

Amerikansk missilforsvar kan ikke standse russiske interkontinentale ballistiske missiler, siger russisk kommandør

17. december 2015 – Generaløjtnant Sergei Karakaev, kommandør over Ruslands Strategiske Missilforsvarsstyrker, sagde til reportere under en pressekonference i Moskva i går, at det amerikanske missilforsvarssystem ikke er i stand til at modstå et massivt angreb fra russiske interkontinentale, ballistiske atommissiler. Russiske militæreksperters analyser har fundet, at »at hverken ildkraftpotentialiet eller databehandlingsevnen hos de nuværende, deployerede amerikanske missilforsvarsinstallationer«, var i stand til at klare et masseangreb fra den russiske atom-triade, sagde han.

Ifølge RT påpegede Karakaev amerikanske eksperters vurderinger, der mener, at et effektivt missilforsvarssystem må bestå af forskellige integrerede typer af midler til at forhindre missiler (et »forsvar i flere tempi«, (amr. 'layered defense'), som det kaldes i det amerikanske militær, -red.), det være sig kinetiske eller lasersystemer, der deployeres i alle omgivelser, inklusive i rummet. Derfor er de langfristede udviklingsplaner for Ruslands Strategiske Missiltropper blevet rettet til at tage det forudsagte omfang og tempo for den amerikanske udvikling af missilforsvar i betragtning, sagde generalen.

De Strategiske Missiltropper har planer om at introducere nogle »splinternye og effektive midler og teknikker til at gennemtrænge ethvert missilforsvarssystem«, sagde general Karakaev og understregede, at russiske ballistiske missiler er

i stand til at ramme mål »hvor som helst i verden«. Den næste generation af ballistiske misiler med banebrydende karakteristika, og med nye midler til at gennemtrænge missilforsvarssystemer, ville »garantere neutraliseringen af de fremvoksende, potentielle trusler«, sagde Karakaev.

<https://www.rt.com/news/326121-us-missile-shield-russian-icbm/>

Foto: Et RS-24 Yars / SS-27 Mod 2 solid propellant interkontinentalt ballistisk missil.

IMF 'indrømmer', de tog fejl med den græske bailout – Men de var nødt til at redde de europæiske banker

17. december 2015 – Længe efter det brutale overgreb siger folkemordets teknikere fra Den internationale Valutafond (IMF), at de måske begik en fejl, og at der burde have været en gældsafskrivning for Grækenland i begyndelsen af krisen. Men de hævder, at de ikke havde noget andet valg end at forhindre »smitte« i hele Eurozonen. De siger naturligvis intet om den brutale nedskæringspolitik, der havde ødelagt økonomien, og om, at de stadig i dag kræver mere af denne

'nøjsomhedspolitik'.

Den såkaldte »Gennemgang af Kriseprogrammet«, der angiveligt skulle vurdere, om IMF har håndteret de forskellige finanskriser, inklusive Grækenlands og Eurozonens, udtaler: »Bekymring for smitte udgjorde en afgørende overvejelse i beslutningerne om gældsstrukturering i programmerne for Euro-området. For Grækenlands vedkommende (2010) kunne Fonden ikke vurdere denne gæld til at være overvejende sandsynligt erholdelig, en vurdering, der normalt er nødvendig for at opnå exceptionel adgang til Fondens ressourcer.«

De indrømmer ikke desto mindre, at, når det drejer sig om at redde »systemet«, så kan alt, efter deres mening, retfærdiggøres: »Risikoen for en international, systemisk smitte, i betragtning af de manglende brandmure på det tidspunkt, til at isolere andre medlemmer af Euro-området, leverede imidlertid en retfærdiggørelse af ikke at kræve en direkte gældssanering som en betingelse for et arrangement med Fonden for at få exceptionel adgang.« Man tilføjede derfor en klausul om »systemisk undtagelse«, som muliggjorde den enorme bailout, som enhver ved sin fornufts fulde fem kunne se var uerholdelig, »til den exceptionelle adgangspolitik, og en sådan blev efterfølgende påkaldt også for Irland (2010), Portugal (2011) og igen i Grækenlands efterfølgende arrangement i 2012.«

Eftersom nogle er mere lige end andre, skriver de, at denne klausul ikke blev anvendt nogen steder uden for Eurozonen, fordi »smitte ikke sås at udgøre en tilstrækkelig stor bekymring«.

De indrømmer, at 'hårklipningen' af den græske gæld i 2012 – det vil sige, at den gamle gæld stadig forfaldt – var »stor målt efter standarden for de andre tilfælde af umiddelbart forestående betalingsstandsning, selv om den var utilstrækkelig til at genoprette gældens erholdelighed med nogen grad af sandsynlighed.« Rapportens forfattere siger

ikke, at denne hårklipning stort set blot drev de græske banker, samt statens sundhedssystem og pensionsfonde, bankerot, og ikke de udenlandske investorer, der havde en 'opsigelsesklausul'.

De fortsætter med at skrive, at »det at holde gældssaneringen tilbage« ved hjælp af den »systemiske undtagelse« i realiteten ikke genoprettede »tilliden til markedet«, men at dette først skete, efter at Mario Draghi, præsidenten for Den europæiske Centralbank, ECB, meddelte, at han ville gøre »hvad som helst« for at redde euroen.

De indrømmer også, at de bailout-programmer, der blev indført under regeringerne Papandreou (2010) og Papademos (2012), havde til formål at skabe en intern devaluering ved at nedskære lønningernes nominelle værdi, »reformere« det kollektive lønforhandlingssystem, fremme privatiseringer, reducere bureaukrati og opmuntre til konkurrence. De nævner selvfølgelig intetsteds, at dette fik økonomien til at kollapse med uhørte 30-35 % og skabte en officiel arbejdsløshed på over 27 %, mens den virkelige arbejdsløshed var på 40 % og ungdomsarbejdsløsheden 65 %.

Foto: Hele familier er stødt ud i den totale forarmelse, for en stor dels vedkommende som følge af arbejdsløshed. Her venter et barn i kø på uddeling af fødevarer, etableret af den græsk-ortodokse kirke i Athen.

Bail-in obligationer for 30 mia. euro er blevet solgt

til fuppede detailkunder i Italien

17. december 2015 – Sidste år, da man diskuterede bail-in-regulering, og denne blev vedtaget som en EU-lov, begyndte banker at udstede de såkaldte »bail-in-obligationer«, dvs. obligationer, der ikke ville være beskyttede i tilfælde af bail-in (dvs. ekspropriering af kundeindeståender/inds kud til gældsreduktion i kriseramte banker, -red.). Hvem ville være dum nok til at købe sådanne værdipapirer?

Det står nu klart, at disse obligationer blev skræddersyet til at blive solgt til detailkunder som »sikrede« investeringer, som tilfældet i Italien viser. Italienske banker har udstedt for omkring 60 mia. euro i opgraderede obligationer (bail-in-obligationer), af hvilke halvdelen blev solgt til detailkunder. De fleste af disse kunder er blevet snydt mht. disse obligationers risikoprofil, som det nu er ved at komme frem i tilfældet med de fire kriseramte, italienske banker, der er blevet underkastet bail-in.[1]

[1] Se: EU's Nye regler for kriseramte banker dræber

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17. december 2015:
Et finans kollaps større end

2008 er allerede i gang

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

EU's nye regler for kriseramte banker dræber

15. december 2015 – En 68-årig italiensk pensionists selvmord i byen Civitavecchia, efter at han mistede hele sin opsparing gennem sin banks reduktion af gæld gennem bail-in (ekspropriering af kundernes indeståender), har rystet det italienske folk. Det har sat fokus på de brutale, nye EU-regler ved kriseramte banker, som træder i kraft i alle medlemslande den 1. januar 2016. Pensionistens bank var en af fire mindre, italienske banker, der havnede i krise og blev »rekonstrueret« af regeringen den 22. november 2015. Flere end 100.000 bankkunder mistede deres opsparing.

Italienernes ophidselse steg til kogepunktet, da det kom frem, at, mens almindelige bankkunder mistede deres livsopsparing, så fik store långivere og aktieejere forvarsel og kunne afvikle deres poster, der i visse tilfælde løb op i millioner.

Fra den 1. januar 2016 er alle EU-lande tvunget til at tilpasse sig de nye regler for bankrekonstruktion, indbefattet reduktion af bankens gæld (bail-in), for banker, der rammes af krise.

Reduktion af gæld er den bureaukratiske term for tyveri af bankkundernes midler. Men, som i tilfældet med rekonstruktionen af de fire, små italienske banker, der kun delvist tog de kundeindeståender, som EU-reglementet tillader,

er dette et tveægget sværd. Denne bankredningsmetode kan snarere kæntré banksystemet end hjælpe det. Det var også, hvad LaRouche-bevægelsen og mange andre sagde, da Den europæiske Centralbank (ECB) og EU-kommissionen kom med forslaget til bankrekonstruktion. Vi advarede om, at det ville give bagslag og skabe større ustabilitet, da det ville sprede panik blandt bankkunderne, der ville løbe storm på bankerne ved det mindste tegn på krise og trække deres penge ud.

I tilfældet med de fire mindre, italienske banker, Banca Etruria, Banca Marche, Carichiati (Sparekassen Chieti) og Carife (Sparekassen Ferrara), blev bankrekonstruktionen gennemført ved en regeringsbeslutning. Dette hastværk viser, at regeringen forsøgte at få det afklaret før 1. januar, for at undgå at være tvunget til at anvende EU's nye reglement til reduktion af bankgælden. Regeringen kunne derfor gennemføre en delvis gældsreduktion. Indeståender på bankkonti blev ikke rørt, men aktier og obligationer i bankerne blev inddraget. Ca. 100.000 ejere af opprioriterede obligationer (subordinate bonds) med høj risiko, men også et højt afkast, mistede alle deres penge op til 750.000 euro. De fire banker vil blive likvideret og opdelt i fire brobanker og en 'dårlig bank' (en 'rygsæk' for dårlige lån). Bankredningen (bail-in) er på 3,5 mia. euro, der vil blive betalt af en bankhjælpefond, som er en indskudsgarantifond, der ejes af banksystemet.

Men denne indskudsgarantifond har ikke penge nok. Derfor skal tre storbanker, Unicredit, Intesa og UBI, stille op med penge, mod at regeringen giver de tre banker skattelettelser på i alt to mia. euro. Dette er blevet afsløret af forbrugerorganisationen Adusbef og betyder, at det er skatteborgerne og bankkunderne, der skal betale regningen.

De mennesker, der har investeret i de opprioriterede obligationer, var ikke ordentligt informeret og var ikke klar over, at deres værdipapirer var ligestillet med bankaktierne, og derfor omfattet af en gældsreduktion. Da det dernæst kom frem, at de større fisk gik fri, så vendte raseriet sig ikke

alene mod bankerne, men også mod regeringen, der ledes af Matteo Renzi. Han blev endnu mere presset, da det desuden kom frem, at både hans minister Elena Maria Boschi og hans egen familie har nære bånd til ledelsen af en af de fire kriseramte banker.

