

De fem brændpunkter for Tredje Verdenskrig

22. november 2015 – Robert Farley, en seniorlektor ved Patterson School for Diplomati og International Handel ved Kentucky Universitet, advarer om, at der er fem mulige måder, hvorpå Tredje Verdenskrig (eller efter hans mening snarere Femte Verdenskrig, idet han tæller Syvårskrigen og Napoleonskrigene med som verdenskrige) kunne begynde.

Brændpunkterne omfatter de følgende:

* **Syrien** – Enten kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly i luften over Syrien eskalere ud af kontrol, eller også bliver ISIS besejret, men USA, Frankrig og Rusland bliver rivaler over, hvordan Syrien efter ISIS skal se ud.

* **Indien og Pakistan** – Indien og Pakistan kunne komme i krig igen af flere grunde. USA har generelt været tæt på Pakistan, men har været i færd med at dyrke tættere relationer med Indien. Kina har længe militært været tæt på Pakistan. Farley nævner ikke Rusland, der rent historisk har haft tætte relationer til Indien, inklusive militært.

* **Det Østkinesiske Hav** – Kina og Japan er modstandere mht. Senkaku/Daiyou-øerne. USA er traktatmæssigt forpligtet til at forsvare Japan, hvilket gør det næsten sikkert, at, skulle der udbryde kampe, ville USA gå ind på Japans side.

* **Det Sydkinesiske Hav** – En krig mellem USA og Kina kunne trække Japan og Indien med og kunne resultere i en udveksling af atomvåben.

* **Ukraine** – En konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland kunne forårsage, at Rusland tyer til taktiske atomvåben, hvis det mener, det ikke kan overleve.

Farley konkluderer, at vi mangler den Kolde Krigs »rædselsvækkende« klarhed. »Der kunne udbryde krig flere steder, som kunne trække krigsførende parter med ind på uforudsigelige måder«, skriver han. »Krigsførende parter begynder meget sjældent en krig med overlæg; lederne af verdens mest magtfulde nationer må være på vagt over for truslen om en optrapning af kriser.«

Foto: Russiske jets under en "aerobatic" flyveopvisning i Rusland. Kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly over Syrien komme ud af kontrol og eskalere?

Leder, 23. november 2015: Det er det Britiske Imperium, tåbe!

Med Bruxelles i højeste alarmberedskab på anden dag i forventning om endnu et større terrorangreb fra Islamisk Stat på samme skala som massakren i Paris den 13. november, er der stigende opmærksomhed omkring den kendsgerning, at omdrejningspunktet for jihadistisk terrorisme i realiteten findes i hjertet af Europa. Bruxelles, hovedstad for både NATO og Den europæiske Union, har nu fået kaldenavnet Brusselstan, ligesom London længe er blevet refereret til som Londonistan på grund af den kendsgerning, at bogstavelig talt enhver jihadistisk, narko- og separatistterrororganisation har fået husly, beskyttelse og finansiering af det britiske monarki. For nylig frafaldt den britiske regering alle anklager imod en angiveligt jihadistisk våbensmugler, fordi hans forsvarsadvokat påpegede, at de samme grupper, som han stod

anklaget for at bevæbne, blev åbenlyst støttet af det britiske efterretningsvæsen MI6.

Dette er en gammel historie. London har været centrum for global terrorisme i årtier. Executive Intelligence Review var ophavsmand til et dossier, som blev overgivet USA's Udenrigsministerium i 2000, og som krævede, at Storbritannien blev sat på listen over stater, der sponsorerede terrorisme. Dossieret byggede udelukkende på bevismateriale, der var fremkommet gennem regeringer i hele verden, inklusive Rusland, Egypten, Indien, Pakistan, Colombia og Peru, og som på afgørende vis viste, at den britiske krone husede verdens værste terrorister, som en del af imperiesystemet. De største britiske banker, med HSBC (tidligere HonKong og Shanghai Bankselskab, berygtet for opiumskrigen) i spidsen, er verdens mest berygtede hvidvaskningsinstitutioner for narkopenge, som det for nylig er blevet dokumenteret af USA's Senat.

Det er ligeledes det britiske kongehus, der har udsendt Ridderkommandør John Schnellhuber til at kapre Paven og Vatikanet for ideen om en radikal befolkningsreduktion, baseret på den videnskabelige svindel med menneskeskabt, global opvarmning.

Alle de grusomheder, som præsident Obama har begået – fra hans massedronedrab i Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen og Somalia, til hans voldelige afsættelse og koldblodige mord på Gaddafi i Libyen, der skabte en zone af kaos, terror og utilstrækkelige stater i store dele af Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, og til decimeringen af livsvilkårene for det store flertal af amerikanere – kan anbringes på det britiske kongehus' dørtærskel. Obama er intet andet end en britisk agent, der blev udvalgt af briterne til at blive installeret som præsident for USA, på vegne af Kronen og City of London.

Efter grusomhederne i Paris er det i stigende grad ved at blive åbenlyst gennemskueligt for et voksende antal tænkende mennesker, at Islamisk Stat er en skabelse af Obama og

briterne. Al-Qaeda blev skabt og næret af briterne, USA og Saudi Arabien i 1980'erne, som kollektivt samlede et slæng af terrorister fra fængsler i hele den arabiske og islamiske verden, for at drive sovjetrusserne ud af Afghanistan. I 1985 sluttede Prins Bandar bin Sultan, bogstavelig talt et medlem af Bush-familien, sig til den britiske premierminister Margaret Thatcher for at lancere Al-Yamamah-byttehandelen (våben for olie), under hvilken en 100 milliarder dollar stor, hemmelig fond blev etableret for i hemmelighed at bevæbne al-Qaeda og andre terrororganisationer. I 2001 deployerede Bandar nogle af disse Al Yamamah-midler til at finansiere 11. september-flykaprernes angreb på World Trade Tårnene og angribe Pentagon.

Hvis man vil forstå, hvorfor den britiske agent Barack Obama har nægtet at ophæve hemmeligstemplingen af de 28 sider af den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, må man begynde fra toppen, med denne redegørelse for, hvordan briterne og Obama skabte al-Qaeda og, senere, Islamisk Stat. Tidligere chef for USA's Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, general Michael Flynn, har åbenlyst rapporteret om, at præsident Obama bevæbnede de syriske oprørere fra Benghazi og fortsatte med at gøre det, fordi det var regeringens politik. DIA-dokumenter fra sommeren og efteråret 2012 forklarer i detaljer de fælles britisk-amerikanske operationer fra Benghazi til smuglerhavne i de områder i Syrien, der kontrolleredes af oprørerne.

Lyndon LaRouche sagde ligefremt til medarbejdere søndag den 22. november, at man må udrydde det britiske monarki, eller også vil der ikke være nogen løsning på krigen i Syrien eller andre globale brændpunkter. Med mindre Det britiske Imperium fjernes, står vi over for en global krig imod Rusland og Kina, der vil føre til udslettelsen af store dele af menneskeheden. Barack Obama er en britisk agent, der blev selekteret til at blive USA's præsident af briterne. Vi må sænke Det britiske Imperium og alt, hvad det repræsenterer, eller også vil vi stå

over for en optrapning af rædselsforestillinger over hele planeten.

Fransk kilde: Forandringer er undervejs – Nye angreb forventes

21. november 2015 – (Nouvelle Solidarité) – En fransk og mellemøstlig kilde, der har gode forbindelser, sagde i dag til EIR's kontor i Paris, at han er bange for, at tingene kunne, og også vil, blive værre i Europa pga. karakteren af terrorist-monstret, der er blevet skabt. Med andre ord, så vil der komme flere angreb.

Han sagde, at Hollandes beslutning om at arbejde med Rusland er det bedste initiativ, han kunne have taget. »Forandring« er ved at finde sted i fransk udenrigspolitik, og en del af de mere positive effekter efter angrebene er de mere og mere vedvarende rygter om, at den franske udenrigsminister Fabius er på vej ud af Quai d'Orsay. Han kunne blive erstattet af Elisabeth Guigou, en tidligere Mitterrandist, der på det seneste har gennemgået en interessant udvikling, hvor hun har nærmet sig tidl. premierminister Raffarin og er venligtsindet over for Kina og Rusland.

Desuden er Guigou forbundet med interesser med handelsforbindelser og økonomiske forbindelser til Marokko og Middelhavsområdet gennem Institut Prospective Economique Monde Mediterranée, som hendes ægtemand Jean-Louis, et medlem af tidl. premierminister Michel Rocard's regering, er chef for.

For at fuldstændiggøre det aktuelle billede af den

igangværende »forandring«, der diskuteredes med denne kilde, har en delegation af højtplacerede Houthis-personer fra Yemen været i Paris nu, og den blev for allerførste gang modtaget af Udenrigsministeriet. »Forandring« pga. denne regering i Paris' hidtidige totale alliance med Saudi Arabien.

Med hensyn til de eventuelle fremtidige angreb bør man bemærke, at muligheden for et kemisk angreb seriøst er blevet nævnt af premierministeren. Nogle mennesker har anklaget ham for at føre skræmme-kampagne af politiske grunde. Men i dag rapporterer Le Parisien, at »Daesh [ISIS] ved, hvordan man fremstiller sennepsgas«. Informationen, som premierministeren kom med, kommer fra franske efterretningskilder. ISIL's anvendelse af sennepsgas har været bekræftet siden sidste sommer. Den blev brugt den 21. august i kamp mod »oprørsgrupper«, der var fjendtlige over for regimet og Daesh. Kurderne har også fordømt ISIL's anvendelse af denne gas.

Det er øjensynligt nu bekræftet, at de kan fremstille det, og at de fremstiller det i Mosul-området. Og minsandten, om ikke 10 NBC-dragter (Nuclear, Biological, Chemical) og 30 par specialstøvler, handsker og anti-bakteriemasker »forsvandt« i sidste uge fra Necker Hospitalet (i Paris).

Det bør også bemærkes mht. »forandringen« i Hollandes politik over for Syrien og Bashar al-Assad i kølvandet på angrebene, at Hollandes og Fabius' »hverken/eller«-politik (hverken Assad eller ISIL) er blevet voldsomt angrebet fra stort set alle partierne. Blandt disse det tidligere UMP, der nu hedder Les Républicains, hvor mange af topledere: Sarkozy, François Fillon, Thierry Mariani, Jacques Myard, blandt andre, står Moskva nær og har bedt Hollande om at droppe denne politik. For ikke at nævne Marine Le Pen. På det yderste venstre er Mélenchon fra Venstrepartiet også på denne linje. Alle disse strømninger siger nu højlydt, hvad vi har fordømt i årevis.

Hollande balancerer på en line i sit forsøg på at gennemføre et politisk skift uden at skabe alt for mange fjender i USA og

Storbritannien, samt deres allierede i Frankrig.

Fremmedfjendske 'Alternativ for Tyskland'-partiet er allerede den tredjestørste magt i landet

19. november 2015 – Ifølge opinionsundersøgelser er det fremmedfjendske parti, Alternativ for Tyskland, AfD, allerede blevet det tredjestørste parti i Tyskland. Støtte til AfD er hastigt steget i de seneste måneder og uger, først som en reaktion på flygtningekrisen, og nu efter terrorangrebene i Paris og den politiske debat, der er domineret af panik.

Krisen og den politiske debat »er som et program, der er skræddersyet til at fremme AfD«, sagde prof. Jürgen Falter, der har hjemme i Mainz, på tysk Tv i dag. AfD »nærmer sig tocifrede tal nationalt – i de østlige stater nåede de derop for længe siden. Med andre ord, så har vi her en politisk magt, der er ved at komme ind i delstatsparlamenterne og sluttelig i det nationale parlament (Forbundsdagen), og som vil styre det politiske spil i en totalt anden retning. Denne magt vil af de andre parter blive anset som værende uegnet til at indgå koalition med.«

COP21: Den eneste klimakrise, vi skal diskutere, er, hvordan vi forhindrer ti tusinder af flygtninge i at fryse ihjel

20. november 2015 – Hvis klimaforandrings-alarmisterne ønsker at diskutere den virkelige klimakrise i horisonten ved den forestående FN-COP21 Paris klimaforandrings-extravaganza, bør de formulere en plan til at forhindre, at ti tusinder af flygtninge fryser ihjel i Europa. Dette er temaet i en ny erklæring, »Terrorisme og Flygtningekrise i en Kold Vinter«, der blev udlagt den 19. november af videnskabsfolkene Paul Dreissen og Joe D'Aleo, med Allan MacRae og Madhav Khandekar, på icecap.us og nu også på mange andre websider.

Som de forklarer, så er ti tusinder af europæiske borgere frosset ihjel i vintre med ekstremt koldt vejr, hvilket er, hvad Europa har oplevet i en stor del af det forgangne årti. Disse dramatiske udsving i temperaturen er i realiteten fremkaldt, ikke af menneskelig aktivitet, men af Solen og andre relaterede kræfter. Men det er de handlinger, som de politiske beslutningstagere skrider til, der vil udgøre forskellen mellem liv og død.

Forfatterne påpeger, at, i ekstremt kolde år kan USA opleve omkring 100.000 ekstraordinære dødsfald. De rapporterer, at der generelt forekommer mere end 20 gange så mange dødsfald som følge af ekstrem kulde end ekstrem varme. For flygtningene, der lever i »ekstrem fattigdom, med dårlig ernæring, utilstrækkelig beklædning og tæpper, og som i

forvejen er syge og har improviseret husly«, kunne tallet for ekstraordinære vinterdødsfald blive svimlende; endda højere end de ekstraordinære vinterdødsfald på 50.000 mennesker i Storbritannien.

»Når en million flygtninge fryser under forringede omgivelser med utilstrækkeligt husly, mad, varme, beklædning og lægehjælp, og når 1,3 milliard mennesker stadig ikke har elektricitet – hvorfor i alverden skulle verden så indgå et forpligtende engagement om at bruge milliarder på angivelige, fremtidige katastrofer som følge af global opvarmning?«, spørger de. »Vi må anerkende, at rædselsfulde scenarier, fremkommet i computermodeller, ikke er en refleksion af virkeligheden på planeten ... «

»Det ville være en samvittighedsløs forbrydelse imod menneskeheden, hvis de nationer, der mødes i Paris, gennemtvinger politiske tiltag for at beskytte vores planets energi-berøvede masser fra hypotetiske, menneskeskabte klimakatastrofer, der skulle optræde årtier frem i tiden, ved at forevige fattigdom og sygdom, der dræber millioner af flere mennesker i morgen. Dette er de virkelige grunde til, at klimaforandring er et afgørende, moralsk spørgsmål, understreger de. »Dette er, hvad vi må erkende, og holde op med at lege med menneskers liv.«

Paul Dreissen er analytiker for Komiteen for et Konstruktivt I morgen (CFACT). Jason Ross fra LPAC's Videnskabsteam interviewede for nylig Paul Dreissen, forfatter af 'Miljø-imperialisme: Grøn magt, Sort død', til EIR's seneste Specialrapport, »Skræmmekampagne mod Global Opvarmning er Befolkningsreduktion – ikke Videnskab« (Se interviewet på dansk). Joe D'Aleo, akademisk seniorstabsmedlem ved American Meteorological Society, er medstifter af The Weather Channel.

LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast 20. november 2015: Obamaregeringen skaber kaos med overlæg ved at sprænge verden luften. Fjern ham, eller se en større katastrofe i øjnene.

Som hr. LaRouche eftertrykkeligt erklærede under vores diskussion med ham, så er den amerikanske præsident Obamas politik den førende årsag til det kaos, som verden nu befinder sig i, og har ikke alene bevirket skabelsen af en frugtbar yngleplads for vækst og deployering af terrororganisationer som ISIS i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, men har også bragt os helt ud på randen af krig med Rusland og Kina – en krig, som ville blive en verdenskrig med anvendelse af atomvåben, som ville betyde udslettelsen af det store flertal af denne planets befolkning. Med Jeff Steinberg m. fl.

Engelsk udskrift.

International LaRouche PAC Webcast for Friday November 20 2015

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 20, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by

both Jeffrey Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and we have

a very timely and important presentation prepared for you tonight, which was informed by a meeting that the three of us had

earlier today with both Lyndon LaRouche, as well as Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who joined us via video-call from Europe.

Obviously we're meeting here tonight exactly one week following the horrific terrorist attacks in Paris last Friday.

As

Helga LaRouche emphasized during our discussion with her earlier,

the sheer horror of these attacks, striking as they did at the heart of one of the leading cities of Europe, claiming the lives

of 130 innocent people, who were slaughtered in cold blood as they went around their usual business on a Friday night – this has absolutely changed everything, and has served to force people

across Europe, and in the United States, to recognize that a sudden and dramatic change in policy must be adopted, or else the

entirety of Western Civilization is on the verge of descending into a total hell on earth, from which it would be virtually impossible to return.

As Mr. LaRouche emphatically stated in our discussion with him, the policies of US President Barack Obama are the leading cause of the chaos which the world now finds itself in, and have

served not only to create a fertile breeding ground for the growth and deployment of terrorist organizations like ISIS in the

Middle East and North Africa, but have brought us right to the edge of a war with Russia, and with China – a war that would be

world war, which would involve the use of thermonuclear

weapons,

which would mean the extermination of a vast majority of the population on this planet.

Now in a very significant development, which I know Jeff will go a little bit more into, and will elaborate on in his remarks, this fact has been explicitly stated by a Congresswoman,

whom we've spoken about previously on these broadcasts, Rep. Tulsi Gabbard, a Democrat from Hawaii, in a press release which

she issued earlier today, announcing the filing of a bill in the

House of Representatives that, in her words, would bring an immediate end to the illegal, counter-productive war to overthrow

the Syrian government of Assad, Barack Obama's war. Congresswoman

Gabbard explains:

"The war to overthrow Assad is illegal and counterproductive, because it actually helps ISIS and other Islamic extremists achieve their goal of overthrowing the Syrian

government of Assad and taking control of all of Syria." Then she

lists 10 reasons, which include the fact that if we are to succeed in overthrowing Assad, as Barack Obama wishes, it would

open the door for ISIS to take over all of Syria, including Damascus, in which case, she says, "there will be genocide and suffering on a scale beyond our imagination."

She also states that the overthrowing of the government of Assad is the goal of ISIS, and other Islamic extremist groups, and "we should not be allying ourselves with these Islamic extremists by helping them achieve their goal, because it is against the security interests of the United States and all of civilization." And she also says that we should learn from the past mistakes in both the regime changes in Iraq and in Libya,

which is saying something from a combat veteran, Congresswoman Gabbard, who was herself deployed in the war in Iraq.

Now, she also makes the point that Obama's war has been the direct exacerbation of the chaos and the carnage in Syria inflicted by ISIS on the innocent people of that country, which

has caused the number of refugees being forced to flee Syria and

elsewhere, to continue to increase at a rapid rate. And later in

the broadcast that is something that I know Ben Deniston will also be addressing.

But most significantly, she lists as reason number 10:

"Because our war to overthrow the Assad government puts us in direct conflict with Russia, and increases the likelihood of war

between the United States and Russia, and the possibility of another world war." So, as far as I know, that makes Tulsi Gabbard the only sitting member of Congress to have had the guts

to state that fact as explicitly and clearly.

I just want to read one more short excerpt from her press release before introducing our institutional question for this evening. Congresswoman Gabbard concludes her press release by stating: "To destroy ISIS will take international alliances. If

we are serious about defeating ISIS, and solving the refugee problem, we'll work in partnership with Russia, with France, and

anyone else who is serious about destroying ISIS and affiliated

Islamic extremist organizations worldwide. The problem is because

the U.S. is trying to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad,

and Russia is supporting the government of Assad, it is

impossible for us to have an effective cooperative

relationship

with Russia in our mutual fight against ISIS. Our focus on overthrowing Assad is interfering with our ability to destroy ISIS. We must immediately end the illegal, counterproductive war

to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad, and ally ourselves

with any countries willing to focus on destroying the Islamic extremists who pose a genuine threat to civilization.”

So this brings us directly to our institutional question for this evening, to which I’m going to ask Jeff to deliver Mr.

LaRouche’s response. The question reads as follows: “Mr.

LaRouche, the Russian Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev has said

that the best way to combat the so-called Islamic State of Iraq

and Syria, or ISIS, is for Russia to unite with the West in a

grand alliance to defeat this common threat of terrorism. In this

regard, Russia is already coordinating airstrikes against ISIS

with France. How do you envision a closer collaboration between

the United States and Russia in this fight to defeat ISIS, and

all of its affiliated terrorist organizations?”

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Mr. LaRouche was very

blunt, as you’ll hear in a just a moment, and in fact, he took

the question one step beyond the otherwise very important and

admirable comments made by Congresswoman Gabbard today. And by

the way, that press release was announcing the introduction of a

bill into the U.S. House of Representatives that would formally

ban the Obama administration from any further actions to

overthrow the Assad government.

Now, during our discussion with Mr. LaRouche, I took rather

detailed notes so what I’m about to read to you are not

verbatim

transcripts of what Mr. LaRouche had to say, but they will give you a very clear flavor, and represent I think a pretty accurate accounting from Mr. LaRouche's comments. And the very first thing that he said is, to defeat ISIS in partnership with the Russians, you have to get rid of Obama. Putin surprised everyone with his military move into Syria in September; and it was the only way to do it. Obama is sunk in, and there is no alternative until he is removed; and this cannot be postponed. We're running out of time, and we are on the verge of the total collapse of the US system; he must be thrown out immediately. And LaRouche went on to add, we must totally dump Wall Street and adopt the approach of FDR at the start of his New Deal. Roosevelt solved the problem within weeks of taking office, by changing the entire direction of the nation after the disaster of President Herbert Hoover. Everything changed within a few years. The idea of totally shutting down Wall Street is not difficult for intelligent people to understand; nothing else works. Congress is pussyfooting around. Wall Street must be shut, and a new Federal operation must be launched to rebuild the nation. Do not try to salvage any part of the old system. The problem is that most people in Congress are idiots; and the President of the United States is a criminal.

When you have a criminal leading idiots, you have a system that will not work. So, Obama must be thrown out, and there is no alternative to that. All of the evidence is there. Shut down Wall

Street! It's not needed.

Furthermore, Obama has committed so many crimes in fact, that he can be removed from office at any moment. Start with his

Tuesday kill sessions; these are crimes that not only demand his

removal from office, but should land him in prison for mass murder. Obama has presided over the destruction of the US economy, to the point that a majority of our citizens are facing

the disaster of impoverishment. He has followed the George Bush/Dick Cheney cover-up of 9/11; this is typical for Obama, who

is nothing but a British agent protecting the brutish.

And so, the problem is not with the evidence; the problem is that most members of Congress lack guts. The Tuesday kill meetings tell it all. The vast majority of people killed on Obama's personal orders, were innocent bystanders; not even the

so-called "legitimate targets". And Obama personally signed off

on every one of those killings.

Now, I want you to take a look at one of the documents that was released as part of the "Drone Papers". We've talked about this repeatedly for the last four or five weeks. The "Drone Papers" that were published by {The Intercept}, a web-based news

organization founded by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill, are

hundreds of pages of documents from the Pentagon and from the House Select Committee on Intelligence. Now the specific document

that you're looking at, is a flowchart that goes through step-by-step the procedures that are used to establish who will

be killed. This is the process that ultimately leads up to those

Tuesday kill meetings, where President Obama personally presides.

If you follow the chain of command – and this is dealing with two specific operations within the overall drone kill program –

one operation in Somalia called Operation Jupiter Garrett; and another operation in Yemen called Copper Dune. In every instance,

the process for deciding on the kill order goes up from the local

military intelligence units on the ground, up through the military command all the way through the Joint Chiefs of Staff,

up to the Secretary of Defense, and up to the Principals Committee and the Deputy Principals Committee; these are the Cabinet and Deputy Cabinet officials of the government. But ultimately, everything leads back to the President of the United

States. And it's only with President Obama's personal signature

that the kill orders go out; the clock starts, and there is a 60-day deadline to track down and kill the designated target.

Now, even by the criteria that are contained in this document, we know from the House Intelligence review and from other exposés that none of the guidelines have been followed; and

that all of procedures that were supposedly built in to make sure

that innocent civilian casualties were avoided, that there was direct confirmation of the whereabouts of the target – none of those things were adhered to. At the very bottom, it says that "At every level, the targetting window suitability is

determined
by rules of engagement.” The rules of engagement are that
there
must be low collateral damage estimates; meaning “collateral
damage” is a polite word for innocent civilians being killed
in
the course of the attacks. There must be “near certainty” of
the
high-value individual’s presence, based on two forms of
intelligence and no contradictory intelligence; and then, all
the
way up the chain of command – including the host government –
must all concur, or otherwise no strike is allowed to take
place.

Now, I can tell you that having reviewed the totality of the
“Drone Papers”, that these procedures – as minimal and as
limited as they are – were never adhered to. None of these
conditions were met in the overwhelming majority of these kill
incidents. And to give you an idea of the callousness of this
structure under President Obama, the formal name given to the
summary documents; the photographs and documentary evidence
that
was used to determine whether or not the President will sign
off

on a kill order, is referred to in these meetings as the
“baseball card”. So, in other words, the lack of any sense of
what this program is all about, is absolutely stunning.

Now, let me just add that, earlier today, President Obama,
Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, and CIA Director John Brennan
received a letter that was written by four former US Air Force
Drone Team members. They are: Brandon Bryant, Sion
Westmoreland,

Stephen Lewis, and Michael Haas; all four of them operated for
years as members of the drone crew. And they wrote this
letter,

urging the President to end the program right now; and I want
to

read you what they had to say, because I think it's one of the most powerful testaments to the murderous criminality of our President. And it should make very clear that anything short of immediate removal from office, by impeachment, or invoking of the 25th Amendment, or forcing his immediate resignation is unacceptable and doesn't rise to the magnitude of the crisis that we're in, or the crimes that he's committed. Here's the letter:

"We are former Air Force service members. We joined the Air Force to protect American lives and to protect our Constitution.

We came to the realization that the innocent civilians we were killing, only fueled the feelings of hatred that ignited terrorism and groups like ISIS, while also serving as a fundamental recruitment tool similar to Guantanamo Bay. This administration and its predecessors have built a drone program that is one of the most devastating driving forces for terrorism

and destabilization around the world. When the guilt of our roles

in facilitating this systematic loss of innocent life became too

much, all of us succumbed to PTSD – post-traumatic stress disorder. We were cut loose by the same government we gave so much to, sent out in the world without adequate medical care, reliable public health services, or necessary benefits. Some of

us are now homeless. Others of us barely make it. We witnessed gross waste, mismanagement, abuse of power, and our country's leaders lying publicly about the effectiveness of the drone program. We cannot sit silently by and witness tragedies like the

attacks in Paris, knowing the devastating effects the drone program has, overseas and at home. Such silence would violate

the

very oaths we took to support and defend the Constitution. We request that you consider our perspective, though perhaps that request is in vain, given the unprecedented prosecutions of truth-tellers who came before us, like Chelsea Manning, Julian Assange, and Edward Snowden. For the sake of this country, we hope it is otherwise.”

Now, again, Mr. LaRouche has put the right punctuation mark on the situation, and has made clear that nothing can be accomplished, nothing can be effectively achieved in partnership

with the Russians, unless Obama is removed. I want to continue briefly reading the remainder of Mr. LaRouche’s comments to us this afternoon, and then we’ll move on. ` He said, the gutlessness of the Congress really started in the current context

with the attacks of 9/11, with Cheney and company. He said, I still have vivid recollection of the planes crashing into the twin towers. This is a Manhattan issue. It goes to the heart of

the Bush family, and the heart of the Obama legacy. Obama’s personality was shaped by his step-father, who was a cold murderer. Obama has blood on his hands; he’s too dangerous for mankind. Since the Russians launched their Syria operations in September, and especially since the Paris attacks of one week ago, there is an implicit taming of Obama, but he is still too dangerous to be allowed to remain in office. Imagine where we would be today without Putin’s actions and the actions of China.

The Victory Day parade in Beijing attended by Xi Jinping and Putin established the Asian factor as a supreme factor in world

affairs. Compare that to the mess we see in France, the mess we

see in Germany, and elsewhere. So you must remove Obama from office, or we can’t make it.

Now, he then returned to the question of Wall Street, which

Obama's Presidency has protected up and down the line. Wall Street is about to implode, and we must shut it down now. Treat Wall Street as something that no longer exists. Use FDR's methods with even more emphasis. Write off all of Wall Street's assets out of existence, and develop a program, an FDR program, to change the direction of the economy. Create a credit system, and make it known that nothing will be paid on the useless assets of Wall Street. And Mr. LaRouche ended by simply noting, Clinton was blackmailed into going along with the end of Glass-Steagall, and Hillary was unfortunately used as a tool in that process. So, again, there is no question that a coordinated alliance between the United States and Russia to defeat ISIS, using the same approach that was used to defeat Hitler in World War II, is feasible. Some leading retired American military officials have openly called for a formal military alliance between the United States and Russia. Let Russia, which has been formally invited into Syria, handle the assault on the ISIS forces from the Syrian side, and let the United States, which has been invited-in by the Iraqi government, handle the assault against the Islamic State from the Iraqi side. Run that as a pincer operation. Hit them from both flanks, and crush them under the weight of the capability that could be brought to bear by the United States and Russia in combination. But again, while that is absolutely feasible, there is no reason to assume that the British will let

that happen, so long as Obama remains in office. And therefore, it is essential, if we are going to have this alliance, if we are going to avoid many more Paris-es – perhaps the next one on the streets of New York City, or Washington DC, or Chicago, or Los Angeles – then Obama must be removed now, and Congress collectively must find the guts to take the necessary action.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, as we mentioned last week on our broadcast here, which we recorded just hours after the initial attacks occurred in Paris, before there was last Friday's attacks in Paris, which killed 130 people, there were also the fore-going attacks in January of this year, against the editorial offices of the satirical magazine {Charlie Hebdo}.

