamics, and think through how these events play out. If you want to understand Benghazi, you can't start on September 11th of 2012; you've got to go back to the fact that a British policy that was coordinated with rotten elements in France – the same elements that were directly involved in the attempts to assassinate President Charles de Gaulle a decade or two earlier – those elements, along with Obama. British directly, Anglo-French forces and Obama, decided to bring down Qaddafi and to unleash absolute Hell throughout North Africa and into the Middle East. Where were the weapons that fueled the Islamic State and the Nusra and other insurgencies in Syria coming from? They were coming from Benghazi; they were coming from the Libya that became an absolute Hell on Earth. An absolutely ungovernable area, because the British – with their French and Obama underlings – got rid of Qaddafi to unleash this process. To unleash a state of permanent warfare across the entire North African and Middle East and really the entire Islamic world.

So, if you don't understand that British factor, it's very difficult to understand why we are in the crisis that we're in. If you understand that dynamic, and you understand that Obama – like Bush before him – was effectively a British agent; then you understand why it is an imperative that Obama is removed from office, and that the other major center of British influence in the United States – namely Wall Street,

which is completely, irreversibly, unrepentantly bankrupt, has to be shut down. And that this is an urgent matter of life and death for the survival of our nation and for the world as a whole.

Putin understands the broad dynamics; he's got to even further understand the real nature of the enemy. The enemy resides principally in London; and it's the London controls and strings that are pulled in Washington, that are the major problem here in the United States. As LaRouche said in our discussion earlier, get rid of Wall Street; remove Obama from office. And that eliminates much of the British influence, the destructive influence, over the United States. Then we've got a shot at rebuilding the world and forging the kinds of alliances that are waiting for us: the BRICS alliance; the collaboration with Russia on bringing an end to this bloodshed and horror show throughout the Middle East and North Africa. The opportunities are all there, but step one is Obama must be removed. And now the book of evidence is there; it's irrefutable, and Congress has to act. And secondly, Wall Street has to be shut down, cold; no compensation. Wall Street goes down; we put back Glass-Steagall, and learn the playbook of Franklin Roosevelt on how to rebuild an economy. If we can do those things, we're in fine shape; the world is in fine shape. But if those actions aren't taken right now, then we're all in grave danger.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. And what I want to do to conclude tonight's broadcast with, is to read something which I think sums up in very cogent terms what Jeff just concluded with. And this is the Presidential policy statement from Lyndon LaRouche that was issued on this website earlier this week. And what Mr. LaRouche says in this, which he issued following the Democratic debate, what he calls "A Brief Statement on the Nature of Our Current National Crisis; and the Proper Framework for Approaching This Vital Presidential Election" is the following; and I'm just going to read it

verbatim, from the beginning of where he makes the points about what actions must be taken. He says:

"First, the defining issue for today is the fact that Wall Street is hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt, and there can be no serious improvement in the conditions of life for the vast majority of Americans until Wall Street is shut down altogether. The first and most immediate remedy for the bankruptcy of Wall Street is the reinstating of Glass-Steagall.

"The simple truth is that an honest appraisal of the disastrous collapse of real productivity in the US economy is that a large and growing majority of our fellow citizens are facing job loss, starvation, collapse of genuine health care services, the destruction of the educational system and an overall disintegration of basic infrastructure. This has accelerated under the Barack Obama Presidency, but it began before that, particularly during the George W. Bush terms in office.

"Any attempt to dodge this fundamental truth during the now ongoing presidential campaigns, by appealing to 'issues' or populist slogans, dooms the United States to total destruction in the very short term period ahead.

"Wall Street must be shut down totally. The entire Wall Street system is bankrupt. It must be ended. Then, we must do what Franklin Roosevelt did to overcome the Great Depression. Today, we face an even greater challenge, due, in part, to the decades of collapse of the productive powers of labor in this nation. Shut down Wall Street now, reinstate Glass-Steagall as a means of reconstituting viable commercial banking, and then begin a program of Federal credit to revive the productive economy, through capital investment in infrastructure and other vital programs. We must begin to reverse the collapse of our industrial economy, and we must train a new generation of young people to develop the skills to function in a modern,

technology-intensive growing economy.

"This is what the 2016 presidential candidates must address. Any attempt to divert from this essential agenda is tantamount to surrendering to Wall Street and those who would see the United States disintegrate altogether.