Regeringen er nu blevet tvunget til at støtte oprettelsen af en parlamentarisk undersøgelse, som er velkommen, hvis den får en uvildig formand. Det, der er påkrævet, er en dristig og uråd formand som Ferdinand Pecora, New Yorker-advokaten af italiensk herkomst, der var leder af den berømte amerikanske Senatskomité i 1933, som afslørede de mægtigste banker på Wall Street og banede vejen for Franklin Roosevelts finansreformer og genopbygningsprogrammet New Deal.[1] På lignende vis skulle den italienske undersøgelse kunne afsløre, hvordan bankerne har narret deres kunder, men også, hvordan de fire kriseramte banker er blevet lavet om til kasinoer og er gået konkurs. En sådan undersøgelse bør bevirke, at der genindføres regler for god bankpraksis og indskydergaranti gennem en bankopdelingslov (Glass-Steagall). Dette spørgsmål har i mange år ligget på bordet, hvor LaRouche-bevægelsen har ført en kampagne for bankopdeling[2] og direkte og indirekte har påvirket det italienske parlament, der har to kamre, således, at der nu foreligger seks (!) forskellige indstillinger til lovforslag om at indføre en bankopdeling.

Blandt initiativtagerne til disse lovforslag har både Marco Zanni og Alessandro Di Battista fra Femstjernebevægelsen i løbet af de seneste dage udtalt sig med krav om, at bankopdelingen nu må gennemføres for at beskytte bankkunderne! Zanni, der er medlem af Europaparlamentet, sagde her den 9. december, at forslaget om at indføre »en moderne Glass/Steagall-lov med en ren og tvungen opdeling af bankerne i traditionel lånevirksomhed (kommerciel bankvirksomhed) og så spekulativ investeringsbankaktivitet« nu er nødvendig for at »undgå en ny systemkrise«.

Alessandro Di Battista, medlem af parlamentet, genlancerede

spørgsmålet om en bankopdeling i et TV-interview den 10. december:

– Lad os én gang for alle, sagde han, udskille kommercielle banker fra investeringsbanker, så en medborger kan vide, at, når han sætter penge ind i en bank, så er denne bank ikke indblandet i spekulationsvirksomhed, spiller ikke på aktiemarkedene, men blot udsteder lån og bedriver normal bankvirksomhed.

Ovenstående artikel er skrevet af Ulf Sandmark, LaRouche-rörelsen i Sverige.

[1] Se 16. sep. 2015: »Wall Street er bankerot, og Obama gennemtvinger ved magt et termonukleart Armageddon. Foregrib! FDR's Første 100 Dage«
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=8147> Artiklen indeholder mange henvisninger til andre artikler på dansk.

[2] Se: Lyndon LaRouche: Fire Nye Love til USA's (og verdens) redning, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=1460>

**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 »jungkældskollaps« 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 junkbondkrak« 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.

Årtiers budgetnedskæringer har udhulet det tyske sundhedssystem

14. december 2015 – Nemesis kunne snart slå til, som en konsekvens af årtiers omkostningsreduktion og endda fjernelse af vitale funktioner i den tyske sundhedssektor. Hidtil er større epidemier og pandemier lykkeligvis blevet undgået, men Ebola-tilfældet tidligere på året afslørede på drastisk vis den kendsgerning, at Tyskland ikke er velforberedt til sådanne udfordringer, og at sammenbrud af sundhedssystemer i andre dele af verden med lethed også kan destabilisere det tyske system.

Der er f.eks. den kendsgerning, at af de 1 million flygtninge, der er kommet til Tyskland i år, har de fleste ikke haft noget, man kan kalde »lægebehandling« i uger, måneder eller endnu længere. Mange kommer fra egne, hvor der ikke findes sådan noget som et sundhedssystem. Hver eneste af dem burde få et lægeligt kontroleftersyn og blive vaccineret imod i det mindste nogle infektionssygdomme, som mæslinger, røde hunde, difteri, kighoste, tuberkulose, polio og deslige, efter de er ankommet til Tyskland, men man har ikke haft midlerne til dette, eller blot det nødvendige sundhedspersonale til at give vaccinationerne, og heller ikke det nødvendige engagement til at forbedre tingene. Problemet er ekspederet videre til de kronisk underbudgetterede kommuner, hvor flygtninge flyttes hen fra de indledende lejre, der hører under staten. I flere byer har læger tilbudt at springe til som frivillige og give flygtningene vaccinationer, hvis myndighederne ikke vil sørge for vaccinerne, som man ikke har gjort, med undtagelse af Bayern, der for nylig er begyndt at gøre det.

Som allerede antydte, så kan ikke engang tyske borgere være sikre på at få en vaccination, hvis de har presserende behov for det. Af hensyn til reduktion af omkostninger er reserverne af ekstra vaccine ikke, hvad de burde være. Og i tilfældet med Ebola, der kræver særdeles intensiv pleje, havde Tyskland kun kapacitet til at behandle maksimalt 100-120 patienter. Vaccinationer mod visse sygdomme er i løbet af de seneste årtier blevet udfaset, fordi de politiske beslutningstagere mente, at disse sygdomme simpelt hen var forsvundet. Men mæslinger dukkede op i Berlin tidligere på året, da sygdommen brød ud i et herberg for flygtninge; der blev ikke i tide indført karantæneforholdsregler, hvilket gjorde det muligt for sygdommen at spredes til befolkningen uden for flygtningene. I dette tilfælde forekom der ikke nogen stor katastrofe; næste gang kan det blive vanskeligt.

Foto: Tyske hospitaler kæmper for at klare den ekstra byrde fra de mange flygtninge.

Diskussion med Lyndon LaRouche 10. december 2015: Tiden er inde til at få både Demokrater og Republikanere, der endnu har deres forstand

i behold, til at handle

Og det, vi i dag har med at gøre, pavens og den britiske kongefamilies grønne politik, deres økonomiske politik, vil resultere i, at størstedelen af menneskeheden uddør og efter kort tid vil det kun være en lille del, der er tilbage og kan overleve.

Så man må betragte disse sager fra en bredere vinkel frem for blot at begrænse sig til visse enkeltsager, som man ønsker at tage op som enkeltsager. Vi bliver nødt til at tage de store spørgsmål op. Og det er det, som folk er bange for. Jeg er ikke bange for de store spørgsmål. Når folk bliver intelligente, bliver de villige til at opgive enkeltsagerne og tage de store spørgsmål op, som er altafgørende for menneskehedens nutid og fremtid.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**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.

General Flynn kalder San Bernardino for et angreb fra ISIS; siger, at Obama tager fejl med hensyn til inddæmning af ISIS

12. december 2015 – Under konferencen i sidste uge i forbindelse med RT's 10-års jubilæum i Moskva, foretog RT-korrespondent Sophie Shevernadze et live-interview med gen. Michael Flynn, forhenværende chef for det amerikanske forsvars efterretningstjeneste (Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA), og en skarp kritiker af præsident Obamas overlagte, hemmelige aftaler med islamistiske terrorister, gennem ulovlige overførsler af våben fra Benghazi i Libyen til jihadistoprørere i Syrien. På grund af sine præcise efterretningsbriefinger og sin villighed til at modsætte sig nogle af de mest katastrofale udslag af præsident Obamas politik blev gen. Flynn i 2014 fyret fra sin post.

Shevernadzets interview med gen. Flynn er slået op på hendes webside, både som video og som udskrift.

Her følger nogle af de vigtigste uddrag af den vidtrækkende dialog, der er centreret omkring gen. Flynns karakteristik af ISIS som fjende nummer et, både for Rusland og USA, og hans skarpe kritik af præsident Obamas påståede successer i krigen mod Islamisk Stat.

Sophie Sheverdnadze: Efter hvad jeg forstår, ønsker vi alle ISIS besejret, ikke sandt, det er vores største interesse, dette er en fælles trussel, som vi er oppe imod, vi befinder os i en lang kamp hen over flere generationer imod

fundamentalistisk islam, så – tyrkiske forbindelse til ISIS og til oliehandlen med terrorgruppen har været kendt, og har været et problem længe før alt dette her med Rusland skete. Så mit spørgsmål er, kan vi overhovedet forvente, at Tyrkiet, der i nogen grad er en allieret, vil kæmpe mod ISIS, når landet profiterer af dem?

Michael Flynn: Ja, jeg tror, der er mange mennesker, der profiterer på ISIS. Jeg mener, at vi for det første kollektivt må – i fællesskab klart må definere, hvem fjenden, vi er oppe imod, er. Vi må klart definere vores fjende. Dette er en kræftform inden for den islamiske religion, folk har tendens til at bruge udtrykket radikale islamister, og jeg mener, at det er en god definition. Jeg har hørt et ord på arabisk, 'fa'hish', hvilket betyder 'mere end foragtelig', og jeg mener, at det er et endnu bedre ord end det andet, vi ser, dette andet ord, der bruges – Daesh. Dette er en fjende, der er udsprunget fra denne region, fra Mellemøsten, og den er nu spredt geografisk, spredt geografisk her i Rusland og spredt geografisk i Europa, og helt bestemt i USA. Vi har set alle disse forskellige angreb for nylig. Rusland havde sine egne problemer i 2001, i teatret i Moskva, i Nordossetien i 2004, hvor den samme ideologi dræbte børn. Jeg mener, dette nylige angreb i Californien, det var imod en social serviceorganisation; jeg mener, det er bare utroligt.

SS: Præsident Obama synes at mene, at han har inddæmmet ISIS.

MF: Ja, jeg ved, at han har sagt det, og jeg er uenig i det. Jeg er absolut uenig i det. Jeg er uenig i forbindelse med, hvordan vi har sagt, at vores strategi virker eller ikke virker. Jeg mener, at USA må indtage en større lederrolle. Et at de store spørgsmål, Sophie, – og jeg mener, dette er vigtigt for denne lytterskare – er, at for et år siden, før Rusland besluttede, før præsident Putin besluttede at tage de skridt, han tog i Syren, var situationen fundamentalt en anden. Der var muligheder, med nogle af os, der virkelig pressede vores regering til at gøre mere, ikke blot militært,

men med at ændre hele det økonomiske system, der eksisterer i Mellempøsten, og det kan jeg sige noget om, hvis du ønsker det. Men da Rusland pludselig dukker op på det mellemøstlige fodboldstadion, om du vil, så bringer Rusland sig selv i spil, og det ændrer fundamentalt dynamikken i dette særdeles geostrategiske spil, som vi befinder os i lige nu. Det er ikke et spil, det er meget virkeligt. Rent taktisk skal man huske på, at dette en fjende, der ikke har jetfly og droner, missiler og alle disse skibe, dette er en fjende, der bliver angrebet med bomber fra himlen – med droner eller jetfly, artilleri – og hvordan går de så til modangreb? De dukker op midt i Paris, midt i Moskva, de dukker op på steder som San Bernardino – det er sådan, de går til modangreb. Så når vi tænker på krigsførelse, og vi tænker på slagmarken, så er det ikke bare en direkte mand-til-mand konfrontation et sted som Raqqa eller Mosul, eller i Fallujah i Irak og Syrien. Dette er en global strid, og denne fjende har besluttet at slå tilbage på den måde, at de indgyder frygt – dette er en terrorbevægelse, det er ikke en bølge-bevægelse, det er ikke en kult, det er ikke en kriminell organisation. Det er en terrorist-organisation, der bygger på en meget radikal form for islamisme.