As a matter of very eerie coincidence, just hours after those attacks occurred, on January 7th of this year, several members of Congress, including Walter Jones, and Stephen Lynch, as well as former Senator Bob Graham, of the State of Florida, and additionally, family members of the victims of 9/11, convened a press conference on Capitol Hill, on the morning of January 7th, which had been previously scheduled, on the subject of a bill to release the redacted 28 pages of the Congressional Joint Inquiry Report into the attacks on 9/11, an inquiry of which former Senator Bob Graham had been co-chair at the time. We are going to replay a very short excerpt of Senator Graham's remarks at that press conference then, January 7th of this year, but while we play this for you, I want you to reflect on how even more relevant and urgent his statements are, now, in the wake, in

the aftermath of last Friday's attacks in Paris, not to mention

the attacks in Beirut, the attacks in Mali earlier today, and elsewhere, and the fact that the failure to release these pages

{then}, on January 7th, or January 8th, in the immediate wake of

that press conference, the failure to release the 28 pages

{then}, puts the blood of the innocent victims of these

subsequent attacks on the hands of those who insist on

perpetuating this cover-up to this day. So watch this brief

excerpt from the press conference on January 7th.

[RECORDING] CONG. WALTER JONES: I introduce the esteemed Senator from Florida, Bob Graham. Thank you.

SENATOR BOB GRAHAM: Walter, thank you very much. And I, too, want to thank Walter and Steve – Congressmen Jones and Lynch – for their leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of

the Congress. I want to thank the family members, who have been

without question the most influential force in all of the changes

that have occurred as a result of 9/11, and will be the most significant force in terms of convincing the President that it is

time to give the American people the truth. Needless to say, my

remarks that I will espouse this morning, are considerably different than they would have been, but for events in Paris this

morning, which in my judgment, bring this matter into its proper

focus.

What have been the consequences of this refusal to release the pages? The consequences, in my judgment are three:

One, is a denial of the truth. A core question in 9/11 is, did these 19 people act alone, or did they have a network of support which facilitated their ability to carry out a very complex plot? No one who has looked closely at the facts, including the individuals that I just named, has come to a conclusion other than that it is highly improbable that the 19 people could have acted alone. Yet, the official position of the

United States government has been that they did act alone, and that there is no necessity for further inquiry into the question

of whether there was a support network.

The second issue, is the issue of justice. Some 3,000 members of the families who were lost on 9/11 have been trying for years to get justice through our system for the losses that

they have suffered. The position of the United States government

has been to protect Saudi Arabia, at virtually every step of the

judicial process. When the United States government was called upon to take a position, it has been a position adverse to the interests of the United States citizens seeking justice, and protective of the government which, in my judgment, was the most

responsible for that network of support.

The third consequence is the issue of national security, and frequently those who have defended nondisclosure, have said, this

cannot be made available to the American people, because it would

be adverse to our national security. It will affect methods and

sources of information, or other information that is inappropriate to be made publicly known. As the two Congressmen

have just said, they both read the report not 12 years ago,

when I participated in writing the report but they have read it recently, and have both come to the same conclusion that we did a dozen years ago: that there is no threat to national security in disclosure.

I'm going to make the case today, that there is a threat to national security by non-disclosure, and we saw another chapter of that today in Paris.

Here are some facts:

The Saudis know what they did. They are not persons who are unaware of the consequences of their government's actions. Second, the Saudis know that we know what they did! Somebody in the Federal government has read these 28 pages, someone in the Federal government has read all the other documents that have been covered up so far. And the Saudis know that.

What would you think the Saudis' position would be, if they knew what they had done, they knew that the United States knew what they had done, and they also observed that the United States

had taken a position of either passivity, or actual hostility to

letting those facts be known? What would the Saudi government do

in that circumstance, which is precisely where they have been, for more than a decade?

Well, one, they have continued, maybe accelerated, their support for one of the most extreme forms of Islam, Wahhabism, throughout the world, particularly in the Middle East. And second, they have supported the religious fervor, with financial

and other forms of support, of the institutions which were going

to carry out those extreme forms of Islam. Those institutions have included mosques, madrassas, and military. Al-Qaeda was a

creature of Saudi Arabia; the regional groups such as al-Shabaab

have been largely creatures of Saudi Arabia; and now, ISIS is the

latest creature!

Yes, I hope and I trust that the United States will crush ISIS, but if we think that is the definition of victory, we are

being very naive! ISIS is a consequence, not a cause it is a consequence of the spread of extremism, largely by Saudi Arabia,

and if it is crushed, there will be another institution established, financed, supported, to carry on the cause.

So the consequences of our passivity to Saudi Arabia, have been that we have tolerated this succession of institutions violent, extreme, extremely hurtful to the region of

the Middle East, and a threat to the world, as we saw this morning in Paris.

So I conclude by saying, this is a very important issue. It may seem stale to some, but it is as current as the headlines that we will read today. It is an issue that goes to the core of

the United States' contract with its people, that the people would give the government the credibility and support to govern;

the government would give the people the information upon which

they can make good judgments, as to the appropriateness of governmental action. It's as fundamental as justice to our people, who have suffered so, by this evil union of extremism and

a very powerful nation-state. And it is the security of the people of the United States of America.

So, I again thank the Congressmen for their leadership. I hope that they will soon be joined by a rising tide of other members of Congress who recognize the importance of this

issue.

And then, finally, that the President of the United States will

declare that he is going to adopt the Lincolnesque standard of full disclosure, and rely on the intelligence and judgment and patriotism of the American people to decide what the appropriate

course of action should be.

Thank you.

OGDEN: Now both Jeff Steinberg and myself had the opportunity to be in that room on that day, January 7, present at

that press conference, and I know Senator Graham's presentation

sent chills through the audience, especially because it came in

such proximity to these terrible attacks on that day, on the headquarters of {Charlie Hebdo}; but especially when he said – and I think this stood out for you, probably, when you were just

listening to this again – when he said, this is a very important

issue. It may seem stale to some, but it is as current as the headlines we will read today.

And tragically, that applies just as much this week, in the aftermath of the horrific attacks in Paris of last Friday, as it

did then, in the aftermath of the attacks at {Charlie Hebdo}.

And

as long as this cover-up continues, innocent people continue to

die. Paris, Beirut, Mali, the Russian airliner – what's next?

What must be done to ensure there {is} no next time?

So I know that Jeff has been deeply involved in this issue

for several years, over a decade, and I'd like him to come to the

podium to briefly comment on the significance of what you just heard Senator Bob Graham say.

STEINBERG: The statement I read a few moments ago from the four former drone pilots reminded me that among the documents that were released in 2010 by WikiLeaks, which of course began the process of revealing some of the murderous behavior of the Obama administration, included a document which was a cable from

then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to Richard Holbrooke, who

was the Special Envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, who was preparing to make a visit to Saudi Arabia soon after that memo was written, towards the end of 2009. And what that memo said was

well, we're in possession of massive evidence that the number one

source of financing for all of the various Sunni jihadist terror

groups is Saudi Arabia. And we've got to begin to develop a policy for putting some kind of pressure on Saudi Arabia so they'll cut it out.

So, in other words, there was full knowledge in 2009 at the very beginning of the Obama administration throughout the administration that Saudi Arabia was still continuing to be a major source of support for the al-Qaeda networks that carried out the 9/11 atrocities. Remember also that General Michael Flynn, the head of the Defense Intelligence Agency until he was

unceremoniously fired last year by President Obama for daring to

continue to supply intelligence on the fact that Obama's own policies were fueling the growth of al-Qaeda and eventually fueling the growth of the Islamic State – ISIS. So, this should

be a further reminder of the points that were made by Senator Graham and the others that this administration, from day one,

has
been fully on notice about the continuing role of Saudi Arabia
as
the principal source of financing and logistical support for
the
activities of these hideous jihadist terrorists.

Now just in the past week, really in the past several weeks,
we can account for hundreds of people who've been killed by
the
very apparatus that this President has refused to take any
action

against. You had the bombing of the Metro Jet airliner – 224
people killed when the plane blew up by a terrorist bomb over
the

Sinai Desert. Secondly, you had two suicide bombings in the
southern portions of Beirut, targetting a largely Shi'ite
neighborhood. We don't have the precise number of people
killed,

but it was a large number of people killed and wounded. And of
course, we now have a death toll of 130 in Paris. And even
earlier today, you had a jihadist assault on the Radisson Blue
Hotel in Mali, where again we're still awaiting the body
count;

but 180 or so people were taken hostage by a group of armed
gunmen, and ultimately Malian, French and American commandoes
raided the hotel. And again, we witnessed a significant fire
fight; people were killed – innocent civilians arbitrarily
targetted simply because they were in the wrong place at the
wrong time.

Now, let's face the reality. If those 28 pages had been
published back in 2002, and had revealed the indications of
the

role of the Saudi monarchy and Saudi intelligence and Saudi
defense industrial company in providing the key support for
the

9/11 hijackers, there would have been a public outcry. There
would have been a serious investigation into Saudi Arabia.

There

would have been a fundamental change in the US relationship to Saudi Arabia. And by the way, the investigation into the specific

funds provided by Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar bin Sultan to the Saudi intelligence agents who were managing and supporting two of the hijackers in San Diego, would have directly led to the

doorsteps of the British; because some of the money that went from Bandar's personal account into the hands of those terrorists, came from the al Yamamah agreement – the British/Saudi barter agreement, which {EIR} documented created an

offshore slush fund of tens of billions of dollars, perhaps hundreds of billions of dollars over the scope and sweep of that

agreement – that was used to finance terrorism. Prince Bandar openly boasted that funds from the al Yamamah project went to financing what were then called the Afghan mujahideen; the so-called freedom fighters who soon were known as al-Qaeda and Taliban.

So, the track record is enormous; it's unambiguous. There has been a top-down Presidential cover-up of the Saudis and British and their role in this terrorism under the Bush/Cheney administration, and continuing under Obama. And in spite of all

of that evidence, the Obama administration continued to smuggle

weapons out of Benghazi into the hands of Syrian rebels; including those who became part of ISIS and the Nusra Front. And

that's not idle speculation; that's from documents from the Defense Intelligence Agency that were presented to the President

by no later than the Fall of 2012. One of those documents specifically said, why are we still smuggling weapons into the Syrian rebels out of Benghazi, when those networks just

assassinated a US ambassador and three other American officials?

So again, let's go back to the original comments in response to tonight's institutional question by Mr. LaRouche. Obama's got

to be removed from office because he's got blood on his hands. And the United States will never ever be able to actually re-establish its role as a leading force for good in the world,

so long as we tolerate a President in office who's got that much

blood on his hands and continues to carry forward the same policies despite all of the evidence and all of the warnings.

OGDEN: Now, a direct correlative of this entire situation in Syria, Libya, Iraq, and elsewhere is the unprecedented refugee crisis now being experienced by the people of this region; who are flooding across the Mediterranean and into Europe. And I know

this is one of the items that was directly cited by Congresswoman

Tulsi Gabbard in her list of ten reasons why the illegal war against Bashar al-Assad must be ended. And it's impossible to underestimate the urgency and the significance of the currently

ongoing refugee crisis. This is a massive displacement of human

beings on the scale of millions, flooding into Europe from the Middle East and North Africa; fleeing from the carnage and the chaos which have taken over that region, which is a direct result

of the regime-change wars of first the George W Bush administration, and now the Barack Obama administration. Again,

the culpability lies on the doorstep of Obama. And in Europe, even before the terrorist attacks in Paris last Friday, we saw a

frightening rise of a right-wing, proto-fascist, xenophobic backlash within the European population against these refugees;

driven by the effects of the policies of such persons as Schäuble

and his so-called "Black Zero" policy. And the danger is that this could drastically worsen and spin out of control as the economic breakdown in the trans-Atlantic region continually gets

worse; and it will get worse rapidly, as long as the necessary policies of a top-down complete bankruptcy re-organization of this Wall Street system are not taken, which must begin with Glass-Steagall, and the correlated policies that Franklin Roosevelt enacted at the beginning of his New Deal.

Now this is the real civilizational crisis, threatening Europe, the United States and the entire world, and {not}, as Obama and his fellow travelers in the British Royal Family would

have you believe, the so-called crisis of anthropogenic global warming. This is the real crisis: this refugee crisis, the crisis

of the destabilization of the entire region of the Middle East and North Africa, and the threat of a total blow-out of the trans-Atlantic bankrupt financial system. This is the real crisis, which responsible leaders of the world's leading powers

should be discussing as they gather in Paris next week for the so-called COP21 Summit in Paris.

So before I say more about that, I would like to ask Ben Deniston to come to the podium to make some very relevant comments in that regard.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Matthew. From our discussion with Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche earlier today, we were discussing

a certain article that had just been released in the last couple

days, and Helga and all of us thought it would be an important

thing to highlight, given the relevance of this article to what

Matt just referenced. You should have graphic on your screen, just a screen-shot of one publication, one blog, which is hosting

this article. The title is, as you can read, "Terrorism and a Cold Winter Refugee Crisis," with a subline reading "A Brutal Cold Spell Could Kill Refugees." Paris COP21 delegates need to discuss this climate issue.

Now this article was authored by two leading so-called climate skeptics, two individuals who have been out front fighting against this fraudulent claim of a man-made climate change crisis. One individual, just to give you a sense of who they are, Joseph D'Aleo, is a certified consulting meteorologist;

he's a fellow of the American Meteorology Society; and he's one

of the original co-founders of the Weather Channel. So, he's somebody familiar with climate and weather. The other author is

Paul Driessen, who is a self-proclaimed former environmentalist,

until the environmentalist movement went against human beings, and he decided it wasn't a good thing to stick with. But he's the

author of such books as the 2003 book "Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death." And he's also done a number of interviews with {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine, one of which is part of the 2015 report put out by {Executive Intelligence Review}, which, if you don't have a copy of, we encourage you to

get a copy of immediately. Our recent report "Global Warming Scare is Population Reduction, not Science"

So, they came out with a rather interesting piece which we want to just put on the table and then comment upon. But just to

quote the beginning of their article. They open by saying

“Even

after these latest Paris massacres, and previous radical Islamist

atrocities in the USA, in France, in Britain, in Canada, in Spain, India, Iraq, Syria, Nigeria and elsewhere, politicians still absurdly say that hypothetical man-made global warming is

the greatest threat facing humanity. In reality, fossil fuel contributions to the climate change pose few dangers to people or

planet, and winters actually kill 20 times more people than hot

weather.”

So after that lunge, they go on to highlight some very relevant facts. They go into focus on the millions of refugees that Matthew just referenced, who are desperately now trying to

escape the horrors of what frankly Obama has unleashed with the

Islamic State. As we discussed, many of them fleeing into Europe.

Well, the authors of this article make the relevant point that these people are coming from a climate that is on average generally 20 to 30 degrees warmer in the winter time than their

current destinations they’re heading into in Eastern and Northern

Europe. That this people who are fleeing desperately to get out

with their lives intact, are simply not prepared to just plunge

into this much colder climate of Europe, and especially if they’re just simply left to try and survive in makeshift shelters

or tents, we could be seeing the beginnings of a very horrific mass death scene, as these people suffer the horrors of a cold European winter.