"A segment of the American people, horrified by the clown show of last week, is demanding nothing less. Any candidate who fails to meet this standard does not belong in the race. This is not a popularity contest or a test of who can best pander to the worst pragmatic impulses of a beaten-down and terrified public. This is an election that will determine whether or not the United States still has the moral fitness to survive.

"I hear the American people crying out for a future minus the scourge of Wall Street. They deserve nothing less."

And with that, I would like to thank everybody for watching our broadcast here tonight, and bring a conclusion to this webcast. Thank you very much. Thank you, Jeff, for joining me in the studio. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**LPAC Fredags-webcast, 16. oktober 2015:
De lækkede 'Dronepapirer':
Brug chancen til at**

katalysere et presserende nødvendigt oprør, hvis vi skal redde USA. v/Jeffrey Steinberg

Som hr. LaRouche understregede, har vi nu en chance for at katalysere et presserende nødvendigt oprør, der kommer internt fra det Demokratiske Parti og de amerikanske borgere generelt imod alt, hvad Obama og hans team står for. Det er den presserende nødvendige handling, der må udføres, hvis vi skal redde USA; og hvis vi skal opbygge et virkelig kvalificeret præsidentskab til at erstatte Barack Obama i det Hvide Hus, som De forenede Staters præsidentskab. Engelsk udskrift.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 16, 2015:

Take the Opportunity of Catalyzing an Urgently Needed Revolt

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's October 16, 2015. You're watching our weekly Friday night live webcast from larouchepac.com. And we are broadcasting live tonight, at our usual time; 8pm Eastern, 5pm Pacific. And we thank you for tuning in. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence Review magazine. And the two of us had the opportunity to meet with Mr. LaRouche earlier today; and had a very important and necessary conversation that we intend to convey the essence of to you. He had a very concise message; and our aim tonight is to get that across to our viewership.

So, we're looking at the opportunity right now, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized, of catalyzing an urgently needed revolt from within the Democratic Party and the American citizenry

generally, against everything that Obama and his team stand for. And this is the urgent, necessary action that must be taken, if we are going to save the United States; and if we're going to build a truly qualified Presidency to take the place of Barack Obama in the White House as the Presidency of this United States. Over the course of this week, the evidence against Obama has only continued to pile up. This is very clear evidence; and we intend to present this evidence in summary form to you tonight. This will include, but will be exclusively, significantly number one: The release by Glen Greenwald and by Jeremy Scahill in their publication, {The Intercept}, of what they're calling "The Drone Papers"; a reference obviously to the famous "Pentagon Papers" of the 1970s, which incidentally were read into the Congressional Record by former Senator Mike Gravel, who has appeared on several forums with representatives of the LaRouche Movement nationally, recently. Number two, you have the continued fall-out from the savage, deadly, murderous bombing of the Doctors Without Borders (MSF) hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan, under the orders and the command of Barack Obama; which the MSF organization is referring to explicitly as a war crime. And number three, in this context, we have the announcement by Obama just yesterday that he is extending the US perpetual-war military deployment in Afghanistan even further. And I know that Jeff will get into all three of these points more in depth tonight.

But first, what Mr. LaRouche wanted to begin tonight's broadcast with, is the significance of what's being referred to as the "insurrection" that has erupted from within a certain layer of the Democratic Party leadership – the Democratic National Committee – which came to a head around this CNN debate that was held in Sin City; Las Vegas, earlier this week on Tuesday. This insurrection is being led by none other than Tulsi Gabbard, a Congresswoman from Hawaii, who is one of the five vice chairs of the Democratic National Committee [DNC]. Our viewers might recall that Tulsi Gabbard

made herself an outright, outspoken enemy of the Obama White House about two weeks ago, by very prominently denouncing Obama's World War III policy in Syria on national television; stating that 1) the overthrow of President Assad would be a grave mistake, akin to the overthrow of both Saddam Hussein and Muammar Qaddafi. This is significant from Tulsi Gabbard, who is herself an Iraq War combat veteran. She called for the direct cooperation with President Putin of Russia in military operations in defeating ISIS and al-Qaeda. This was in the image of Franklin Roosevelt's cooperation with Russia during World War II to defeat Hitler and the Nazis; which is by the way an echo of exactly what President Putin himself called for in his speech at the United Nations General Assembly.