<https://www.rt.com/shows/sophieco/325569-strategy-isis-terrorism-attacks/>

General Gerasimov: Det russiske militær udvikler sig

fortsat

som reaktion på truslerne, som Rusland står overfor

14. december, 2015 – Den russiske generalstabschef, general Valeriy Gerasimov, afgav en længere rapport om det russiske militær til forsvars-attachéer i Moskva i morges. "Tilspidsning af globale og regionale sikkerhedsproblemer karakteriserer situationen i verden nu til dags. Det hænger først og fremmest sammen med udvidelsen af den internationale terrorisme og radikale ekstremisme", lagde han ud med at sige. "For det første giver NATO's uvenskabelige militærpolitik over for Rusland anledning til bekymring. Alliancen udvider sin militære tilstedeværelse og forstærker sine væbnede styrkers aktivitet langs den Russiske Føderations grænser." Med deployering af et ballistisk missilforsvar og udvikling af nye krigsvåben", sagde han, "forværres problemet med ubalancen i de strategiske styrker."

Andre trusler inkluderer farvede revolutioner (han brugte ikke dette udtryk, men det fremgik klart af hans beskrivelse, at det var det, han talte om) til at omvælte regeringer, spredning af masseødelæggelsesvåben; forbrydelser og narkotikahandel hen over grænser; separatisme; og ukontrolleret folkevandring samt fremmedhad. "Kombinationen af disse årsager og tilstedeværelsen af en dybt rodfæstet, mellemstatslig spænding skaber en trussel om optrapning af nye og aktuelle konflikter. Desværre bare stiger og stiger antallet af sådanne konflikter", sagde han. "En forening af hele verdenssamfundets bestræbelser imod de fælles udfordringer og trusler, først og fremmest international terrorisme, er en tiltagende oplagt nødvendighed."

Med hensyn til Syrien er Rusland i færd med at smede relationer til mange lande over denne konflikt. "Så meget

desto mere, som den moderne historie udviser eksempler på succesfuldt samarbejde mellem de vestlige lande og den Russiske Føderation. Heriblandt fælles aktiviteter under den Internationale Styrkes Sikkerhedsassistances operation i Afghanistan, løsning af problemet med kemiske våben i Syrien, styrkelse af drøftelser om "Irans atomprogram", undertegning og implementering af "Minskaftalerne" og kampen mod pirater i området ud for Afrikas Horn", sagde Gerasimov. "Under disse omstændigheder udgør de russiske væbnede styrker statens hovedinstrument i tilvejebringelse af sikkerhed i enhver situation, såvel som i løsningen af opgaver under militærkonflikter af forskellig intensitet."

Meget af den resterende del af rapporten var helliget det russiske militærs moderniseringsbestræbelser, som er ganske store inden for områderne bemanning samt uddannelse og udstyr. Af største betydning var Gerasimovs understregning af moderniseringen af Ruslands atom-afskrækkelsesvåben, der, sagde han, vil blive udviklet "til at opretholde de offensive og strategisk defensive styrker på et niveau, der vil levere den garanterede afskrækkelse af aggression rettet mod den Russiske Føderation og dens allierede." Andre områder, som Gerasimov rapporterede om, var fremskridt mht. fornyelse af udstyret i de militære tjenester hen imod målsætningen om 70 % 's moderne udrustning ved år 2020, og professionaliseringen af tjenesternes mandskab.

Russisk forsvarsminister:

NATO kommer stadig tættere på Rusland

14. december 2015 – Den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu satte, i bemærkninger i Forsvarsministeriet den 11. dec., kød på NATO's militære opbygning rundt om Ruslands periferi. »Alene i løbet af det seneste år har NATO deployeret tretten gange så mange tropper, otte gange så mange militære fly og op til 300 tanks og infanteri-kampkøretøjer til de Baltiske Stater, Polen og Rumænien«, sagde han. Han bemærkede, at NATO aktivt er i færd med at muliggøre de tidligere jugoslaviske republikkers, Georgiens og Ukraines indtræden i 'forsvars'-alliancen og trække Finland, Sverige og Moldova ind i sin sfære. NATO har ligeledes etableret et cybersikkerhedscenter i Estland og et strategisk propagandacenter i Letland. NATO har 200 atombomber i Europa, og disse bomber er i færd med at blive moderniseret, og NATO har 310 fly, der befinder sig i forskellige stadier af beredskab til at kaste disse bomber, bemærkede Shoigu.

Moskvas bekymringer blev leveret direkte til Washingtons nationale sikkerhedsetablisement i løbet af weekenden i form af en kronik i *Defense News*, forfattet af Ruslan Pukhov, direktør for Centret for Analyse af Strategier og Teknologier i Moskva. Pukhov skriver om de fremskridt, som det russiske militær har gjort inden for modernisering af sig selv, konfronteret med sanktioner og andre handlinger fra NATO's side, og de udfordringer, det stadig står overfor, såsom mht. mandskab. »Samtidig har NATO's anti-russiske, aggressive militære aktivitet i Østeuropa, som NATO-landene ikke engang gør sig den ulejlighed at lægge skjul på, hidtil ikke ført til nogen håndgribelige ændringer i Ruslands militære planlægning«, skriver han. »Dette får os til at mene, at Moskva ikke anser en militær storkonfrontation med Vesten for at være en reel mulighed.« I stedet forlader Rusland sig på

sine strategiske atomstyrker for at modgå Vestens militære trussel, en strategi, som han sammenligner med Eisenhowers »New Look« i 1950-erne.

I Syrien, fortsætter Pukhov, er det fortsat uklart, om den russiske militære intervention vil frembringe det ønskede resultat, alt imens den komplicerer Ruslands relationer med USA, Tyrkiet og andre magter. Ud over alt dette søger regimet i Kijev at sabotere Minsk-aftalerne med det formål at tiltrække mere international opmærksomhed og sympati. »I 2016 vil Moskva blive konfronteret med udsigterne til voksende krise på to fronter samtidigt. I begge tilfælde vil opgaven for præsident Putin være at gennemføre en hårfin balancegang mellem at beskytte russiske interesser og forhindre en endnu større konfrontation med Vesten, konkluderer Pukhov.

Foto: 11. december 2015: Præsident Vladimir Putin taler ved Forsvarsministeriets styrelses udvidede møde i Nationalforsvarets Styrelsescenter i Moskva.

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 gribbefondene 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)

Tyske ingeniørtropper uddanner flygtninge til genopbygning af Syrien

11. december 2015 – Med det Tyske Udenrigsministerium som medsponsor er Technisches Hilfswerk (THW) begyndt at rekruttere syriske flygtninge til at uddanne og ansætte dem til civil beskyttelse og katastrofehjælp både i og uden for Tyskland, i tilfælde af oversvømmelser, jordskælv og lignende.

Et hundrede lokale enheder fra THW deltager i programmet, der

går ud på at finde 1.000 flygtninge, der er interesseret i et sådant program. En fordel ved THW-initiativet er, at der ikke kræves tysk statsborgerskab og heller ikke, at man behersker det tyske sprog, for at en syrer kan blive ansat. THW-specialprogrammet er designet til også at forberede syrere til den senere opbygning af Syrien, med rydning af miner, bomber og andre former for krigsaffald og ammunition, samt genoprettelse af forsyninger af vand og elektricitet, transport og kommunikation.

Foto: Der forestår et enormt oprydnings- og genopbygningsarbejde i Syrien, når der engang kommer fred ... Her, Aleppo.

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-den-ne-uge

Irak angriber voldsomt tyrkisk invasion og amerikansk respons i brev til FN's ambassadør Samantha Power – kræver handling fra FN

12. december 2015 – På trods af, at det Amerikanske Udenrigsministeriums talsmand, John Kirby, verbalt langede ud efter RT-reporteren i denne uge og hævdede, at Irak vil håndtere Tyrkiets invasion af Irak som et bilateralt anliggende, så er kendsgerningen, at Irak går til FN's Sikkerhedsråd. Kirby fik et hysterisk anfald over RT-reporteren og kaldte hende »latterlig« og »gal« for at rejse spørgsmålet om Iraks vrede mod NATO-medlemmet Tyrkiet.

RT's reporter have ret, og i går indgav den irakiske regering en officiel klage over Tyrkiet til FN og sendte et brev fra den irakiske regering til Samantha Power, Obamas 'ansvar-for-at-beskytte (R2P), regimeskift'-galning i FN.

Reuters rapporterer, at den irakiske ambassadør til FN, Mohamed Ali Alhakim, i brevet til Power skrev: »Vi anmoder Sikkerhedsrådet om at kræve, at Tyrkiet omgående trækker sine styrker tilbage ... og ikke igen at krænke irakisk suverænitet. ... Dette anses for at være en åbenlys overtrædelse af principperne i FN's Charter, og en krænkelse af Iraks territoriale integritet og staten Iraks suverænitet.«

I sproglige vendinger, der er en kindhest mod Tyrkiet og en advarsel til USA og andre NATO-medlemmer, sagde Alhakim, at den tyrkiske invasion er en »aggressiv handling« og tilføjede, »Assistance med militær uddannelse og avanceret teknologi og

avancerede våben for at bekæmpe terrorenheden Islamisk Stat må være baseret på bilaterale og multilaterale aftaler og ske i fuld respekt for national suverænitet og den irakiske forfatning, og må være koordineret med de irakiske bevæbnede styrker.«

Irak har også klaget over Obamas meddelelse om, at dræberteam fra Specialstyrkerne vil ankomme til Irak.

Foto: Tanks fra den tyrkiske hær på den tyrkisk-irakiske grænse.

USA: Kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard udtaler sig imod Bush/Obama-politik for regimeskift

12. december 2015 – I løbet af det seneste døgn har kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard optrådt på TV og i radio og talt imod Bush/Obama-politikken for regimeskift, der netop nu er i gang imod Syriens præsident Assad. På National Public Radio (NPR) her til morgen konkluderede Gabbard: »Hvis Assads syriske regering bliver væltet, vil ISIS og al-Qaeda og disse andre grupper tage magten i hele Syrien og skabe en endnu større humanitær krise, så de mennesker, der er flygtet fra Syrien, fortsat ikke vil have noget hjem der. De vil fortsat ikke se nogen fred og stabilitet, og truslen mod resten af verden vil være endnu større.«

Gabbard tilbageviste værten Steve Simons linje om, at syrere skulle være flygtet ud af deres land for at undfly Assad,

hvilket er den linje, som forfølges af London/Team Obama. Hun sagde: »Hvis vi ser på tidslinjen, så begyndte folk at forlade – folk begyndte at forlade landet, da borgerkrigen gik i gang. Og meget af dette er blevet drevet af den finansiering, udstyring og bevæbning, som er udført af lande som USA, Saudi Arabien, Qatar og Tyrkiet. Og det har været, og er fortsat, en meget grim borgerkrig, hvilket er en af grundene til, at jeg er fortalende for at standse og afslutte denne borgerkrig, så vi kan fokusere vore ressourcer omkring overvindelsen af ISIS.«

I går aftes, på Fox TV News' program med Greta van Susteren, afviste Gabbard spørgsmålet om, at Assad-regeringen skulle købe ISIS-olie på det sorte marked, som en afledningsmanøvre. »Det er vigtigt at huske på, hvem, der er vores fjende.« Hun sagde, man skulle se tilbage på San Bernadino, på hvem det var, der fløj flyene ind i tvillingetårnene, samt andre terrorhandlinger. Disse mennesker var ikke kæmpere på mission fra den syriske præsident Assad! Gabbard, der er veteran fra Irakkrigen og har rank af major i Hawaiis Nationalgarde, gentog, at vi præcist ved, hvem disse mennesker er – al-Qaeda, al-Nusra og ISIS. Med hensyn til påstandene om, at Syrien skulle købe olie fra ISIS, sagde hun, at »de rapporter, der kommer frem, er et gennemskueligt forsøg på at aflede kritik bort fra Tyrkiet«, som er et hovedtransitsted for salg af ISIS-olien. Erdogans søn og svigersøn profiterer af det. Faktum er, at, hvad enten Syrien køber noget olie eller ej, så har det minimal virkning i sammenligning med Tyrkiets åbne grænse med Syrien, som giver mulighed for, at udenlandske kæmpere, våben, ammunition, penge og olie kommer ind i terroristgrupper.