And these authors give a warning, that this could actually be worse, this particular winter, if we see the return of some of

these periodic blasts or movements of frigid, extremely cold Siberian air transfer over Europe, which is a not-uncommon phenomenon, and could give rise to, again, a very cold, deadly cold in this case, winter over Europe.

Now, they make the point: this prospect of a potentially harsh cold is obviously in stark contrast to just the insane propaganda lies about global warming, including, for example – a

couple of their highlights are rather useful, if anything, for comic relief. But they cite a headline article from the German publication {Der Spiegel} from 15 years [ago], from the year 2000. And the title of this article was: " Goodbye, Winter. In Germany cold winters are now a thing of the past." This was declared in 2000 to be the reality. Or a scientist with a British

Climate research unit, who was quoted saying, again about 15 years ago, around the year 2000: "Children are not going to know

what snow is."

So, despite these crazy lies that have been spouted for decades, and are being spouted again now, they make the relevant

point that for five years, between 2008 and 2013, you had a whole

series of extremely cold winters throughout Europe, in some cases

setting many records. England, for example, having one of the coldest winters they had in centuries. Mind you, 8 to 12 years after it was proclaimed that children in England would no longer

know what snow is, they had the coldest winter they've had since

sometime in the 1600s, in the Little Ice Age.

So anyway, they go on to point out that with most recent

scientific knowledge, these particular climate conditions, these blasts, this movement of very frigid, cold air from the Siberian region into Europe, tends to be associated with certain fluctuation in the Atlantic ocean, certain multi-decadal cycles in the Atlantic, in correspondence with certain changes in solar activity. There's a very close correlation and indications between these solar phenomena and this particular process leading to extremely cold winters in Europe. And they – obviously none of this having anything to do with human CO2 emissions. But Driessen and D'Aleo do make the point that the fact of the matter is that the current phase of what the ocean is doing in the Atlantic, the current phase of solar activity, generally points to the possibility that we could be seeing another very harsh, very cold winter in Europe. Now, it's not to say for certain that's going to happen, but that is the type of reality, the type of threat to these people, that we should be thinking of – that the people in Paris should actually be addressing. So, with literally millions of lives on the line, we thought today in our discussion that these authors' call could not be more correct, could not be more relevant: their call on the delegates to this upcoming UN conference on climate change – which, as Matt said, is going to start in just a little over a week and run for two weeks in December – that at this event, this is the climate issue that should be being discussed. And they present this refugee crisis against evidence for a broader reality, that quite frankly – and as has been shown even in more

detail on some recent studies – cold weather generally kills something on the order of 20 times more people than hot weather.

Periods of extreme cold, winter is on average, averaged over many

locations, far more deadly than warming. And on top of that, this

entire Green energy program makes it even worse; it's making it

more expensive if not impossible for many people – especially in

cold regions – to be able to afford basic heating for their home

to keep themselves alive during the winters.

So with this framework, this particular article concludes

rather sharply that it would be an “unconscionable crime against

humanity if the nations gathering in Paris implement policies to

protect our planet's energy-deprived masses from hypothetical manmade climate change occurring decades from now by perpetuating

poverty and disease that will kill millions of people tomorrow.

These are the reasons that climate change is a critical, moral issue. We need to recognize that and stop playing games with people's lives.”

So again, in the discussion earlier today, we thought that

this recent article, Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in particular that

this should serve as a real challenge to people. This should be a

challenge to many of the so-called “climate skeptics” out there;

it should be a challenge to really all individuals who, for one

reason or another might be claiming they're opposing this

upcoming UN climate conference. And it should really be a challenge obviously, to anybody participating directly in this process. This is not an academic debate; this is not a debate about one scientific theory against another in academia. This is

a life or death issue for millions upon millions of people. This

has real world consequences; it has had them, it's having them now, it's going to have them in the future. If this type of thing

is going to go through, you're literally condemning millions of

people – potentially billions – to unnecessary poverty, to suffering, and to early death. Those are the facts of the matter.

So the question on the table right now is, will you let this happen? Will you go down in history as having let this happen? And as we've documented, especially in this report and in other

locations, we know what this is all about. This is intentional;

this is the 21st Century version of Thomas Malthus' policy.

This

is the modern Zeus policy.

Who did we just hear is going to be one of the leading prominent speakers at this Paris COP 21 conference? Prince Charles, the British Empire; the next in the series of degenerations of the British Royal Family, following Prince Phillip and Queen Elizabeth. And it's no secret these people are

promoting a policy of outright genocide; they're advocating and

promoting a policy saying the world can only support 1-2 billion

people. And we need to push to reduce the world's population to a

few billion people. So if you let this type of program to go

through, this will go down in history as the greatest mass killing on record; save perhaps Obama's thermonuclear war if we

let him launch that. But if that's not launched by Obama, this would go down in history as the greatest mass death; and you will

be the people who let that happen.

So the crisis conditions facing these refugees are a leading expression of this more general threat. And this is occurring at

the same time as we're seeing this gathering for this fake global

warming scare conference in Paris, which is just about to occur.

If you reflect on this process, it really almost sounds like you're describing the opening scenario of a rather famous short

story by Edgar Allan Poe; it's almost reminiscent of something like {The Mask of the Red Death}. We have some major gathering of

representatives of upper class layers of society, gathering in some isolated, climate-controlled conference halls – very comfortable; hoping they can celebrate their own delusional picture of the world. Hoping they can celebrate their determination of the fate of the masses of people, under the fantasy that they themselves are going to free from the effects

of their actions. Well at the same time that this absurd scene is

going on, you have millions of desperate people gathering around

them throughout Europe; fleeing into Europe. Running from the policies which most of the people at this conference refuse to address; Obama's policies. Masses of people suffering from the reality that those people at this conference refuse to accept; which is the fact that global warming is nothing but a Malthusian

hoax. So, it's got an eerie similarity to some stories of the past, but unlike Poe's dramatic account, what we have now is that you still have the time to act.

OGDEN: Thank you very much Ben. And let me just say in conclusion, there is a petition which is circulating; it was authored by the Schiller Institute, and it is now posted on the LaRouche PAC website titled, "A Resolution To Defend Billions of Lives; We Say 'No' to Paris COP 21". So, we invite you to sign that and to circulate that as widely as you can in the coming days. Also, as Ben mentioned, that {EIR} Special Report is available from {Executive Intelligence Review}. So, that's available for you to obtain as well. So, I'm going to bring a conclusion to our broadcast here tonight. I want to thank very much both Ben and Jeff for joining me here; I want to thank you for tuning in, and please, stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Frankrigs præsident Hollande
og premierminister Valls
briefer parlamentet, Det
Hvide Hus og Kreml om
de nødvendige handlinger for**

at bekæmpe terrorisme

19. november 2015 – I en tale til en forsamling af Frankrigs borgmestre den 18. nov. sagde præsident François Hollande, at begivenhederne i Saint-Denis bekræftede, at Frankrig var »i krig ... det, som er disse terroristers mål, er det, som Frankrig repræsenterer. Det var det, der blev angrebet den 13. nov. Disse barbarers mål var at ramme Frankrig i sin forskelligartethed. Det er Frankrigs ungdom, der var målet, simpelt hen fordi den repræsenterer livet.«

Premierminister Manuel Valls har bekræftet, at Abdelhamid Abaaoud, den angivelige planlægger bag angrebene den 13. nov., blev dræbt under en politirazzia i Saint-Denis. Indenrigsministeriet sagde, at politiet havde ransaget yderligere 118 adresser i hele landet natten mellem den 17. og 18. november og havde foretaget 25 arrestationer og beslaglagt 34 våben. Der er foretaget razzia mod flere end 400 huse, og 60 mennesker er blevet tilbageholdt, siden Frankrig erklærede undtagelsestilstand fredag, den 13. nov.

Efter planen skal Hollande besøge den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama for at vise den bydende nødvendighed af kampen mod Islamisk Stat, når de mødes i Washington i næste uge. Den britiske avis *Guardian* citerede en unavngiven diplomatisk kilde, der beskrev, hvad det er, Hollande vil klargøre for Obama.

»Det budskab, vi ønsker at sende USA, er simpelt hen, at krisen er i færd med at destabilisere Europa. Problemet er, at angrebene i Paris og flygtningekrisen viser, at vi ikke har tid. Der er en nødsituation«, sagde kilden til *Guardian*. Han tilføjede: »Det er de udenlandske krigere, men det er også migranterne, der splitter europæerne og destabiliserer kontinentet, så vi må handle hurtigt og fortælle USA's regering, at kerneinteresser for europæerne, jeres bedste allierede, står på spil.« Pointen er, at Obama efter Frankrigs

mening nægter at handle hurtigt nok. »Det er grunden til, at den franske præsident vil være i Washington på tirsdag, før han flyver videre til Moskva for at mødes med præsident Putin.«

I sin tale til Nationalforsamlingen for at forlænge undtagelsestilstanden advarede den franske premierminister Manuel Valls om, at terrorister i fremtiden kunne benytte kemiske og biologiske våben.

Ansøgninger til den franske hær er steget voldsomt, fra 135 om dagen til 500 om dagen, siden regeringen meddelte, at den vil rekruttere yderligere 15.000 personel i år og yderligere 16.000 i 2016. Den franske hær består i øjeblikket af 115.000 mænd og kvinder.

Foto: Soldater på Champs Elysées, Paris, med Triumfbuen i baggrunden. Undtagelsestilstanden er efter premierminister Manuel Valls begæring til Nationalforsamlingen blevet forlænget med 3 måneder.

RADIO SCHILLER den 20. november 2015: 5-punkts-program efter terrorangrebet i Paris

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Rusland fornyer sin diplomatiske offensiv for international antiterror-koalition

17. november 2015 – Det Russiske Udenrigsministerium meddelte i dag, at, i overensstemmelse med artikel 51 i FN's Charter, der indeholder bestemmelser om en stats ret til selvforsvar, opfordrede det til en global respons på terrorbølgen som den, vi har set i Paris, samt angrebet på den russiske Airbus fra selskabet Metro.

»Rusland anmoder alle stater, organisationer og individuelle personer, alle sine venner og partnere, om at stille assistance til rådighed i denne indsats for at sikre, at gerningsmændene bliver behørigt straffet.« Erklæringen slutter: »Vi opfordrer FN's Sikkerhedsråd til ikke at spilde tiden og gøre udkastet til en resolution om at danne en bred, antiterror-front på basis af normerne og principperne i international lov og FN's Charter, og som Rusland initierede den 30. september, færdigt.«

Den russiske Duma har udstedt en lignende erklæring, der opfordrer alle parlamentariske kolleger i Europa, Nordamerika, Mellemøsten og andetsteds »til ikke at spare nogen indsats for at danne en international antiterror-koalition ... med anti-Hitler-koalitionen som et model for foreningen af mange lande og nationer imod en fælles fjende«. Duma-erklæringen påmindes også om »Ruslands uophørlige advarsel om, at en permanent destabilisering i Mellemøsten udført af dem, der gør krav på global dominans, primært USA, kunne føre til en udbredelse af

den blodige kaoszone og medføre utallige menneskelige tragedier. Frankrig og andre europæiske stater høster nu i realiteten konsekvenserne af Washingtons kortsynede og selviske politik.«

Den stærkt formulerede Duma-erklæring tilføjer: »Det er åbenlyst, at Vestens uansvarlige og fejlagtige politik, der forfølges under sloganet 'eksport af demokrati', har resulteret i fremvæksten og styrkelsen af den såkaldte Islamiske Stat. Forsøg på at bruge radikale grupper som rambuk for at vælte uønskede regimer er fyldt med yderligere negative scenarier.«

Foto: Plenarmøde i den russiske Statsduma

Udtalelse fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark den 18. nov. 2015: Verden må samarbejde om at nedkæmpe IS og skabe økonomisk udvikling. Fem afgørende indsatspunkter

Vi kan måske ikke forhindre alle terrorangreb, der nu er på vej, men vi har nu en unik chance for at få etableret det internationale samarbejde, der på sigt kan få nedkæmpet IS og andre terrorbevægelser og fjerne grobunden for, at andre kan komme i deres sted. Følgende fem indsatspunkter er afgørende:

Frankrig søger fælles amerikansk-russisk angreb på ISIS

17. november 2015 – I går eftermiddag talte den franske præsident François Hollande til begge de to, samlede parlamenter i Versailles. Præsidenten valgte denne meget sjældne procedure, der kun er forekommet to gange tidligere, for at markere det betydningsfulde øjeblik. De fleste af de meddelte forholdsregler har fået de vigtigste politiske partiers godkendelse; med undtagelse af ændringer i Forfatningen (se nedenfor), som nogle fornuftige personer stiller spørgsmålstegn ved, på grund af sagens mulige rækkevidde. Alle kommenterer de pro-russiske skift.

I en meget højspændt situation, hvor hele den nationale, politiske repræsentation ved, at Republikkens overlevelse står på spil, meddelte Hollande de hovedforholdsregler, som han har til hensigt at tage, for at bekæmpe denne terrorisme. Dette er ikke en »krig mellem civilisationer«, sagde han, fordi fejfe personer, der skød ind i en ubevæbnet forsamling af mennesker, »ikke repræsenterer en sådan«. »Det er en krig imod jihadistisk terrorisme.«

Hollande sagde, at han havde bedt FN's Sikkerhedsråd om at træde sammen for at vedtage en resolution, der markerer den fælles vilje til at bekæmpe terrorisme, eftersom dette er et internationalt spørgsmål. Siden årets begyndelse har ISIS/ISIL/Daesh slået til i Paris, Danmark, Tunesien, Egypten, Libanon, Kuwait, Saudi-Arabien, Tyrkiet og Libyen.

Franske deployeringer vil øges i Syrien, sagde Hollande og rapporterede, at søndag aften, den 15. nov., blev der gennemført en massiv bombekampagne imod ISIS' hovedkvarter i Raqqa med støtte fra USA. På et spørgsmål om, hvorvidt den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad kunne forblive i embedet efter en politisk overgangsperiode, gentog Hollande, at Frankrig søger »en politisk løsning, en, der ikke inkluderer Bashar al-Assad«. Han understregede imidlertid hurtigt to gange, »men vores fjende, vores fjende er Daesh«.

I et markant skift i Vestens krigsdoktrin i området sagde han, »Der kan ikke være tale om at begrænse det. Denne organisation må knuses.«

Hollande sagde, at »vi har brug for, at alle de, der virkelig kan bekæmpe denne terroristhær, går i forening som del af en eneste, stor koalition. Det er, hvad vi tilstræber. I løbet af de næste par dage vil jeg derfor mødes med præsident Obama og præsident Putin for at forene vore styrker og opnå et resultat, som, på dette tidspunkt, alt for længe er blevet udsat.«

Idet han fremførte den kendsgerning, at konsekvenserne af situationen i Mellemøsten rammer alle EU-lande som en bølge af migranter, sagde Hollande, at han havde bedt Forsvarsministeriet om at mødes med andre EU-forsvarsministre under artikel 42-7 i EU-traktaten, der garanterer europæisk solidaritet med et medlemsland, der er blevet angrebet.

