

Leder, 26. december 2015: 5 onde regenter leder os til udslettelsen – 1. januar vil udløse den

Massenedsmeltningen af finanssystemet, der nu er programsat til umiddelbart efter Nytårsdag, lover en næsten omgående nedlukning af økonomierne i USA, Vesteuropa og det meste af Mellem- og Sydamerika. Det vil blive værre end sammenbruddet i 2008 eller 1929 i en grad, der ikke kan måles.

Det seneste tilfælde, der kan sammenlignes med den katastrofe, vi står overfor i de nærmest forestående dage, er katastrofen i Europa i det 14. århundrede. Dengang som nu banede en mangeårig forrådnelse af kulturen vejen for en række brutale, anti-humane handlinger, udført af rent ud sataniske regenter, der pludseligt og hovedkulds styrtede samfundet ud i kollaps og massedød. Midt i de evindelige krige var en række tilfælde af hungersnød i århundredets begyndelse med til at bane vejen for det onde, der fulgte. I 1344 erklærede Bardi- og Peruzzibankhusene i Lombardiet sig konkurs, hvorefter det venetianske banknetværk lukkede hele det økonomiske system i Europa ned, og hermed fremtvang vilkår, der yderligere decimerede befolkningernes modstandskraft over for sygdom. Den Sorte Død (byldepest) slog til i 1347. De efterfølgende bølger af sygdomsudbrud skønnes at have aflivet 60 % af Europas befolkning.

Nu, i dag, i kølvandet på det udbredte, kulturelle forfald, der går under navnet det 20. århundrede, leder tre, sataniske regenter os mod vores umiddelbare ødelæggelse: Dronning Elizabeth af England, præsident Barack Obama af USA og Pave Frans.

Den imperiale Dronning Elizabeth II er en langt mere bevidst, ond skikkelse, end hendes forfader Georg III, der myrdede vore amerikanske patrioter for over 200 år siden. Hun repræsenterer Det britiske Imperium i det 20. århundrede, med Lord Bertrand Russel, der udstedte love til at gøre en ende på videnskab og kunst til fordel for død matematik. Ligesom Russell er hun og hendes mand, Prins Philip, fortalere for en verdensomspændende befolkningsreduktion gennem alle midler. Det var den ikke-så-hemmelige dagsorden for hendes netop afsluttede konference i Paris, om den angivelige menneskeskabte klimaforandring.

Dronning Elizabeths og hendes ligesindedes satanisme drejer sig om deres fremstød for at udslette den »guddommelige gnist« i mennesket – det, der gør mennesket til »skabt i Guds billede«. Med andre ord, at være menneskelig.

Alle katolikker – ja, alle kristne – burde føle sig skamfulde over den kendsgerning, at Pave Frans vedtog Det britiske Imperiums anti-humane credo i sin encyklika, sit pavelige brev, »Laudato Si'«. Han har kæmpet for den lige siden. Uanset motiverne, så har han diskvalificeret sig selv som Pave, ja endda som simpel præst.

Vores såkaldte præsident, Barack Obama, er denne imperiale Dronnings marionet, der kontrolleres af det britiske monarki gennem Valerie Jarrett, som var den person, der oprindeligt udpegede ham til at blive præsident, da han blot var en ukendt delstatssenator. Det var britiskkontrollerede narko- penge, der gav Obama en uhæderlig sejr over den folkelige favorit Hillary Clinton i de demokratiske primærvalg i 2008. (Desværre har Hillary ødelagt alle sine kvalifikationer, efter at hun blev Obamas marionet efter at han blev valgt.)

Obama blev opdraget til at blive en masse-morder af sin indonesiske stedfader Lolo Soetero. Nu præsiderer han hver tirsdag over et møde i Det Hvide Hus, hvor han træffer beslutning om en ny liste over mennesker, der skal myrdes – inklusive amerikanske borgere. Grunden til, at de store medier

giver ham fripas – såsom *New York Times* og *Wall Street Journal* – er, at de er bange for, at han også vil myrde dem. Hvad han sandsynligvis vil.

Kongresmedlemmer har den samme, berettigede frygt – men de har ingen undskyldning. Den ed, de aflagde til Forfatningen, er en soldater-ed. Hvis de ikke omgående vil fjerne Obama og lukke Wall Street, er de slet ikke ægte kongresmedlemmer.

Kort og godt, så har jeres ledere forrådt jer til Djævelen. Jeres kongresmedlemmer har i bedste fald forrådt jer af frygt. Men de løsninger, som Franklin Roosevelt tog i anvendelse i 1932-33, under en langt mildere krise, er stadig anvendelige i dag. Kun et barn ville tale om »oddsene«; vi har tydeligvis oddsene imod os. Og hvad så?

Leder, 25. december 2015: SØRG FOR, AT DER BLIVER ET NYTÅR: DUMP OBAMA OG WALL STREET!

I den sammenbrudsproces, der allerede er i gang, af hele det døde, transatlantiske finanssystem, ser vi nu time for time nye tilfælde af insolvens og stormløb for udtræk, alt imens en vifte af »officielle« regler træder i kraft den 1. januar, som vil bære atombrændsel til bålet. Om denne proces sagde Lyndon LaRouche i sidste uge, »Det, der vil ske, er, at der bliver en acceleration af krisen.« Han sagde: »Accelerationsraten – processens selv-acceleration – er sådan, at, inden for en uge, kunne det hele være udslettet. Det er en sådan situation, vi er i.«

Vi står ved et punkt, hvor det er 'do-or-die' – knald eller fald – denne Jul: enten fremtvinger vi en handling for genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall og de relaterede nødforanstaltninger, eller også får vi massehelvede og forbandelse.

Wall Street Journal præsenterede i går en oversigt af de seneste opdateringer om den finansielle disintegration ved at opremse navnene på de hedgefonde, der er bukket under, og ved også at dække status for flere mere fremtrædende selskaber, der nominelt set stadig er aktive, men kun ved at gennemtvinge »betaling i afdrag« til de spekulantkunder, der ønsker at få deres penge. For eksempel forventes en enhed under det berygtede Carlyle Group LP, Claren Road Asset Management, pr. den 1. januar at have en sum af 1,25 mia. dollar under deres forvaltning, hvilket er langt under de 8,5 mia. dollar, de havde for kun 15 måneder siden, før deres kunde-investorer begynde at forlange masseudbetalinger i løbet af 2015. Men eftersom Claren Road-operationen har gennemtvunget en politik med »betaling i afdrag« over seks måneder, så dækker disse 1,25 mia. dollar ved årsafslutningen ikke engang de udestående krav om afdrag for tredje og fjerde kvartal 2015. Den samme situation gør sig gældende for mange andre af Wall Streets spekulationshuse, store så vel som små fisk.

Sjoverne er bankerot! Nogle af udtrækkene og udsalgene, der finder sted, skyldes, udover et stormløb mod udgangen, forsøg på at honorere kontrakter og de sædvanlige krav om kontantreserver, men det markerer, at systemet er færdigt. Så kommer vi til 1. januar og mange nye punkter for en detonering.

I Den europæiske Union træder nye regler for bail-in i kraft på denne dato (1. jan.) efter at politikken allerede er blevet gennemført i Cypern, Italien, Portugal, Spanien og andre steder, med dræbende konsekvenser. Denne EU-forholdsregels officielle navn er Artikel 55, med titlen BRRD (Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive) ('direktivet for bank-genrejsning og

bankopløsning').

I Eurasien træder Ukraines frie handelsaftale med EU i kraft den 1. jan. Samtidig var der et sammenbrud i drøftelserne den 21. dec. mellem Rusland, Ukraine og EU om, hvordan man skulle gå videre. »Ukraine er på vej ned«, bemærkede LaRouche. De kan ikke komme nogen vegne.

I Amerika er Puerto Rico på vej mod betalingsstandsning den 1. januar, med Washington, D.C., der ikke har taget skridt til nogen handling i den forbindelse.

Generelt set vil tredje del af Baselaftalerne træde i kraft den 1. januar. Det, som 2016 Basel III-reglerne gør, er, at de beordrer banker til at sælge massive mængder af dødelige bail-in-obligationer; med andre ord, så skal banker udstede »rottegift« til bankkunder og investorer. Det går under betegnelserne »med lang løbetid« eller »absorbering af tab«, eller mere elegant, obligationer »i overensstemmelse med Basel III«.

Læg hertil Obama/Londons fremstød for krig, og konsekvenserne af at tillade dette vanvid at fortsætte en dag mere er dødbringende. LaRouche indkalder til en »mobilisering af de villige« – af dem, der er villige til at se problemet, af dem, der er villige til at handle.

Leder, 23. december 2015: Dump Wall Street til jul

Den hastighed, hvormed finanskrakket nu accelererer, kræver handling nu – før jul. Med mindre Wall Street dumpes i de nærmest forestående dage, er der ingen garanti for, at USA stadig står til Nytår. Junk-obligationer og kommercielle investeringsobligationer til 15 billioner dollars er blevet indløst blot i løbet af den seneste uge. For det meste dækker selskaber deres tab ind i forventning om en endnu større nedsmeltning på et tidspunkt i den allernærmeste fremtid.

Dette er dødsens alvorligt. En ukontrolleret nedsmeltning af det transatlantiske finanssystem, som kunne ske om timer eller dage, ville skabe den form for massekaos, der er den klassiske, britiske opskrift for den værste form for fascistiske diktatur, som altid, uundgåeligt, fører til generel krig. Fra og med den 1. januar træder i Europa de regler for bail-in i kraft, som blev presset igennem af EU-kommissionen. Banker i Italien og Portugal har allerede plyndret indehavere af aktier og obligationer i fallerede banker, og næste skridt er den fulde Cypren-model for plyndring af kontohavernes penge. Pariser-avisen *Le Parisien* gav i dag sine læsere en forsmag på bail-in under overskriften, »Hvad hvis din bank gik ned og hjem?«

Nærmere ved USA står Puerto Rico til at gå i betalingsstandsning den 1. januar over et forfaldent afdrag på 1,4 mia. dollar på en total gæld på 72 mia. dollar, og den amerikanske Kongres valgte bevidst at ignorere denne krise ved at nægte at vedtage en lov, der godkendte en beskyttelse mod bankerot, som tilbydes alle amerikanske stater og kommuner. Formand for Repræsentanternes Hus Paul Ryan og Nancy Pelosi har meddelt, at de »lover« at komme frem til denne lov pr. 31. marts, men det er en syg vittighed, for krisen for Puerto Rico og hele det transatlantiske område venter ikke til marts

måned. Den kommer nu.

Lyndon LaRouche advarede i dag om, at, med mindre der før jul foreligger en komplet plan for den totale fjernelse af Wall Street og en lancering af et program for økonomisk genrejsning, med Franklin Roosevelts politik som model, så står det amerikanske folk over for den umiddelbare udsigt til et totalt, samfundsmæssigt sammenbrud. En strategisk plan fra øverst til nederst, der følger de retningslinjer, som Lyndon LaRouche har fastlagt i løbet af de seneste dage, må omgående være på plads.

Kongressen har demonstreret sin fejhed, senest ved at vedtage en katastrofal lov om bevillinger, der trodser virkeligheden omkring det umiddelbart forestående krak. Kongressen må trodses og latterliggøres for sin inkompetence. Enten lukker man Obama og Wall Street ned nu, eller også er der ingen chance. Politikken må være den at sænke Wall Street og sænke dem, som Obama og flertallet af Kongressen, der har fulgt Wall Streets linje.

LaRouche understregede også, at den saudiske sygdom med promovring af wahhabi-terrorisme må udslettes. Obamaregeringen har systematisk mørklagt de bjerge af beviser for, at saudierne står bag væksten af al-Qaeda, Islamisk Stat, Taliban og Boko Haram. Saudierne har, sammen med deres britiske sponsorer, udløst et narko-terrorist-jihadistisk angreb imod hver eneste større nation på planeten, og topembedsfolk i Obamaregeringen, fra Susan Rice til CIA-direktør John Brennan og dir. for den nationale Efterretningstjeneste, general James Clapper, har præsideret over en ondsindet mørklægning af disse forbrydelser og har udsøgt og forfulgt enhver ærlig efterretningseksponent, der sagde sandheden og trodsede Obamas ondsindede fantasier. De er fuldt ud medskyldige i opkomsten af ISIS og angrebene i Paris og San Bernardino og bør retsforfølges efter USA's kriminallovgivning og international lov.

Beviserne for disse forbrydelser er ved at gennembryde den mur, der skulle inddæmme dem. Tiden er nu inde til, at de 28 (hemmeligstemplede) sider fra den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september 2001, fra 2002, frigives fuldt ud til offentligheden. Disse sider vil, ifølge amerikanske regeringsfolk (eks. kongresmedlemmer i særlige komiteer), som har læst dem, bevise, at al-Qaeda var de britiske og saudiske monarkiers skabelse, og at dette var kendt af top-regeringsfolk i den amerikanske regering, inklusive præsidenterne George W. Bush og Barack Obama, som er fuldt ud medskyldige.

Politikken må være den, fuldstændigt at ødelægge fjenden. Slå til på deres mest sårbare, dødelige flanker, med begyndelse i den kendsgerning, at Wall Street er død, er allerede død. Vi befinder os på randen af en stor dårskab, og vores nations og menneskehedens overlevelse står på spil i de umiddelbart forestående timer og dage.

Nyhedsorientering december 2015: GLASS/STEAGALL – ELLER KAOS!

I denne nyhedsorientering har vi valgt at bringe en række uvurdelige, strategiske vurderinger vedrørende kampen imod Islamisk Stat, flygtningekrisen i Europa og det igangværende finanskollaps, som er fremkommet i løbet af december måned på de ugentlige webcast, der finder sted hver fredag aften amerikansk tid på www.larouchepac.com. LaRouchePAC er en amerikansk politisk aktionskomité, grundlagt og vedvarende inspireret af den amerikanske økonom og

statsmand, Lyndon LaRouche. Jeffrey Steinberg (t.v.) er en ledende medarbejder til Lyndon LaRouche og er også efterretningsredaktør for tidsskriftet Executive Intelligence Review. Ben Deniston er leder af LaRouchePAC's Videnskabsteam.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 21. december 2015: Fjern City of London, eller sammenbruddet vil være uden for kontrol

Under diskussioner med sine kolleger søndag aften opsummerede Lyndon LaRouche den globale, strategiske krise i præcise vendinger: Londons og Det britiske Imperiums magt må omgående elimineres, eller også vil hele det transatlantiske område, med start i USA, hastigt styrtdykke ud i et ukontrollerbart kaos. Forholdsregler til kontrol må indføres, og dette betyder, at Det britiske Imperiums magt, der kontrollerer Obama, må fjernes.