General Flynn træder frem i Moskva og opfordrer til international antiterror-koordination

10. december, 2015 – Den tidligere leder af det amerikanske forsvars efterretningstjeneste (Defense Intelligence Agency), den bramfri generalløjtnant Michael Flynn, var blandt hovedtalerne ved en RT-konference (Russia Today) i Moskva i torsdags, hvor han understregede behovet for et samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og andre lande med henblik på at besejre Islamisk Stat.

Konferencen højtideligholdt 10-årsdagen for grundlæggelsen af RT som Ruslands internationale nyheds-Tv-station. RT har over samme tidsrum opbygget et publikum på 700 millioner mennesker til dets engelsk-, spansk- og arabisksprogede udsendelser, som det blev bemærket af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin i hans lykønskings-budskab til konferencen.

Gen. Flynns deltagelse i konferencen sendte i sig selv et budskab om, at seriøse personer i USA's og Ruslands regeringsinstitutioner har planer om at etablere, som deres fælles sag, besejringen af et internationalt terror-apparat, der i henhold til gen. Flynns estimat sandsynligvis tæller 30.000 plus udenlandske krigere fra 80 forskellige lande i sine syriske og irakiske rækker.

I et interview med RT i forbindelse med konferencen sagde Flynn, at "Jeg står i et forum sammen med russisk TV, helt ærligt, for at stå frem og sige til verden: 'Hør her, vi er nødt til at gøre mere som internationalt samfund'" for at besejre denne fjende, "og vi er nødt til at have en følelse af en påtrængende nødvendighed". Han opfordrede russerne og

amerikanerne til at finde ud af at tilpasse deres strategier og angav nogle af sine egne tanker om, hvad det indebærer.

Islamisk Stat er vokset ud over blot at være en regional trussel; det er en global trussel, som vi har set det i Paris og San Bernadino i Californien, understregede Flynn. Ligesom der også har været direkte trusler inden for Ruslands grænser.

"Jeg tror, at små ting, såsom at dele efterretninger, arbejde sammen, at få hinanden indenfor i vore respektive operationscentre, kan skabe en begyndende forståelse for, hvor de militære muligheder ligger – men vi er også nødt til at have nogle andre strategiske målsætninger, der i praksis virker gensidigt understøttende", sagde Flynn.

Af konferencens øvrige internationale deltagere, hvis præsentationer endnu ikke er nedfældet, kan nævnes den tidligere tjekkiske vicepremier- og udenrigsminister Cyril Svoboda; samt den "tyske statsmand og forhenværende vicepræsident for OSCE, Willy Wimmer".

**Leder, 13. december 2015:
Lyndon LaRouche: Alt, hvad
der er vigtigt
ved mennesket, kan reduceres
til kravet om,**

at mennesket må udvikles til et højere niveau af selvudvikling

Lyndon LaRouche: Men pointen her er altid, at menneskeslægten ikke er en (automatisk) selvudviklende personlighed. Menneskehedens skæbne er forbedring af menneskets evner, i den betydning, at mennesket kan forudse menneskehedens evner til at opnå virkninger, som menneskeheden ellers ikke ville være i stand til at præstere. Dette er noget, der går op til et højere niveau end det, vi tænker på som givne kendsgerninger, eller givne former for kendsgerninger.

Alt, hvad der er et vigtigt omkring menneskeheden, kan reduceres til kravet om, at menneskeheden må udvikles til et højere niveau af selvudvikling. Menneskeheden skaber ikke selvudvikling, men menneskeheden kilder potentialet for selvudvikling. Og det er, hvad vi kalder opdagelsen af kreativitet. Og det bedste eksempel på dette, det enkle tilfælde på dette, er Einstein. Einstein gjorde præcist, hvad der måtte gøres: At opdage, hvad fremtiden er, at opdage, hvad menneskehedens muligheder er, for at virkeliggøre intet mindre end noget bedre, som kan forstås i denne sammenhæng. Det er, hvad Brunelleschi gjorde. Det er sådan, det fungerer, og det er den eneste måde, det faktisk virker på tilfredsstillende måde.

Med andre ord, så kommer menneskeheden ikke og siger, »Jeg er et stort geni«. Kommer frem og siger, »Jeg er et stort geni«. Hvad betyder det? Ved hvilken standard opdager man, hvad dette såkaldte geni er? Man ser på Einstein, og man ser på hans største række af udviklinger, og man ser det samme. Man ser det samme tidlige, i Brunelleschis arbejde. Det er alt sammen det samme. Det er begrebet om menneskehedens udødelighed, at altid gå op til et højere niveau af

kreativitet, ikke inden for den eksisterende opfattelse af menneskeheden, men i en opfattelse ud over, for mennesket, ud over menneskehedens tilegnede kundskaber, på det tidspunkt.

Det er fremtiden, skabelsen af fremtiden på et højere niveau. Dette kommer ikke fra mennesket selv. Det kommer fra menneskehedens skæbne som en agent for opdagelse, der når op på et højere niveau end menneskeheden nogen sinde før har nået.

Redaktionens bemærkning: Dagens leder fra LaRouche-bevægelsen er hele Lyndon LaRouches Manhattan-diskussion fra lørdag, den 12. december. Vi har desværre ikke kapacitet til at oversætte det hele til dansk, men anbefaler kraftigt, at man læser/hører hele diskussionen, der omhandler LaRouches pointering af unikke, videnskabelige opdagelser, viljemæssigt udført af enkelte individer, som det bærende element i de periodevise revolutioner, der fører den menneskelige kultur fremad til et højere niveau, og altså ikke er noget, der 'sker af sig selv' som følge af en forud fastlagt 'evolution'. God fornøjelse! (-red.)

Lyndon LaRouche Dialogue with the Manhattan Project, Saturday, December 12, 2015

HUMAN CREATIVE COMPOSITION: ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S MANHATTAN, BRUNELLESCHI'S DANCING ROPE BRIDGE, AND VERDI'S TUNING IN MUSIC

DENNIS SPEED: My name is Dennis Speed and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee I'd like to welcome you to today's meeting. I believe this is the 27th meeting, but I want to say this:

Lyn, everybody today, has or has access at least, on the table in the back, to an {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine

simply entitled "Brunelleschi." Now, our Manhattan Project is over the next week going to go into a new phase, and the music will be leading that. And that musical process, which will reach

a certain level, particularly over next Friday, next Saturday, and Sunday, has already been started here today, by what Diane just did, especially her last reference to the question of the Solar System being inside one's head.

So Lyn, I'd like you to do something today which I'm requesting, which is an opening statement which takes us past the

noise of the Barack Obama apologizers of this week, such as Donald Trump and others; and puts us on a different plane so we

can consider this concept you've put forward about the unity of

the nation, and the need for people, good people, be they Republican, Democrat, Independent, or other, to come together and

accomplish what you've outlined can be done, which is the immediate removal of Barack Obama from office, and the immediate

defeat of Wall Street, but by use of these methods that you had

uniquely pioneered. And the Brunelleschi {EIR} just brought this

to my mind. So I know I don't usually do that, but I'd like to

ask you for an opening statement, and then we go to Q&A.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: Yes, I think the important thing that is for us to consider, is what was actually accomplished with Nicholas of Cusa, but prior to Nicholas of Cusa, and what preceded that. And therefore, once you place your ideas of

judgment in that category, suddenly you find yourself in sort of
of
a happy state of mind, that you are sure that you're on the
right
ground, you realize that there's creativity. And you go
through
the Brunelleschi series entirely. And Brunelleschi is a very
complex question for people to deal with, who are particularly
{ingénues}, because they don't understand it.
But in the time of Brunelleschi's leadership, he was {really
a master} in this area. And that was something on which the
foundation, of modern civilization, has depended, on the great
achievements of Brunelleschi. And everything else followed
from
that.
But that's a whole story in itself. It's something, we've
just gone through a choral practice, and the idea of a choral
practice, which you've just been doing again, on this
afternoon,
and what we do in society in general, are one and the same
thing.
There has to be a harmonic agreement which is not simply
singing
notes one after the other, but going with the idea that
everything you've done up to a certain point, requires that
you
make an innovation to the next note; and then to make another
one, again, an innovation to the next note. And that's
exactly
what Brunelleschi did. And the best illustration, is he
composed
or constructed, a harmonic chorus, which was {totally
beautiful
music, itself}, absolutely beautiful, in his composition, in
this small area, that he occupied for this subject-matter.
And
this thing set a standard for all wise people, to look up and

see
something beautiful.

SPEED: Thank you, Lyn. He's referring to the Pazzi Chapel, I believe.

And I'd like to have us go to the first question, which is here.

Q: My name is J-W-. And I love that we're doing notes, and starting on notes, because my gosh, we've got some crazy notes going on in politics – like Trump and Hillary Clinton.

So
who, as a bipartisan coalition, would you see helpful to bringing
some harmony in our country?

LAROUCHE: I think, the point is, why not go from, beginning with Brunelleschi; And Brunelleschi was actually the founder of
modern science, in many ways. He did everything, everything imaginable. The list of his accomplishments is immense. But his
building of the Florence Cathedral, that particular construction,
which anyone can see these days, still, this was a magical development, and it reflects his mind.
And what the small occasion that he struck there, in that little temple kind of place the Pazzi Chapel, musical temple, is
one of the most beautiful little things ever produced, and it sets the standards for all kinds of beautiful things, in poetry,
music, and so forth, in general. And so he is one of the great
geniuses who brought the future of mankind into possibility.

Q: [follow-up] In our bipartisan coalition that we would like to see happen in this country, do you see any particular

individual that we could anchor in on, and get some better music notation?