På aftenen for angrebet meddelte Hollande, at han havde beordret den omgående genetablering af grænsekontrol og udråbte en undtagelsestilstand, som nu er i kraft i hele det franske territorium. Det blev udvidet til muligheden for at gennemføre eftersøgningsoperationer i hele Frankrig.

Hollande meddelte, at, den 18. nov., vil et lovforslag blive fremstillet i parlamentet for at forlænge undtagelsestilstanden til tre måneder, den periode ud over de

indledende 12 dage, der ikke kræver en parlamentsvedtagelse.

Hollande sagde, at han vil benytte lejligheden til at foreslå en forfatningsreform mht. to højst delikate paragraffer, der i den franske forfatning drejer sig om forholdsregler, der tages under exceptionelle omstændigheder. Det drejer sig om artikel 16 og 36. I artikel 16, sagde han, »specificeres det, at den ordinære funktion af offentlige myndigheder kan suspenderes. Præsidenten vil derefter tage sådanne forholdsregler, som omstændighederne måtte kræve, og som tager forrang over den forfatningsmæssige magtfordeling.« I artikel 36, fortsatte han, »erklæres en undtagelsestilstand (opr. belejringstilstand) i situationer med umiddelbar fare som resultat af en udenlandsk krig eller en bevæbnet opstand. I denne situation overføres diverse magtbeføjelser fra de civile til de militære myndigheder.« Han sagde, at ingen af disse to planer er tilpasset til kampen imod jihadistisk terrorisme.

Der vil blive introduceret love, der giver Frankrig mulighed for at fratage et individ dobbelt nationalitet, hvis individet er blevet dømt for at krænke nationens fundamentale interesser eller for terrorisme, også selv om personen er født fransk. En fransk person med dobbelt nationalitet, der vender hjem fra en krigsskueplads, kan kun vende hjem, hvis han eller hun underkaster sig streng overvågning.

Undersøgelsestjenester og anti-terror-dommere må have adgang til de mest moderne efterretningsteknikker. De må især have alle midlerne til at bekæmpe »våbenhandel«, og »domme vil blive væsentligt strengere«, sagde han.

Henved 5.000 jobs i politiet og gendarmeriet vil blive skabt for at udvide sikkerhedsstyrkerne til 10.000 frem til 2017. Dette vil blot genetablere denne organisations størrelse til det, den var før nedskæringerne i 2007.

Henved 2.500 jobs vil blive skabt i Justitsministeriet og 1.000 jobs i grænsepolitiet.

Der kommer ikke flere indskrænkninger i hærens personel fra nu og frem til 2019, og disse styrker vil indgå i efterretning, operationer og cyber-forsvar.

Hollande krævede, at man undersøgte den mulighed, om reservister »i fremtiden kunne danne en nationalgarde, der er trænet og til rådighed.«

Alt dette kræver finansiering, sagde Hollande, og »jeg mener, at sikkerhedspagten vil tage forrang over stabilitetspagten«, idet han refererede til EU's forholdsregler for budgetnedskæring.

Citaterne stammer fra den officielle oversættelse (til engelsk, og herfra til dansk, -red.): <http://www.franceonu.org/Francois-Hollande-s-Speech-Before-a-Joint-Session-of-Parliament>

Foto: Det exceptionelle sammentræde af begge de franske parlamentshuse tirsdag aften i Versailles, Frankrig.

**12. nov. 2015: Lyndon LaRouche diskuterer med aktivister:
Der er ingen plads til Wall**

Street; der er ingen plads til Obama!

LaRouche: Okay. Der er ingen grund til, at vi nogensinde behøvede at tolerere afskaffelsen af Glass-Steagall. Glass/Steagall-loven blev indført af præsident Franklin Roosevelt. Og alt, hvad Franklin Roosevelt gjorde imod Wall Street-slænget, var dårligt for Wall Street.

Så i samme øjeblik, som Roosevelt døde, tog Wall Street over, og det blev værre og værre og værre. Og i efterkrigstiden opdelte man den ameri-kanske befolkning, og der var dem, som blev 'underdog' (lavest i hækkeordenen) og dem, som var bagdels-kyssere. Og jeg vil gerne forsikre dig om, at det ikke virkede særlig godt.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

I samarbejde med USA udfører Frankrig gengældelseskampagne imod ISIS i Syrien

16. november 2015 – Franske kampfly lancerede et »massivt« angreb på Raqqa, Islamisk Stats de facto hovedstad, sent den 15. nov. som gengældelse for angrebene i Paris den 13. nov. Ifølge det Franske Forsvarsministerium ødelagde de et kommandocenter og en træningslejr for oprørere med 20 bomber. Frankrig udførte missionen i samarbejde med amerikanske

styrker, og de trak på informationer, der var indsamlet under tidligere rekognosceringsmissioner, sagde ministeriet, rapporterer *Defense News*. Det første mål tjente som kommandocenter, rekruttering og lagerfacilitet for våben og ammunition, mens det andet mål var en træningspost.

Talsmand for Pentagon, flådekaptajn Jeff Davis, sagde under en briefing til reportere i Pentagon i dag, at franskmændene havde udvalgt målene på baggrund af amerikanskleverede efterretninger, og at de franske angreb havde koalitionen »fulde vægt« bag sig. Han fortalte også, at, som et resultat af to telefonsamtaler i løbet af weekenden mellem forsvarsministrene for hhv. USA og Frankrig, Ash Carter og Jean-Yves Le Drian, vil USA og Frankrig gøre deres samarbejde omkring efterretninger tættere i kampen mod ISIS. Carter og direktør for den nationale efterretningstjeneste James Clapper har udstedt nye instruktioner, sagde Davis, der »vil gøre det lettere for amerikansk militærpersonel at dele information om planlagte operationer og efterretninger med vore franske modparter vedr. en hel række af fælles udfordringer, til den yderste grænse af, hvad der er tilladt iht. eksisterende lov og politik«.

Mens det franske angreb på Raqqa fandt sted, ødelagde amerikanske A-10 angrebsfly og AC-130 'gunships' 116 olielastbiler i byen Abu Kamal, på bredden af floden Eufrat nær grænsen til Irak. Angrebet var det seneste i kampagnen med navnet »Operation Tidal Wave II« (Operation Tidevandsbølge II) for at eliminere ISIS' olieindtægter. »Denne del skulle angribe distributionsdelen af ISIS' oliesmuglingsoperation«, sagde Davis, »samt nedgradere deres evne til at finansiere militære operationer«. Davis rapporterede, at det amerikanske Finansministerium sidste år vurderede, at ISIS' illegale olieindtægter beløb sig til næsten 1 mio. dollar om dagen.

Davis var imidlertid i lidt af en kattepine, da han skulle forklare, hvorfor kampagnen imod ISIS' oliehandel nu intensiveres, når det har været åbenlyst kendt siden

kampagnens begyndelse, at oliesmugling fra territorier, som ISIS kontrollerer i Irak og Syrien, har fremskaffet en væsentlig del af ISIS' indtægter. Davis sagde, at, indtil for nylig havde balancen tilgodeset beskyttelsen af syrisk og irakisk olieinfrastruktur, til brug for disse lande efter besejringen af ISIS, men at denne balance nu har ændret sig.

Tysklands general Kujat og Europas kommende skæbnesvangre beslutninger efter angrebene i Paris

15. november 2015 – Med den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, der spiller en ledende rolle i at bringe Rusland og USA sammen ved drøftelserne om Syrien og G20, og på trods af chokket ang. terrormassakren i Paris, måtte pensionerede, tyske general Harald Kujat, under en ZDF TV-specialudsendelse om angrebene sent lørdag, meget eftertrykkeligt holde fast ved at fokusere diskussionen på årsagerne og de mulige løsninger på ISIS-terroren, i særdeleshed om det nødvendige i, at Frankrig og Vesten samarbejder militært og politisk med Rusland og den syriske hær. Først sent i udsendelsens løb bragte spørgsmålet om en NATO-mulighed spørgsmålet om samarbejde med Putin og Syrien frem.

Den tyske justitsminister Heiko Maas, der var gæst i studiet, reagerede på en gavnlig måde på, at general Kujat bragte spørgsmålet om en NATO-mulighed på bane, idet han selv bragte samarbejde med Rusland, og ikke kun en militær løsning, på

bane. General Kujat brugte Maas' bekymringer om NATO og USA til at komme med den afgørende pointe om Putins flanke i Syrien: »Med hensyn til Ruslands intervention, den russiske intervention, den militære intervention, så har det transformeret situationen, militært og politisk. Det faktum, at vi i dag kan tale om, at der forhandles om en politisk løsning, er en konsekvens af den russiske intervention i Syrien, og hvis Frankrig ønsker at engagere sig militært i Syrien, inklusive med landtropper, så må de tale med russerne, hvilket amerikanerne for resten også gør, og som har gjort det lettere at sætte sig sammen ved forhandlingsbordet [i Wien] for at drøfte en politisk løsning.«

General Kujat sagde, på et spørgsmål om, hvad han foreslog: »Det, vi ser nu, er, at Rusland har grebet initiativet og går fremefter militært. Alle stater, der kunne udøve militær indflydelse på situationen, har hidtil afvist at sende landtropper dertil, også Rusland, europæerne under alle omstændigheder, og også USA. Rusland bruger nu Assads hær som landtropper og støtter dem med luftangreb. Og det, vi ser, er fremskridt på den russiske side, selv om dette ikke behandles på en fremtrædende plads i de tyske medier. I Irak ser vi fremskridt deri, at kurderne har styrket deres offensiv. Det har alt sammen naturligtvis ført til den kendsgerning, at IS på andre måder [angrebene i Paris, -red.] forsøger at tiltrække sig opmærksomhed. Det har brug for støtte og indstrømning af kæmpere.

Foto: Som udtryk for deltagelse i sorgen var Brandenburger Tor i Berlin lørdag og søndag dækket i de franske farver.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler ved BüSo-kongres i Berlin: Vi behøver en offentlig debat om alle nationers virkelige interesser

Hvad kan Tyskland gøre? Meget, i modstrid med dem, der hævder, at vi er for små til at gøre noget som helst. For det første må vi starte en debat om, hvad Tysklands virkelige interesser er. Vi bør hæve sanktioneerne mod Rusland. Helmut Schmidt havde ret, da han sagde, at krisen i Ukraine var begyndt med Maastrichttraktaten. Vi bør også afslutte enhver mission og alle missioner, som Bundeswehr deltager i til støtte for USA's/Storbritanniens politik. Vi bør promovere en offentlig debat om alle nationers sikkerhedsinteresser. Vi må have en ny, inkluderende sikkerhedsarkitektur. Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble bør træde tilbage, fordi hans »sorte nul«-politik giver næring til optrapningen af højrefløjen.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Putin og Obama mødes i Tyrkiet til diskussion om

Syrien og Ukraine

15. november 2015 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin og den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama holdt et uformelt, fokuseret og tilsyneladende produktivt møde på over 30 minutter på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, hvor de adresserede både Syrien og Ukraine.

Efter mødet sagde den russiske, præsidentielle assistent Yuri Ushakov, da han blev spurgt, om de to ledere havde kunnet bringe deres holdninger om Syrien nærmere hinanden: »Med hensyn til strategiske mål vedr. kampen mod Islamisk Stat, står de generelt nær hinanden; men der er stadig uenigheder om taktik«, rapporterede Tass den 15. nov. Ushakov fortsatte og sagde, at de havde diskuteret »den temmelig kritiske situation« med terrorismen, der blev sat i relief gennem angrebene i Paris.

En regeringsperson fra Det Hvide Hus sagde til Reuters, iflg. RT den 15. nov., at »præsident Obama og præsident Putin blev enige om, at der var behov for en syrisk ledet og syrisk ejet overgang, forud for hvilken der ville være FN-formidlede forhandlinger mellem den syriske opposition og det syriske regime, så vel som en våbenhvile«. Regeringspersonen tilføjede, at Obama gentog sin støtte til Minsk-aftalen i Ukraine, iflg. RT.

Parallelt hermed understregede flere udenrigsministre, der mødtes i Wien, Østrig, den 14. nov., at der var fremskridt. Iflg. den erklæring, der blev udgivet af både det russiske og det amerikanske Udenrigsministerium, indgik deltagerne i Wien-forhandlingerne aftale om at støtte og arbejde for en ikrafttræden af en landsdækkende våbenhvile, »så snart repræsentanterne for den syriske regering har taget indledende skridt til overgangen under FN's opsyn på basis af Geneve-kommunikatet«. En mulig tidsramme blev etableret for Syrien til at udvikle en forfatning inden for 6 måneder og for at afholde

nationale valg inden for 18 måneder.

Ved forhandlingernes afslutning satte udenrigsministrene for Rusland og USA, hhv. Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry, sig sammen for at udfærdige erklæringer. Kerry erklærede, at, alt imens »vi stadig er uenige om, hvad der skal ske med Bashar al-Assad, ... så er vi enige om dette: Tiden er inde til, at Syrien skal ophøre med at bløde; tiden er inde til at berøve terroristerne hver eneste kilometer at gemme sig på« rapporterede Associated Press, iflg. den tyrkiske avis *Hurriyet* den 15. nov.

Alt imens Ruslands Lavrov erklærede sig enig i ånden, så forklarede han, at konflikten – og dens løsning – »ikke handler om Assad. Det er lige meget, om man er for eller imod Assad. ISIL er fjenden«.

Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier meddelte: »Ingen lyver for sig selv om de vanskeligheder, vi står overfor, men den faste beslutning om at finde en løsning har gjort fremskridt i løbet af 14 dage«, iflg. Agence France Presse med henvisning til de første forhandlinger i Wien, der afholdtes den 30. okt.

Iflg. *Wall Street Journal* den 14. nov. tilføjede Steinmeier optimistisk: »De forfærdelige angreb i Paris har kun gjort vores fælles faste beslutning om at bekæmpe ISIS større og stærkere. Vi må, og ønsker, at bryde denne årelange uoverstigelige, onde cirkel, idet vi nu optrapper drøftelserne og forhandlingerne mellem syrerne.«

Drøftelser om det vigtige spørgsmål om, hvem, der skal klassificeres som terrorister, der opererer i Syrien – ud over ISIS og al-Nusra – skal efter planen finde sted i Jordan.

Foto: Puttin og Obama mødtes på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet.

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 16. november 2015:

Efter terrorangrebet i Paris:

Hvad der skal gøres

Amerikansk admiral: Aktiver NATO imod ISIS og inviter Rusland til at være med

15. november 2015 – Det er nu et åbent spørgsmål, hvorvidt Frankrig vil anmode om aktiveringen af NATO, under bestemmelserne om kollektivt forsvar i NATO's artikel 5, i kølvandet på terrorangrebene i Paris den 13. november. Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, en tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende og et nuværende seniorstabsmedlem af Fletcherskolen for Jura og Diplomati ved Tufts Universitet, skriver i en artikel 14. nov. på avisen *Foreign Journals* webside, at Frankrig bør anråbe artikel 5, og at NATO nu må gå ind i kampen mod ISIS.

