

# **Genindfør Glass/Steagall- bankopdelingsloven NU: Italien: En halv bail-in er nok til at sprede panik**

27. november 2015 – En delvis bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindeståender, *-red.*) af fire mindre banker i Italien er i færd med at fremprovokere panik og stormløb på bankerne. Det ironiske er, at regeringen gennem denne halve bail-in troede, den kunne forhindre et stormløb på bankindeståender ved ikke at gennemføre de fulde EU-regulativer for bankopløsning, der inkluderer en bail-in af [læs: tyveri fra] aktieindehavere, obligationsindehavere og indskydere. Indskyderne blev udeladt, men de såkaldte »underordnede obligationsindehavere« blev inkluderet. Dette berører omkring et hundrede tusinde kunder og 750.000 euro.

Regeringens eksekutive ordre, der blev udstedt søndag, den 22. nov., vedrører Banca Etruria, Banca Marche, Carichieta (Chieti Sparekasse) og Carife (Ferrara Sparekasser). De fire banker vil blive opløst og opsplittet i fire 'bro-banker' og en 'dårlig bank'. Denne bail-out (statslig bankredning, *-red.*) vil koste 3,5 mia. euro, som vil blive betalt af en bankopløsningsfond, der etableres af Indskydergarantifonden (DGF), der ejes af banksystemet.

DGF hr imidlertid ikke penge nok. De tre store banker vil således erlægge pengene, og til gengæld vil regeringen tilstede de tre banker en skattenedsættelse til en total værdi af 2 mia.

Adusbef forbrugersammenslutningen afslører, at det på denne måde bliver skatteborgerne og bankkunderne, der betaler regningen. Især har købere af underordnede obligationer ikke

fået tilstrækkelig information og var ikke klar over, at disse papirer ville blive betragtet som aktier, og således være med i en bail-in.

Pludselig blev mange kunders indeståender annulleret af bail-in af disse værdipapirer, og de vendte sig vredt imod bankerne. Fremtrædende personer fra fagforeninger advarede, alt imens de forsvarede kunderne, om, at situationen kunne blive voldelig og komme ud af kontrol.

Regeringen var blevet advaret af chefen for DGF, Salvatore Maccarone, der, under sine bemærkninger foran en parlamentskomite, havde sagt, at en bankopløsning med en bail-in kunne sprede panik og fremprovokere et stormløb på bankerne. Regeringen gennemforhandlede således med Bruxelles en bailout/bailin, der ikke ville røre indeståender, og ikke ville blive regnet for statslig hjælp.

Men selv om nominelle indeståender ikke røres, så skaber involveringen af underordnede obligationer ikke desto mindre panik. Dette bør være en advarsel til de EU-idioter, der troede, de kunne redde det bankerotte banksystem ved at udplyndre indskydere.

Det er en yderligere skandale, og faderen til regeringsminister Maria Elena Boschi, en nær medarbejder til Renzi, er vicepræsident for en af de banker, der nu får en bail-out, Banca Etruria.

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 30.  
november 2015:  
COP21-klimakonferencen:  
udvikling, ikke  
befolkningsreduktion //  
advarsler om atomkrig**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Inkluderer også: Høring om atomkraft (thorium) i Folketinget  
/ Stem NEJ: bevar retsforbeholdet!

---

**COP21:           Udviklingslande  
deltager kun i Klimatopmøde i  
Paris  
for at beskytte deres lande  
mod at blive offerlam  
på alteret for det globale  
opvarmnings-credo**

*29. november 2015* – En artikel i dag af Gal Luft i Kinas statslige, engelsksprogede avis, *Global Times*, rapporterer, at morgendagens COP21 i Paris vil blive den største samling af

statsoverhoveder nogen sinde – hele 147 af slagsen – uden for FN's Generalforsamling. Men, hvorfor kommer de? »Mange af disse ledere vil ikke deltage i topmødet pga. bekymring for verdens klimaforandring, men snarere for at sikre, at deres lande, der for det meste er under udvikling, ikke ender som offerlam på 'klimatismens', dvs. den grønne kults globale opvarmnings-credos, alter.«

Den indiske regering brugte sin officielle twitter-funktion for Topmødet til i dag at udstede en erklæring, forud for premierminister Narendra Modis afrejse til Paris. Erklæringen sagde, »resultatet af Topmødet må understøtte tilpasning til og udvikling af billige teknologier til at afbalancere periodisk forsyning af sol- og vindenergi«, rapporterede ANI.

Blandt disse billige eller prisbevidste teknologier er kul i dag stadig den førende. Artiklen i *Global Times* påpeger, at »kul er den brændselsform, der bruges i næsten 80 % af Kinas energisektor. Indien, hvor antallet af energi-berøvede mennesker tæller flere end den totale amerikanske befolkning, bruger kul i 60 % af sin energiproduktion. De sammenlagt 600 mio. mennesker i de 10 sydøst-asiatiske lande er også dybt afhængige af kul.« Artiklen opsummerer ved at sige, at arbejdshesten i Asien under udvikling, hvor de fleste af denne verdens fattige mennesker lever, altid har været, og fortsat er, kul.

Forfatteren udpeger korrekt den intention om folkemord, der ligger i COP21, selv om han desværre kun gør det implicit. Det er en fejltagelse ikke at pege på kernekraft og fusionskraft[1] som menneskehedens fremtid,[2] og det er en fejltagelse ikke at anklage de samme britiske imperialister,[3] der har arrangeret COP21, for at nægte adgang til disse højere teknologier.