Problemet er, at ledende personer i regeringsinstitutionerne i Washington, med start i den amerikanske Kongres, der allerede burde være trådt i aktion imod Obama, ikke har handlet. Obama leder stadig sine tirsdagsmøder for (drone-)drab, på trods af den kendsgerning, at hans tilstand er under hastig degeneration, i accelererende tempo. Det britiske monarki er fortsat den institution, der regerer over det transatlantiske område.

LaRouche bemærkede, at Rusland er anderledes, og Kina er også anderledes. Det er nationer, der samarbejder, og ser hen til en udvidelse af deres samarbejde. Men der er alvorlige problemer, med at skaffe tilstrækkeligt med vand og mad til en begyndelse. Rusland og Kina er i dag de eneste, virkelige magter, der potentielt set handler imod Det britiske Imperiums stadigt eksisterende magt, og imod deres redskab, præsident Obama.

I realiteten, erklærede LaRouche, så har kræfterne bag 11. september (2001) magten over USA. Der har været et utilstrækkeligt angreb imod det anglo-saudiske apparat, der stod bag 11. september. Som følge heraf har de kræfter, der repræsenteres af Bush og Obama, fået fribillet til at handle. Hvis arven efter det britiske monarki og dets Bush- og Obama-operationer kan knuses, kan USA og store dele af den øvrige verden reddes.

LaRouche understregede, at centrum for kampen imod det britiske tyranni, der repræsenteres af Bush og Obama, skal findes på Manhattan og nærmeste omgivelser. Denne pointe blev tydelig i denne weekend gennem to koncerter, der blev afholdt af Schiller Instituttet, der præsenterede Händels Messias i Brooklyn og Manhattan. Alt i alt blev de to forestillinger besøgt af flere end 1.000 mennesker, med kun ståpladser til begge forestillinger. Den strøm af støtte til forestillingerne og til ideen om forbindelsen mellem klassisk kultur, videnskab og den politiske kamp for en genoplivning af Det amerikanske System, illustrerer den kendsgerning, at der i den amerikanske befolkning er en kerne, centreret omkring Manhattan og dele af det nordlige Californien især, der kan redde nationen. Disse områders førende borgeres særlige egenskaber kan spredes i hele landet, men kun med fokus på ånden og aktiveringen fra Manhattan.

Nedsmeltningen af hele systemet er i fuld gang. Det globale blodbad kan udelukkende standses af et gennembrud i USA, med start i fjernelsen af Wall Street og genindførelsen af Glass-

Steagall. Dette må ske inden krakket finder sted, og det kunne ske, hvornår det skal være, fra nu af og fremefter. Dette er ikke et 'hype' eller et slogan. Den 1. januar 2016 træder reglerne for bail-out i kraft i Europa. Samme dag vil Puerto Rico gå i betalingsstandsning med de første 1,4 mia. dollar i gæld til gribbefondene.

Enten får man Glass-Steagall vedtaget nu, eller også vil følgen blive kaos i hele det transatlantiske område, og under disse omstændigheder er det næsten sikkert, at kræfterne i Det britiske Imperium vil satse på krig med Rusland og Kina.



**RADIO SCHILLER den 21.
december 2015:**

**Luk Wall Street og City of
London.**

**Indfør Glass/Steagall-
bankopdeling**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

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

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

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

TRANSCRIPT

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

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

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

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

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

"What you do is you cancel all the so-called assets that are

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

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

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

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

So, Mr. LaRouche said, we have to make the announcement, and this is what we're doing over the course of this week. We make the declaration that we have come to a conclusion, a solid conclusion; and we have to get more and more people to jump in onto this policy that we're presenting. And very rapidly, you will find that this will become the trend of policy-making

inside the United States, in particular. And if you just consider the crucial evidence that we have here at hand, if you just consider the developments that have broken out in the recent period, when Mr. LaRouche said, you just have to say, "This is the greatest Christmas present that we could possibly give you – the opportunity to shut down Wall Street, and save the United States."

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

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

As the question indicated, we've seen four Italian banks go under in the recent weeks, and we've seen bondholders and stockholders in those banks wiped out through bail-in – in other words, the grabbing up of their assets as a first stage towards a bail-out of those banks. And this has already resulted in widespread protests in Italy. It resulted in a suicide that is now being investigated by Italian authorities. You've got Ukraine facing a \$3 billion unpayable debt to the IMF that comes due very soon; and the IMF has indicated,

because of the geopolitical significance of Ukraine, despite the fact that Ukraine is a failed state, it is thoroughly bankrupt – that the IMF is going to pony up a bail-out of Ukraine that violates all of the IMF's rules.

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

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

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

So, in other words, we are at a moment of reckoning, where the entire financial system is hanging by a thread, and will most certainly blow. There's no way to predict a date certain, but, as I say, it could happen at any moment from now on; which means that you've got to basically shut down this entire

system. The system that's been in place and growing as a cancerous factor on the real economy of the world, going back for the last 40 years and more. You could go back to end of the Bretton Woods system in 1971, carried out by people like George Shultz, Henry Kissinger, on behalf of the British. You could go back to 1999, when under the impeachment blackmail, President Bill Clinton signed into law the repeal of Glass-Steagall. And, of course, it goes back much earlier than that.

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

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

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

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

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

The fact of the matter is that to understand what's going on to the American people, and to the European population, you've got to look at some other statistics. You've got to look at the fact that there is a persistent rise in the rate of deaths among middle-aged people in the United States, from the ages

of 45 to 54. It's gone up precipitously. It started in 2001 – not coincidentally when Bush and Cheney came into office. It's accelerated at an accelerating rate since 2009, when Obama came into office.

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

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

So the question is: Is there a combination of leading citizens, of Democrats and Republicans, who are prepared to come together and show the courage to simply declare that Wall Street is finished. It's shut down. No money in. It's doomed. So shut it down; and if we shut down Wall Street in a timely fashion, that opens the door for the kinds of measures and actions that were taken by Franklin Roosevelt, in the very first days of his Presidency. Massive infusions of Federal investment into real job creation, into vital infrastructure. And we've got to then set our sights on the Galaxy. We've got to begin a revival of our space program because man doesn't belong stuck here on Earth. At this point, we have the ability, by coordination and cooperation with other leading nations, like China, for example, in particular – to explore

where our Solar System stands in the larger Galaxy. That's where man's future. That's where the discoveries lie that will define and guarantee a bright future for mankind.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He did this with the PWA. Later he did it with the WPA for much larger-scale projects. This was done through the TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which absolutely transformed the entire Southern states of the United States, and created the possibility for the United States to fight and win World War

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

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

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

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Matt. So I think we've mentioned this on a few of these broadcasts before, this new report. And to put it in context, we have the EIR full special report on the “New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge,” and about a month ago, in the process of her work organizing around that

report internationally, Helga Zepp-LaRouche put out the call to develop somewhat of an addendum to that report, focused on the United States.

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

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

If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 2]: It's broken into a couple main sections, but after the introduction, which covers some of the material which we already discussed here today, the first bulk section of the report is pretty much a reconstruction program for the United States. Something going along with what LaRouche has called for, for a return to true physical economy. We're seeing the end of this speculative

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

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

So, if we go to the next image[Fig. 3], we have, in one sense, kind of a keystone for this whole project. Something that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been very much at the center of organizing for, for decades now. The long-standing proposal for a Bering Strait connection; connecting this relatively small gap between Alaska and Russia. Connecting that with a tunnel, perhaps a bridge, depending on whatever seems to be the best design; and connecting these two major land masses with high-speed rail systems. And this, in a sense literally, but also figuratively, connects the United States and North America directly into this entire New Silk Road orientation, this entire Eurasian Land-Bridge development which is now

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

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

If we go to the next graphic [Fig. 5], we can see that this is not just about connecting the economy as it currently exists; but this will also open up the potential for the development

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

So, these are some of the things that – again, they're treated in more detail in the report – but these are some of the basic elements that are just needed right now to save the United States. As Matt had referenced the historical precedent of

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

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

In the next graphic [Fig. 7], we have a section on power, on energy, on energy-flux density. And the longstanding need to finally push for the development of fusion power; the longstanding need to explore, implement, and develop the domain of the nucleus – the nuclear economy. This is something that has been denied and suppressed for decades already now; we're long past the time where we need to fully develop the capabilities of the nuclear domain for mankind. Giving us dramatically higher levels of energy-flux density; enabling us to power all these programs we're talking about here, and many more programs. But also opening up a whole new domain of

mankind's ability to interact with the very nature of the universe itself. Moving man beyond just being limited to the domain of chemical reactions, and chemistry on a chemical domain; but moving into a nuclear domain. Not dealing with just the interactions of chemical elements; but dealing with being able to control the very chemical elements themselves on a nuclear level, which opens up whole new potentials for mankind.

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

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

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

future; to fight for their own ability to have access to creating this new future.

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

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

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

I think that's what we have to put up front; and this is part of a longstanding fight. If you just look back to the work of Kepler himself, the great genius who completely revolutionized mankind's existence in the universe by discovering that we're part of this higher order Solar System. And you look at Kepler's own understanding of his own discovery process; and if you go to his works – go to the *Harmony of the World* – go to Book 4 of the *Harmony of the World*, where he says this is really the essence of my entire discovery process. Where he discusses the actual process of thought of discovery; and he, himself, roots his whole investigation in the continuity of the fight going back to the fight of Plato against Aristotle. The fight over whether the human mind actually generates new discoveries, or is just merely a product of sense perceptions. Kepler right then and there himself declares the evil of Aristotle's view that the human mind is just a blank slate; that sense perceptions are just written on the human mind as a blank slate, and that's all you are. That's the nature of knowledge, is just the impressions upon you through your sense perceptions; which Aristotle posed as an attack against Plato's idea of recollection, that discovery is more of a process, it's almost as if the mind is remembering something it had within it. That discovery doesn't come from sense perceptions from the outside, but there's a potential in the human mind to generate something for which the potential was

already there in the mind itself.

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

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

OGDEN: Thank you, Ben. Now let me just say in conclusion, just to reiterate the point that Mr. LaRouche made in the remarks that I read in the beginning, and what Jeff went over; what's

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

Now, the other point I'll make is that Mr. LaRouche has emphasized that the pivot point, the leverage point around which we can move and transform the entire country, is what he's called the so-called "Manhattan Project". The highly focused activation over the last 12, 13, 14 months of our association's activities in Manhattan and the broader Manhattan region. Now one thing about this that many of you may be aware of, is that in addition to the regular Saturday afternoon discussions that Mr. LaRouche holds with a live audience in Manhattan, also this weekend, there will be a series of concerts which are going to be presented by the Schiller Institute Community Chorus of Manhattan, as well as co-sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture; which will be presenting a large excerpt of Handel's *Messiah*. The entire Part I, and much of Part II and Part III. The performance of this piece – which includes participation from a large array of activists and other volunteers from the New York area, as well as professional soloists and a very highly skilled orchestra – is that this performance will take place at the natural, scientific so-called "Verdi tuning" of A=432. And this is a very significant aspect of what Mr. LaRouche's association's intervention into a revival of true

Classical culture in the United States and worldwide, is built around. So, one of the performances will be at a church tomorrow afternoon, Saturday afternoon in Brooklyn near the Park Slope area; and the other performance will take place early on Sunday afternoon in downtown Manhattan. So, if you are in the area, and you have not yet gotten the details about that, please make sure that you contact our representatives in the New York region.

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

Tema: Den Islamiske Renæssance var en Dialog mellem Civilisationer

Som Lyndon LaRouche beskrev sagen med sine medarbejdere for nylig, så er et uddannet samfund et, hvor, selv om det store flertal ikke selv er genier, så har samfundet visse kvalificerende intellektuelle og moralske evner, og de ved, at de må se op til historiens og nutidens genier og vandre i deres fodspor. De største muslimer i renæssancens periode så hen til de store genier i andre kulturer, som grækerne, og lærte af dem – men frembragte i processen deres egne genier. Vi bør alle se op til dem og vandre i deres fodspor.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 20. december 2015: Lyndon LaRouche: Luk Wall Street nu, ligesom Franklin Roosevelt gjorde

Wall Street og hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er nu dødsdømt og kunne forsvinde ud i den blå luft, hvornår det skal være, i løbet af de kommende dage eller uger, lød advarslen igen i dag fra Lyndon LaRouche. Faren er, at dette vil føre til en tilstand af panik og medfølgende massedød, som kun kan undgås ved at lukke Wall Street på samme måde, som USA's præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt gjorde, erklærede LaRouche. Vi har presserende behov for en »mobilisering af de villige« blandt det amerikanske folk for at få nationen – og verden – tilbage på ret kurs.

Det drejer sig ikke om at forhandle en eller anden form for reform eller indrømmelser. »Wall Street må lukkes ned, uden at give nogen compensation«, sagde LaRouche. »Vi må lukke det ned, ligesom Franklin Roosevelt gjorde. Og hvis man ikke lukker dem ned, har man alligevel mistet det hele. Med andre ord, så kan man ikke forhandle med banksystemet; man må lære

lektion af FDR!«

LaRouche var eftertrykkelig: »I har intet spillerum. Hver eneste stump finansiel aktivitet, som er derude, og som er af spekulativ art, må udslettes uden nogen compensation. Man gør hver eneste af disse svindlere bankerot, i alle kategorier, og ribber dem for alt.«

Omfanget af den globale spekulationsboble overstiger nu 2 billiarder dollar, et konservativt skøn, og er vokset med over en tredjedel under Obamas vagt. Dette er et direkte resultat af Wall Streets kriminelle politik med bail-out (finansiel kvantitativ lempelse – 'pengetrykning') og nu bail-in (ekspropriering af bankkundernes indeståender/indskud) – med 'nøjsomhedspolitik', der har folkemord til følge, og budgetnedskæringer, der er designet til skarpt at forøge dødsraten, i kombination med decideret tyveri af folks opsparinger, som det skete på Cypern og for nylig i Italien. Wall Streets gæld har nået et punkt, hvor den ikke længere kan betales i dollar; nu kræver de, at den betales i lig.

Se på tilfældet med Italien, hvor en tvungen bail-in af kunderne i fire banker tidligere på måneden udslettede mange menneskers livsopsparing. Mindst en person vides at have begået selvmord som følge heraf, som det er sket med hundreder af erhvervsfolk og arbejdere, der blev ødelagt af den samme politik.