And this isn't the only policy which Tulsi Gabbard has openly disagreed with Obama on; she's also a major and outspoken supporter of the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. And this is a point that Mr. LaRouche stressed was very significant and must be emphasized.

So, it just so happens that Congresswoman Gabbard is at the center of the rebellion within the leadership of the DNC against the chairwoman of the DNC, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, who is an ally of Obama. So, according to an article in Bloomberg today, which is titled "Insurrection Erupts at the Democratic National Committee", this has, in fact, been brewing for quite some time; but it boiled over this week when Gabbard was dis-invited by Debbie Wasserman Schultz from attending the Democratic Party debate in Las Vegas, because she had openly criticized the policy of limiting the number of these Democratic debates to only six.

Only four of them are before the significant primaries at the beginning of next year. And Gabbard also criticized the policy of punishing any of the candidates if they participated in any forums that were not sanctioned by the DNC. Now, what this is being called, and the adjectives that are being used in this Bloomberg article are "autocratic", "dictatorial", this policy by Debbie Wasserman Schultz. And there's an open coup that's

brewing against her leadership of the Democratic National Committee. And I'm going to ask Jeff to get into is the implications of this.

I'd advise that people read some of the coverage that's in this Bloomberg article. One very significant quote is by another one of the vice chairs, a man named RT Ryback; a former mayor of Minneapolis, who is allied with Tulsi Gabbard on this issue. He is outspoken, saying Wasserman Schultz is operating with dictatorial, autocratic power over the Democratic National Committee; her leadership must be questioned. And he's almost at the point of saying she should be kicked out as the leader of the Party. Ironically, this is coming on the heels of the exact same treatment that was dished out to John Boehner on the Republican side.

So, what I'm going to introduce Jeff with, is just a quote from this article. And I think this sort of summarizes exactly what we have the responsibility to address here tonight. "Says one Democrat with close ties to the Democratic National Committee, 'The next Chair is going to have to burn the place down and rebuild it.'" So Jeff, how do we do that?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I think the critical thing to bear in mind here is that Debbie Wasserman-Shultz is nothing other than a total clone and voice at the DNC for President Obama. Go back to the beginning of the Obama presidency. Initially, former Congressman and former Ohio Governor Ted Strickland had been called by the White House, and had been asked to be the Chairman of the DNC, and had been told, "Wait by your phone, because you're going to get a call from the President very soon." He waited, and waited, and waited, and then several days later, read in the newspaper that Debbie Wasserman-Shultz had been named instead as the party chairman.

As we understand this, this was the direct result of an intervention by Valerie Jarrett, by Michelle Obama, and it was a foretaste of many things that would follow from them. So,

what she is doing to the Democratic Party is all being done on the basis of orders coming directly from the White House. Tuesday's debate in Las Vegas was a demeaning insult to the institution of the Presidency. That's not to say that everything that the participants in the debate said was demeaning, but the whole way that the debate was organized by CNN, which has no qualifications whatsoever to actually be hosting a debate like this, was turned into some version of the Barnum and Bailey circus mixed with the Gong show. Every candidate brought swarms of people, probably right off the floors of the casinos half drunk, and they were being encouraged to scream and razz and make all kinds of noise whenever their candidate had something to say. It was shameful, it was demeaning, and what Mr. LaRouche said is that this was organized by the British. This wasn't even done directly by President Obama. This was the kind of stunt that's meant to demean the office of the Presidency, and people who participated in this process were by and large victims of a set-up that should have never ever been allowed to happen.

Of course, this is the same CNN that bailed out Obama four years ago, when Mitt Romney was about to nail him on what had actually happened in the Sept. 11, 2012 attacks in Benghazi, but instead, you may recall Candy Crowley jumping in on behalf of Obama, and shutting down Mitt Romney mid-sentence. So what you have here is an assault against the appropriate decorum and respect for the Office of the Presidency, and even though there were a few comments by Martin O'Malley, on two occasions, openly calling for Glass-Steagall, the reality is that the entire event

was a shameless circus, and the best thing to do is to make sure that this is forgotten as soon as possible, and that there is never again this kind of insult to the Office of the Presidency by allowing this kind of clown show to occur.

And Mr. LaRouche, during his Thursday night Fireside Chat with supporters from around the country, emphasized that we've got

to return the Presidency to a constitutional framework. We've got to have qualified candidates, and we've got to assemble not an individual, not some personality or popularity contest, but we've got to assemble a qualified team of people, a President, a Vice President, qualified people to fill out the cabinet, so that we can get away from the horror show of the last 15 years, where 8 years of Bush and Cheney, and now 7 years of Obama, have all but effectively destroyed the institution of the Presidency.