LAROUCHE: Well, in terms of my own experience, I search for these kinds of opportunities. And by that I mean, when I'm dealing with something, I don't like to do something I think is shabby, or dull, either one. And therefore I think my impulses always are, to get some element of beauty, that is, but beauty in the true sense, not beauty as some kind of construction. But when you just try to do the things that you think are the next things which should happen, which is what Brunelleschi did, in his practice, if you go back his history. We're doing this now, it's a big story. But what he did, he set up whole systems. Like this idea that of a rope, if you take a rope and you pull a rope across the stream, and the rope has a flexibility in it. So the people who are walking across this rope, from one shore to the other; and this one of the famous things of Brunelleschi, and his treatment of "yes, no; yes, no; yes, no," and so forth, was a typical part of his whole mental life. And he used this to induce people, how to trust a rope system, as you walk as a human being across the rope, from one shore to the next. And people were doing that. In Italy up to the recent time, this thing of the Rope Song, was a very common feature of the culture. In other words, you imagine you had two points across a

river. You create a flexible structure, of the type Brunelleschi himself made, developed, designed. And you walk across the thing, and you find that the rope dances. And in order to cross the river, you must dance, in a sense, across the rope. When you move on the rope, you change the direction of the rope, in terms of the walking; and you can think that backwards and forwards, and that's what the Italian standard was. And people up to the present, or recent time, at least, remembered that song, about the dancing rope. Because there's two points; you have one rope, with a slack in it, and you're going to use the slack as like a piece of music. So you step on the rope; now when you make the next step, you're going to a different point in the crossing of the rope. The effect is that the rope effectively dances, according to your steps of moving in one direction or the other. And this is typical of the concept of construction, which Brunelleschi represented. And up to recent times, people used to sing that song, of the Rope Song, created by Brunelleschi. And this one of the principal methods of demonstration, of what he was trying to convey, to the minds of the people who were actually using that rope to cross a stream. And that's still a valid thing today, as even in my youth, or a little bit later, I was part, you know, you would sit there and you were thinking, you were thinking the dancing rope; but just imagining that you were walking from

one

step to the next in either direction, in terms of passing over that rope. And this idea created an idea in the mind of the people who were walking across this rope, from one point of departure to point of arrival. And this was an Italian theme, which dominated everything since Brunelleschi, up to a recent time, of the dancing rope.

Q: [follow-up] How can we apply that to our bipartisan issue here, politically, with Trump and Hillary Clinton, and how can we...?

LAROUCHE: Very easily, just do it. The way to do it is, you go backwards. What you do is, you construct the experiment.

Now, Brunelleschi did a lot of that. Everything that he did, including the whole development of the chapel that he created, he

did everything that way. And so therefore, everything worked. He built the whole structure of the tower was based on creating a shell which had a space, a shell within a shell.

And

I and my wife Helga walked up that system, inside the shell.

You

have also in the Italian music records, the same thing, you have

the choral presentation there. It was all there. It's still all there.

The problem is, you don't have a population today which has that sense of experience. And the best thing we can do, is to take Brunelleschi's old work, including the tower that he built;

and that will give you an education, because you are forced to follow a certain ropes, with values. And you realize that your

music is the way the rope moves when you walk across it. And by designing that thing as what you can do in music, is the same thing. You can change the character of the rope, and that will change the tune of the walking of the rope, across the stream.

Q: [follow-up] Sounds good to me. Thank you very much!
[applause]

Q: Okay Mr. LaRouche, it's a pleasure to actually be here, actually meet with you, and not to mention that singer-songwriter

Mariah Carey will perform here at the Beacon Theater tonight. And so it's a pretty wonderful experience, you know, to learn more of the notes that take you back to high school, with the music notes that we just pronounced here.

Basically, my name is C-J-, and I'm actually an owner of a law firm. And so basically my primary concern is, basically on

regards of Barack Obama, our President, who is supposedly in violation of the 25th Amendment. So I wanted to know, basically

in order to require more of my students, and to teach more of my

law students in more with regards to the 25th Amendment; and as

far as the Congress, who, as far as not producing any functioning

or producing any reins, on his behalf as far as not contributing

to him violating the 25th Amendment, and as far as them not per

se doing anything in regards of him moving in directions away from Constitution, or violating the Constitution. What do you think on that?

LAROUCHE: I looked, as to Obama's function, was the

beginning of his career. And I looked quickly at what he was up to. I had a large core group was gathered around me on this business. And I launched the identification of what Obama meant, and before the end of the week, I had Obama's number. And my justness on his number was never lessened; I was right from the beginning. {He only became worse.} And if we want to have a civilization, you must remove any leadership, which corresponds to that of Obama. He is identical with the idea of a Satanic mentality. I think there are certain Roman emperors, Nero, for example, who would fit exactly what Obama represents today.

Q: [follow-up] Definitely. So do you think that him and the British Crown are affiliated with each other, as far as coinciding with each other?

LAROUCHE: They're identical. The Roman legacy, that is the ancient Roman legacy, is still the foundation of the British System.

Q: [follow-up] Definitely.

LAROUCHE: It's evil.

Q: [follow-up] So, what do you think as far as Congress? And what is their functional role because of him violating the 25th Amendment to the Constitution?

LAROUCHE: It's obvious. Mankind has to create. Mankind is not something that is going to be fixed. This is stupid, the way it's done. And the ignorance with which people approach the subject, by habit, by induced habit, is really very destructive.

Because mankind is not a self-determining creature. Mankind is a response to the potential of not only the Solar System, but the Galactic System. Now, here mankind is actually, from our own experience, mankind has progressed in understanding itself by educating themselves to get these ideas of physical principles, or what is the effect of physical principles, and to recognize, that that is the natural tendency. And when you study the Galactic System as such, and the Galactic System is a very large and varied system. It's an immense thing. We have very limited actual knowledge of the scope of that principle. But what we find out, is we find out we can adduce the destiny of mankind from the standpoint of things like the Galactic System. But the Galactic System is only {one part} of a larger system, which is the whole system of the Solar System and beyond. And so, therefore, mankind, must come to an agreement with that objective. And you get that with Kepler, Kepler is a big change in the system, his accomplishments. Then you go to another layer, a higher layer of discovery. From Einstein, for example. Einstein is one of the greatest models for introducing the concept of what the human mind is properly directed to do. And we have {not} explored this thing fully. We just know that mankind is not the stupidity of a single human being. No single human being, per se, is adequate to be a human being. Mankind must always, be moving in a direction which goes to mastering challenges, as Einstein did, in his time; is to find a creative pathway, to a higher level than mankind has ever

known

before.

So mankind is not {sui generis}. Mankind is not something which creates a Solar System per se, but rather mankind adapts to

the opportunity of the Solar System and beyond; and mankind is not a self-contained creature. Mankind is a guided creature, which is guided by the heavenly powers, so to speak; those heavenly powers which are way beyond anything mankind had known

before. {But}, the crucial thing, if you follow that pathway of

improvements, you are acting in {harmony} with mankind's destiny.

Q: [follow-up] I think it's well said. I very much appreciate it, Mr. LaRouche. Thank you.

Q: Hi, Mr. LaRouche, my name is C—. I've been looking into Brunelleschi, ever since you mentioned the triad, with Brunelleschi, Cusa, and Kepler. And one of the things that stood

out to me when I was looking into the subject, – you know, with

arches, an arch structure is not stable until you put that last

centerpiece, the keystone. And with domes that were built in that

time they needed the centering, and they were only stable when the keystone was put in place.

With Brunelleschi's dome, it never required any of that. It was self-standing throughout the entire process. And there was a

contemporary during that time who described that, because he grew

up watching Brunelleschi do this incredible thing, and he

described it such that the catenary effect allowed for every

brick to be a keystone. I was wondering if you could maybe elaborate on that?

LAROUCHE: Simply, this is something which I'm very familiar with. I've spent a good deal of time particularly in Italy, when

I was working in that area with some of the people, the Italians

who were gifted Italians at that point; and with their whole system. And this is something which is natural.

But the point here always is, that mankind is not a self-developing personality. Mankind has a destiny of improvement, of man's powers in terms, that mankind is able to foresee the powers of mankind, to achieve effects which mankind

would not otherwise be able to accomplish. This is something which goes to a higher level than what we think of as given facts

or given kinds of facts.

Everything important about mankind can be reduced to the requirement that mankind {must} develop to a higher level of self-development. Mankind does not create self-development, but

mankind tickles the potential of self-development. And that's what we call the discovery of creativity. And the best example of

that, the simple case of that, is Einstein. Einstein did exactly

what has to be done: To discover what the future is, to discover

what mankind's options are, to realize nothing less than something better which you can understand in those terms.

That's

what Brunelleschi did. That's the way it works, and that's the {only} way it really works satisfactorily.

In other words, mankind does not come out and say, "I'm a great genius." And walk out and say, "I'm a great genius."

What

does that mean? What's the standard by which you discover what this so-called alleged genius is? And you look at Einstein, and

you look at his major series of developments, and you see the same thing. You'll see the same thing {earlier}, in the work of

Brunelleschi. It's all the same thing. It's the immortal conception of mankind, to always go to a higher level of creativity, not within the opinion of the existing mankind, but

of a comprehension beyond, for man, beyond mankind's accessed knowledge, then.

It's the future, the creation of the future to a higher level. This does not come from man itself. It comes from the destiny of mankind, as a discovering agency, which reaches a higher level than mankind has ever reached before.

Q: Hi Mr. LaRouche, I'm R- from Bergen County, New Jersey.

I apologize if I am a little bit disorganized today. But it was

last night that I came across Jeff Steinberg's excellent presentation last night [in the Friday Webcast], and an article

from LPAC brought my attention to a new development in the Congress called H.Res.198, submitted by Mr. Yoho. And to me, I

would like to get your thoughts on this, but to me this is an extremely interesting development, where the purpose of the resolution is to define impeachable high crimes and misdemeanors.

Without reading a lot of it, it says that: "The absence of impeachment standards creates an appearance that [as read] impeachment is a partisan exercise, which undermines its legitimacy and deters its use; and whereas the impeachment power

in the House of Representatives is a cornerstone safeguard

against Presidential tyranny..." etc. And then they go through and define the Presidential impeachable offenses, and it's pretty

amazing when you read down the list, because there's nothing in

the list that hasn't been violated numerous times, by the last two Presidents. For example, initiating war without Congressional approval, killing American citizens, failing to superintend subordinates guilty of chronic Constitutional abuses

– the list goes on and on and on. You can read through it and see, there are probably hundreds of instances, in which all of these conditions have been violated by the last two Presidents.

But it raised to me, the question of why has Congress held back? I mean, it looks to me like there is some kind of emerging

consensus, in some sense coming into existence, which is reflected by this H.Res.198. But I went back and re-read the Preamble to the Constitution, and I asked myself, has Congress actually defended any of these conditions in the Preamble to the

Constitution? "In order to form a more perfect Union." Has Congress helped to form a more perfect union? I don't think so.

"Establish justice?" Have they been defending justice? Not with

regard to Wall Street, for example. "Ensure domestic tranquility"

– we're not seeing a heck of a lot of domestic tranquility these days. "Provide for the common defense?" are they doing that

with the rise of ISIS? "Promoting the General Welfare?" Well, they sure as heck have {not} done that. "Securing the blessings

of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?"

Bottom line is, it looks like Congress over the last 15

years has done nothing to defend the Preamble to the Constitution.

So my question to you is, according to the Constitution, does the Congress have the obligation to meet the requirements of

the Preamble, or is that an option for them?

Beyond that, it looks like, if these diverse elements, come into the existence in the Congress, as reflected by Yoho's House

resolution, it seems that LPAC, in that case, plays an essential

and very important and historic role in being a catalyst to bring

those elements together, to force these issues to be confronted.