Eller se over grænsen, til vores nabo Canada, hvor nedsmeltningen af Wall Streets oliefracking-boble har decimeret hele lokalsamfund og er i færd med at slå folk ihjel. Selvmordsraten er i de seneste måneder eksploderet blandt afskedigede arbejdere i canadiske oliefelter i provinserne Alberta og Saskatchewan, med en stigning i selvmord på 30 % i de første seks måneder af 2015, sammenlignet med de første seks måneder af 2014.

Ønsker du, at dette skal ske for dig? Det vil det – med mindre

man lukker Wall Street ned.

Erstat britisk monetarisme med Franklin Roosevelts kreditsystem

Lyndon LaRouche understregede, at det haster med omgående at gribe til handling. »Det her er ikke 'hen ad vejen'; det er nu. Vi må, så hurtigt som muligt, lukke hele det monetaristiske system ned, i USA i særdeleshed – inden Nytår, hvor det her vil bryde ud i fuldt flor.«

»Det, der er brug for, er mere end bare noget regulering«, fortsatte LaRouche. »Pointen er, at man må eliminere ideen om penge, om det monetaristiske system, som er karakteristisk for det britiske system. Vores løsning er ikke mod anvendelsen af penge, men imod monetarisme; så man må annullere monetarisme. Man kan ikke antage, at penge har en iboende værdi i sig selv; det er problemet.«

Det, som præsident Franklin Roosevelt gjorde, var absolut korrekt og tjener som en god indikator for den kurs, vi i dag må tage. Efter at lukke Wall Street ned, må man etablere en kreditfacilitet af samme type, som FDR skabte. »Man udsteder kredit, og denne kredit – hvis den bruges korrekt – afføder produktivitet«, erklærede LaRouche. »Kreditte er baseret på den generøse indsats på vegne af selve regeringen, på vegne af det amerikanske, statslige kreditsystem. Det, der skete under FDR's politik, er, at folk rent faktisk blev dækket ind af det præsidentielle systems generøsitet. Man måtte imødekomme den kendsgerning, at man havde en gæld til den nationale regering, som en magt; og man måtte optjene vejen til at opbygge sin egen økonomi. Det var, hvad vi gjorde under Franklin Roosevelt.«

LaRouche konkluderede: »Vi står nu ved et punkt, i løbet af de kommende uger frem til Nytår, hvor vores eksistens kunne være

dømt til undergang, med mindre vi gør dette, med mindre vi får dette gennemført. Det er virkeligheden. Det er der, vi står.

Vilkårene i USA er nu af en sådan art, at det nuværende system ikke kan fungere; det vil bryde sammen. Og vi må forhindre et sammenbrud. Hvordan forhindrer vi et sammenbrud? Vi gør det, som Franklin Roosevelt gjorde ved Wall Street. Der er ingen anden mulighed; det eksisterer ikke. Og det haster. Fra og med begyndelsen af det nye år, kunne I være døde, med mindre dette gøres.

Hvad betyder så dette? Det betyder, at man skal se at få sparket præsident Obama ud af embedet; hurtigt, omgående.«

LaRouches Fire Hovedlove

Lyndon LaRouche opstillede den 9. juni 2014 de Fire Hovedlove for en reel genrejsning af den fysiske økonomi:

* Genindfør Glass-Steagall med et total adskillelse af kommercielle banker og investeringsbankernes hasardspilsaktiviteter, hedgefonde og andre spekulanter. Dette vil omgående udslette gælden til Wall Street, som er ubetalelig og har været illegitim fra første færd – og vil samtidig udslette Wall Street/London-bankkartellernes magt.

* Lancer en massiv indsprøjtning af statskredit igennem dette nu genoprettede banksystem, ind i realøkonomien. Denne fremgangsmåde, i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton, med et statsligt banksystem og statskredit, er også omdrejningspunktet for FDR's politik.

* Fokuser på de områder for investering, der mest forøger energi-gennemstrømningstæthed[1] i økonomien som helhed, inklusive infrastruktur og videnskabelig og teknologisk forskning og udvikling. Dette betyder billioner af dollars i anlægsinvesteringer for at opbygge det 21. århundredes

infrastrukturnetværk langs med Verdenslandbroens ruter.

* Forfølg den videnskabelige udforsknings fremskudte grænser, med afsæt i det 20. århundredes store, russiske videnskabsmand, V.I. Vernadskijs arbejde inden for biokemi og noosfæren. Dette må inkludere et internationalt, forceret program for at opnå fusionskraft til kommercielt brug, et afgørende træk i den næste fase af rumforskning, så vel som også for løsningen af kravene om vand- og energiforsyning i en verden, der konfronteres med en sammenbrudskrise af proportioner som i den Mørke Tidsalder.

Kontakt dit lokale LaRouchePAC kontor/Schiller Institut nu. Slut dig til »mobiliseringen af de villige«, for at lukke Wall Street ned.

[1] Se: [Video: Energi-gennemstrømnings-tæthed](#), et kort overblik, dansk udskrift

Leder, 19. december 2015: Lyndon LaRouche: En ny politik for USA, Nu!

Og det eneste, der er at gøre, er at gennemføre Franklin Roosevelts politik; man må sige: »Vedtag Franklin Roosevelts politik nu, imod Wall Street.« Det er den eneste måde, hvorpå problemet kan løses. I modsat fald står vi med noget, der vil accelerere, og der er intet, man kan gøre for at stoppe det. Det, man må gøre, er at fremstille den kendsgerning, at der ikke er nogen løsning, med mindre Wall Street omgående lukkes

ned. Det er faktisk, hvad Franklin Roosevelt gjorde. Han lukkede Wall Street ned, hvilket gjorde en ende på den inflation, der var i gang på det tidspunkt, før valget. Og den eneste måde at gøre det på er ved at lukke det ned!

Med andre ord, så er det uden for diskussion, man må lukke det ned. Og man må ganske enkelt annullere alle såkaldte aktiver ('værdipapirer'), der ikke er skikket til denne rolle. Man siger simpelt hen: »I får ingen penge overhovedet. I får ingen som helst compensation. I er ekskluderet; I eksisterer ikke mere.«

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17. december 2015: Et finanskrækkelse større end 2008 er allerede i gang

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Leder, 17. december 2015:

USA: Finanskrakket accelererer; Franklin Roosevelt ville have lukket Wall Street, i en fart!

»Gode nyheder! Wall Street er færdig. Lad os nu genopbygge landet.«

Sådan lyder det fra LaRouchePAC-møder på Manhattan og i store byer over hele USA, med denne erklæring: »Finanskrakket er i gang: Kun en revolution i politikken kan afvende katastrofen«.

Det såkaldte »junkgældskollaps« i det amerikanske finanssystem bringer budskabet om et generelt finanskrak, der kan komme over os ved månedens slutning.

EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche udstedte erklæringen om en national mobilisering, fordi han havde advaret om dette krak – der er meget mere end et »junkbondkollaps« – og krævede, at præsident Franklin Roosevelts politik omgående blev implementeret for at standse det.

Larouche sagde i går, at det eneste, der er sikkert omkring dette krak, er, at det »accelererer i en accelererende rate, og er ude af kontrol; den kontrolfaktor, der kan standse det, er at gennemføre præsident Franklin Roosevelts politik imod Wall Street og for national, økonomisk genrejsning«.

FDR indtog sit embede og standsede bogstavelig talt et krak, med en 'banklukkeferie' og Glass/Steagall-loven for at lukke Wall Streets spekulation ned; dernæst udstedte han statslig kredit til produktiv beskæftigelse og fornyet produktivitet.

Som LaRouche understregede, så er dette krak allerede dødbringende. I Italien, hvor fire banker netop er gået bankerot, blev bankkundernes opsparing eksproprieret af storbankernes »bail-in«-politik, og mindst én bankkunde har begået selvmord. I Canada, hvor »energisektorens junkbond-krak« hidtil har været mere intensivt end i USA, er der massearbejdsløshed og selvmordsbølger blandt produktive arbejdere i Alberta og Saskatchewan på den anden side af grænsen – en advarsel til USA.

Wall Street, og City of Londons spekulative finansverden, må lukkes ned. Hvis vi giver dette krak lov til yderligere at accelerere, vil folk dø. Som LaRouche sagde, man må beskytte folk fra at dø – ikke flere selvmord!

Det eneste alternativ til accelererende kaos er atter at sætte FDR's politik i arbejde. Begynd med Glass-Steagall, for at gøre en ende på Wall Street. LaRouche advarer: Dette skal gøres omgående!

At genindføre Glass-Steagall vil lukke Wall Streets spekulation ned på en reguleret måde, hvis det sker med det samme. Dernæst kan en Nationalbank, i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton, tage sig af statslig kredit, likviditet, rentesatser, alle de økonomiske faktorer, som Federal Reserve har rodet grundigt rundt med. Politikken er produktiv kredit, beskæftigelse og produktivitet pr. person.

Men Obama? Han har fremkaldt dette kollaps ved at blokere for genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall og ved at gennemføre »britisk politik«: en politik for en anti-teknologisk, anti-industriel »klimaforandring«.

Som det så ofte blev sagt om Herbert Hoover, så er Obama et dumt sv... Han må fjernes fra embedet som en væsentlig del af løsningen på denne økonomiske og finansielle krise.

Leder, 16. december 2015: Wall Streets kollaps er uafvendeligt – Kun Franklin Roosevelts politik, med Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit til realøkonomisk investering, kan forhindre et kollaps ned i Helvede

En fjerde New York-hedgefond lukkede i dag for udtræk, som følge af, at hele junk- og højrente-obligationsmarkedet er i færd med at nedsmelte. I takt med, at de raketstore spekulative lån i olie, gas og mineraler løber ind i kollapsende priser under en sløv økonomi, er flere »markedseksperter« (gribbeinvestorer) såsom Wilbur Ross og Carl Icahn kommet med erklæringer, hvor de siger, at de ser en trussel om, at kollapset i junkkredit kan sprede sig til det langt større kreditmarked for kreditvurderings-selskaber – hvilket muligvis kunne få hele det vestlige finanssystem til at krakke.

Under alle omstændigheder står systemet ikke til at redde. Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag, at alle pengene på Wall Street er nominelle, spekulative værdipapirer, der ikke er en rød øre

værd og må afskrives på samme måde, som Franklin Roosevelt gjorde det, da han tiltrådte sit embede i 1933. FDR kunne dernæst sætte folk i arbejde og atter give en befolkning, der nær var blevet drevet ud i døden, sin værdighed tilbage. Men situationen i dag er langt værre. LaRouche påpegede de tusinder, måske millioner, af midaldrende, aktive mennesker, der er drevet ud af arbejdsstyrken, og som kommer ud i stofmisbrug, hvilket er, hvad der ligger bag den seneste tids voldsomme stigning i selvmord. Han påpegede den italienske borger, hvis livsopsparing blev stjålet under en bank »bail-in« (dvs. ekspropriering af kundernes indeståender) i sidste uge – »et signal om, at gribbene er gået for vidt«.

Obama står i vejen for den eneste løsning på katastrofen, som er en gennemførelse af Glass-Steagall og en lukning af »for store til at lade gå ned«-bankerne og den efterfølgende opbygning af et nyt system. Det, der mangler, er lederskab – der kan fjerne Obama, gennemføre Glass-Steagall og skabe en genrejsning af USA's og verdens økonomi gennem store infrastrukturprojekter sammen med BRIKS og Kinas programmer under den Nye Silkevej. »Det kræver ikke et stort antal mennesker«, sagde LaRouche i dag, »men et antal store mennesker«.

Hvis den rablende fascist Donald Trump og Obama-marionetten Hillary Clinton blev fjernet som kandidater, så kunne de anstændige kandidater og andre fra både det demokratiske og republikanske parti komme sammen for at udføre jobbet, nu, før finanssystemet imploderer, og før Obama kan begynde sin krig med Rusland og Kina.

I dag meddelte (udenrigsminister) John Kerry, efter et møde med Sergei Lavrov og Vladimir Putin i Moskva, at USA ikke længere stillede krav om, at Assad skulle afsættes, før en koalition imod terroristerne kan lanceres og en overgangsproces til en ny regering initieres i Syrien. Som Putin gentagne gange har sagt, så er det kun det syriske folk, der kan beslutte, hvem, der skal regere Syrien, på trods af

Obamas kriminelle regimeskift-galskab. John Kerry har nu brudt med denne Obama-politik – men, så længe, Obama forbliver ved magten, så længe eskalerer faren for krig ganske enkelt, alt imens finanssystemets krak kommer stadig nærmere – måske i de næste par dage.

Flyveblad, 15. december 2015: Finanskrakket er i gang – Kun en revolution i den transatlantiske politik kan afvende katastrofen

Hele det transatlantiske, London/Wall Street finanssystem befinder sig på randen af det totale kollaps. Det kunne ske hver time, hver dag, det skal være. De kritiske tegn er allerede synlige for enhver, der ikke med overlæg gør sig blind. Fire italienske banker er gået fallit i den forgangne uge, med den Europæiske Unions påtvungne bail-in plyndring af indskydernes midler til følge. Puerto Rico har allerede meddelt, at landet sandsynligvis vil gå i betalingsstandsning den 1. januar over en forfalden gæld på 1 milliard dollar, toppen af en gældsboble til i alt 72 mia. dollar; og gribbefundene er helt eksponeret. Flere hedgefonde, der er eksponeret over for Puerto Ricos gæld og den bankerot, der har fundet sted i sektoren for skiferolie og -gas, er allerede bukket under. Dette er blot et forvarsel om det transatlantiske systems umiddelbart forestående, totale

sammenbrud.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

RADIO SCHILLER den 14. december 2015: Vil finanssystemet overleve en mulig rentestigning

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/vil-finanssystemet-overleve-en-mulig-rentestigning-og-et-kollaps-af-gaeldsboblen-denne-uge

LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast 11. december 2015: LaRouche: Vi må gå tilbage

til Franklin Roosevelts intention med sin reform, ved at lukke Wall Street ned i USA, Europa osv., og opbygge et nyt, økonomisk system.

LaRouche: Dvs., at der fra begyndelsen af det 20. århundrede og frem til i dag har været en fortsat degeneration mht. de økonomiske tendenser over længere tid i USA og Europa. Vi må derfor lukke alt dette ned, ikke alene Wall Street i USA, men i Canada, Storbritannien og mange dele af Europa: Luk det ned! Og gå tilbage til Franklin Roosevelts intention med sin reform, ved at lukke Wall Street ned og opbygge et nyt, økonomisk system.

Engelsk udskrift.