Now the reality is that we can't wait. The reality is that Obama must be removed from office in the immediate days ahead, and this is not a matter of trying to scramble around to find some pretext in which to do that, because Matt just mentioned at the outset, that the Glenn Greenwald, Jeremy Scahill new publication, the Intercept, has published an extraordinary 8-part series, based on newly-leaked government documents. These documents were prepared after Edward Snowden had already dumped his material, and had already left government, and probably already taking refuge in Russia. But what these documents show is that President Obama is guilty of mass murder. The entire drone program that has been the hallmark, the entirety, of the Obama administration's counter-terrorism program, has been conducted outside the framework of the U.S. Constitution, outside of international law, and represents perhaps the single greatest incident of mass murder in the modern history of this planet.

Now, that may sound extreme, but I would urge all of you to not just read the 8-part series of articles, but to go to the links to the actual documents that reveal the true nature of this Obama administration, completely lawless mass murder campaign. One of the points that's made right at the outset, in the opening article of this series, is that since 1975 – and you can go back to the history of the revelations about CIA crimes, the Church and Pike Committee investigations – during that period President Gerald Ford issued an Executive

Order and laws were passed, making it explicitly illegal for the U.S. President to order assassinations. And of course, President Obama, since the very beginning of his term in office, has been regularly convening Tuesday meetings at the White House, where they've been specifically developing kill lists of targets to be gone after. And so, rather than use the appropriate and accurate term of assassinations, President Obama and his team choose the word "targetted killings," but the concept is identical.

Now, we've talked on a number of occasions in recent weeks, on these webcasts on Friday night, about the fact that General Michael Flynn, who was the head of the Defense Intelligence Agency and was fired by President Obama in the summer of 2014 for being a major obstacle to the kinds of illegal programs the Administration has been running since the beginning – General Flynn was interviewed by The Intercept to comment on the documents and to comment on his own first-hand knowledge of this assassination program. General Flynn had been the Director of Intelligence for the Joint Special Operations Command, for Central Command, and then became the head of the entire Defense Intelligence Agency. Here's what he had to say about the Obama Administration's program:

"The drone campaign right now really is only about killing. When you hear the phrase 'capture or kill', capture is actually a misnomer. In the drone strategy that we have, 'capture' is a lower case c. We don't capture people any more. Our entire Middle East policy seems to be based on firing drones. That's what this Administration decided to do in its counter-terrorism campaign. They are enamored by the ability of Special Operations and the CIA to find a guy in the middle of the desert, in some shitty little village (pardon my French), and drop a bomb on his head and kill him."

Now to hear President Obama, you would think that the White House program has been surrounded by Constitutional lawyers who've been studying every step along the way, to make sure

that everything involved in this program is legal. In a speech at the National Defense University several years ago, President Obama discussed the program, and again, quote: "The United States has taken lethal, targetted action against al-Qaeda and its associated forces, including with remotely piloted aircraft, commonly referred-to as drones. As was true in previous armed conflicts, this new technology raises profound questions about who is targetted, and why. About civilian casualties and the risk of creating new enemies. About the legality of such strikes under U.S. and international law. About accountability and morality. Drone strikes, he concluded, are effective and legal. Now, it happens that under pressure, particularly after news reports about his Tuesday kill-meetings at the White House, caused quite a stir, the White House issued a policy document. It's in the public record, it didn't have to be leaked out. It's called "U.S. Policy Standards and Procedures for the Use of Force in Counter-Terrorism Operations Outside the United States and Areas of Active Hostilities." I won't bore you with the precise language of this document, but among the highlights, they say, "In every instance we prefer to capture rather than kill. We have precise standards for the use of lethal force, and these criteria include, but are not restricted to, near-certainty that the terrorist target is present, near-certainty that non-combatants will not be injured or killed, an assessment that capture is not feasible at any time of the operation, an assessment that the relevant government authorities in the country where action is contemplated cannot or will not address the threat to U.S. persons, and an assessment that no other reasonable alternatives exist to effectively address the threat to U.S. persons." And they say, "There must be a legal basis for using lethal force, and secondly, that lethal force will only be used against a target that poses a continuing imminent threat to U.S. persons."