»Paris ville være i sin gode ret til at forvente, at NATO spiller en betydningsfuld rolle i at organisere en afgørende, militær respons på angrebene«, skriver admiral Staviridis. »Det fundamentale formål med NATO's mission bør være at

besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, som de dér har skabt.« Dernæst forklarer Stavridis de skridt, som NATO bør tage, inklusive at gå til FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Stavridis går imidlertid et skridt videre og kræver, at man inviterer Rusland til at deltage i denne NATO-mission. »NATO bør lægge vægt på, at det opbygger en »åben koalition«, en koalition, der ikke kun kan omfatte de traditionelle allieredes styrker, men også styrker fra NATO's traditionelle modstander, Rusland«, skriver Stavridis. »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

Foto: Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, 15. nov. 2015.

Leder, 16. november 2015: Paris ændrer alt – NATO må gå sammen med Rusland for at knuse ISIS

USA og Europa har fået et alarmsignal til at vågne op gennem det barbariske terroristangreb i Paris. Mange ledende personer kræver nu, at Obamas vanvittige politik for regimeskift i Syrien – som, ligesom tidligere i Irak og Libyen, er i færd med at udløse kaos i hele verden – omgående må afsluttes, så verden kan gå sammen imod ISIS-svøben.

Lørdag sagde præsident Putin:

»Det er klart, at, for effektivt at bekæmpe dette onde, har vi

brug for en reel, fælles indsats fra hele det internationale samfund.«

Tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende admiral James Stavridis sagde til *Foreign Policy*, at Frankrig kunne forvente, at NATO anråbte artikel 5, der bemyndiger en NATO-respons på angrebet, med det »fundamentale formål« fra NATO-missionens side at »besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, den dér har skabt«. Hvad der er vigtigere, så tilføjede admiralen: »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

I Wien lørdag anførte den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov en bred koalition af nationer med et krav om en våbenhvile i Syrien, med en tidsramme på 18 måneder til almene valg. Præsident Assad er ikke ekskluderet fra denne proces.

Søndag talte præsidenterne Obama og Putin på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Tyrkiet, hvor en regeringsperson fra Det Hvide Hus til Reuters sagde, at

»Præsident Obama og præsident Putin enedes om behovet for en syrisk ledet og syrisk ejet politisk overgang, forud for hvilken ville være FN-formidlede forhandlinger mellem den syriske opposition og det syriske regime, så vel som en våbenhvile.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde søndag fra Tyskland, at amerikanerne må forstå, at »intet vil være det samme i Europa efter dette«. Det overlagte angreb mod hverdagslivet – koncerter, sportsbegivenheder, restauranter – viser, at alle er sårbare, ikke blot i Frankrig, men i hele Europa. Hun rapporterede, at højtplacerede europæiske kilder ved, at amerikanske og britiske efterretningskræfter åbenlyst har støttet terroristerne, både gennem saudierne og direkte, som tidligere chef for den amerikanske Forsvarsintelligenstjeneste (DIA), general Michael Flynn, allerede har afsløret.

Hun påpegede den kendsgerning, at i januar, den dag, da angrebet mod Charlie Hebdo fandt sted i Paris, sagde den tidligere amerikanske senator Bob Graham ved en pressekonference, at, hvis de hemmeligstemplede 28 sider af Kongressens undersøgelsesrapport om angrebet mod USA den 11. september var blevet frigivet, ville angrebet i Paris ikke have fundet sted. Vi må nu, sagde fr. LaRouche, atter fokusere på vores indsats for at få dette ødelæggende bevis frigivet, der viser, at Obama er i en åben alliance med terroristerne med det formål at opnå sin kriminelle politik med regimeskifte.

Lyndon LaRouches ven, den amerikanske, tidl. senator Mike Gravel, har udstedt et følgebrev til et juridisk dokument, der viser, at hans sejr i Højesteret i 1971 – da retten dømte, at hans offentliggørelse af de hemmeligstemplede Pentagon-papirer i Kongressens arbejdsprocedure, var legal under Forfatningen – også gjaldt for de 28 sider, og at ethvert medlem af Kongressen kunne indlæse dem i Kongressens journal. Lyndon LaRouche har pålagt en fuld mobilisering af sin organisation over de næste par dage for at frigive dette dokument til alle kongresmedlemmer, pressen og alle borgere.

LaRouche understregede, at Obama nu er den mest hadede person i verden, og at der ikke er, og ikke vil være, nogen tillid til USA, så længe han forbliver i præsidentembedet.

Supplerende dokumentation:

Amerikansk admiral: Aktiver NATO imod ISIS og inviter Rusland til at være med

15. november 2015 – Det er nu et åbent spørgsmål, hvorvidt Frankrig vil anmode om aktiveringen af NATO, under bestemmelserne om kollektivt forsvar i NATO's artikel 5, i

kølvandet på terrorangrebene i Paris den 13. november. Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, en tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende og et nuværende seniorstabsmedlem af Fletcherskolen for Jura og Diplomati ved Tufts Universitet, skriver i en artikel 14. nov. på avisen *Foreign Journals* webside, at Frankrig bør anråbe artikel 5, og at NATO nu må gå ind i kampen mod ISIS.

»Paris ville være i sin gode ret til at forvente, at NATO spiller en betydningsfuld rolle i at organisere en afgørende, militær respons på angrebene«, skriver admiral Staviridis. »Det fundamentale formål med NATO's mission bør være at besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, som de dér har skabt.« Dernæst forklarer Stavridis de skridt, som NATO bør tage, inklusive at gå til FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Stavridis går imidlertid et skridt videre og kræver, at man inviterer Rusland til at deltage i denne NATO-mission. »NATO bør lægge vægt på, at det opbygger en »åben koalition«, en koalition, der ikke kun kan omfatte de traditionelle allieredes styrker, men også styrker fra NATO's traditionelle modstander, Rusland«, skriver Stavridis. »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

Rædsel har slået Paris: »At overvinde frygten« af Jacques Cheminade, leder

af Solidarité et Progrès (LaRouche-bevægelsen i Frankrig)

Paris, 14. november 2015 – Rædsel har slået Paris. Massakrer er blevet begået i blinde for at sætte vores land i en tilstand af chok. Med det samme barbari og de samme metoder som i Mellemøsten, Libanon, Irak og Israel, eller i Syrien. Seks samtidige angreb i hjertet af vores hovedstad og ved Stade de France-sportsstadion, med det formål at mangfoldiggøre ofrene, bunkerne af lig i gaderne, restauranter, der er forvandlet til lighuse, udrykningskøretøjer for hylende sirener: en strategi af frygt, omhyggeligt planlagt, for at levere det budskab, at det værste kan ske overalt og for alle mennesker.

Vores reaktion må modsvare udfordringen. Vi må kun frygte selve frygten, for frygten inspirerer til vanvittige reaktioner, der kommer oven i det første vanvid. At beherske den kan ikke lade sig gøre i passivitet eller fornægtelse, men ved at se tingene i øjnene, i sandhedens navn. Kun kampen for sandheden gør det muligt at undfly angstens kvælertag.

Erklæringen af undtagelsestilstand og lukningen af grænserne, som Republikkens præsident har annonceret, så vel som også deployeringen af politi- og militærstyrker, er de umiddelbart nødvendige forholdsregler, for vi er i krig. At forblive forenet og gøre fælles front i de værdiers navn, der er indskrevet i Republikkens Forfatning, er umiddelbart uundværligt.

Man må imidlertid gå til de første årsager, uden hvilket rædslen vil gentage sig og endda optrappes. Hvilket vil sige skabe en verden, i hvilken de nationale og internationale omgivelser ikke længere skaber kriminalitet, som de gør i dag.

For man kan ikke undfly det onde ved simpelt hen at undertrykke det, men ved at virkeliggøre vilkår, under hvilke det gode overlader det onde mindre og mindre plads.

Det er NATO's krige, de økonomiske uretfærdigheder og ødelæggelsen af værdige livsvilkår, der har skabt betingelserne for terrorisme. Det samme gælder for den kyniske og forbryderiske politik med del og hersk i traditionen efter Det britiske Imperium, og imod hvilket intet i realiteten har modsat sig i vores transatlantiske univers.

At sætte en stopper for rædslen indebærer således en absolut politisk kursændring. Med lanceringen af gensidig udvikling, »win-win«, der sikrer, at vores børn og børnebørn lever bedre end vi selv, er denne lancering, der er annonceret af de kinesiske og indiske ledere, den eneste, virkelige kilde til fred. Samtidig med, at vi i Mellemøsten bekæmper alle terroristgrupper, Islamisk Stat såvel som al-Nusra-Front og Erobringshæren.

Denne lørdag, den 14. november, i Wien, bør Frankrig spille en aktiv rolle i forhandlingerne, der tilsigter at lancere en fredsproces i Syrien, idet vi koordinerer vores indsats med det russiske diplomati, og ikke spiller i hænderne på dem, der tager friheden som gidsel.

I Mellemøsten må Islamisk Stat slås i hjertet af sine økonomiske ressourcer, med bombardementer af deres olieledninger og ved at slå de banker, der hvidvasker deres ressourcer, hvilket hidtil ikke er sket.

Der må sættes en stopper for medskyldigheden i terrorismen hos Qatar, Saudi-Arabien og Emiraterne, uden at vise dette klientel nogen forekommenhed. Og sluttelig må man samtidig genskabe økonomiske udviklingsbetingelser i alle regionens lande, for at migranterne dér kan genfinde værdige livsbetingelser, hvilket Kina tilbyder os ved at udstrække sit koncept med Den nye Silkevej. I mellemtiden må man, i alle

regionens flygtningelejre, og i samarbejde med de internationale, humanitære organisationer, skabe disse værdige vilkår ved at sikre tilstrækkelige fødevarer, lægebehandling, anstændige, midlertidige beboelser og uddannelse til børnene.

Dette koncept er ikke russisk, kinesisk, amerikansk eller fransk, det er det koncept, der retfærdiggør nationalstatens eksistens: at tjene menneskehedens sag. Frankrig bør indtage en prominent plads i dette afgørende engagement, og ikke underkaste sig barbarer i djellaba, kameez eller jakkesæt.

Jacques Cheminade, leder af Solidarité et Progrès.

***Ovenstående leder af Jacques Cheminade er oversat fra fransk. Vore fransktalende læsere kan følge med i situationen i Frankrig på Solidarité & Progrès' hjemmeside:
<http://www.solidariteetprogres.org/>***

Tyrkiet - EU flygtningeplan undervejs

13. november 2015 – Det forlyder, at der er en aftale på vej mellem Den europæiske Union og Tyrkiet om flygtningespørgsmålet, der, som forventet, er fuldstændig utilstrækkelig i forhold til opgaven. *The Guardian* rapporterer, at det blev besluttet, under et EU-hastetopmøde

på Malta på sidelinjen af EU-Afrika-topmødet, at tilbyde Tyrkiet 3 mia. euro til gengæld for at systematisere flygtningestrømmen til Europa, og som ville omfatte registrering af flygtninge i Tyrkiet og med Europa, der indvilliger i at tage et vist antal hvert år. Tyrkiet skal så acceptere ikke-syriske flygtninge, der forlod Tyrkiet for Europa, men som ikke kvalificerer til flygtningestatus. Pengene skal gå til flygtningenes underhold i Tyrkiet. Der skal være et topmøde senere på måneden eller i december med Tyrkiet for en endelig aftale.

Den tyrkiske avis *Hurriyet* rapporterer ligeledes, at der har været forhandlinger mellem EU-kommissionsvicepræsident Frans Timmermans og højtrangerende tyrkiske regeringsfolk den 11. nov. i Ankara, hvor en flygtningeaftale, der er parallel med den, *Guardian* rapporterer om, blev udarbejdet i udkast. Udkastet kræver også en genoplivelse af forhandlinger om Tyrkiets medlemskab af EU, ved at åbne for flere kapitler og bestemmelser om tyrkiske borgeres rejse uden visum til Schengen-zonen. Til gengæld vil Tyrkiet begynde at gennemføre en aftale om, at migranter igen kan komme ind i landet. Aftalen skal ratificeres af regeringslederne. Timmermans vil fremlægge aftalen for EU-rådet i december, hvor man vil søge enstemmig godkendelse.

I mellemtiden vil præsident for EU-kommissionen Jean-Claude Juncker afholde diskussioner med den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, den 15.-16. nov.

Det er interessant, at, alt imens Tyrkiet tilbydes 3 mia. euro, så har EU-medlemmet Grækenland, hvor henved 600.000 flygtninge er ankommet til siden januar i år, modtaget sølle 8 mio. euro.

EU-Afrika-topmødet den 10. nov. domineredes også af flygtningespørgsmålet, hvor europæerne krævede, at de afrikanske lande tager såkaldte økonomiske flygtninge tilbage

til gengæld for blot 2 mia. euro. De afrikanske ledere siges at have været rasende over EU's holdning.

LPAC Fredags-webcast 13. nov. 2015: Terrorhandlingerne den 13. nov. i Paris. Hvorfor vil New York Times ikke offentliggøre de lækkede »Drone-papirer«?

Vi mødes naturligvis i aften under meget alvorlige og forfærdelige omstændigheder, mens rapporter løber ind om, at over 100 mennesker er blevet dræbt i noget, der synes at være terrorangreb i hele Paris. Hele den franske nation er nu i undtagelsestilstand. Jeff Steinberg vil kommentere hele denne situation senere i aftenens udsendelse.

Engelsk udskrift.

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 13, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review.}

Now, obviously, we are meeting here tonight under very solemn and horrifying conditions, as we are hearing reports that

over 100 people have died in what seem to be terrorist attacks across Paris. The entire nation of France is currently under a state of emergency, and obviously details of these attacks are still coming in, as this is an ongoing situation. I know Jeff will have something to say later on this subject, later on this

evening, during this broadcast, as pertains to these horrific events.

But this evening we're going to be beginning our broadcast with an on-the-ground video report from New York City, where the

LaRouche Political Action Committee held a rally earlier today in

front of the headquarters of the {New York Times}. I'm sure many

of our viewers have had a chance to see on the front page of the

LaRouche PAC website a press release which was published on this

website yesterday, which is titled, "Why won't the {New York Times} publish Obama's Drone Papers?", which makes the point that, despite the fact that the Times played a central role back

in 1971 in publishing the so-called "Pentagon Papers", which were

revealed by Daniel Ellsberg, and were released to the American people by the courageous actions which Senator Mike Gravel took

by reading them into the {Congressional Record} – despite the fact that the Times was instrumental in this action, which was instrumental in laying the foundation for the downfall of Richard

Nixon, and the ultimate end of the Vietnam War – today the {New

York Times} has made the willful choice {not} to publish any serious coverage of the so-called “Drone Papers”, which were likewise leaked by a courageous whistleblower from within the drone program itself, a so-called second Edward Snowden, and published by Glenn Greenwald’s internet-based publication, {The Intercept.}

Despite thoroughly damning new details that have emerged and are contained within these documents, the Drone Papers, which pull back the curtain on the murderous and completely out of control targetted assassination program that’s being run, top-down by President Barack Obama, in his weekly kill sessions, without any due oversight, and from behind closed doors, despite this, the editors of the {New York Times} have publicly stated that in their opinion, these new revelations do not “warrant their own story.”