TRANSCRIPT

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening, it's December 11, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're watching our weekly Friday night broadcast here from larouchepac.com. Tonight I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review and by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC scientific team, and the three of us did have a chance to have a sit-down conversation with both Mr. and Mrs. Helga LaRouche earlier today.

Now, that discussion was largely a development on a very important policy statement that Mr. LaRouche made last night, and for those of you who had the opportunity to participate in the Fireside Chat discussion last night, you had a chance to hear Mr. LaRouche's remarks live. But what I would like to do

during this initial stage of the broadcast here tonight, is to go through in fairly substantial detail what Mr. LaRouche's remarks were last night, as sort of a statement of policy right up front here, to begin tonight's broadcast: In order to put these remarks on the record, and to underscore what Mr. LaRouche's marching orders are for the present moment.

Now Mr. LaRouche said that we are clearly seeing a current tendency of a handful of decent senior people in both the Republican Party and in the Democratic Party, who are beginning to distinguish themselves as potential sources of qualified leadership, and these are persons who could, under the correct leadership, be brought together into a sort of unified organization to create a functional government in this nation. On the Republican side, you see the huge backlash against the outrageous and frankly fascist statements that were made earlier this week by Donald Trump, and as Mr. LaRouche said last night, disliking Trump is curiously a virtue among Republicans. And he emphasized that Trump is very dangerous, and absolutely must be dumped.

And then on the Democratic side, you have those who are now increasingly allying themselves openly against what both Obama and Hillary represent. So Mr. LaRouche said that if we can take these elements from both of the political parties, and, granted, these are persons who might not agree with each other on everything, but if we can find common ground when it comes to at least the core fundamental principles which are required to save this nation, and if we can unite those elements around these core fundamental principles, then we can create a team which will be qualified to confront the urgent crisis that is now facing the United States.

And let me just read a little bit of what Mr. LaRouche said in his own words, to underscore this:

"That is urgent. That is not a choice, that is an urgent command. Because we're on the edge, of possibly going into a

horrible situation. It's building up fast and we've got to take charge. The people of the United States have to take charge on the basis, of the right people from the Democratic side and the right people, from the Republican side. *That is what we must stick to, right now.*"

Now this doesn't mean," Mr. LaRouche said, that you're going to have a perfect organization. "It *does* mean that we can bring together these two major elements of our nation. *But*, that is still not good enough. On top of this, we've got to shut down Wall Street. We've got to shut it down right away. You can't leave it. You've got to get rid of it. Get rid of Wall Street, period. Because everything you do to try to defend any part of Wall Street, means that you're killing Americans. And I'm sure you don't want to do that.

"Now, among Republicans and Democrats who are sane, and human, unlike the other type, the different type, this will work."

Then, Mr. LaRouche continued: "What we have to do, is make a fundamental change, from everything that most people in this nation have learned. That is, beginning with the 20th Century policy, and up to the present time, there has been a continuous degeneration, in terms of long-term trends of the United States and European economy. Therefore, we must *shut down* everything that is like, not only the Wall Street system in the United States, but in Canada, in Britain, and in many parts of Europe: Shut it down! And go back to what Franklin Roosevelt had intended, for his reform, by closing down Wall Street and building up a new system of economy.

"But no more of any of this thing. No deals! No deals for Donald Trump. No deals for Hillary Clinton. No deals for any people of those categories."

We're going to get two teams together, Mr. LaRouche said. The Democrats and Republicans and some other people who are fit to serve, and we're going to get what Franklin Roosevelt aimed to

do, when he did it in the 1930s. That's our policy. There's a certain element of shambles in this whole thing when we do it, I mean, decent Republicans and decent Democrats don't always agree; they don't even have the same agenda. But we have to take that part of the policy, build the organization around that, get some degree of unity among those two elements I've indicated, and do the best we can to build up from there.

Now later in the discussion on the Fireside chat last night, Mr. LaRouche responded to a question and he emphasized that what he laid out in the initial phase of that discussion, is something that absolutely can be done. He said, because there are people in our nation who are senior, and very important people in terms of their political and economic functions in the United States – and Mr. LaRouche mentioned that he's in both direct and indirect dialogue with persons of that caliber. And Mr. LaRouche said that what he's observed over the recent period, is that there's been a phenomenon of a sort of division among this group of people, because they haven't been able to figure out the formula for unity, unity among those people who are prepared to make a reasonable agreement in order to save the United States as a viable organization, but he said that what *his* obligation is, is to concentrate on what that element, what that recipe for unity is.

And this is how he said it has to be done:

“Once we decide, that a significant number, among the Republican members of the organization, and the Democratic Party part, minus Wall Street and minus what Hillary's trying to do, and under those conditions, you will find that we have a possibility of a very sudden turnabout, where doubtful people are no longer going to be doubtful. Because if we can bring together that kind of unity, around those kinds of considerations, *we are able to pull the United States population together* around this issue.

“A lot of people will still disagree, but we have a hard core,

of both Republicans and Democrats and the thinking that goes with that, and that is the best thing we can possibly do *at this time*. It's from that point of view, if we start that, then a lot of other development can be obtained."

So, at the conclusion of last night's discussion, what Mr. LaRouche said was the following:

"The time has come, to take Democrats and Republicans who fit the sanity test, and get them into motion. Because if we can get an agreement within a significant part of the totality of our own Presidency, and spill that same spirit, into other countries which we deal with, I think we can make a good headway quickly, and it's one which is very much needed...

"Therefore, instead of worrying about blaming people who are making mistakes – without question, making terrible mistakes – you've got to take the people, who as a group, will build a force which will spread its influence throughout other parts of the United States.

"Because if you just sit and say, 'We've got a terrible situation out there, it ain't going to work. It's not working.' You're just asking for the worst kind of effect. You have to get in there, form organization, focus on your issues, and get people together on those issues. Without that, everything you will say will become a waste of time! And we don't want that.

"We want our citizens, to recognize that what I'm talking about, as *some* Republicans, a significant number of Republicans, and that's a late reform; and some other members of the House, are thinking a little more seriously now.

"What you've got to do is focus on encouraging, *those forces*, to become unified forces, with a unified conception of what has to be done! Without that we're dead. So just complaining and denouncing people will not work. It just makes things worse. You've got to get people on the issues

that *mean* something to them! Real issues!

“I need to get Republicans, who are decent, but who are not necessarily very accurate right now; we’ve got to bring them into the fold. We’ve got to do the same thing in other parts of the nation. We’ve got to bring the people *together*. We’re not going to get them all there at once, in one big swoop. But we can organize very rapidly; there are intelligent people, members of the Congress many of them; members of the House of Representatives; other kinds of people like that; and we have a force.

“Our job now is to bring those willing people, who are willing to do that, and bring them together and enlarge the growth of their movement.”

So, that was Mr. LaRouche’s very clear statement of policy last night, and I wanted to go through it in detail, because it’s very important that it go on record, and that it be underscored in terms of what Mr. LaRouche’s outlook is at the current time.

Now, earlier today, as I mentioned, when we had a chance to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, the discussion developed from there, based off of what Mr. LaRouche had to say last night. And the discussion developed in the context of the following question which I’m about to read, and which I’m going to ask Jeff to elaborate a little bit of what Mr. LaRouche’s answer was. This our institutional question for the week, and it reads as follows:

“Mr. LaRouche, the European Union’s Executive on Thursday stepped up pressure on the Bloc’s governments to enforce migration rules, launching a legal case against Hungary’s stringent asylum law, and advancing steps against Italy, Greece, and others for failing to implement EU legislation. In your view, how should the European Union manage the refugee crisis, emanating from multiple conflicts in countries such as

Syria, Libya, Iraq, and Afghanistan?”

So, I'll ask Jeff to come to the podium at this point.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. The response by Mr. LaRouche was very immediate, very rapid, and very clear. He said, the problem emanates from the European Union itself, and the only viable solution for Europe is to break up the European Union itself. It's become a factor chaos in all of Europe, and the basic policies of the European Union are creating the conditions for effectively the sealing-off of the borders of the entire European territory from desperate people, fleeing the wars in places like Iraq, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan, which have been creations of the policies coming from the United States and from Europe over the course of the last 15 years – really, the problems go back even earlier. In effect, the Afghan operation began in 1979, when Jimmy Carter was still President of the United States, and Zbigniew Brzezinski was the National Security Adviser, taking his cue from a high-level British intelligence figure named Dr. Bernard Lewis.

That was the beginning of the promotion of the terrorist apparatus, that at the time was known as the Afghan mujahideen. They were called freedom fighters. A number of years later, they were known as al-Qaeda, and more recently, they've morphed into other even more virulent forms, such as the Islamic State.

So, the policies that have come out of the trans-Atlantic region, including policies emanating from the European Union, have been catastrophic, and they've brought the entire trans-Atlantic system to a point of absolute breakdown.

Now, at the same time that we've seen this policy of building a wall around the European region, and of creating the conditions for widespread deaths of desperate refugees trying to get into Europe, to escape the ravages of the war in Libya, for example, which came about because Britain, France, and the

United States, Cameron, Sarkozy, and Obama – with a very strong endorsement from Hillary Clinton, unfortunately – overthrew and assassinated Libyan leader Qaddafi, and opened the floodgates for a jihadist stronghold on the Mediterranean shores of the Maghreb region of Africa.

Weapons flowed out of that area, into Syria, fueling the rise of the Islamic State. So Europe, particularly Britain and France, with the full complicity of the Obama Administration in the United States, created that refugee crisis in Northern Africa. Similarly, the United States and Britain created the catastrophes in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and it's been the regime change policy of Washington and London to overthrow the Assad government in Syria, that's led to the rise of the Islamic State, and created yet another major refugee flow into Europe.

So the European Union's policy of shutting out those desperate people, is basically a condemnation of those people to mass death.

Now, internally within Europe itself, over the past week, we've seen four major banks in Italy go bankrupt, and under the policies adopted by the European Union and the European Central Bank, those banks have looted their depositors' funding in a massive bail-in operation, which has meant the impoverishment of scores of citizens, hundreds, thousands of citizens of Italy, who thought their money was protected under the guideline rules of the European Union, only to find that the Cyprus model of bail-in has looted their accounts. There's now an ongoing criminal investigation in Italy, because one of the depositors who had his entire life savings looted, committed suicide, and there's an appropriate investigation now underway, as to the fact that the policies of the European Union, the European Commission, and the ECB, acted upon by the leading management of those banks, was a direct cause for a death.

So, you're talking about a capital offense having been carried out.

This is the legacy of the European Union. And what Mr. LaRouche said, is that the theft of funds in Italy, along with the sealing-off of the European borders, is a worse form of fascism than we've seen since the end of World War II. And the same exact trend is in existence in the United States, under the top-down direction of Wall Street. He said, when you take people's lives away, this is an act of mass murder, and this is an act of a policy of outright fascism. Wall Street, London fascism.

We've seen similar things going on in Greece. And therefore, the starting point for any kind of solution, for Europe in particular, is that you've got to destroy the European Union. Whatever benefit some people may have argued in the past, may have been associated with the EU, are now vastly overshadowed by the damage and negative factors. Bail-in as a policy is unforgivable. We already have bail-in in Europe. We already have bail-in in the United States – it's yet to be acted upon, but it's there, imbedded in Dodd-Frank, in Article 2 of the Dodd-Frank Act. Anyone involved in these policies deserves to be immediately pushed into jail, immediately. These are mass kill policies. These same mass kill policies are playing out in Paris at the COP-21 forum, and an outright mass genocidalist, Hans Joachim Schellnhüber, one of the leading advisors to the Pope on this issue of global warming, is calling for the Pope to step in and make a "religious intervention" to salvage the COP-21 conference, because leading nations in the developing sector are saying, "This is flat out a policy of genocide; we will not go along with it." Malaysia, India, in particular, have taken the lead on this issue.

Now, the policies that we're discussing, in the case of the European Union, are being carried out with the same ferocity here in the United States. And what we're seeing, in terms of

the reaction against the [Dec. 2 mass killing] incident that took place in San Bernardino, California, the overall blanket condemnation of Islam, the stoking up of this hatred ,on the part of Donald Trump, among others, is a further indication of the degeneration of the entire political situation.

Now, as Matt said earlier, quoting Mr. LaRouche from his Fireside Chat on Thursday night, there are clearly people of good will in both political parties, who've got to, basically, forge a non-partisan political alliance. We've got to clean out the garbage, and we've got to create the condition where the Presidential election in 2016 represents a return to core principles upon which this nation was founded. Many people are familiar with the first President of the United States, George Washington's Farewell Address, from the standpoint of his warnings against foreign entanglements. But, in that same Farewell Address, George Washington warned against the tyranny of political parties, the tyranny of factionalism and sectionalism, and those warnings ring more true today, than perhaps at any point in recent memory.

Now, you've got some serious members of Congress, both the House and the Senate, and it's not surprising that the areas where there is already common collaboration, are areas that are the most relevant to the issues that Mr. LaRouche put on the table, namely, wiping out Wall Street, and wiping out the power of the British Empire system, which still dominates the trans-Atlantic region. You've got a large and growing numbers of members of both the House and the Senate, who are supporting the idea of the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, which would be an efficient means of bankrupting Wall Street, in one fell swoop.

Many of those same members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, are also demanding the release of the 28 pages from the original 2002 Joint Congressional Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks, the September 11, 2011 attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. Remember, that those 28 pages

catalog the role of the Saudi royal family, the role of Saudi intelligence, the role of the Saudi Ambassador at that time to the United States, Prince Bandar bin-Sultan, in financing the hijackers who carried out the greatest terrorist atrocity on U.S. soil in recorded history.

So, there are movements that strike at the heart of the problems that are facing this nation and are facing the world – that combination of people, many of them in Congress, others in the military and intelligence domain, former leading military figures, like [ret. Lieut.-]Gen. Michael Flynn, who we've talked about repeatedly in recent weeks on this broadcast. Michael Flynn was in Moscow this week, speaking at the 10th Anniversary Conference of RT, along with a number of other prominent American critics of the Anglo-American policy.

And Gen. Flynn correctly emphasized that to destroy ISIS, to defeat the Islamic State decisively, there must be cooperation between the United States and Russia. Others, leading retired military and intelligence figures, have come out publicly and said there must be a joint, unified, military command, conducted by the United States and Russia. Russia is an invited power that's been asked in to Syria to help the Syrian government to fight the Islamic State. The United States has been, similarly, invited into Iraq, to do the same thing, until our invitation runs out. If there were a joint effort, the United States launching a pincer attack from the Iraq side, Russia launching a pincer attack with Syrian military forces from the Syrian side, you could crush the Islamic State. You could decisively defeat it.