Now, the fact of the matter is that these were strict rules for targetted killing that were promulgated by the Obama

Administration, signed by the President himself, and as documented in The Intercept series, by commentaries by people like General Flynn, this policy has been violated in virtually every instance. So even by the criteria that his own Administration set forth, President Obama has been guilty of carrying out what can only be described as mass murder. Now, there are procedures for dealing with crimes of mass murder. Number one, to the extent that the President is directly implicated in these actions, this is cause for immediate and obvious impeachment, and perhaps, because of the urgency and timeliness of this, it would be more appropriate to simply invoke the 25th Amendment. If you have somebody who has been living under the cloak of apparent civility and respectable position, but who turns out to be a mass murderer, then you'd have to conclude that that person was suffering from a form of socio-pathological insanity. That invokes the 25th Amendment immediately. And so, that's the situation that we're dealing with. What Mr. LaRouche said, is in this case, you would want to remove that person, President Obama, from office immediately, and then immediately commence with criminal proceedings for the mass-murders that he's committed.

Now, among the documents that were leaked to the authors of this series of articles, is a document that was prepared by the House Select Committee on Intelligence, in April of 2012. It was called the Performance Audit of the Department of Defense Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR). And what this audit by the House Intelligence Committee concluded, is that the entire targetted-kill program was rife with violations, with failures to live up to any of the standards that would be appropriate under the Constitution, or even under the Obama Administration's own guidelines, and that basically there was a mad rush to try to line up as much money as possible for these drone-kill programs, and therefore there were shortcuts, there was misrepresentation of the program, and in fact since the September 11 attacks, the Defense Department has spent \$67 billion on putting together the ISR

infrastructure that the Obama Administration has exclusively used for the drone killing-program.

Now, other comments on this. Again, from General Flynn. He said that the White House, for expedient reasons, abandoned its own guidelines. There were no attempts to capture. There were no attempts to work with local governments on setting up the circumstances to capture. There was no attempt to live up to the standard that to be a legitimate target for these assassinations, the individual had to oppose an immediate and imminent threat of terrorist attack against the United States. And what General Flynn said, quote, "We've tended to say, drop another bomb via a drone, and put out a headline that 'We killed Abu Bag of Donuts' and it makes us all feel good for 24 hours. And you know what? It doesn't matter. It just made them a martyr. It just created a new reason to fight us ever harder." Flynn went on to say that there was "way too much reliance on technical aspects of intelligence, like signals intelligence, or even just looking at somebody with unmanned aerial vehicles. He gave an example. "I could get on the telephone from somewhere in Somalia, and I know I know I'm a high-value target. And I say in some coded language, 'The wedding is about to occur in the next 24 hours.'" Flynn said, "That could put all of Europe and the United States on a high-level alert, and it may just be total bullshit. SIGINT is an easy system to fool, and that is why it has to be validated by other INTs, namely like human intelligence. You have to ensure that the person is actually there, at that location, because what you really intercepted was the phone."

And in fact, one of the things that was concluded in this in-depth House Intelligence Committee review of this drone-kill program was that in most instances, there was almost exclusively reliance on the tracking of cell phones, and so, very often, it was the cell phone that was the determinant of the location where the drone attack occurred. And in many instances, almost a majority of the instances, many innocent

people who just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time were killed, and immediately afterwards, even though these people were not known, they didn't even know what their identities were when the drone-firing took place, they would immediately be classified as unknown enemy combatants. In other words, if you were there, you were de facto a terrorist, and it was de facto justified that you were a legitimate target for Obama's assassinations.

Now, the documents also included a number of structural flowcharts. The point that the Pentagon and the CIA wanted to make, was that these programs did not involve a few people sitting around in a room, going through piles of what they themselves called "baseball cards" – photographs and biographical information on the people who were on the potential-target list. It was based on the data in these "baseball cards" that the President of the United States would sign the kill-order. And once the kill-order was signed – and by the way, it usually took on average 58 days from when an individual was identified by name to when he went through the process of investigation, surveillance, and his name landed on the President's desk for a finding that this person should be killed. And then from that moment on, there was a 60-day time deadline for accomplishing the killing. I'm sure part of the reason for that is that every week there were more and more names being added, and the priorities were continuously shifting. But the fact of the matter is, that there was an elaborate chain of command through which this vetting process took place; chains of command within the military and the CIA. Then there was a chain of command which led up to what was called the Principals Committee, which are the leading members of the President's Cabinet and heads of other agencies that have critical roles to play in this process. And then in every single instance, the ultimate decision was made and was signed off on by the President of the United States. So, in other words, every single person killed in this drone warfare program was authorized for

assassination by President Obama.