The truth is – and you can be assured that the {New York Times} editorial staff well knows this – any widespread and serious coverage of the “Drone Papers” today. by a major national newspaper of record, such as the New York Times, in the fashion of the Times’ own coverage of the Pentagon Papers in 1971, would have an utterly devastating effect on revealing to the American people the true reality of how this secret drone program is actually run, and the character of the President who runs it. And just as the Pentagon Papers did back then, major publication of the “Drone Papers” today would likewise lay the foundation for the indictment and political downfall of this President – as his murderous proclivities are put on full display for the entire

country to see.

The question is: Knowing all of this, as the press release puts it, "Is the {New York Times} more afraid of Barack Obama than it was of Richard Nixon? And will that fear of taking on the true characteristic of what this President stands for, cause the {New York Times} to fail to address that awful reality at the very time that Obama is leading the United States into unprecedented war-provocations against both Russia and China, and by failing to do so, thus finding themselves – the {New York Times} – complicit in actions which threaten the outbreak of a Third World War, and endanger the continued existence of all mankind.

With that said as an opening statement, we bring the on-the-ground report from New York City, delivered by LaRouche PAC's Daniel Burke:

"Hi, I'm Daniel Burke, and this is a LaRouche Political Action Committee rally that you're witness to at the moment, in front of the {New York Times} headquarters on 41st Street and 8th Avenue. And we stand here today in the midst of certainly the gravest crisis that our species has ever faced, which is well expressed in this banner that we have before us "Obama Leads America to Hell." But our mission is to unify the United States, to have the courage to stand up against the insanity that is dominating our government today.

"At the moment, we are on the brink of a thermonuclear war, because of the fact that this man has been tolerated, and his provocations against Russia, and against China, are unprecedented

in the history of humanity, in terms of the danger that they pose. But as we've laid out in webcasts over the recent weeks, there is a clear train of abuses; the evidence is before you, and

now it's a matter of having the courage to stand up against

it.

So that's what we're doing today, because the fact of the matter

is that the {New York Times} has been covering up for Obama's Satanic drone murders. It's been released through {The Intercept}, from a new whistleblower, as we've documented in our

webcasts so far: that Obama is at the top of a chain that is mass-murdering civilians. And the {New York Times} buried the release of these documents at the bottom of a column a couple of

weeks ago, and then they justified this, by claiming that it did

not warrant its own story.

"So, we stand here to specifically indicate the editors, the writers, who were involved in this cover-up; demand that this be

brought to justice; and in the meanwhile to consider that what we

need today is for one Senator to stand up, and to move against Obama. This is what happened with Richard Nixon, and it was in that case that the {New York Times} had the courage in 1971 to publish the 'Pentagon Papers'. Why will they remain silent on these Satanic murders from Barack Obama?"

OGDEN: Now, Mr. LaRouche wanted to feature this video report from New York City for the reason that he has placed Manhattan at

the center of his strategy to restore the United States to its original founding principle as embodied in Alexander Hamilton, the very opposite of everything that Obama has come to represent

today. Further coverage of this rally will be available on the LaRouche PAC website, including a longer version of this on-the-ground report, as well as the text of the press release,

which I mentioned at the outset of tonight's proceedings.

But, when you place Obama's drone program in the context of

his open and blatant war provocations against both Russia and now increasingly against China, in the recent days and weeks, which will lead to a global thermonuclear war if not stopped. In that context, I would like to ask Jeff to elaborate a little bit on what Mr. LaRouche's assessment was of the importance of using this campaign, as you just saw, centered in Manhattan around the revelations that are now contained and released in the "Drone Papers" in order to drive Obama from office before he has the chance to lead the world into World War III.

STEINBERG: I learned earlier today that there is a joke circulating very widely in Israel, and I'm sure in other places around the world. And the joke goes something like this: What's the difference between God and Barack Obama? The answer? God doesn't think he's Barack Obama. What we're dealing with here is truly a Satanic personality, and yet, he's been permitted to carry out atrocity after atrocity; all on behalf of the British, whose policy, at the level of the British Empire, at the level of the British monarchy, has been always one of massive population reduction through policies of genocide. I think that's the way you've got to understand the events that are unfolding right now in Paris. In a very real sense, the slaughter that's taken place over the last few hours – and of course French authorities are not sure that it's over; there were seven attacks against seven different random targetted popular nightspots all around the city of Paris,

highly coordinated. Kind of what we saw in 2008 in Mumbai, but on a much more elaborate scale. And you've got to ask yourself, where does this kind of Satanic behavior come from? What are the roots of this Islamic State jihadist apparatus? Well, remember that the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, General Michael Flynn, warned earlier this year in a now widely circulated interview with Al-Jazeera America, that he had gone to President Obama in the summer of 2012 and warned that the policies that the US was pursuing – particularly the policies of facilitating the running of heavy weapons from the Libyan port city of Benghazi into various Syrian rebel groups – was going to result in the creation of a jihadist caliphate on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and in that general Middle Eastern region. Now, this was two years prior to the formal surfacing of the Islamic State, which really launched its operations in Iraq with the dramatic takeover of Mosul; and that was in June of 2014. So you've got high-level US Defense Intelligence officials telling the President of the United States, "Drop your fixation with the overthrow of the Assad government in Syria. Halt the flow of weapons that were unleashed on the world as the result of the overthrow of Qaddafi and his instant execution back in the fall of 2011; which unleashed floods of weapons throughout Africa. And through this Benghazi operation of British Intelligence and John Brennan as the Counterintelligence Director of the Obama administration,

the
weapons began to flow into Syria; and these weapons went into
the
hands of the very jihadist networks that we've now seen
operating
on the streets of Paris.

So, is there a causal relationship between the British
Satanic policies of mass population reduction, often stated by
Prince Philip – the royal consort who insists that the world's
population must be reduced by 80%. The fact that General
Flynn

openly said that President Obama did not ignore the warnings,
but

pursued a willful policy of continuing with the arming of the
Syrian rebels after he was repeatedly told what the
consequences

of that would be. And now we've seen those consequences, with
the establishment of the Islamic State; we've seen those
events

now spilling over into the streets of Paris. The situation in
France is still unfolding; there's no definitive answers in
terms

of who particularly carried out these heinous attacks. But we
know that the circumstances under which those kinds of events
could happen, were the product of a persistent line of policy
that has come out of the Presidency of the United States for
at

least the last 15 years; the 8 years of Bush and Cheney, and
now

the 7-plus years of Barack Obama. So you're dealing with
somebody

who is by his character, pursuing outright policies that are
evil, that are Satanic, and that at their core are British;
that

directly go to the demands of the Prince Philips of the world,
who call for mass population reduction.

Now we know that in two weeks, the COP21 climate change

conference is scheduled to happen in Paris; we may very well find that there was a relationship between these attacks that we're now just seeing unfolding on the streets of Paris right now, and that upcoming conference. Earlier this week, Secretary of State John Kerry bluntly stated what has now become obvious; namely that that COP21 conference – despite the efforts of the papal encyclical and John Schellnhüber and other outright proponents of genocide – that conference is likely to fail. There's too much resistance from developing sector countries that realize that what they're looking at is a recipe for genocide. So, what we have before us then, are other means by which the world is careening towards the kind of events that can lead to the mass population reduction policies that are being demanded principally out of the British monarchy; and are being carried out principally through agents of that monarchy such as Barack Obama.

So, what have we seen just in the recent days? The administration has continued with the drone kill policy; and as we saw in the rally out in front of the {New York Times}, it's quite clear that the White House has put enormous pressure on the major US media outlets to suppress the story. Because if the story were to get national media attention through the {New York Times}, through the {Washington Post}, through CNN or one of the major cable news outlets, there would be a groundswell of demand for President Obama's removal from office. These policies are policies of outright genocide. And we've been continuing our

own

investigation into the drone kill policy of Obama; looking beyond

the "Drone Papers" that were released by {The Intercept} about three or four weeks ago. And when you dig deeper into this policy, what you find is that there have been repeated and consistent studies carried out by the military, carried out by major thinktanks whose job it is to do analysis of the actions of

the military. You have the Stimson Center producing a series of

two reports in 2012 and in 2014; the Naval Post-Graduate School

out in Monterrey, California, produced a major study; the Rand Corporation produced a major study. In every instance, they can

to the identical conclusion: the drone policy is a failed policy;

it can never work; it will never work. The idea of targetting priority terrorist agents for elimination, does nothing to reduce

the spread of these kinds of jihadists. If anything, it becomes a

major means of further recruitment, of expansion of operations.

These are not things that are unknown at the levels of the National Security Council, the Obama White House, and similar locations. It is {willfully known} that these polices do not curb

terrorism, do not defeat insurgent movements. They feed them, they fuel them, they expand them.

And so, you really do have a principle here, in which the objective is not to defeat terrorism, but the objective is to spread the kind of murderous chaos that weve seen engulf Syria for the last four and a half years; that weve seen in Iraq and Afghanistan, going back to the beginning of the Bush/Cheney administration in 2001, with the aftermath of the 9/11 events

that have been systematically covered up, first by President Bush, now by President Obama.

The real issue, here, is not exposing the role of the Saudis in this kind of sponsorship of terrorism, including the 9/11 attacks. The real issue here, is that there is a {conscious policy} of creating conditions of global instability and chaos,

that ensure that the targetted population- reduction goals are being met, and war is still one of the major means for that to be

carried out. So, we have a period that weve been living through,

that constitutes more than a Thirty Years War, a period of perpetual war, and these last two Presidencies have been major instrumentalities to make sure that that policy happens.

Now, in the past days, in addition to the continuing cover-up of the Obama drone kill programs which go directly and

personally to Obamas desk in the Oval Office, every single one of

these kill orders has Barack Obamas personal signature on it.

Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, when he was asked to comment about the drone program, simply said, Its the only game

in town. So, this has been the {signature policy} – an indiscriminate mass murder policy, of this President and of this

administration. The idea of toleration for that, for one moment

more, is something that now clearly threatens us all. If these kinds of actions can happen in the streets of Paris, France, then

they can happen anywhere, including here in the United States.

Now, not only is Obama continuing to pursue and defend this policy of drone kill, but, in the past week, weve seen an escalation on the strategic scale, as well. Defense Secretary Ash

Carter spent last week in Asia, attending the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting. He tried to turn that event, unsuccessfully, fortunately, into a gang-up against China. The host government, Malaysia, refused to include a reference to the South China Sea situation in the draft communiqué for that conference. Carter showed up – and by the way, the United States is not a member of ASEAN. Carter was there as an invited guest of the ASEAN countries, the ten nations of Southeast Asia. But, he basically intervened to try to hijack the entire direction of that conference. Fortunately, many of those countries of the region simply refused to do it. As the result, the conference ended in a shambles; there was no final communiqué.

From Kuala Lumpur, Carter returned to the United States via Simi Valley, California, where he gave a major speech at the Reagan Library, and assailed both Russia and China, and accused them of sabre-rattling around the threat of nuclear war. What he was referring to, in the specific case of Russia, is that Russia, in response to the United States deployment of ABM systems right along the southern borders of Russia, the expansion of NATO throughout eastern Europe, in violation of the agreements that were reached at the time of German reunification. In response to all of those provocations, the Russians have moved to establish new levels of defense against what President Putin this week described as a clear attempt by the U.S. and its allies, to break

up the strategic balance that had existed throughout the period of the Cold War and the post-Cold War period, up until this time, and that the United States, by refusing to collaborate with Russia on some kind of global missile defense program, as President Reagan had proposed back in 1983, when he was in close collaboration with Lyndon LaRouche on that project. The United States policy, is to create a thermonuclear war-winning option. That poses not just an existential threat to Russia, but a grave threat to all of mankind. Now, middle of this past week, President Putin convened the annual meeting with top Russian defense officials and leaders of the defense-industrial sector of Russia, at Sochi, on the Black Sea. In opening remarks to that event, which were widely televised throughout Russia, Putin made very clear: the United States has been targeting Russia with the ABM deployment. The fact is clearly demonstrated, because even after the P5+1 deal was reached with Iran, the United States announced it was continuing to move full steam ahead with the ABM deployment, not in partnership with Russia, but unilaterally, with U.S. allies. Since the original argument had been made that this ABM system was strictly directed against Iran, now that Iran has come into compliance with the nuclear deal, with the P5+1, it just shows the lie to everything that Obama has been saying on this. Putin made very clear, that Russia is moving forward to develop new weapon systems that can defeat any kind of ABM program that the

U.S. puts in place, which {will} be directed against Russia. At the same time, as reported this week in the {Guardian} – we've mentioned it here on these Friday night webcasts for some time – the United States is going ahead with the deployment of what is, in effect, a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons that will be forward-based in central and eastern and western Europe, which will be a new generation. They're called the B61-12, with highly accurate tail-guidance systems, that will penetrate deeper into Russian territory, with much more precision accuracy, and therefore these nuclear weapons will have greatly-reduced thermonuclear payloads, which means that the gap between strategic nuclear war and tactical-theater conventional nuclear war, is greatly reduced. In other words, we're moving towards a policy of having a deployable force of thermonuclear weapons, directed at close range, against targets in Russia. Now, we learned this past week, through excerpts from a forthcoming authorized biography of George Herbert Walker Bush [{Destiny and Power}, by Jon Meacham], that at the time of the 1991 Operation Desert Storm, and again during 2003, during the period of the invasion and overthrow of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, [Vice President] Dick Cheney was persistently pushing for the use of nuclear weapons. In the case of the first war in the Gulf, Cheney was promoting the idea that the U.S. should use 17 tactical nuclear weapons against targets in Iraq. So now we've got a continuation of that policy under President Obama. So, here we are, more than 25 years after the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the collapse of the Warsaw Pact – we're facing the gravest threat of thermonuclear war not because of any actions on the part of Russia, but

because
of the character of the President of the United States, a
Satanic

character who has no sense whatsoever of the consequences of
pursuing this kind of policy of genocide.

So, whether it's preparing the groundwork for thermonuclear
confrontation with Russia, and similarly with China – we've
had

B-52 bombers, which are bombers that are capable of carrying
thermonuclear warheads, flying over territory that China
claims

in the South China Sea, as China's sovereign territory, as
part

of the Spratly Islands. That happened just in the last several
days, and it's only now been first acknowledged by the
Pentagon.

There was an earlier incident involving naval ships,
incursions,
into those same waters.

So we've got the targetting of Russia, the beginnings of a
similar outright targetting of China. We have the drone
policy,

and the cover-up of that policy. So here we are, literally
looking at somebody whose track record, documented proven
track

record, is that of mass murder. And yet there is toleration
for

his remaining in office.

Now in our discussion this afternoon with Mr. LaRouche, he
very much placed the emphasis on the situation in Manhattan.