So, there are people who are thinking strategically. We've got to take all of those elements, and create the kind of team that can coalesce around a viable American Presidency. And that both can and must happen, in the immediate period ahead. Trump, Hillary Clinton – these are not viable figures. They've demonstrated that repeatedly in the recent period. President Obama is not a viable figure. I had meetings, just in the past

week, where a number of leading figures were expressing grave concern that the United States will not survive, if Obama remains in office for the next 13 months. There are people now who are openly discussing the idea of invoking the 25th Amendment. We talked about this last week.

Many people were shocked to see President Obama's psychological meltdown on three recent occasions: first, you had the joint press conference with French President [François] Holland, following the Paris attacks of November 13th, where Holland was clearly in a frame of mind of marshalling for war, and President Obama was disassociated, disconnected, and thoroughly emotionally blocked, on the greatest challenge facing the trans-Atlantic region, in memory. Then in Paris, at the CO-P21 conference, where the [series of coordinated terrorist attacks] that took place on Nov. 13th in Paris, were trumping the issues that were nominally on the table, around "global warming." Obama's [Nov. 16th] press conference in Paris was shocking, in terms of the level of disassociation from reality. And so people became openly alarmed. And then, again, last Sunday evening, when the President dragged a podium and a teleprompter into the Oval Office, to deliver what was supposed to be a rallying cry for a war against the Islamic State, after the attacks in San Bernardino. And, once again, it was a disconnected, disassociated, policy statement that had nothing in it of any content.

People are talking about the need for the 25th Amendment. It's been out in the media. Behind the scenes in Congress, it's being discussed intensively, to the point that President Obama dispatched [Senior Advisor to the President] Valerie Jarret to Capitol Hill this week, to basically tell Democrats that the Republicans are getting ready for impeachment, and that the Democrats better be prepared to rally behind Obama. This is absolute nonsense, but indicates a further level of paranoia, emanating from the inner circle at the White House.

So, this Presidency has to be ended, using Constitutional means. And, frankly, at this point, the 25th Amendment is far more viable as a means to do it. Either members of Cabinet, or leaders of the Congress, can take action to convene a review, and immediately suspend the Obama Presidency, and move on from there. This is both necessary and vital for avoiding the kind of war danger which continues to emanate from this White House; even as military figures like General Flynn, like former Defense Secretary Bill Perry, echo warnings that we are closer to a thermonuclear war of annihilation than we were even at the height of the Cold War.

So these are real issues. You can't tolerate the continuation of this existing system; whether it's in the European Union case or it's in the case of the Obama Presidency. We need the kind of change that is only going to come about from this sort of rallying of a nonpartisan grouping of leading figures who don't think of themselves any longer as Democrats or Republicans; but as responsible leaders of a republic facing its gravest crisis in recent history. If we can do that, if we can marshal those forces, with the proper mobilization of you, the citizens of this country, we can get through this crisis and turn things around. But anything short of that, leaves us dangerously on the edge of destruction.

OGDEN: Thank you Jeff. What I read from Mr. LaRouche earlier was sort of a thesis along which lines we were going to follow through on the course of the remainder of this broadcast. And I want to call your attention to one short part of those remarks that I did read, but I want to underscore as sort of an introduction to the next segment of what you're about to see. One thing that Mr. LaRouche said last night is the following: "What we have to do is make a fundamental change from everything that most people in this nation have learned. That is, beginning with the 20th Century policy and up to the present time, there has been a continuous degeneration in terms of long-term trends of economy and culture."

Now, last week, at the concluding of the webcast, as an introduction to Benjamin Deniston's segment, I referenced another very important statement that Mr. LaRouche delivered at the conclusion of his previous Fireside Chat; the one of last Thursday, on the topic of how history actually works in terms of mankind's obligation to willfully generate his own future. In order to set up what Jason Ross is going to present to us in the remainder of this broadcast tonight, I would actually like to read that statement in full; what Mr. LaRouche had to say on this subject last week. What Mr. LaRouche said was the following:

"There is no such thing as an evolutionary process of development of human culture. There are effects which occur at certain times, but then suddenly, the whole culture collapses; vanishes. Then, somebody else arrives and stimulates something new, and gives mankind another chance at progress. And our job is to understand this question of progress; and progress is not an evolutionary process. It's always a revolutionary process; it is never evolutionary. And everybody who is sitting around waiting for a revolutionary process is just kidding themselves. A revolution of that type has to be an act of genius, which comes as if from nowhere; but that's the way mankind succeeds. And I'm looking for people who will do that kind of work, and become the geniuses who cause the future to be reborn again."

So, let me ask Jason to speak on that subject.

JASON ROSS: All right; thanks. One key figure who LaRouche has pointed to for understanding this notion of breaks, of jumps, of revolutions in human self-conception and in the history of our species, is Filippo Brunelleschi. Who, along with Cusa and Kepler, was one of the three real founders of modern science. I'm going to read another quote from LaRouche; this is from the show this Monday. LaRouche had said, "Most of human history is breaks; breaks in human history, and evil periods and broken periods came into existence in the

history. And so then, what Brunelleschi did was, he brought in a concept of science which is unique in terms of what is known today. Most people who were educated in this have no comprehension whatsoever of what Brunelleschi did. It's all available there for people if they were to study it enough; and it was brilliant, it was absolutely unique. And so, I would say, the problem is that in our location itself, and in other locations, the lack of understanding of the work of Brunelleschi is the reason for the source of stupidity shown by even many of our own members on this. And therefore, it's extremely important that we realize that we are facing a great challenge threatening us. And the Obama administration is an example of the great danger to the existence of the human species. And this kind of thing, which is expressed by the work of Brunelleschi, is actually the solution; the key to the solution to understand actually how things were intended to work." What I'd like to do tonight is help give some background to the point that Mr. LaRouche is making by going through some of what Brunelleschi did in his life, and then come to some conclusions from that about intent and about shaping history today.

So, Brunelleschi himself – he lived from 1377 to 1446 – what he's most known for is the construction of this magnificent dome [Fig. 1]. What you see here is the dome of the Cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiori in Florence. You can just see from this picture, this is far larger; it dominates the entire city. It's an incredible accomplishment. And you might be able to make out, standing on top of the red dome at the base of the white lantern as it's called which tops it, there are people there, standing at a railing which may not even be visible as more than a pixel to you. It gives some sense of how tall this structure is. At the top of that gold ball on the top, which Da Vinci helped create, it rises higher than the US Capitol. This is an enormous building; and it was built over the period of the 1300s and 1400s.

So, to give a little bit of background about the other things that Brunelleschi did as a very frankly, universal genius, I want to step through some other things in his life. These aren't in chronological order, but I want to give a sense of what he did, to then come back to the dome. Among his accomplishments was the purported first construction of a spring-based watch, so you could actually have a clock that was based on springs, as opposed to weights, as they were made at the time. I'm not really entirely certain that that was done. He did work on perspective; he had created a sort of a "trick" painting that incorporated a mirror; so that if you stood in the right place, you would have an effect where the mirror would become part of the painting. To show his work in sculpting – if we see the next image – he was officially apprenticed as a goldsmith, which is the same occupation that Donatello, his friend the great sculptor, took up. Verrocchio, who was Da Vinci's mentor, Da Vinci himself; these were goldsmiths. Here you see one of his first projects, which was on the right [Fig. 2] a panel he submitted for a competition to design a set of doors for the Baptistery in Florence there. He didn't win; this was one of his first tries at getting a commission, but this is from him early in life. You get a sense of what kind of skill he had.

The next image [Fig. 3], we see a painting in Santa Maria Novella in Florence by a colleague of Brunelleschi's; this is by Masaccio, and it's painting of the Trinity. You may not notice, but there's a dove there as the Holy Spirit in between the Father in the back and Christ in the front. This is the first painting that really used perspective, so that on the flat wall of the church, you had a space that was created there; where the boundary, the type of the medium was broken. And something flat turned into something solid. Leon Battista Alberti, later the writer of a very famous book on painting, credited Brunelleschi with the invention of perspective. And this is the work of one of his colleagues.

We see in the next image [Fig. 4], on the left we see an image of a crucifix, Christ on the cross that was made by Donatello. Brunelleschi saw it, and he said that he didn't really think Donatello had done a good enough job; he thought that Christ looked a little too "meaty" – that wasn't the word he used. But Donatello said all right; well, you take a shot at it, knowing that this wasn't exactly Brunelleschi's foremost skill as a sculptor. But Brunelleschi created the image you see on the right [Fig. 5], and in Donatello's eyes, it was superior.

The next image, we see a building that he had designed [Fig. 6]; this is a very nice looking building. It's got what's called a loggia on the front; a sort of porch, the sort of thing you would see on the front of the house of a wealthy Roman from the height of the Roman Empire, or in Venice. This is a building for orphans, this is the *Ospedale degli Innocenti*; and da Vinci brought that humanist approach to the beauty of the individual in constructing this building for orphans, where a decision could have been made to do this on the cheap. Let's throw up something that looks like it might have come out of East Germany in more recent times; but no, this is what he created.

The next image [Fig. 7], we see the interior of a church, Santo Spirito, which was designed by Brunelleschi; and although it's difficult to get a sense of space when you see still images, these are buildings which give you a sense of goodness and beauty walking through them. They're beautiful buildings. One more beautiful building we see here in the next image [Fig. 8], is the exterior – unfortunately this is the outside of the Pazzi Chapel that LaRouche has made frequent reference to. Inside the chapel, which was designed by Brunelleschi, there is a really astonishing quality of sound; reverberation, echo, but not simply echo. As LaRouche has put it, if you sing to it, it sings back to you. And I'd like to read some words from the Italian soprano Antonella

Banaudi, who spoke about this chapel in a conference of the Schiller Institute in Berlin in 2012. Banaudi said, "I recently went to the Pazzi Chapel in Florence; the Florence of Brunelleschi and Ficino. In its naked proportion and simplicity, in the balance of light and colors, it gave a beautiful resonance to the sound of my voice. A demonstration that it is the proportion, the idea translated into construction, that resonates inside of us. The emotion I felt in hearing a response from the stone that almost supported me in singing; as if the stone were alive and expressing itself through cosmic vibration, made me feel part of a whole that unites stone and man in a harmony that is the reason for the existence for everything. It is the same harmony that we seek and experience when singing together, playing together, participating in a sort of rite or celebration that is beyond religion and is profoundly moral and human." Pretty good endorsement for a singing space.

So now, let's come back to the dome; I'd like to talk about its background and creation. The first stone was laid for its construction back in 1296, and construction was continuing through the 1300s; at a time when Florence saw a great period of growth. In 1367, there was a referendum on how to build the cathedral. I know I've got local things that come up on the ballot, like school bonds, or things like that. Imagine having this to vote on. There was a referendum for two designs for the cathedral, which at that time was certainly nowhere near complete. And the referendum was to vote between the structure you see here, which is obviously the one that won the referendum. The alternative approach was one that had a different idea of building. You see on the cathedral here, the windows are very small; this is not a bright cathedral on the inside. It's very spacious, it's enormous; but there's not a lot of natural light coming in through those huge stained glass windows that you might associate with the beginning of the cathedral movement in Europe. Those cathedrals with the huge windows, given that they had a lot of

glass and not a lot of stone to hold the building up, had those arches on the outside – the flying buttresses to hold it in. But the vote on this referendum, which Brunelleschi's father voted in, and he voted for this design which eventually won; was to forego the windows for a more beautiful design of the building as a whole. And it laid out some requirements for the dome.

At the time, no one knew how to build the dome, but its general height was proposed; the height of that ring above the height of the rest of the cathedral to the dome was set. So, this occurred in 1367. To give a couple of numbers, the cathedral is 140 feet tall; the timbre, that extra ring before the dome starts, is another 30 feet tall; and then the dome itself goes to 300 feet with another 70 or so for the lantern and the ball and cross on top of it.

Brunelleschi was born ten years after this referendum in 1377. He lived a few blocks from the cathedral; he would have – you couldn't have missed this obviously, if you lived in Florence anywhere. But living only a few blocks from it, he saw this every day; he saw the construction taking place. This is the kind of thing that would cause a young person to have an incredible sense of wonder. So, as he became a more accomplished sculptor, artist, architect, goldsmith, he entered later in his life, in 1418, another competition. And this was the competition to become the contractor, so to speak, to build the dome.

Now, there's a lot of difficulty in terms of how you would build the dome; and it raised a very important question of construction. So in the next image [Fig. 9], you see a typical sort of Roman dome; you can barely even see that there's anything going on there. This is the Pantheon; and you can see there's a bit of a pimple or something sticking out of the top of it. That dome is about as wide as the one in Florence, but you can barely see it; it's in the shape of a sphere. It's 23 feet thick at the base, where the dome starts

to come out of the rest of the building; that's how thick they had to make it to hold itself up, and the way it was built – Let's see the next image [Fig. 10] for a similar example of construction. If you think about the images – maybe you've seen Roman aqueducts with the semi-circular arches along the way – the way that they're built, this is the Pont du Gare in today's France. The way that these arches were built was that you built a scaffolding underneath while you built the circular arch; and once the whole arch was done, and you put the keystone on top, then it would support itself. The two parts that are trying to lean inward on the two sides could lean against each other and hold themselves up. So, here you can see this type of construction being applied to an arch today in the next image [Fig. 11]. This is in Morocco. You can see there's scaffolding.

Now, the dome is very large. It would have been impossible to build scaffolding under the dome. It began at the height of 170 feet; there are no trees that tall. This is beyond the height of trees. So, if you're trying to put up a bunch of posts to go underneath this thing to hold up the dome as you're building it, you're not going to get enough wood. It would have taken 1000 trees anyway, even if you could have big enough ones; it was basically impossible. So, what Brunelleschi had done in this competition is, he said it's not an issue. I'll build this dome without scaffolding. I'll build this dome without centering, he said.

So, people asked him, "How are you going to do this?" He actually responded with a joke. I don't know if it's a true story about him, but a story about an egg, where he said, here's the challenge; how do you make an egg stand up on its base. And Brunelleschi took the cooked egg and just cracked it down, flattening the bottom, and said, "There you go; see? The egg stands up just fine." And they said, "Well, if we knew that, we could have put the egg up." And he said, "Exactly. I know how to build this dome, and you don't. So,

you're not going to understand it, but I can do it. I'm your man."