Now, we know that there were a number of leading advisors, particularly John Brennan; who for the first four years of the Obama Presidency was the President's Counter-terrorism Advisor right there at the White House – then he was made Director of the CIA. We know that David Petraeus, who was formerly a high-ranking military commander, brought over to the CIA, and who was found not only to have been engaging in an extramarital affair, but was caught passing massive amounts of classified documents to his mistress and biographer; and yet he only received a slap-on-the-wrist misdemeanor, and to this day is still a key advisor to President Obama. Petraeus propagated a series of orders, establishing the chain of command and the operational profile of at least the Joint Special Operations Command [JSOC] part of this kill program. But ultimately, everything landed on the desk of President Obama; and when he signed the kill order, the 60-day clock began to tick down, and that was when the operations in the field went into action.

We know, of course, that Anwar al-Awlaki – an American citizen – clearly someone who had an association with al-Qaeda, was put on the assassination list; and yet, as an American citizen, he was denied any of the Constitutional due process that all American citizens are entitled to. And so, al-Awlaki was killed in an American drone attack in Yemen; several weeks later, his 16-year old son and another American citizen were killed in another drone attack. The administration had to scramble to cover that up. And now there are at least some indications that Anwar al-Awlaki may have been targeted for cold-blooded murder; because he was an FBI informant, and in that capacity, knew certain secrets about how this whole process and program of targeting was working, and perhaps knew of certain government ties to al-Qaeda. We don't know that, but there are court actions underway right now that may provide an even further light on the specific case of al-

Awlaki. In Afghanistan, in Yemen, in Somalia, in Pakistan – those were the four major areas where this mass assassination was taking place; there were extensive drone bases, massive amounts of military equipment. But yet, in all of the instances, it would appear that more often than not, the criteria that the administration itself put forward were never in a single instance adhered to; and the collateral damage, the number of innocent people later, after the fact, posthumously declared enemy combatants was massive. We don't even begin to have a total death toll, but for every individual on the Presidential-approved kill list, there were multiple numbers of people who were killed simply because they were in the immediate vicinity. And one aspect of the program evolved to the point that targeted assassination operations were conducted on the basis of activity profile, not even identification of specific individuals. In the case of Afghanistan, there were instances where drone-targetted operations were directed against weddings, simply because the drones detected a large number of young males holding up guns in the air and firing them into the air. Now that happens to be part of a fairly typical tribal wedding ceremony in Afghanistan; so we don't know how many of these targeted assassinations were conducted on the basis of those kinds of activities.

Now, there was a report that was issued in 2014, that was done by General John Abizaid, who was the former head of the Central Command, and a lawyer from Georgetown named Rosa Brooks, who was a former attorney at the Department of Defense. And that report noted that there are "enormous uncertainties" in drone warfare, and that these uncertainties "are multiplied further when the United States relies on intelligence and other targeting information provided by a host nation government. How can we be sure we are not being drawn into a civil war; or being used to target the domestic political enemies of the host state leadership?" So, in other words, this program was completely out of control, off the

charts; but was thoroughly embraced by President Obama from his first days in office – probably initially courtesy of people like John Brennan. But the fact of the matter is that a massive number of crimes have been committed. The official documents, including those classified documents leaked out to {The Intercept}, make it clear that there was an absolute, unambiguous chain of command. In other words, the way that law enforcement would map out the structures of a mafia organization that they were going to break up; and unambiguously, the godfather of this entire mass kill program was President Obama. And if that doesn't constitute sufficient criteria for immediately launching impeachment proceedings or invoking of the 25th Amendment, then we've pretty much lost any sense of what our Constitutional republic is all about.

OGDEN: OK, I would like to just present the institutional question which we got in this week, which is very brief. It reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the United States is to extend its military presence in Afghanistan beyond 2016. What is your opinion about the extension of our military presence in Afghanistan?"