LAROCHE: Let's take the case of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was the force of evil working against the foundation of

the United States. And since that time, there have been a great

number of Presidents of the United States, who have, like Jefferson, maintained a commitment to this evil, or relative evil, at least. And this has been the dominant feature among the

Presidencies of the United States; and by the local states in particular. The Southern states in general are hopelessly degenerate in these questions.

And the very best of our Presidential system of recent vintage, is a number of Presidents, who typify the effort, to bring about - . But then you find out that the President of the

United States, while Franklin Roosevelt seemed to be a great genius, but when the new election came, he was replaced by the FBI, the development of the FBI. Once the FBI was set into motion, the corruption of the United States was, consistently, but irregularly, going in a direction: {downward, downward,

downward, downward.}

Now therefore, in this situation, we have to operate on the basis, of understanding a universal principle which was already

grafted, in at least its raw essence, by the founding of the United States. And what you have from our great first leadership

of this thing, which led to bringing of the Washington institution as a President, from that point on, was being savaged

in one degree or another, ever since.

Now, if we understand what the original principle was, and understand the measures by which you can test the principle, that's the only solution that we have. We have to go back to the

original Constitution of Alexander Hamilton, in particular.

Hamilton had the most precise insight into what these principles

meant. Like the four first measures on economics. And if you look at his four cases, and apply that, that would be sufficient

to demonstrate what the inconsistency is of most practices since

that time from more or less evil, or just stupidity.

So the point is, if we understand that principle, we have a guide to clean up this mess. Now, of course, Obama we have to get rid of entirely; the Bushes—you have to burn the Bushes.

God says burn the Bushes. Get these Bushes burned out and {clean

it up}. And we need to have a Presidency which finally says, no,

{we are not going to go one step further, in this kind of monstrous behavior, which we have been doing as a nation up and

down in various ways, during the best of time.}

We've come to a point of crisis, and it's a crisis which deals with the question of the United States and other nations

of

the planet as a whole. We have to bring a new condition among nations. We're working on a fight on this for China; we're trying to rebuild India's prospects; we're looking at efforts in

Japan; we're looking at new canal systems, which are major canal

systems, and all kinds of things. We're also working on recognizing that mankind, is not a creature limited to the Earth

as such—that we also have to respond, to what are the implications of the Earth existing within this system, including

the aquatic system, like the Galactic System. And these are factors which mankind must take into account.

The most efficient example is that of Einstein. Now

Einstein was absolutely unique, among all the people of his time,

absolutely unique. It was the time in the 20th century, when the

20th century was going through a process of early disintegration

and degeneration; and it's been going more and more deep into degeneration ever since. So we have to stop the process of degeneration, which has been given to us, by recent authority, since Franklin Roosevelt's birth. And we have to {exactly} put

into a new conception of mankind, which is a knowledgeable accord

with what mankind should be. It's not a perfect one, but it's a

knowledgeably sound one, which will lead hopefully, to more and

more improvements of man's role inside the Solar System, inside

the Galactic System, and beyond. We have to discover the mystery

of what the purpose of the existence of mankind is in the universe, and follow that pathway.

Q: Hi Mr. LaRouche. [E-B-] I would like to ask you, if Sen. Bernie Sanders, the Senator from Vermont, becomes the Democratic Party nominee for President, would you be able to support him? Would you be able to work together with him, if he becomes President?

He is saying that we must bring back Glass-Steagall, and that we must divide the wealth of the nation evenly. He's against the rich corporations getting away with the tax loopholes

and not paying any taxes at all or very little taxes. And Senator Sanders is for the working class families and for the middle class. So I'm just wondering, do you think he would make

a good President? Would you be able to work together with him and advise him?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely not! Absolutely not. He's a fraud. We've got another candidate up there, who is much capable, and much more intelligent, who is also hesitating on the edge on

this thing. But the problem is that we don't have any prospect,

a functional prospect, to create a new Presidency. Now we could

create that. And I'm aware of means by which we could create that, with the existing institutions of government, that is the

foundations of our Constitution. And I think O'Malley would be a

more likely candidate than anyone else on the screen right now.

There are other people—you know, I've supported Ronald Reagan; I was actually a part of his team, for a time. And

then
they got me out of there, because they wanted to get me out;
they
wanted the Bushes in there. And since then we've been living
in
the Bushes. Which means that everybody who's been functioning
since Ronald Reagan was shot—he did survive—but he was shot by
a member of the Bush family. And therefore everything has
been
backed down.

I was assigned, I was in the last two terms of the
organization. And I was sent in to become, together with a
great
Einstein tradition figure, with two of us—Teller. Teller and
I

were actually collaborators in this thing. And we had been
collaborating ever since, for most of the decade.

And so we went with this, and we came up with a good
program. But what's happened is that—what happened with
Reagan,

when Reagan got shot, is that the Bush family interest took
over,

heavily, and since that time we have not had a good Presidency
in

any sense, since that time. We had Bill Clinton, who was the
only approximation of that, and he had problems of getting his
own government into shape. He never did get a full
government,

because his Vice President was a foul ball. And I worked with
him, closely on some of these projects. And so I know what
Bill

Clinton was capable of, and I understood what Reagan was
capable

of. But that was a turning point. And that was the turning
point

that I experienced.

And since that time, {there has been no good President}, or

Presidential candidate of any function in the United States.
And
our issue now is, to define what the requirements are of a
valid
President of the United States, which is not an offense
against
the foundation of the United States, from, shall we say, the
great leader from New York.
And he {founded} this nation. He actually pulled it
together, and got George Washington to pull it together, too.
And that's how we got a United States. And we have been
generally drifting up and down, ever since ever since the
course
of time.
But we can do it. {We can do it.} We have better resources
than ever before. But only a few of them have them. Our job
is
to spread, the knowledge, that we have, and to spread it to
more
people, to create a unity of understanding, among the people
of
the United States and elsewhere.

Q: Hi, Lyn, how's it going? We've been doing a lot of work
in Brooklyn on this Italian question, back to the Italian
standard we were discussing before. And quite generally we've
been working to push the Verdi tuning more prevalently amongst
a
lot of the older Italian opera singers. In fact, one of
these
Italian opera singers we met with earlier in the week, when
briefed on our mobilization around the Verdi tuning, she was
very
moved; it wasn't like—she didn't just respond to the fact that
the Verdi tuning was just a better way of singing. But she
got
very moved because she knew that, "Ah, now you guys can do the

{Va Pensiero}. And I can help teach you the {Va Pensiero}.”

So

she was moved on that level, that now we can actually communicate

the {idea} of the piece itself.

That same type of resonance around the music question, around the Verdi tuning is similar to what we're getting in the

response around even concert we're doing with the {Messiah} in Brooklyn. From the business owners and the people generally in

the population, that when we present it from the standpoint that

we are going to use this, use the music question as a counter to

the homicides, the suicides, the police shootings, the mass killings, people are responding in a similarly moving way.

And I just wanted to get your feedback, on what the effect generally this is going to have on the population, generally?

LAROUCHE: Yes, I understand. The point is the Italian standard. Now I had exposed in Italy, and was a participant in a

celebration in honor of this work in Italy. And I was a participant in the centenary, in effect, of that period.

And what the Italian standard, as defined by that standard, is probably the highest level of principled development of musical development, known to me. If anything matches that, it's

not known to me. And so Verdi is the standard for {all good modern music}, as far as I know. The perfections are great.

Now the next thing, you would have other things—the Spanish thing is complicated, it's a mess; the French language is a mess,

to deal with in music: it's too much grunting and groaning involved there. And grunting and groaning is not good for the musical mind.

And so what Verdi represented {is} the standard which should set, {by Verdi's strict standards}, as such, is the standard for {all good music known to me}. If it's known to someone else, we'll have to talk about that. But Verdi's standard, as I experienced it, at the celebration of his achievements—he was then dead, of course; and so, we went to his headquarters where he had lived; it was still his headquarters. And we had a great assembly among Italian musicians, and some Italian musicians who were also functioning from the United States and so forth. And we had this great event, celebrating the work of Verdi. And that standard is still the best.

After the Italian, you have some German work, in terms of poetry and things like that which are better. The French language is a grunting language and it's a very bad language the way it's used. "Uhhnh, eehhnnn, hmm." Spanish similarly; Portuguese similarly. It does not produce good music. And there's some German music which is good, but Verdi is better. The Italian Verdi is much better. That's my knowledge.

Q: [follow-up] Just to follow up on that, what would you say the overall impact is going to have is going to have on the population when we do more of this?

LAROUCHE: We're going to do it. And you know what we're going to do? We're going to take Manhattan – you may be acquainted with that locality. But that locality can be the proper place within the United States as such, within Manhattan, within the United States and bring in the Italian standard and the things that portend to the edge, of the Italian Classical

standard. That's the way to go.

And my conviction is that if we do that effectively, and we do have some talent which can supply the training of some other

people, who have some skills of their own talent now, and can acquire an improvement, copied on that talent, we can actually change, not only the quality of music, in the United States, and

beyond, we can also create an improvement of the minds, of the musicians, now. Because by doing these things which are themselves beautiful, and true, you make people stronger. You make them richer, in terms of what their lives mean to them and

to the people around them.

So the idea of the retuning, of music – shut down all this crap! Take the real standard required, for competent musical composition, associate yourself with the best people in terms of

musicians, who could help to build the team, of a new musical school, which is founded on the basis of, for example, exemplary,

the Italian school of Verdi, and that itself, will make things

{much} better. It'll make it much better in Italy, too.

Q: [strong accent] When I left Russia, I hoped the end of my life, I live in peace. I found war outside and inside, every time. So I remember now two people, Hitler and Stalin. I spent

50 years learning what happened to them. I'll just take three minutes, not more.

Hitler's performance was based on absolute stupidity, not one reasonable step. When Stalin routed him at Moscow in 1941,

then he understand that the war will be over. After that four years for Hitler, it was an effort to save his war, his Germany

and himself. In 1945, the war collapsed and he collapsed. But Germany remained. It was the strongest nation in Europe, and civilization, and what happened, that such a bastard, that he did.

In 1944, I was small, and my train was travelling from Moscow to the Crimea, across the battle of Kursk. We stopped. I

saw a German cemetery; it was about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long. The crosses, beautiful German crosses, I don't know where

they got the wood [to make them]; these were prairies. And on each cross, a German cask with bullets. That was what you call a

"weapons row" [s/l 50:28.4]. They got territory.

One stupidity after another; miserable country. And the one gigantic, giant, one-sixth of the Earth, and then what happened,

I find very similar now. It's striking similarity!

Again, somebody makes war, and has no idea how it will end.

To start you know; to finish, nobody knows. The Crimea, I lived

in Crimea, but I don't want to continue about that, but I simply

want to tell you what's going on, reminds me of the same damned

situation between Hitler and Stalin. A striking similarity.

A

lot of talk, a lot of things, and then a catastrophe. That war,

10 million people; in Russia, 18 million, Germany 12. It was a

[inaudible] and one fool could do it!

What's going on now, you know better than I do. Thank you.

LAROUCHE: Thank you.

SPEED: Lyn, that speaker is someone who, a couple years ago

when you were very much emphasizing the danger of nuclear war, after Qaddafi, helped to convey a message. And I'd just like for you and everybody to know, that the idea that we are in the throes of the end of humanity if we don't get Obama out, is very, very well understood by many people in the world. I just wanted to make that quick comment, and ask that the next questioners come up.