In the construction, he developed a number of new techniques. So, I'm going to talk about the overall shape of the dome; and Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized the importance of the catenary principle in this. The catenary is just a word that means chain; it just means chain-ish. So, the catenary, the shape of a hanging chain, it's a shape that's not coming from geometry, it's not in Euclid; you can't make it with a compass and a straight edge, the kinds of things you do in geometry class. It's a physical shape that's made by a physical thing – a chain; it's something real and physical. It has a different kind of curvature in every spot of it; and LaRouche sees in Brunelleschi's use of this principle in the construction of the dome, that Brunelleschi rejected the idea of linearity in the small. That in the infinitesimal, there's always an activeness to it; it's not flat, it's not linear.

In building this dome, let's take a look at some of the technologies Brunelleschi developed. In addition to being a sculptor and a goldsmith, he was also a very good contractor. The next image [Fig. 12], you see a crane that he had developed. If you're lifting a bunch of material up to the top of this dome, you don't want to be carrying it up all those steps. If you imagine you're carrying every brick up these steps, that would be a very grueling and tiring way to build this. So what he did was, he repurposed, he developed a new way to use a winch system to lift material. Before him, they used cables to lift things up, but they would use people, because people could turn around more easily than animals. So before Brunelleschi, they used basically a giant hamster wheel with people in it, a treadmill. And people would run in it, and that would twist the cranks and lift the bucket up; and when it came time to bring it down, they'd run the other way. The difficulty of using animals – this is a picture of a horse by da Vinci [Fig. 13], but oxen were used is, you can't make

them go backwards; they don't like to turn around. So, here you see a transmission. Brunelleschi built this with two sets of pegs on the vertical axis to connect to the horizontal one, where you'd change the height of it, and you could make it go forward or in reverse without making the animals change direction. So, what a guy.

In the next image [Fig. 14], you see an interior schematic of the dome itself, where here we see another chain. Four stone chains, a wooden chain which you can see inside the cathedral today, and a metal chain which is believed to exist. Sort of like the hoops around a barrel to hold it in, Brunelleschi built in these chains to help hold in the dome. This let him build it very thin, and actually surprising light. Unlike the dome of the Pantheon, which was 23 feet thick at its base, the inner dome that Brunelleschi built was only 7 feet thick; and the outer dome – the one that you see on the outside of the building – is only 2 feet thick at its base, which is pretty astonishing.

So another aspect we see in the next image [Fig. 15] is the brickwork which Brunelleschi used. Rather than flat layers of brick, where the bricks would basically fall off or cave in, Brunelleschi didn't know how sheer lines; and with this space that you see here, this is the space between the inner and outer dome that you walk through to get up to the top. This was a new technique that required 4 million bricks; these were custom shaped bricks; all different sizes. He made these bricks very well; he'd season them for two years before he'd bake them. This was a major, major undertaking.

So, the dome is under construction; it takes over a decade and a half. The Pope himself comes to announce that it's complete. The Council of Florence, which I think people who are familiar with Mr. LaRouche's work will have heard of; this important council to pull for unanimity and to resolve religious differences, was held here in Florence with this cathedral. Which I'm sure had an amazing impact on the

participants. If you're trying to think through what's the relationship of God and man; and you're in this incredible, astonishing, unbelievable construction, I think that'll have an effect on what you believe man's identity to be, for sure.

So, shortly after that, Brunelleschi died. The white lantern on the top made of marble – and this terrified people living in the area, because that's tons and tons and tons of marble. They were amazed that the dome was up at all; when it came time to bring even more weight up on top, to add the marble on those ribs, to add the marble for the lantern, people thought it was going to crack, it was going to break. Obviously, it didn't; it's still here. In 1461 it was completed, and as I mentioned, da Vinci was part of the crew that helped build that golden ball that you see at the very top there. So, this takes us from Brunelleschi into da Vinci.

That other image you saw of the light on the ground, in 1475, Toscanelli put a plate inside the lantern to have a nice spotlight come down from the Sun. Since this was the tallest structure around – the top of the lantern is 370 feet up – this is a very good solar observatory. So, you're able to get a very good sense of how the Sun is moving to correct the length of the year, you have a sense of the timing of the seasons. And this is the kind of thinking that went into Toscanelli's collaboration with Columbus, and providing him with maps, and the whole voyage to the New World.

So, that's some about Brunelleschi; let's talk about the implications for today, briefly. In his approach, Brunelleschi – if you think about in the way that LaRouche like to talk about science vs. mathematics today, for example, if you compare the physical structure built by Brunelleschi to the geometry of the Pantheon, which was just a hemisphere, circle shape, those other arches in the Roman aqueduct. They served their purpose, but they're very much a shape that's conceived and then you figure out how to bring it into being. Brunelleschi started with the physical space he was working

with, and went from geometry into physics; in a way like what real physics is, as compared to Euclid. In the same way that Kepler, taking the insights from Brunelleschi's work, taking the insights from Cusa's work, approached astronomy; from the standpoint not of shapes but of the physical causes that brought about the motions of the planets. Of gravitation, of the need for harmony; this was Kepler's approach. It was the approach of Leibniz, who, unlike the math and geometry based ideas of motion in physics that came from Descartes; Leibniz said, "No, forget it. We can't understand the physical world by how it appears to us," by geometry and by shape. There's something more there; there's something physical that's distinct from the perceptual or from extension and shape and geometry. Leibniz discovered what we would today understand as the force of motion; what he called *vies viva*, what today people would call kinetic energy.

You think about what Riemann did, where he in his *Habilitation* dissertation of 1854 said what Gauss knew but didn't really say, when he said, "Look; we have been using ideas of mathematics and geometry to shape our thinking, but we don't even know if it's based on something that's true." Are the idea of geometry that we base everything else on, are they true? Is space flat? How would we answer that question? And what did Riemann say? He said, in that tradition of Brunelleschi, get out of geometry; look to physics. In the small, things are happening; it's something physical, but it's not a shape you can just imagine.

So, with these kinds of jumps that we saw, with Brunelleschi's character as a person, he had certain achievements. But what he did was, he made new things happen; that was his personality. He did new things; they don't happen on their own, he made the leaps. So, think about the kinds of leaps we need to make today. Some of the leaps, like leaping over the crap; throwing out Obama, dumping Trump. And then there are the leaps upward, besides leaping over the pits; the leaps

upward, things like developing fusion power. We don't know how the nucleus works; there's so much unknown about it. What's occurring with low-energy nuclear reactions; will that be a viable source of power? Maybe. Will it be an insight into what's actually going on in the nucleus? Yes. What will it mean to have a fusion power basis for our economy? How will that change our relationship to materials, to resources, to water, when we can produce all we want and not worry about shortages of materials anymore?

What do we have to learn about the galaxy, where the limits of Newtonian gravity are making themselves very apparent with the inventions of dark matter and dark energy to try to keep the old law in place while accounting for new things that don't fit them? What are we actually going to learn? What are we going to learn about water? About the ability to control water cycles here on Earth? What's role of the galaxy, of the Sun, in changing how the atmosphere responds to the formation of clouds, to climate over time, to water? How does our Sun's relationship to the galaxy we are in impact life here on Earth over evolutionary time, over climatic time, over long periods and shorter periods in terms of weather effects?

These are all incredible jumps that need to be made; that will not come from the past, but will come from what we'll look back on and say, "Oh, that was that necessary step." And that's the real basis in economy; the intention to have a leap, the intention to make a jump. The desire to go to a future that hasn't existed before. This is what Alexander Hamilton's outlook was in setting up our initial credit system, and his goal for an industrial, scientific, and technologically advancing United States; as opposed to the agrarian dream of Thomas Jefferson.

Here's one of Hamilton's mottoes. He said, "As a general marches at the head of his troops, so ought wise politicians – if I dare use the expression – they should march at the head of affairs, insomuch that they ought not to await the event to

know what measures to take, but the measures which they have taken ought to produce the event." We can produce a recovery; we can have direction in our economy. We can have missions the way that Kennedy with the space program; the way Lincoln did with building the transcontinental railroad and other programs even during the Civil War. With the initiatives that Franklin Roosevelt took to create a real recovery and separate the economy from the Wall Street-connected finance that Hoover was tied to.

So, nothing happens on its own. As LaRouche has been saying, you don't get evolutionary development over time in that sense in human history; it's revolutionary. Things don't just happen; you make them happen. You go out and you do them. You throw Obama out, you create a credit system; they don't just happen on their own.

And I'd like to end what I was going to say with another quote from Mr. LaRouche, from our discussion with the Policy Committee on Monday. LaRouche said, "With the personality of human beings, you can't say that you located it in the person as such; the living person who dies. That is not the way to define the problem; you have to find the connection which creates the leap into progress, as opposed to a continuity. You don't know what the process is until you live it, and find out what the mystery is. It's sort of, when you go to Kepler, you get a leap; when you go to the galactic system, you get a leap. You get all kinds of leaps in the Solar System and through the whole thing itself; and it's the understanding that this is the mind of man which is creating mankind, and not the other way around."

OGDEN: Well, thank you very much, Jason. And I think that gives us a very good idea of exactly what Mr. LaRouche was saying; that history is not something that you allow to act on you and just react against. But, history is something which must be understood in terms of the future being something that we must generate. So, I think what Mr. LaRouche has prompted

to think about, that that generation of the future can only come through an act of genius, which comes apparently out of nowhere, as Brunelleschi's did. And as Mr. LaRouche said, "I'm looking for people who will do that kind of work, and become the geniuses who cause the future to be reborn again."

So, with that said, I would to bring a conclusion to tonight's webcast. Thank you very much to Jason and to Jeff for joining us here tonight; and thank you to all of you. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Leder, 11. december 2015: USA: Tro ikke på de offentlige løgne!

Den fordærvede offentlige mening og de ditto offentlige medier påstår, at Obamas fjernelse er umulig. Ja, de går endda så vidt som til at påstå, at det ikke engang bliver diskuteret. Men takket være først og fremmest, og mest af alt, den hovedrolle som katalysator, der spilles af Lyndon LaRouches »Manhattan-projekt« – er ingen af disse påstande sande. Ja, faktisk finder der en aktiv diskussion sted om behovet for at fjerne Obama på højeste regeringsplan. Ikke flere løgne; det kan gøres, og det må gøres, og vi må sørge for, at det bliver gjort, og gjort hurtigt.

Undertiden har en aktion, der angiveligt synes at være lokaliseret til et enkelt sted, såsom »Manhattan-projektet«, en universel virkning; tænk f.eks. på Brunelleschis kuppel i Firenze (katedralen Santa Maria della Fiore).

En del af det, som disse fordærvede medier og den offentlige mening forholder dig, er, at der nu foreligger et aktuelt lovforslag i Kongressen, der opregner 11 overtrædelser, der kunne udløse en rigsretssagsprocedure imod enhver præsident, der begik en hvilken som helst af disse overtrædelser. Den mest prominente af disse overtrædelser er lige netop disse »store forbrydelser og forseelser«, for hvilke Lyndon LaRouche har rejst tiltale mod Barack Obama i sine ugentlige dialoger med Manhattan-projektet.

Kongresmedlem Ted Yoho (R-Fla.) introducerede »H. Res. 198« den 13. april i år. Den er behagligt kortfattet. Efter nogle indledende »alt imens'er«, siger dens operative afsnit ganske enkelt det følgende:

»Repræsentanternes Hus erklærer, at de følgende præsidentielle handlinger skal udgøre 'store forbrydelser og forseelser' inden for rammerne af artikel II, sektion 4, der skal udløse Husets vedtagelse af en artikel eller artikler for en rigsretssag ('impeachment'), der skal sendes til Senatet til efterprøvelse –

»(1) at indlede krig uden udtrykkelig bemyndigelse fra Kongressen

»(2) at, i USA eller i udlandet, dræbe amerikanske borgere, der ikke er engageret i aktive fjendtligheder imod USA, uden korrekt retssag (med mindre drabet var nødvendigt for at forhindre umiddelbar, alvorlig fysisk skade mod tredjeparter);

»(3) at forsømme udøvelsen af tilsyn med underordnede, der har gjort sig skyldig i kroniske forfatningsmæssige overgreb;

»(4) at bruge anviste midler i modstrid med betingelser fastsat for deres anvendelse;

»(5) med overlæg at lyve for Kongressen for at opnå bemyndigelse til krig;

»(6) at forsømme omsorgen for, at love samvittighedsfuldt udøves, derigennem, at erklæringer eller en systematisk politik for ikke-håndhævelse underskrives;

»(7) at indsætte eksekutive aftaler i stedet for traktater

»(8) med overlæg at lyve under ed for en føderal dommer eller undersøgelsesjury (grand jury)

»(9) at misbruge føderale (statslige) organisationer til fremme af en partisk politisk dagsorden;

»(10) at nægte at overholde en Kongresstævning om (udlevering af) dokumenter eller vidneafklæggelser, der er udstedt til et legitimt juridisk formål; og

«(11) at udstede eksekutive ordrer eller præsidentielle memoranda, der krænker eller omgår Kongressens forfatningsmæssige magtbeføjelser.»

Bemærk, at kongresmedlem Yohos lovforslag vil træde i kraft, så snart det er vedtaget af et flertal i Repræsentanternes Hus. Der behøves ingen handling fra Senatets side. Kongresmedlem Yoho har to medsponsorer: republikanerne Jeff Duncan fra South Carolina og Tom McClintock fra Californien. Republikaneren Justin Amash fra Michigan var en medsponsor, men trak sig tilbage den 9. juni. Vi kender endnu ikke hans begrundelser for tilbagetrækningen, men de involverer sandsynligvis intensiteten i kampen – i en kamp, som nogle ønsker, vi skal tro, slet ikke finder sted.

Hele den aktuelle fokusering på det umiddelbare behov for at fjerne Obama har ført til, at nogle personer igen undersøger bestemmelserne i Sektion 4 i det 25. tillæg til Den amerikanske Forfatning, der foreskriver, hvordan man fjerner en præsident, »der ikke er i stand til at udøve sit embedes magtbeføjelser og pligter«, men som forsømmer at gå af på eget initiativ – og således har brug for et lille skub, kunne man sige.

Den sædvanlige fremlæggelse af Sektion 4 – det, der rent faktisk har været vores sædvanlig fremlæggelse af Sektion 4 – siger, at vicepræsidenten og et flertal af regeringsmedlemmer skal vedtage at erklære præsidentens mentale defekt (i det aktuelle tilfælde). Men det er rent faktisk ikke, hvad den siger. Dette er blot et af alternativerne. Det andet alternativ er, at Kongreshusene (dvs. Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet) ved lov etablerer en anden »institution«, der ville få virkning af en særlig kommission til at undersøge og vedtage præsidentens evne til at fortsætte i embedet.

Det er potentielt set en temmelig stor forskel.