STEINBERG: Well, I think first of all, you've got to consider the timing of this announcement. Regardless of whatever process there was, however long the deliberations were about making this decision, I find it extremely distasteful that the President chose to make this announcement just days after the United States had bombed the hospital of Doctors Without Borders in Kunduz. There are new developments just in the last 24 hours, indicating that some American or NATO either tanks or APCs – armed personnel carriers – had arrived on the site soon after the bombing had ended, and had basically plowed through the rubble. And at least in the eyes of Doctors Without Borders, this was an attempt to bury and conceal evidence of a major crime that was committed. We spoke last week about the fact that Doctors without Borders had issued a call under the Geneva Convention for a top-down investigation,

and they basically say that the actions that were undertaken under the auspices of President Obama, constituted war crimes.

So I think if you step back, and think about the thrust of what we've presented here in the last half hour or so, about the nature of the drone program, and then situate the bombing of this Doctors Without Borders hospital within that overall framework, I think you'll see that this situation is completely out of control, and lawless. In fact, one of the commentators who have been noting the horrors of this incident has pointed out that it may come down to the fact that President Obama's only legacy is that he will have been the only Nobel Peace Prize award recipient to bomb another Nobel Peace Prize recipient – because Doctors Without Borders has also been far more legitimately granted that award.

Now, the fact of the matter is that the United States has been engaged in Afghanistan since 2001, since soon after the 9/11 attacks, and here we are, 14 years later, still debating the question of whether or not we're on the verge of the Taliban taking the place over again. I think that that 14 year process, at an estimated cost to U.S. taxpayers of well over \$2 trillion, ought to raise some serious questions about whether this policy is advisable to continue indefinitely into the future, even past the Obama Presidency. And one of the ways that the argument is being framed, for why the U.S. should remain and why NATO should remain, in Afghanistan, is the argument that there's more training, there's more assistance needed, but the implication is that there's only a binary choice: either we stay, or we go, as if there were no other options on the table, which is emphatically not true.

There are some senior retired U.S. military officials, and others, who have recently proposed that there is a viable alternative, and that you have the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which is a regional security arrangement which involves Russia, China, all of the countries of Central Asia, and as of their last meeting earlier this year, it also

includes India and Pakistan. And it's virtually a certainty, now that the P5+1 agreement has been ratified both here in the U.S. and by the Majlis in Iran, so that the sanctions will be lifted in the months ahead, that Iran will be the next member country given full membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

Just look at that on a map. Every country surrounding Afghanistan is a member of the SCO, and again, within a very short period of time Iran, which borders on Afghanistan, will be included in that membership. Right now, they're associate members, so in effect they're already part of the deliberations.

What about having the SCO, which has a strong vested interest in the security and stability of the area, working out a coordination with the US and NATO for a hand-off of security responsibility, as well as economic development responsibility, to the SCO? China, which was one of the initial sponsors of the SCO, has a critical vested interest, because the entire One Belt, One Road policy that is the cornerstone of Xi Jinping's international outreach, requires stability in exactly that area around Afghanistan. You have countries that are of the same ethnic background. You've got Tajiks and Uzbeks, and Iranians, Persians, who form a major part of the population of Afghanistan. You've got Pashtuns, who are also across the border in Pakistan. India has historically played an extraordinarily important and close role with the government in Kabul, and of course, Russia is gravely concerned about the security of Central Asia, as well as the Caucasus region of Russia.

So, it would be a sane and natural policy for the U.S., for NATO, to enter into discussions with the SCO, and propose an orderly transition, and develop a coherent strategy for bringing this whole 15 year crisis to an end. If you in fact go back to the original Brzezinski plans for conducting covert operations against the Soviets in Afghanistan, which preceded

by six months the Soviets coming into Afghanistan, you see that this area has been affected by an even more than 30 years of war uninterrupted process. So there is an alternative. There's a thoughtful, diplomatic, economic, security alternative, and one must wonder, if this option is not being considered, whether the real concern here is to keep Afghanistan safe for the opium trade, because 95 % of the world's opium supply, at enormous profits, is coming out of Afghanistan.

OGDEN: Well, thank you very much, Jeff.

What we've now presented in the summary course of this webcast tonight, was what Mr. LaRouche asked for. It is high time for the Obama policy to go. The evidence has just been presented by Jeff and myself here on this broadcast tonight, and that evidence speaks for itself. However, the task still remains, as Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, that LaRouche PAC and responsible citizens across the United States, must also build a New Presidency, to lead the United States out of what is arguably the worst disaster that we've ever faced as a nation, after eight years of Bush and Cheney, and then eight more years of Obama.