LAROCHE: It registers. I understand this.

Q: Hi Lyn, it's A- here, in New York again. We have, as everyone knows, a weekend of concerts of coming up, and the timing of this is no accident. The crucial importance of it, is obvious to us. I've been, this past week, doing flyer distribution and talking to individuals about the {Messiah} and I can't help but draw that, as confused and as concerned as people are, the personal response I'm getting is a very welcomed and openness to attending. And I think we're going to have a very big turnout, at least from the Manhattan standpoint, and we still have another week of talking to people and making these distributions. And one of the things that's kind of funny to me, in not so much the distributions, but just in conversations with people, we're having a heat wave up here, and several people have said to me – and Im not kidding – “Yes, it's warm and that worries me.” [laughs] And so, I said, “well, you know, we're singing Handel's {Messiah}” – I can't even get into the global warming thing

with
them! – I tell them what we're doing, and the response has
been
very, very good. This is not just from Boomers, these are
younger people; I think the church that we're using is
unknown
to me, but very well known to people, and so, there is
something
different that is radiating from them. And you oftentimes
wonder
if it's you yourself that's kind of seeing this, but I don't
think this was there before. And where we are with the
silliness
that people believe, and the insanity of the President, even
though they won't talk about it, is something that's affecting
them. so they're drawn to something like the {Messiah}.
My question to you is, now, once we complete this, I think
we're going to be in a very strong position, to catalyze
people.
And what is it that we should be looking to do, to make sure
that
that happens, and we can make Manhattan really grow?

LAROCHE: Well, let's go back, that, in October of last
year, I made a resolution, to free the United States from the
local states within it. And my conception was to look at what
was
focussed on Alexander Hamilton, and to take the Hamiltonian
principle, which is a very useful one for all of these
purposes,
and to say, let us create, again, something which is
consistent
with the intention and the legacy of Classical musical
composition. And what we did is, we found we were able to
influence musicians, some of them who are first-rate
musicians,
performers, and others who are capable to be trained, to join

the

company of musical performers.

The idea is that, and this would go largely to the area of Manhattan and to certain areas around northern New Jersey, which

are that; and to some limited degree, to Boston and so forth, there. So, my view has been, we should go full speed for this kind of program, on Classical music and related kinds of things.

And with a great emphasis on the Classical composition work. That's what we've been doing.

Now, we've got only in motion on this, because we are bringing people together, who are resolved to carry this out. The leading group of people around this group, are fully qualified for that talent. We have had experiments, in education

experiment, absolutely qualified. We've had successes. We simply need to get more perfection and more breadth and more depth in new areas of musical work; and people are coming to it.

So this is particularly in the Manhattan region.

Now, my view has been, is the idea of the United States as being the ruling institution, I said, that's crap! I know the Southern states of the United States, and most of them are crap.

I know it; and many of them who are intelligent, also know it. but they go along with the yokel local stuff, and that local yokel commitment destroys their ability to fulfill any mission that they want to really get to. So therefore, my view is, we have Manhattan and the Manhattan area; and we have a spread into

certain areas in New England and certain other locations. We can

take what we have, as there and potential, serious potential, work on that, and spread that from {that} region, into the rest

of the United States.

But the idea of the local yokel idea, in the state, is stupid. It doesn't work! It's wrong! You don't develop geniuses by training them to be fools. And that's the point. And so, what we've got in the Manhattan area, with a certain group around the northern parts of New Jersey, and you know what those regions are; and Brooklyn, of course, is always included in there; and we find that we have, in Manhattan and in the adjoining area, there, we have, we have the potential of creating a choral organization, or a nest of choral organizations, which can bring a new spirit to the United States, through this vicinity. And we know you can't do the job efficiently, if you go at it in some other territories. You have to go in and {colonize}, these other states, and bring them to the reality of the purpose of their life.

Q: Hello, Lyn! [Bob Baker] I wanted to attempt a question regarding the impact of the Manhattan Project into the other parts of the nation. And from the standpoint, after a series of meetings with farmers and ag producers in Iowa and Illinois, last week, and the week before in Kansas and Missouri with cattlemen, what I've come to understand, as many people know, is that the state of the agriculture producers, is probably in a worse shape now than it was in the 1970s: Cattle prices have dropped 51%; in 1973, the price of corn was \$3.75 a bushel, and the price of good farmland was \$700 [an acre]. Today, the average price of good farmland is

\$12,000-\$15,000 an acre and the price of corn is – \$3.75 a bushel.

So what you can see is, there's been a massive leveraging, and it's all coming from the Wall Street process, to where, now,

the majority of the livestock produced in the areas, is under contracts with big packing plants which are all connected to the

Wall Street banks. So in effect, what you've done is, you've moved the independent, owner-operator farm, into a process where

the farmer's building buildings, providing the land, supporting

the debt, and now he gets, a fee, to work on his farm for a big

packing plant of some kind; to raise crops for them or livestock.

What that's done is that's brought into the understanding of almost everybody agriculture, is that this situation cannot continue. And what you see is, you see the most advanced technology, things that you would just think about were only done by the rover on Mars, in terms of technology, is being used

by the average high-tech farmer today, in putting in his crops with the GPS modern technology. So it's very productive and very

efficient – except they're becoming slaves to a financial system.

Now, as a counter to that, the Manhattan Project has influenced some people, farmers in certain areas; and in one case, farmers who were facing a situation where their local church was going to be knocked down, and they fought that.

Their

ancestors came from Germany, they fought to keep it, and a couple

farmers, after being connected with your type of thinking and the

Manhattan Project and Classical music, set in motion to have Classical concerts in the church – which had never happened before, since it was erected.

And what happened is, the one farmer commented, he said, “I never saw so many grown men pull their hanky out” [pauses, emotionally moved] “and wipe tears out of their eyes.”

I would like you to comment on that, in terms of the Manhattan Project’s effect on the nation.

LAROUCHE: This is obvious, absolutely obvious. This is the course that we must take, there’s no other course that’s going to

work. Agriculture, everything, the whole thing is one thing.

All

you have to do is say, “what did we lose? What was destroyed that

we had, in terms of earlier generations and earlier decades of the population?” And when you look at that, and you look at what

I saw while I was part of the Reagan administration, in that period, there’s been a general trend of degeneration, of the opportunities and resources, of the people of the United States.

We have to {eliminate} that discrepancy between the two values, and go beyond that in terms of progress, directedly.

We

can do that and we {must} do that, and we must not accept anything {less}, than that direction of achievement. It has to

happen fast, it has to happen now, it’s necessary to bring the nations in general, like the nations of Asia, like China, like India, like other nations in other parts of the world; in Africa,

in other parts of that world; in South America, to bring South America and Central America and bring them back into a productive

role of mankind. {We must do that on a global scale.} We must

bring those nations together for unification, of realizing, that is, actually realizing, {physically realizing}, the reconstruction of the productive powers of labor, and of the human mind: That has to be done! That is a mission which we must never abandon. And we must keep going, once we've gotten to that point.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, good afternoon. R- from Brooklyn. In the past, you've talked about the Galactic coordinates; I've found in talking to people, various persons, college graduates, that global warming is not happening; that the education is so bad, that I have to explain the Galactic coordinates. What do you think about this?

LAROUCHE: Well, of course this is obvious. The point is, since the beginning of, well, shall we say, the Reagan administration, the first part of the Reagan administration, before the Bush family really got moved in there; and there's been a consistent degeneration. See the last time we had an achievement was when I won a victory, in Manhattan, at the beginning in, in 1971, and we won then on that case, and we've been losing ever since. And when I came into the Presidency, under the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, was a part of a middle area, when we still had the potential at that point, of getting progress again.

But when Reagan was actually almost killed, by a member of his own Bush family, the trend has been {downward}, ever since.

And the rate of downwardness has tended to be predominantly, an increasing rate of stupidity, the destruction of ideas. So therefore, once we take that into account, we have a

mission to perform. It's a mission in which mankind demands for the sake of mankind as such. We cannot accept anything less. And it is {achievable}! It is an achievable event!

Q: [follow-up] I take it that that if the Manhattan project is successful, we will have an effect on the educational system?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely. That's the only answer. That's the only possibility.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, it's W- from the Bronx. I just wanted to know, what do you think about Trump and a lot of his influence here in the New York City?

LAROUCHE: I think a Trump is an insult against elephants. He's a kind of animal we don't want, a Trump. And a Trump is also a piece of folly, even in the gambling business. Now, I hope that makes your day sweeter.

Q: [follow-up] Yes, thank you. Thank you. A lot of my friends seem to like him, and I don't understand them.

SPEED: Wow – well, we all have friends like that. The ones we need to “unfriend”! [laughter]

Q: Or uplift!

LAROUCHE: How are you, young man?

SPEED: Well, I have a story for you. There is a recent movie made, and there is an earlier documentary, about the August 1974 walk, between the two towers of the World Trade Center. There was a Frenchman, 24 years old, who one night, with a team, put a wire up between the two Towers; and he walked for 45

minutes between the two Towers. {Except}, when the police went to apprehend him – and there is documentary footage of the actual policeman speaking in 1974, – he said, “well, he wasn’t really walking. The only thing that you can say is that he was dancing.”

Now, when this was said at the time, when I saw it, I just thought, well, there was somehow an athletic achievement. No! Because the wire-walker explained, in a brief discussion, he said, “no, well, there’s a technical name for this, it’s called a catenary, but let me just tell you what I did.” And so he goes on and never says more. But he had learned the technique – he was not a member of a circus. He had studied various circuses, and he also was a bit of an artist himself; he did a lot of drawings of a lot of different constructions. But I only bring this up because, what you were saying earlier about the rope dance and the fact that there are people who {knew} this, and that this is something that {is} known and is a physical knowledge that people have. I thought I would just tell you that.

We’re looking for the gentleman who did it; he happens to live in New York City these days, and to see what he might have to say about all this.

So I just wanted to tell you that story.

I guess, if there are no other questions, we have a choral rehearsal and other things we have to do this evening. So Lyn,

I’d like you to give us some final remarks and we’ll get to

work.

LAROUCHE: OK, that's a good idea! Well, I think I have spoken my speaking on this question today. And I think it's something which, by its nature, is something which demands a continuity of realization. And so, I hope what we've done so far in terms of this particular session, that will be something which will lead to a profitable benefit for the people who were involved in this work.

SPEED: OK! Well, thank you. So on behalf of everybody here: Thank you very much, Lyn. Let's let Lyn know we appreciate what he just did for us. [applause]

**»Pariseraftalen om
Udslettelse«
vedtaget ved slutningen af
COP21**

Klimaforandrings-tamtam

12. december 2015 – Den 31 sider lange »Pariseraftale« blev i dag vedtaget af repræsentanter fra henved 196 nationer, der deltog i det to uger lange COP21 Klimaforandrings-tamtam i det nordlige Paris, hvor tusinder af mennesker var forsamlet og millioner af dollars givet ud i den hensigt at blåstempe en politik, der er anti-videnskab og som, hvis gennemført, ville bevirke milliarder af menneskers død i en ikke så fjern fremtid. Dokumentet kræver handling for at begrænse temperaturstigning i verden med et pænt stykke under 2 grader Celsius ved slutningen af århundredet i forhold til den førindustrielle periode.