Lyndon LaRouche tilføjede her til aften, at der må være et tværpartisk initiativ for at dumpe (Donald) Trump. Netop nu har demokrater og republikanere mulighed for at sænke Trump på en regulær, upartisk basis. Hvis de kommer frem og siger det sammen, så omdefinierer det arten af præsidentkampagnen for 2016. Selv januar måned vil være for sent. Det bør ske nu, en upartisk organisering imod Trump, og denne samme kombination må også tage initiativ til handling for at dumpe Obama.

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 10. december 2015:

Er NATO allerede i krig med Rusland?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Leder, 10. december 2015: USA: Et spørgsmål om overlevelse – for hele verden. Fjern Obama!

Spørgsmålet om Frankrigs overlevelse efter det andet terrormassemord i Paris på et år blev udtrykt, da den franske præsident Hollande omgående og tvingende nødvendigt gik i aktion for at fremtvinge en alliance mellem Rusland, Frankrig og USA for at knuse ISIS og al-Qaeda.

Spørgsmålet om Ruslands overlevelse efter Tyrkiets bombing af det russiske fly over Syrien blev udtrykt, da præsident Putin holdt sin magtfulde tale til parlamentet i militærets hal, og påkaldte Ruslands 15 år lange kamp for at bekæmpe terror i Rusland, og nu, international terror, og indkaldte hver eneste russiske borger til at se sig selv som en »soldat« i denne krig.

Spørgsmålet om Amerikas overlevelse nu har intet at gøre med valggøglet efter terrorangrebet i San Bernardino. Spørgsmålet handler om den præsident Obama, der insisterer på at angribe og konfrontere Rusland og Kina som fjender, og som skjuler og benægter beviser for, at Saudi Arabien, Tyrkiet, Qatar og London støtter radikal jihadisme. Den præsident, der beordrede den amerikanske »åbning« til det Muslimske Broderskab siden 2011; som, siden afsættelsen og mordet på Gaddafi, har ført en bevidst kurs mod et endeligt opgør med Rusland og Kina, og i hvilket selvmorderisk opgør han tror, at de vil kapitulere til regimeskift, hvor som helst, han måtte ønske det.

Stiftende redaktør for Executive Intelligence Review Lyndon

LaRouche har krævet, at Obama fjernes fra embedet, siden 2009, hvor han, med det samme, Obama indtog Det Hvide Hus, identificerede hans fatale »Nero-kompleks«.

LaRouche fremlagde det i dag: »Putin udøver en kvalitet af lederskab, der er de fleste amerikanske præsidenter i vores historie overlegent – men Obama! Obama begik et bevidst bedrageri, to gange på nationalt TV, hvor han dækkede over terroroperationen i Californien. Han støttede denne operation ved at forsøge at skjule dens karakter, og dernæst skjule dens sponsorer. Obama er en faktor for terrorisme og krig, en potentiel atomkrig.«

Obama driver nu nationen og planeten hen mod en atomar konfrontation, som den menneskelige civilisation ikke kan overleve. Atomvåbeneksperter kan se det og kommer med offentlige advarsler. Mindst ét kongresmedlem kan se det; kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard fra Hawaii udfordrede forsvarsminister Carter med denne Obamas trussel om atomkrig i Husets Komite for de Bevæbnede Styrker. Præsident Putin og det kinesiske lederskab ser det helt bestemt og træffer enhver foranstaltning til at forberede sig, så vel som til at undgå krig.

Onsdag ringede en af LaRouchePAC's samarbejdspartnere i Midtvesten til sit kongresmedlem, briefede ham og sagde til ham, at Obama måtte fjernes ved hjælp af det 25. forfatningstillæg, omgående. Kongresmedlemmet sagde, at han ikke havde hørt nogen diskussion om dette. Vælgeren svarede magtfuldt, »Så kan du begynde diskussionen!« Det gjorde kongresmedlemmet, usandsynligt nok, og ringede tilbage til sin vælger to gange til for at rapportere, hvordan de andre i Kongressen havde reageret.

Det er blot én borger. Gang det op. Ændr hvad du tænker mht. din mulighed for at være med til at gøre, hvad der i virkeligheden er ret og nødvendigt.

Leder, 9. december 2015: NATO har bevæget sig over i en krigstilstand mod Rusland

Efter fuldstændigt at være blevet taget på sengen af den russiske præsident Putins strategiske flankoperation i Syrien, som annonceredes den 30. september, har Det britiske Imperium og præsident Obama lanceret en igangværende række direkte militære angreb og provokationer imod Rusland, som eskaleres for hver dag, der går. Dette har de gjort gennem helejede datterselskaber såsom ISIS (der mere ligner en gren af Londons Dope, Inc.), den tyrkiske regering, Saudi Arabien osv. Tag denne korte kronologiske oversigt i betragtning:

* 31. okt.: Ruslands Metrojet sprænges i luften over Sinai af ISIS.

* 24. nov.: Tyrkiet nedskyder et russisk SU-24 over Syrien, med klar godkendelse og forudgående ondsksfuld hensigt fra Obamas side. Tirsdag modtog præsident Putin flyets sorte boks, som det lykkedes russiske og syriske styrker at bjærge, og meddelte, at den kun vil blive åbnet under internationale eksperters tilstedeværelse, og at den ville vise, at flyet var blevet ramt i syrisk luftrum.

* 1. dec.: Den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ash Carter annoncerede deployeringen af yderligere amerikanske specialstyrker i Irak, under den irakiske regerings højlydte protester.

* 3. dec.: Tyrkiske tropper invaderede det nordlige Irak under den irakiske regerings skingre protester, igen med klar opbakning fra Obama. Dette eskalerede den 7. dec., da der

rapporteredes om yderligere tyrkiske tropper, der gik ind i området, hvilket bragte tallet op på 900 iflg. guvernøren for provinsen Ninive, rapporterer Sputnik. Tyrkiet har nægtet at trække sine tropper tilbage; deres eneste »indrømmelse« har været endnu ikke at sende yderligere 350 tropper, der er opstillet på grænsen, ind.

* 6. dec.: USA bombede en syrisk militærbase i Syrien og dræbte tre soldater; et yderligere amerikansk bombeangreb dræbte 32 civile. Forsvarsministeriet har afvist ansvaret for angrebet på militærbasen og har modargumenteret med, at russerne gjorde det.

Finnian Cunningham, den anti-britiske, irske, politiske analytiker, hvis artikler jævnligt udgives i de russiske medier, opsummerede situationen i en artikel den 7. dec. i *RT*: »På trods af de absurde benægtelser, så er den barske konklusion den, at NATO er i krig med Syrien ... gennem forlængelse betyder dette, at NATO også har bevæget sig over i en krigstilstand imod Rusland, som den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assads regerings allierede.« Cunningham konkluderede: »Det ser ud, som om Washington er parat til at starte en verdenskrig.«

Og den russiske militærekspert Vladimir Bogatyrev gav et interview til Radio Sputnik den 7. dec., hvor han sagde, at Tyrkiets indrykning i det nordlige Irak er en provokation, der er koordineret med den amerikanske regering. »Vi er gået ind i en helt ny fase i kampen mod Daesh [ISIS] ... Det er afgjort en tyrkisk provokation. Og den var selvfølgelig koordineret med USA.«

Men alle disse provokationer på vegne af briterne og Obama går op imod Putins stålsatte beslutning og hans igangværende flankering af provokationerne. Tirsdag meddelte Putin og hans forsvarsminister Shoigu, at Rusland havde lanceret krydsermissiler imod ISIS fra en russisk ubåd i Middelhavet. Putin tilføjede, at missilerne kan armeres med enten et

konventionelt sprænghoved eller et atomsprænghoved, men at han håbede, atomsprænghoveder »aldrig vil blive nødvendige«.

Leder, 7. december 2015: USA: En sand præsidentiel erklæring om terrorisme fra Lyndon LaRouche

»Det, vi har her, er et problem, der umiddelbart kan spores til det terrorregime, der ramte Paris og andre dele af Frankrig for nylig. Vi har nu i USA, i mindre skala, den samme type operation med en arabisk gruppe for panik, og som begår masse mord. De masse mord, der styres af Tyrkiet og andre netop nu, er en del af den samme ting, som nu dræber amerikanere i USA på samme basis. Og grunden til, at dette finder sted, er Barack Obama, der har magt til at håndtere dette problem, men ikke gør det. Man kan derfor ikke klage over disse ting, hvis man ikke handler med de midler, der er til rådighed, for at korrigere problemet.«

»Der sker det, at politiets styrker har nogen indsigt i dette her, men den form for indsigt, der behøves, bliver ikke leveret! USA's præsident er ansvarlig for at håndtere dette, for denne bølge af terror, der smittede fra Frankrig, som kom fra Saudi Arabien oprindeligt, derfra, rammer nu USA, og enten ved USA's præsidentskab det, eller også er det så dumt, at det ikke ved det.«

»Nogen bør gøre noget ved det. Det her vil blive værre. Men

hvis man ikke sørger for at blive dette særlige tilfælde af terror kvit – for dette er kun en del af en plan for at skabe massiv uro, på denne måde, internt i USA, så vel som andre steder.«

»Så derfor gør Obama ikke sit job! Obama handler ikke for at redde amerikanske borgeres liv. Og det er den eneste måde at få ram på det her. Lad være med at kommentere det: Korriger det.«

»Vi er kommet til et tidspunkt, hvor vi ikke simpelthen kan løse et problem ad gangen. Vi må erkende, at hele planeten, under Det britiske Imperiums indflydelse, som sådan; det var Det britiske Imperium, der organiserede de generelle krige i forrige århundrede; [den amerikanske] borgerkrigen var et produkt af dette samme problem.«

»Problemet er således, at vi simpelt hen må rense op i dette rod.«

Senere i diskussionen gentog LaRouche:

»Denne præsident må fjernes fra embedet, fordi han terroriserer hele USA's befolkning, og han er derfor ikke skikket til at være USA's præsident.«

LaRouches lederskab overlapper den voksende afsky i landet mod Obamas løgne, og hans afsindige fremstød mod en atomar konfrontation med Rusland og Kina – som på det seneste bruger Erdogans regering i Tyrkiet til at lancere den ene provokation efter den anden imod Rusland. Den 4. dec. var Melon-Scaifes *Pittsburgh Tribune Review* den seneste avis, der tog spalteskriver Charles Hurts artikel i *Washington Times* op, hvor denne rejser spørgsmålet om det nødvendige i at aktivere det 25. forfatningstillæg imod en præsident Obama, de er ansvarlig for, at ISIS nu »kommer til Amerika«. Andre medier, såsom *Boston Herald*, er oprørte over Obamas håndtering af San Bernadino-skyderiet og skriver: »Vold på arbejdspladsen? Virkelig?«

Men det er kun få mennesker i USA, der endnu forstår dybden af de forandringer, der kræves for at løse disse problemer – såsom den presserende forlængelse af Verdenslandbroen ud i hvert eneste hjørne af planeten, inklusive i det krigshærgede Mellemøsten. De har heller ikke overvejet den menneskelige kreativitets enestående egenskaber, der ligger uden for de dagligdags vaner med »praktisk tankegang«, og som er nødvendige for at få denne revolutionerende transformation til at ske.

Her kommer LaRouches Manhattan-projekt ind, som netop tager dette afgørende spørgsmål op. Som LaRouche erklærede i sin **'Samtale omkring Pejser'**:

»Sådan noget som en evolutionær proces inden for udvikling af menneskelig kultur eksisterer ikke. Der er virkninger, der finder sted på bestemte tider. Men så kollapser hele kulturen pludselig, den forsvinder, den bliver slagtet. Senere kommer der så en anden person og stimulerer til noget nyt, og giver således menneskeheden en ny chance for at gøre fremskridt.«

»Det er vores opgave at forstå dette spørgsmål om fremskridt, og fremskridt er ikke en evolutionær proces. Det er altid en revolutionær proces, det er aldrig evolutionært! Og alle, der bare sidder og venter på en revolutionær proces, narrer sig selv. En sådan form for revolution må være en genial handling, der ligesom kommer ud af intetheden. Og jeg leder efter folk, der vil gøre den slags arbejde og blive til de genier, der vil forårsage, at fremtiden bliver genfødt.«

Leder, 4. december 2015: Præsident Putin nagler Obama; LaRouche banker det ind

Præsident Putin holdt sin årlige tale til det russiske parlament (Den føderale Forsamling) i dag foran flere end 1.000 mennesker i Skt. Georgs Sal i Kreml. Han begyndte med at hylde de russiske militærfolk, der gør tjeneste i kampen mod terrorisme, og fortsatte med at introducere enkerne til de to soldater, der blev dræbt af Erdogan, og holde et øjeblik stilhed. Russerne ved fra 1990'erne, hvad den internationale terrorismes aggression vil sige, sagde han. Terrorismen vil aldrig blive nedkæmpet af et enkelt land.

Engang fredelige og stabile lande, – »Irak, Libyen og Syrien – er styrtet ud i kaos og anarki, der udgør en trussel mod hele verden.«

»Vi ved alle, hvorfor dette skete. Vi ved, hvem, der besluttede at afsætte de uønskede regimer og brutalt gennemtvunge deres egne regler. Hvor har det ført dem hen? De oppiskede ballade, ødelagde landenes statsdannelse, satte folk op imod hinanden, og dernæst 'vaskede de deres hænder', som vi siger i Rusland, og banede således vejen for radikale aktivister, ekstremister og terrorister«.

Han fortsatte med at sammenligne den nuværende situation med den, der førte til Anden Verdenskrig, med alt, hvad det indebærer for russerne.

»Det internationale samfund burde have lært af fortidens lektioner. De historiske paralleller i denne sag kan ikke benægtes. En manglende vilje til at slutte kræfterne sammen

imod nazisterne i det 20. århundrede kostede os millioner af liv i den blodigste verdenskrig i menneskehedens historie. I dag står vi atter ansigt til ansigt med en destruktiv og barbarisk ideologi, og vi må ikke tillade disse moderne, mørke kræfter at opnå deres mål.«

Dernæst tog han sig af Tyrkiet.

»Vi ved, hvem der propper sine lommer i Tyrkiet og lader terrorister få fremgang af salget af den olie, de stjal i Syrien. Terroristerne bruger disse indkomster til at rekruttere lejesoldater, købe våben og planlægge inhumane terrorangreb mod russiske borgere, og imod borgere i Frankrig, Libanon, Mali og andre stater. Vi husker, at de militante kæmpere i Nordkaukasus i 1990'erne og 2000'erne fandt et fristed og fik moralsk og materiel hjælp i Tyrkiet. Der kan vi stadig finde dem.«

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at uighur-terroristerne fra et tyrkisktalende mindretal i det vestlige Kina, der beviseligt støttes i deres terrorisme af Erdogans aktuelle regering i Tyrkiet, vækker Ruslands særlige bekymring, som de naturligvis også vækker kinesernes bekymring.