You've got a unique characteristic of the population of
Manhattan, the population of New York City and the great
metropolitan area – but particularly the population of
Manhattan. They still have a greater sense of reality, at
least

large segments of the population do. They have a greater sense
of

the morality that goes with recognizing the great danger that we're facing in the world today. And so, if you look back historically, Manhattan was the place where the core concepts around which our Constitutional republic was organized were formulated. They were formulated in Manhattan in particular by our First Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. There is a Hamiltonian tradition that prevails, and that tradition is the organizing principle for our nation, for our republic. So Manhattan holds a special place for the nation as a whole. Mr. LaRouche pointed out that if you do a survey, region by region around the United States, you will find that region by region the economy has been destroyed. The social fabric has been gutted. We have drug addiction, suicide, all kinds of social dislocation because region by region, the economies of these areas of the United States have been gutted, particularly during the period first of the Bush-Cheney administration, and at a greater and greater accelerating rate, under President Obama. Never mind that since 9/11, \$44 {billion} in your taxpayers' money has gone into the establishment of this drone kill program that is one of the critical factors that keeps expanding the size and brutality of the terrorist apparatus that we've now seen playing out on the streets of Paris just in the last few hours. So we're dealing with an assault against the American people, an assault that has weakened the social fabrics of many parts of our country. So again, Manhattan represents a certain kind of glue, a potential critical point of inspiration for saving this nation,

and this event that you've just seen a brief excerpt of in front of the {New York Times} headquarters today, is indicative of the kind of thing that we will be doing at an accelerating and continuing rate of expansion in Manhattan. And we've got a situation in Washington, where there are a precious handful of elected officials, people in other positions within the Federal government, within the military, within the diplomatic corps, within the intelligence services – a handful of people – who remain truly committed to the survival of this nation and the planet, and we call on you, the American people, to put maximum pressure on them to step outside the bounds of what's required to "go along to get along" and for a handful of these people to step forward and speak the absolute truth about what has gone on in this country, particularly during the seven years of this Obama presidency. One or two leading members of the U.S. Senate, in particular, taking their oath of office seriously, can bring this President down and start the process of reversal of this destructive, literally Satanic takedown of the United States and everything it has historically stood for. We need that step, but we need the voice of the American people, led by Manhattan, to make sure that that actually happens, and that it happens in time.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Jeff's comments just now regarding the events which occurred in Paris this evening prompted me to recall the remarks that former Senator Bob Graham made at a press

conference on Capitol Hill on Jan. 6 of this year, which was nearly hours after the Charlie Hebdo attacks, also in Paris. And

in that press conference, former Senator Bob Graham laid the responsibility right at the doorstep of President Obama, and put

the fault right on Obama's doorstep, because of his refusal to end the cover-up of the 28 pages of the 9/11 Joint Inquiry report. And as Jeff just said, this indictment of Obama's fault

on this matter, obviously still applies, and Bob Graham at that

press conference, called for a Lincolnesque standard of full disclosure of the contents of the 28 pages in that count, but also this obviously applies to the "Drone Papers", and all the other crimes that remain in the shadows.

Bob Graham was referring to Abraham Lincoln's full disclosure of the role of the British in supporting the Confederacy during the Civil War. And what Senator Graham said at

that time, was that the national security threat lies {not} in the disclosure of these documents, but in the non-disclosure, as

could be seen then in the case of the attacks on {Charlie Hebdo},

and I believe as can be seen again today in the continuing attacks in Paris. Also, I would say the 28 pages warrant the Pentagon Papers treatment by some courageous member of the United

States Senate, or U.S. House.

Now, with that said, we have a question which has come in from our institutional source, and I'm going to read it. It's very brief, and I'm going to ask Jeff to respond: "Mr. LaRouche.

What are your thoughts on the immigration crises in Europe, and

what is our advice to European leaders?"

STEINBERG: Mr. LaRouche's answer to this question was very brief and very blunt. He said the first step toward solving this

problem is that Wolfgang Schäuble, the Finance Minister of Germany, has got to be dumped. Schäuble, in Mr. LaRouche's words,

belongs to be put in a pig pen, because his ideas and his opinions stink. He's terrible, he's disgusting, and he personifies those in Europe who are trying to stir up this refugee crisis into a showdown, a kind of a confrontation that could ultimately lead to the eruption of an outright civil war in

Europe. In fact, I greatly fear that in the wake of these Paris

attacks, that you're going to see an enormous backlash.

German

Chancellor Angela Merkel, who is increasingly becoming a captive

of the revolt by people like Schäuble in her own party, actually

took the surprising, but courageous stance, of saying that these

refugees must be assisted; they must be protected, and they must

be given an opportunity to be integrated into European society.

And so, there's a deep split over this issue.

The Russians, through President Putin, have intervened forcefully into the Syria situation to bring the Syria war to an

end. The Russian military intervention on behalf of the Assad government, is beginning to show significant success.

Remember,

the Russian involvement only began directly on September 30; so

we're talking about a period of six weeks. And in that six week

period, there have been a number of significant setbacks delivered to the Islamic State and some of the other jihadist elements of the Syrian rebel opposition. The area around the city of Aleppo, which is the industrial capital of Syria, is now in the process of being retaken by the government forces. 60% to 80% of the population of Syria has now moved, or has already been located in areas under government protection. So, the idea that the Syrian people are fleeing to Europe through Turkey and other routes to get away from Assad is not the reality of the situation. They're fleeing to get away from the Islamic State, the Nusra front, and the jihadists who've been the instruments for the war to overthrow the Assad government. Remember, in August of 2009, President Obama simply declared, "Assad must go"; and with that declaration, the US began facilitating the efforts of the Saudis, the Turks and others to provide weapons to an army of jihadists who have come in from around the world. So, defeat the Islamic State; push back against the tyranny of the Anglo-Saudi apparatus; dump the likes of Wolfgang Schäuble and others of his ilk, who are trying to stir up literally a Hitlerian backlash in Europe against these refugees, who are caught in a trap between the brutality of ISIS back in the Middle East and Iraq and Syria, and the emergence of a nativist right wing, literally a Hitlerian backlash inside western Europe. If Europe is to survive, if Syria is to be rebuilt, then you've got to take certain decisive actions; and

the United States should be collaborating with Russia in a coordinated effort to defeat ISIS. Because every effort that the US and this so-called coalition of 60 nations has taken against ISIS has been a completely transparent fraud. So, who's responsible for the flood of refugees streaming into Europe? Start with President Obama, British Prime Minister Cameron, former French President Sarkozy, current French President Hollande. These are the criminals who, along with the Saudis, the Turks, the Qataris and the others, have been providing all of the logistical and other support to the spread of jihadism. Because ultimately what they're out to accomplish is a population war. We've said this previously. The British policy towards the entire Islamic world, is to foment a new religious Hundred Years War between Sunni and Shi'a on a global scale; because ultimately their objective is population reduction. If they can launch such a Hundred Years War, then how many of the 1.8 or so billion Muslims on this planet will survive at the end of the day? And again, we have a President of the United States who, by personality and by ownership by the British, is a fully witting instrument in this process. So, on the one hand, as Mr. LaRouche said, Schäuble and people of his ilk have got to be dumped. They're the menace; they're the danger. Schäuble wants to go ahead with murderous austerity against the population of Europe; and has even less interest in doing anything for these refugees. And Obama, in his own right, has carried out the same kinds of policies. The destruction of the United States on his watch and on the watch

of
the previous President, is a crime beyond imagination. And
so,
it's time for the American people and even a handful of
leading
elected officials in Washington to wake up to exactly where
the
clock stands and to act before midnight.

OGDEN: Well, with that said, I think is the point where we
are going to bring a conclusion to our broadcast tonight.
Again,
I would recommend people go on the website and watch the full
coverage of the rally in front of the {New York Times}
headquarters today in New York City; as well as reading the
full
text of the press release that was circulated en masse there
today. Thank you for joining us, and please stay tuned. And
please, if you are in the New York City area, participate in
the
weekly discussion which Mr. LaRouche holds every Saturday
afternoon with the citizens of Manhattan. If you're not, you
have the opportunity to do the same on Thursday nights with
the
weekly Fireside Chats. Thank you very much for joining us
tonight; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Kina går med i den Europæiske
Bank for Genopbygning og**

Udvikling

12. november 2015 – Ledelsen for den Europæiske Bank for Genopbygning og Udvikling (EBRD) accepterede onsdag Kinas bud på at blive medlem af banken og banede vejen for, hvad der forventes at blive en endelig vedtagelse af de regeringer, der har aktier i banken, for det meste finansministrene for de 64 medlemslande, i næste måned, rapporterer Reuters i dag.

Hvis de, som forventet, vedtager forslaget, vil det give Beijing en »beskeden, men symbolsk andel på 0,1 procent« i EBRD, siger Reuters og tilføjer, at »Kina vil indbetale til udviklingsbanken snarere end at modtage investering fra den. Men arbejder, som EBRD allerede er ved at planlægge i lande som Kasakhstan, overlapper med Kinas såkaldte 'Ét bælte, én vej'-initiativ.

EBRD's præsident Suma Chakrabarti har sagt, at banken gerne vil udføre arbejder i partnerskab med den nye, kinesisk ledede Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, AIIB.

Etableret i 1991 for at investere i de østeuropæiske lande, der tidligere var under Sovjetblokken, investerer EBRD nu i Mongoliet, Tyrkiet og Maghreb, så vel som i eurozone-kriselandene Grækenland og Cypern.

Den italienske regering under voksende pres for at udvikle

Mezzogiorno

11. november 2015 – Velunderrettede kilder har fortalt *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)*, at den italienske premierminister Matteo Renzi's nylige udtalelser om projektet for en bro over Messinastrædet[1] reflekterer en regeringsaftale om at bygge broen mellem det italienske hovedland og Sicilien, i sammenhæng med voksende pres fra vælger- og erhvervsgrupper om at adressere spørgsmålet om at opgradere infrastrukturen og udvikle økonomien i Italiens Mezzogiorno, som det sydlige Italien kaldes. I særdeleshed fik Renzi for nylig et par tidligere medlemmer af Berlusconi's parti Forza Italia, der, iflg. kilden, som betingelse satte broen, bl.a., som en betingelse for at sikre deres støtte til regeringen. Renzi har brug for denne støtte for at kompensere for tabet af et par delegerede fra det venstreorienterede Demokratiske Partis lejr, som forlod partiet.

I et interview, der blev publiceret den 6. nov., sagde Renzi, at, før vi taler om Messina-broen, »lad os løse spørgsmålet om vand til Messina, om rensningsanlæggene. Vi vil også bygge broen og endelig forlænge højhastigheds-jernbanen også til Sicilien og investere i Reggio Calabria, som er Sydens hovedby. På den anden side må vi også færdiggøre [moderniseringen af] Salerno-Reggio Calabria-hovedlandevejen. Når vi først har afsluttet disse kapitler, vil historien, teknologien og ingeniørstandarden indlysende gå i retning af broen, der vil blive endnu et smukt symbol for Italien.«

En sådan udtalelse kan læses på flere måder, men reflekterer iflg. *EIR's* kilder regeringens hensigt om at genintroducere spørgsmålet om broen så smidigt som muligt. Regeringen arbejder angiveligt på et lovudkast, der skal sætte broen på dagsordenen igen. Det er nødvendigt med en lov, da projektet blev annulleret ved en lov af Monti-regeringen i 2011. Regeringen ønsker at redde ansigt ved at finde en måde, hvor den ikke skal poste flere penge i projektet end de penge,

regeringen skal betale i bøde til byggekonsortiet for at have brudt aftalen.

[1] Se Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport: »Et økonomisk mirakel for Sydeuropa, Middelhavsområdet og Det afrikanske Kontinent«, juni 2012

Cypern tilslutter sig Kinas udviklingsinitiativ 'Ét bælte, én vej'

11. november 2015 – Cyperns præsident Nicos Anastasiades har meddelt, at Cypern tilslutter sig som fuldgældig partner i Kinas projekter under »Ét bælte, én vej«.

Han talte ved et seminar i Nicosia den 9. november med titlen, »Ét bælte, én vej – den kinesiske forbindelse, og hvorfor Cypern bør være inkluderet«, som var præsidentens rapport efter sit besøg i Kina i sidste måned.

Anastasiades besøgte Kina i oktober måned efter invitation fra den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, med hvem Anastasiades mødtes under besøget. Han mødtes også med den kinesiske vicepræsident Li Yuanchao og andre kinesiske regeringsfolk, og han talte ved den store konference med titlen »Ny vision for Silkevejen: Ny handling for fælles udvikling«, der var sponsoreret af Kinas Kommunistiske Partis Centralkomites Afdeling for Internationale Relationer. 60 delegationer fra 30 lande deltog i konferencen, men Anastasiades var den eneste leder fra et EU-land, der var inviteret til at tale ved konferencen.

Den cypriotiske præsident deltog også i et arrangement i Beijing, der var arrangeret af Cyperns Handels- og Industri-kammer, og endnu et i Shanghai, arrangeret af Cyperns Sammenslutning af Land- og Bebyggelses-entreprenører.

I sine bemærkninger ved seminaret i Nicosia, der var arrangeret af Cyperns Handels- og Industri-kammer og den Cypriotisk-kinesiske Virksomhedssammenslutning, sagde Anastasiades, at projektet med Ét bælte, én vej »udgør en stor vision, der giver den nødvendige impuls til at bryde den nuværende, økonomiske stagnation ved at tiltrække investeringer, bekæmpe arbejdsløshed og adressere underudvikling. Det er et initiativ, der etablerer en ny ramme for samarbejde og udvikling, og som lægger grunden til stabilitet, fred og fremgang«.

Præsidenten sagde, at hans »regerings mål er vedvarende at støtte udviklingen af virksomheder og økonomiske relationer mellem Cypern og Kina i mange økonomiske sektorer, inklusive handel, turisme, privatisering af havne, elforsyning og telekommunikation, skibsfragt, ejendomsmarked, storstilede udviklingsprojekter, uddannelse, sundhed, forskning og innovation ... «

»Med dette formål for øje er Cyperns regering parat til at samarbejde tæt med vores kinesiske, asiatiske og europæiske partnere for effektivt at støtte dette initiativ, især mht. den heldige promovning af målene og værdierne i den Maritime Silkevej, som en hovedtransit-ø på den maritime Silkevejs handelsruter ... «. Det 21. århundredes Maritime Silkevej er en af de to komponenter af Ét bælte, én vej-initiativet; den anden er det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte.

Phidias Pilides, præsident for Cyperns Handels- og Industri-kammer, udtalte, at »den kinesiske regerings nye initiativ med at genoplive den antikke idé med Silkevejen vil udvikle sig til at blive den mest ambitiøse infrastrukturplan i verden i dag«.

Panicos Kaouris, præsident for den Cypriotisk-kinesiske Virksomhedssammenslutning, sagde, »Omfanget og størrelsesordenen af dette initiativ er af en sådan art, at det potentielt i væsentlig grad kan ændre det økonomiske verdenskort ved at accelerere det skift, der allerede er ved at finde sted, af den økonomiske magt fra Vest til Øst«, rapporterede *Famagusta Gazette*.

Anastasiades' Silkevejs-diplomati er i overensstemmelse med det igangværende og formelle samarbejde mellem Cypern, Grækenland og Egypten, der alle nyder fremragende relationer med Kina, inden for energi, logistik og sikkerhed, især i sammenhæng med Egyptens Suezkanal-udviklingskorridor.

Foto: Cyperns allerede gode relationer til Kina styrkedes yderligere under Anastasiades' besøg i Kina i oktober 2015. Her, med præsident Xi Jinping.