Efter at have gjort sig selv til grin ved åbningen af COP21, tog præsident Obama i dag triumferende æren for afstemningsresultatet. Få minutter efter vedtagelsen tweetede Obama, »Det her er stort. Næsten hvert eneste land i verden har netop underskrevet 'Pariseraftalen om Klimaforandring' – takket være det amerikanske lederskab.« Ak, alt for sandt. I dag udgav Det Hvide Hus også et faktablad om pagten.

I mellemtiden siger formanden for Senatets Komite for Miljø og Offentlige Arbejder, Jim Inhofe (R-OK.), at klimaforandrings-overenskomsten i Paris i dag ikke vil forandre status quo ret meget. Han sagde, at overenskomsten ikke adskiller sig fra Kyotoprotokollen om klimaforandring, som blev vedtaget for 18 år siden. »Det er samme nyhed. Denne overenskomst er ikke mere bindende end nogen af de andre 'overenskomster' fra nogen anden konference, som parterne har afholdt i løbet af de seneste 21 år«, sagde Inhofe i en erklæring i dag, som Washington, D.C.-avisen *The Hill* i dag rapporterer.

»Senatets lederskab har allerede udtalt sig ganske klart om sine holdninger, nemlig, at USA ikke er juridisk bundet til nogen som helst aftale, der sætter mål for udledninger, eller til nogen som helst finansiel forpligtelse til en sådan

aftale, uden Kongressen godkendelse.« Inhofe, der er en skarp kritiker af denne absurde, anti-videnskabsholdning, som indtages af 'de grønne' og deres med-globetrottere blandt anti-mennesker-økonomer og ditto politikere, nemlig, at menneskelig aktivitet er årsagen til klimaforandringerne, har i de seneste måneder arbejdet på at underminere overenskomsten og kræve, at denne forelægges Senatet til godkendelse, som den ikke ville få, skrev *The Hill* i dag.

**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 C0-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 Baptistry 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 way, 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.

COP21: 'Grønne nazister' inklusiv Obama forsøger at banke en aftale igennem

11. december, 2015 – Det var planlagt, at de delegerede på COP21 skulle udsende deres afsluttende kommuniké i dag, men mødets præsident, den franske udenrigsminister Laurent Fabius, annoncerede i morges ud på de små timer, at aktiviteten vil udstrække sig mindst til lørdag. Men problemet er, at Obama og franskmændene prøver på at knuse oppositionen fra Indien, Kina, Malaysia og andre, alt imens de over for udviklingslande gennemtrumfer drakoniske fordringer om at opgive udvikling.

Torsdag d. 10. december om aftenen opkastede Fabius et nyt forslag til et slutkommuniké, der i henhold til Malaysias delegerede, Gurdial Singh Nijar, underminerer 'differentierings-konceptet', der ellers tillader udviklingslande mere spillerum i nedskæring af fossile brændstoffer. "Vi bevæger os baglæns," sagde Nijar. "Vi kan ikke skifte spor fra den ene dag til den anden ... og gå over til vedvarende energikilder. Hvis man fjerner konceptet om differentiering, skaber man meget alvorlige problemer for udviklingslande."

Også Indiens repræsentant udtalte sig: "Jeg må fremhæve, at begrebet 'bidrag, der planlægges beregnet efter nationalitet' (INDC – baseret på konceptet om differentiering) er en glimrende nyskabelse, der har vist sig at kunne ændre spillet. Det har sat 186 lande i stand til at deltage. Alligevel er INDC ikke så meget som nævnt i udkastet", sagde Indiens miljøminister Prakash Javedekar, ifølge *BRICS Post*.

Obama er sprunget til, klar til at bevise, hvad alle nu siger om ham – at han har mistet "sin stemme" såvel som sin forstand. Han talte med premierminister Narendra Modi over

telefonen i onsdags, og med Xi Jinping i dag, om end der ikke er rapporteret noget om indholdet af samtalerne.

Ude af stand til at opnå bindende nedskæringer har Obama ændret mening, og kræver nu "gennemskelige mekanismer" for at måle nedskæringerne – en klar overskridelse af national suverænitet. Han forlanger i særdeleshed, at Indien og Kina – som "kompetente" lande, giver efter.

Den russiske forsvarsminister forklarer NATO's provokerende udvidelse mod Rusland

11. december 2015 – I en tale i dag ved det Russiske Forsvarsministeriums Bestyrelses udvidede møde gav forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu en detaljeret rapport om NATO's udvidelse i Vest- og Østeuropa, der tydeligvis er rettet imod Rusland – og intet andet.

»Tendensen mod en forværring af den militære og politiske, internationale situation er fortsat, især i Europa, Centralasien og Mellemøsten«, advarede Shoigu i sin brede spektrerede tale, der dækkede alle aspekter af Ruslands forsvarsevner og beredskab.

NATO's udvidelse er foregået hurtigt, sagde han, og har inkorporeret 12 nye medlemmer på relativt kort tid. »I dag forbereder Montenegro, Makedonien, Bosnien og Herzegovina, Georgien og Ukraine sig på at tilslutte sig NATO«, sagde han. Finland, Sverige, Serbien og Moldova er i færd at blive

trukket ind i NATO's interesseområder.

Antallet af NATO-fly er steget med otte gange, rapporterede Shoigu, alt imens antallet af tjenestegørende mænd steg med tretten gange på De baltiske Staters, Polens og Rumæniens territorier. Der er også planlagt op til 300 tanks og infanteri-kampkøretøjer til disse nationer, ligesom Aegis Ashore missilforsvarssystemet også deployeres til Rumænien og Polen.

Hertil kommer omkring 200 amerikanske luftatombomber, i Italien, Belgien, Nederlandene, Tyskland og Tyrkiet; desuden er 310 bombefly i forskellige stadier af beredskab. Den russiske forsvarsminister bemærkede også, at et cybersikkerhedscenter er blevet etableret i Talinn, i Estland, samt et strategisk propagandacentrum i Riga, Letlands hovedstad. Sidstnævntes formål, sagde han, er at give NATO-medlemslande mulighed for at opnå »informationsoverlegenhed« over Rusland.

Præsident Putin fremlægger Ruslands globale militære strategi for landets Øverste Kommando og Generalstaben

11. december 2015 – I en tale i dag ved det udvidede møde i Forsvarsministeriets bestyrelse, der inkluderede Ruslands militære topledelse, fremlagde præsident Vladimir Putin og forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu et detaljeret billede af landets globale militære strategi frem til 2020. Putin indledte med en diskussion om det russiske militærs rolle i Syrien, men understregede mere bredt betydningen af

opgraderingen og moderniseringen af Ruslands militære evner, inklusive landets Strategiske Atomstyrker.

Rusland må »bevæbne alle komponenterne i atomtriaden med nye våben, hæve effektiviteten af missilangrebs-advarselssystemet og luftforsvarssystemet«, sagde han. Som Shoigu påpegede, så tager den Nationale Forsvarsplan 2016-2020, som præsident Putin godkendte i november, »alle militære trusler og udfordringer i betragtning og yder beskyttelse til landet i henhold til alle varianter af militære konflikter, der måtte bryde ud med deltagelse af den Russiske Føderation. De Russiske Bevæbnede Styrkers kvalitetsforhold er blevet forbedret«. I denne sammenhæng gav Shoigu en detaljeret rapport over NATO's provokerende udvidelse op til Ruslands grænser (se separat nyhedsrapportering).

Men hensyn til Syrien understregede Putin, at luft- og flådestyrkerne, der er deployeret dertil, forsvare deres land.

»Vore handlinger er ikke motiveret af nogle obskure og abstrakte geopolitiske interesser eller et ønske om at træne vore styrker og afprøve nye våben – hvilket selvfølgelig også er et vigtigt mål«, sagde Putin. »Vores hovedformål er at afværge en trussel mod den Russiske Føderation.« Han sagde udtrykkeligt, at enhver styrke, der truede det russiske militær, ville blive ødelagt og opfordrede militæret til at reagere »på den mest barske måde« over for sådanne trusler. Shoigu rapporterede, at ISIS nu kontrollerer 70 % af Syriens territorium og har 60.000 militante kæmpere der. Pr. dags dato har Rusland udført 4.000 sortier og ødelagt 8.000 terroristfaciliteter.

Den russiske præsident rapporterede ligeledes, at militære aktioner er koordineret med politi og efterretningstjenester, såsom FSB, internt i Rusland. »I har set, at FSB's organisationer i bogstavelig talt hele landet har afsløret hemmelige celler for diverse terroristorganisationer,

inklusive den berygtede ISIS.« Folk med russisk nationalitet, ikke kun fra Nordkaukasus, men også fra andre regioner, er aktivt involveret i terroristernes kamp i Syrien, sagde han. »Og dette er en direkte trussel mod Rusland«, sagde han. Shoigu advarede om, at »Islamisk Stats indflydelsesområde ekspanderer. Der er en trussel om, at deres handlinger vil blive overført til Centralasien og Kaukasus.«

Putin roste de ubådslancerede krydsermissiler, der blev brugt imod terrorister i Syrien, og påpegede, at både vandbaserede og luftbårne krydsermissiler har vist sig højest effektive og kan udstyres med både konventionelle og atomare sprænghoveder. »Dette er«, sagde han, »selvfølgelig ikke nødvendigt i kampen mod terrorister og vil, håber jeg, aldrig blive nødvendigt.«

Sputnik rapporterede i dag, at Putin beordrede de Russiske Bevæbnede Styrker til at koordinere med kommandoposter under den israelsk og amerikansk ledede koalition. »Det er vigtigt at fremme Kooperation med alle de lande, der virkelig er interesseret i at eliminere terrorister. Jeg taler om de kontakter, der tilsigter at sikre sikkerhed [dekonfliktion, -red.] med det israelske Luftvåbens kommandoposter og med den amerikansk ledede, anti-Daesh koalitions styrker.«

USA og Rusland må samarbejde

—

Kun et nyt paradigme kan

forhindre fascisme!

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Men hverken menneskehedens udslettelse i et termonukleart Armageddon eller ofringen af menneskeliv til fordel for finansoligarkiet er uundgåelig. At forhindre dette kræver først og fremmest, at man overvinder partianskuelser eller geopolitiske anskuelser og i stedet erstatter dem med et upartisk samarbejde på alle niveauer, for menneskehedens fælles interesser. Ikke overraskende viser EU, der siden Maastrichttraktaten har udviklet sig til et monstrum, i lyset af flygtningekrisen og det forestående finanskarak, sig ikke alene at være en mislykket model, men EU er yderligere nu ved at gennemføre en åbenlyst fascistisk politik. Det seneste fremstød i denne retning er Bruxelles meddelelse om, at den under alle omstændigheder allerede afskyelige EU-grænsekontrol-organisation Frontex skal erstattes af en ny organisation, der kontrolleres fra Bruxelles, og som deporterer flygtninge med egne grænsevagter, opererer i ikke-EU-medlemsstater og kan sætte sig ud over indvendinger fra medlemsstater. Dermed ville det i flygtningespørgsmålet komme til den største overførsel af suveræniteten til Bruxelles, siden euroens indførelse.

Download (PDF, Unknown)