»Vi vil aldrig glemme deres hemmelige og svigagtige aftale med terrorister«, sagde Putin. »Vi har altid bedømt forræderi til at være den værste og mest skamfulde ting, man kan gøre, og det vil aldrig ændre sig. Jeg ønsker, at de skal huske dette – dem i Tyrkiet, der skød vore piloter i ryggen, de hyklere, der forsøgte at retfærdiggøre deres handlinger og dække over terrorister.«

»Jeg forstår ikke engang, hvorfor de gjorde det. Ethvert spørgsmål, de måtte have haft, ethvert problem, enhver uenighed, som vi ikke var vidende om, kunne have været afgjort på en anden måde. Plus, vi var parat til at samarbejde med Tyrkiet omkring alle de mest følsomme spørgsmål, det måtte have; vi var villige til at gå endnu videre, hvor dets

allierede nægtede at gå hen. Kun Allah ved, formoder jeg, hvorfor de gjorde det. Og Allah har sandsynligvis besluttet at straffe den herskende klike i Tyrkiet ved at tage deres hjerne og forstand.«

»Men hvis de forventede en nervøs eller hysterisk reaktion fra os, hvis de ønskede at se os blive en fare for os selv, såvel som for verden, så får de det ikke. De vil ikke få nogen som helst respons, der er beregnet til at være en opvisning, eller selv en umiddelbar, politisk gevinst. Det får de ikke.«

LaRouche sagde, at Putin her peger på Barack Obamas verdensomspændende mordapparat. LaRouche sammenlignede det med det mordapparat, der blev etableret i Frankrig i 1790'erne af Det britiske Imperium, og som gjorde det af med det franske oligarki, og dernæst de fleste af de bedste og mest talentfulde franskmænd. Dette mordapparat fortsatte igennem det 19. århundrede, under Napoleon I's og Napoleon III's imperier. Selv om LaRouche ikke nævnte dette i dag, så omfattede dette mordapparat Frankrigs Vichy-regime under Anden Verdenskrig. Det er årsagen til, at Frankrig stadigvæk i dag er så ødelagt, især efter Charles de Gaulle blev tvunget bort fra præsidentskabet.

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/50864>

**Leder, 3. december 2015:
Obama deployerer for krig,**

mens det 25. forfatningstillæg påkaldes

Præsident Obama fortsætter sin mobilisering for krig med Rusland. NATO planlægger at sende kampfly og antiluftforsvars-missiler til Tyrkiet – med Rusland som eneste mål for sådanne offensive våben – med USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carter, der tirsdag meddelte deployeringen af 200 amerikanske jagt-og-dræb specialstyrker til Irak for at finde og dræbe ISIS-ledere i både Irak og Syrien. Ikke »rådgivere« og »uddannelsesofficerer«, men dræberteams. Selv Irak reagerede imod den gale dræber, med premierminister al-Abdi, der til pressen sagde, at Irak har brug for uddannelse, våben og rådgivning fra det internationale samfund, »ikke udenlandske kamptropper på jorden, der kæmper på irakisk jord«. Han tilføjede, at en sådan deployering »ikke kan ske uden [regeringens] godkendelse, fuld koordinering og fuld respekt for Iraks suverænitet«.

Flere amerikanske aviser havde i dag udgivet opfordringer til at tage det 25. forfatningstillæg i anvendelse som nødvendigt middel til at fjerne Obama fra embedet med den begrundelse, at han ikke længere er mentalt skikket til at udføre sine pligter. Lyndon LaRouche har gentagne gange krævet, at dette forfatningstillæg omgående blev taget i anvendelse, før det lykkes Obama at lancere en menneskelig udslettelseskrig.

Obamas optræden på Klimaforandringskonferencen i Paris var så usammenhængende, at selv en af hans faste tilhængere, reporter Richard Cohen fra *Washington Post*, skrev en spalte med overskriften, »Obama, en præsident, der mistede sin stemme« og sagde, at »hans veltalenhed var blevet erstattet af arrigskab, og han har mistet evnen til at overtale« og at »hans problem er, at han ofte ikke har noget at sige«.

Journalisten Mark Whittington fra *examiner.com* responderede

imidlertid: »Har Barack Obama mistet sin stemme, eller har han mistet forstanden?« Han fortsatte: »I mangel af en rigsretssag kan vicepræsident Biden måske sammenkalde regeringen, påkalde det 25. forfatningstillæg og erklære præsident Obama mentalt uegnet til at sidde rest af sin embedsperiode ud.«

LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at det var Vladimir Putin, der satte denne dynamik i gang med sin tale til FN's Generalforsamling[1] i september, da han roligt, men bestemt, fremlagde Obamaregeringens kriminelle handlinger, hvor de rev FN's Charter i stykker, lancerede ulovlige krige, gennemtvang regimeskift og udførte dronedrab i hele verden. Det internationale publikum var frastødt af sandheden om Obamas handlinger, og siden da har Obama selv været ude om det.

Frygten for Obama er det eneste, der holder det amerikanske folk, så vel som ledere i hele verden, tilbage fra at sige sandheden og kræve, at han fjernes, og at USA og Europa i stedet går sammen med Rusland, Kina og BRIKS-nationerne om at opbygge verden gennem processen med den Nye Silkevej, som det eneste middel til at standse Bush-Obama-politikken med overlagte, evindelige krige. Som Franklin Roosevelt sagde, stedt over for truslen om fascisme: »Vi har intet at frygte, ud over selve frygten«.[2]

[1] Præsident Putins fulde tale i FN, video, engelsk voice over.

[2] FDR's første indsættelsestale, dansk.

Leder, 2. december 2015:

Hvad er rådet til den kriseramte verden i dag? Lær af Brunelleschi!

Rådet til den kriseramte verden i dag? 'Lær af Brunelleschi!' Det var det råd, som Lyndon LaRouche gav i går, da han udlagde Brunelleschis opdagelser, der på ingen måde var en fortsættelse af den tidligere erfaring og tankegang, men var kreative gennembrud af Brunelleschi, både mht. princip og anvendelse. Historien markeres af »opdagelsesperioder«, adskilt af perioder med degeneration, sagde LaRouche. Forstå dette, for at forstå, hvor dødbringende det nuværende øjeblik er, og søg at opnå den intellektuelle og karaktermæssige kvalitet, der kræves for at standse »dårlig historie under skabelse«, og for at skabe fremtiden. Historien er ikke noget, der 'sker for én'; man skaber den.

Lige nu kræver fremtiden, at Obama kommer væk. Der er ingen fremtid, hvis han bliver. Den trussel, der kommer fra ham, kan ikke formildes gennem reform, forhandling eller ønsketænkning.

I går konfronterede et kongresmedlem, Tulsi Gabbard (D-Hawaii), Obamas to top-forsvarsregeringsfolk med sandheden om Obamas politik i Syrien, der truer med altomfattende atomkrig. I en omfattende høring i Husets Komite for de Bevæbnede Styrker begyndte Gabbard sine kommentarer til forsvarsminister Ash Carter og formand for Generalstabscheferne Joseph Dunford således: »Eftersom vores politik med at vælte Assads syriske regering grundlæggende set har bragt os til en frontal konflikt med Rusland, har jeg nogle vigtige spørgsmål at stille om dette emne.

»Hvor mange atomspræghoveder har Rusland rettet mod USA, og hvor mange har USA, rettet mod Rusland?« Forsvarsminister Carter undveg og svarede, at han ville tilsende hende svaret

på skrift. Gabbard fortsatte: »Godt. Og det ville være korrekt at sige, at begge vore lande har evnen til at affyre disse atomvåben inden for få minutter?« Carter svarede, »Det er det«: dernæst fortsatte Gabbard med sine spørgsmål, der trak detaljerne om Syrien skarpt frem, med Obamas anti-russiske politik, der nu udgør en umiddelbar, potentiel fare for et atomholocaust.

Samtidig med, at Gabbard konfronterede Kongressen med Obamas vanvid, begyndte NATO sit todages ministermøde i Bruxelles, hvor dets London/Obama-dagsorden er at inkludere en forpligtelse til at sende mere luftforsvarsstøtte til Tyrkiet. Det kommer oven i de amerikanske F-15 fly, der allerede afpatruljerer den tyrkisk-syriske grænse. Som Gabbard sagde til Obamas regeringsfolk under høringen i går: i betragtning af, at ISIS *»ikke har nogen luftvåbensaktiver, kan jeg blot antage, at disse fly har russiske fly som deres mål ... «* (fremhævet af red.)

Det ligger ikke i den nuværende, degraderede 'amerikanske personlighed' let at fatte faren og finde modet til at handle. Men det er vores udfordring. Skab fremtiden!

Forslag til fordybelse: Redaktionen anbefaler:

»Skab en Ny Renæssance«, hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche ved Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris, juni 2015

»Ny renæssance eller Tredje Verdenskrig? Valget der dit!«, hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, april 2014,

Hongkong-professor: Obama truer Kina med atomkrig

30. november 2015 – Zhang Baohui, en professor i statskundskab og direktør for Centret for Studier af det Asiatiske Stillehavsområde ved Lingnan Universitet i Hongkong, og som i omfattende mål har skrevet om Kinas atomkapaciteter, udstedte en kraftig advarsel til Obama om, at denne fremprovokerer en konflikt, der hurtigt kunne blive til en atomkrig.

I en artikel i *RSIS Commentary South China Sea Series Nov. 12*, skriver Zhang, at, da Obama sendte et amerikansk krigsskib inden for 12-milegrænsen omkring Kinas nyligt konstruerede øer i det Sydkinesiske Hav den 27. okt., »tog Kina denne gang ikke skridt til konkret handling for at konfrontere det amerikanske krigsskib, men sådanne fremtidige operationer kunne alvorligt destabilisere situationen i det Sydkinesiske Hav og endda freden og stabiliteten i hele regionen. De kunne igangsætte en utilsigtet optrapning og forcere de to lande hen imod en militær konflikt. Tankegangen er ganske indlysende.

»Yderligere handlinger fra den amerikanske flådes side vil trænge det kinesiske lederskab op i en krig og tvinge det til at respondere på opfattede provokationer mod landets nationale interesser og magtanseelse. Til syvende og sidst udgør det Sydkinesiske Hav en væsentlig del af Kinas geostrategiske interesser ... Desuden kunne Kina føle, at det var nødvendigt at stå fast for at afskrække en fremtidig optrapning af de amerikanske udfordringer over for landets interesser og anseelse.«

Zhang citerer både viceadmiral Yi Xiaoguang, der er vicestabschef i Folkets Befrielseshær (PLA), og som sagde, at

Kina »vil tage alle nødvendige midler i anvendelse for at forsvare sin suverænitet«, hvis USA udfører lignende handlinger, og også general Fan Changlong, vicepræsident for Kinas kommunistiske partis (CCP) Centrale Militærkommission, der til kommandør for USA's Stillehavskommando (PACOM), admiral Harry Harris, sagde, at alle fremtidige aktioner fra den amerikanske flådes side kunne udløse utilsigtede optrapninger, der skader begge landes interesser.

Kineserne har sidenhen udvidet sine militærøvelser i regionen og offentliggjort fotos af søbaserede strategiske missiler, der bæres på deres atomubåde, og som »har til hensigt at afskrække USA«, siger Zhang.

Under kapitel titlen »Defekt amerikansk opfattelse« advarer Zhang: »Diverse kinesisk retorik og forholdsregler indikerer, at Kina kunne ty til mere konkrete og magtfulde forholdsregler for at konfrontere den amerikanske flåde. I så tilfælde vil en konfrontation mellem de to flåder blive uundgåelig. Hvad der er endnu værre, så kunne konfrontationen udløse en optrapning mod militære konflikter.

Det amerikanske militær synes imidlertid at være intetanende om dette scenario ... Det er i høj grad sandsynligt, at amerikanske beslutningstagere antager, at Kina ville indtage en politik for ikke-handling, når konfronteret med indtrængende amerikanske flådefartøjer. Denne amerikanske forventning er defekt, eftersom Kina er en atomstormagt. Når de trænges op i en krog, kan stater med atomvåben true med en asymmetrisk optrapning for at afskrække en modstander fra at skade deres nøgleinteresser. Militærparaden i Beijing den 3. september afslørede, at Kinas nye generation af taktiske missiler, såsom DF-26, kan armeres med atomsprænghoveder. Nylig information indikerer også, at Kinas luftlancerede langtrækkende krydsermissiler ligeledes kan armeres med taktiske atomsprænghoveder. Faktisk kunne de seneste fotos af JL-2 søbaserede atommissiler, der affyres fra havet, være et gedulgt atomsignal, som Kina sender for at afskrække USA.«

Zhang bemærker, at, alt imens det Sydkinesiske Hav tydeligvis er en del af Kinas kerneinteresser, så gælder dette ikke for USA. »Når en krisesituation eskaleres og begynder at involvere potentielle atomare scenarier«, skriver han, »står USA over for det barske valg, at de enten er de første til at trække sig tilbage, eller også står over for at kæmpe mod et atombevæbnet Kina. Ingen af disse muligheder er attraktiv, og begge kræver høje omkostninger, enten for anseelse eller i menneskeliv, for USA.«

»Det vil derfor være uklogt af USA at udfordre Kina. Ved at undervurdere Beijings faste forsæt om at forsvare sine interesser, omdømme og evne til at afskrække, kunne denne plan igangsætte en eskalerende spiral, der sluttelig ville skade amerikanske interesser.«

Han konkluderer, at begge sider må overveje 'worst case scenarios' – de værst tænkelige scenarier.[1] »Det er bydende nødvendigt, at både Kina og USA overvejer, hvordan deres handlinger kunne medføre utilsigtede konsekvenser, isæt en utilsigtet optrapning mod en militær konflikt ... Der er ingen, især ikke lande i regionen, der ønsker dette scenarie.«

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at denne analyse er »fuldstændig korrekt«, bortset fra, at en sådan konsekvens ikke ville være »utilsigtet« fra Obamas side; det er hans plan at tvinge Kina og Rusland til et tilbagetog, eller også gå i krig.

[1] Se video fra LaRouchePAC: »Ingen overlevende«, danske undertekster.

En mørk, grusom, men helt igennem sandfærdig afbildning af truslen om en termonuklear krig og konsekvenserne, og Obamas deployering af hovedparten af USA's termonukleare kapacitet i flere områder, som truer både Rusland og Kina.