It's very clear, what Mr. LaRouche's thoughts were about the Tuesday Democratic debate, and what Jeff said earlier about the CNN kind of clown show atmosphere that was created around that. But as people who listened to Mr. LaRouche's fireside chat last night might have heard, he was also emphatic on keeping our vision clear as to what our responsibility as citizens is, not to just pick and choose among candidates, but to create what he calls a Presidency, and to conclude tonight's webcast, I actually want to read what I found to be a very compelling section of Mr. LaRouche's discussion on this question of the Presidency last night.

He said: "The point is that people usually think that we want a President. Now, according to our national law, we do get a

President, one President. We also get a Vice President. But on the other hand, what we need is a team of citizens who are qualified to lead the formation and institution of a system of government under a Presidential system. In other words, you can't just say, this is the President; now everyone's going to listen to him. That's not right. You have to have a President who is acceptable, who's qualified to lead the nation, but no one person can control the United States as a nation efficiently. There has to be a team based on the kind of team that we had when we composed a Presidential system. It also means we depend in the way that we can deal with certain members of Congress, in the House of Representatives in general, and so forth.

"You have people who don't always agree with each other, but we need that kind of office as a deliberation process, in order to have the kind of people of the United States find they have a core of agreement on goals and purposes which suit the requirements of the Presidency.

"Now the other part of that has a feature to it. When we create a Presidential system, we don't create a President per se. We try, in the best features of our existence, in our history, our intention is always to introduce new concepts, more appropriate concepts, more brilliant, more fruitful than ever before. Maybe some people can come together as a team around that idea. They might be rivals, but our goal is to go to the higher level, the highest level of achievement, of the improvement of our system of government: to create a team of people who are qualified, and actively qualified, to conduct the business of our government as a whole. And that's the way we have to look at it."

So, lest we get too distracted by the personality contests, and all of the media hype that's created by CNN and related organizations, I think it's important to keep that idea in mind.

And that's what Mr. LaRouche has devoted his entire career to, over the last 40 to 50 years of his public life. So we have the responsibility as leaders of the LaRouche PAC, and you have the responsibility as viewers of this broadcast here tonight, to cooperate with us in trying to bring that lofty and noble goal about.

I appreciate your attention to our broadcast tonight. I advise that you take the evidence that we've presented here, and let it speak for itself. Please share this as widely as you can. Get it around to your friends and neighbors, and continue to participate in all of the events that LaRouche PAC is hosting – from these Friday night broadcasts, to the Fireside chats with Mr. LaRouche, and the continuing activities in Manhattan, including the discussion that I know we will be engaged in again tomorrow, with Mr. LaRouche himself.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

USA; Hele verden: LPAC's landsdækkende aktionsuge: Vedtag Glass-Steagall nu. LPAC-TV: The Takedown of Glass-Steagall

Over hele USA, men især i NYC, mobiliserer LPAC i højeste gear for en omgående vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall, før det uafvendelige Wall Street-krak indtræffer og kaster ikke blot USA, men hele verden ud i kaos. De kæmper ikke blot for USA

'lokalt', men også for os her i Europa. Kontakt os og tag kampen op: Glass-Steagall, ikke kaos!

Schiller Institutets Aktionscenter DK

Følg med i LPAC's afgørende kamp i USA her:

Lyndon LaRouches opråb til en fuldt optrappet indsats for at komme Wall St.'s krak i forkøbet med Glass-Steagall, 5. okt. 2015

Kend hele historien:

LPACTV: The Takedown of Glass-Steagall – Feature Film:

Video: EIR Pressekonference
Live:
Skræmmekampagne **om**
Klimaforandring
er befolkningsreduktion –

ikke videnskab

Vær med på pressekonferencen der præsenterer udgivelsen af Executive Intelligence Review's seneste specialrapport, **»Skræmmekampagne om Klimaforandring er Befolkningsreduktion – ikke Videnskab«**,

tirsdag 22. september 2015, kl. 11:00 AM Eastern.

Denne rapport udgives på optakten til FN's Generalforsamling i New York og Pave Frans' besøg i USA, hvor begge disse begivenheders dagsorden for reduktion af verdens befolkning er i fuld gang. Denne rapport går lige til hjertet af svindelen med 'klimaforandring': Befolkningsreduktion.