[1] Se Specialrapport: **En Prometheus-tilgang til nye former for ild: Udvinning af helium-3 på Månen, for en menneskehed med fusionskraft**

[2] Se video: **En vision for fremtiden**

[3] Se specialartikel: **Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

---

**EU vil bestikke Tyrkiet med 3 mia.**

**euro for at forhindre syrere i at**

**komme til Europa, siger Reuters**

*29. november 2015* – I kølvandet på Tyrkiets ensidige brud på NATO's uskrevne regler for kamphandlinger med sin nedskydning af det russiske SU-24-fly, går EU nu frem med en belønning til Tyrkiet på 3 mia. euro og tilskynder Ankara til at forhindre sine syriske flygtninge i at gå ombord i plimsollere med kurs mod de nærliggende græske øer, rapporterer Reuters i dag og citerer et udkast, der er udfærdiget i kølvandet på dagens topmøde mellem EU og Tyrkiet i Bruxelles. Uden at nævne aftalen sagde EU-rådets præsident, Donald Tusk, til journalister, at hovedformålet for topmødet var at stemme op for strømmen af migranter til Europa. »Vi er nået frem til en

aftale, som jeg håber, vil blive vedtaget af alle parter i dag«, sagde han.

Reuters bemærkede tidligere, at den tyske kansler Angela Merkel før mødet til reportere sagde, at »en væsentlig del af denne handleplan for EU og Tyrkiet vil dreje sig om, hvordan vi kan erstatte illegal migration med legal migration, hvordan vi kan forbedre situationen for flygtninge i Tyrkiet. Tyrkiet giver husly til godt og vel 2 millioner flygtninge, og har kun modtaget minimal international støtte, så Tyrkiet har en retmæssig forventning om, at EU og dens medlemsstater vil hjælpe Tyrkiet med at klare denne byrde.«

Den tyrkiske premierminister Ahmet Davutoglu, der den 28. nov. i tre timer havde møde med statsledere i EU, sagde ved sin ankomst til drøftelserne i Bruxelles, at det var »en ny begyndelse« for Tyrkiets forsøg på at blive medlem af EU, der har været sat i stå i 10 år. »I dag er en historisk dag i vores optagelsesproces til EU«, sagde Davutoglu til reportere. »Jeg er taknemlig over for alle europæiske ledere for denne nye begyndelse«, sagde han iflg. Reuters.

*Foto: Tyrkisk flygtningelejr i grænsebyen Suruc, med 35.000 flygtninge. Lejren har to hospitaler, syv sundhedsklinikker og klasseværelser til 10.000 børn.*

---

**Rusland gennemfører  
sanktioner mod Tyrkiet:**

# »Det vil afskære finansieringen af terrorisme«, siger højtplaceret russisk politiker

29. november 2015 – Den 28. november gennemførte den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, ved eksekutiv-ordre, sanktioner mod Tyrkiet. En stor del af hans dekret virker vagt, men det står klart, at russiske firmaer efter 1. januar ikke længere kan ansætte tyrkiske borgere; det er slut med visa-frie rejser; russisk turisme til Tyrkiet er begrænset eller ophørt; og de fleste tyrkere vil få forbud mod at komme ind i Rusland efter den 1. jan. Visse tyrkiske eksportvarer til Rusland vil blive forbudt, andre begrænset.

Idet hun kommenterede det eksekutive dekret fra Putin, sagde formanden for Dumaens Komite for Sikkerhed og Modforholdsregler for Korrupsion, Irina Yarovaya, at de økonomiske forholdsregler, som Rusland nu indfører over for Tyrkiet, blandt andet har til hensigt at afskære finansieringen af terrorisme, rapporterede Tass i dag. »Putin har gennemført forholdsregler til at forsvare dette land fra politikken med »kniven i ryggen«. Det er vigtigt, fordi Tyrkiet er i armene på terrorisme, mens vi standhaftigt fører krig mod terrorisme«, sagde Yarovaya, iflg. hendes komites pressetjeneste og Sputnik News.

---

# Tyskland: Der Spiegel interviewer general Mike Flynn, tidl. chef for DIA

29. november 2015 – Det tyske magasin *Der Spiegel* interviewede den amerikanske generalløjtnant Mike Flynn (pensioneret) i dag, den tidligere chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA), der blev fyret af Obama, og som derefter offentligt anklagede Obama for med overlæg at forfølge en politik, der skabte og udbredte IS. *Der Spiegel* er ikke Al-Jazeera America, hvor Flynn tidligere fremkom med disse anklager, påpegede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag. Det er flagskibet inden for det tyske establishments medieverden, og en grundpille i det europæiske establishment.

Det faktum, at *Spiegel* har interviewet Flynn på dette tidspunkt, siger en masse om de forandringer, der er sket i Europa, siden massakrerne i Paris og Tyrkiets efterfølgende nedskydning af et russisk militærfly og mordet på dets kaptajn. Hvor står Europa? Ser de hen mod en koalition med Obama, der ikke kan opretholdes? Vil de skifte standpunkt i retning af at alliere sig med Rusland i Syrien?

Fr. Zepp-LaRouche mente, at den vigtigste del af interviewet var den ordveksling, hvor interviewereren fra *Spiegel* sagde, »Der ville ikke være noget IS, hvis ikke amerikanerne havde invaderet Bagdad i 2003, Fortryder De ... «

Flynn: ... ja, absolut...

Spiegel: ... Irakkrigen?

Flynn: Det var en kolossal fejltagelse.

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/former-us-intelligen>



# Jacques Cheminade til Sputnik: »Tyrkiet må bortvises eller suspenderes fra NATO eller også bør Frankrig melde sig ud«

28. november 2015 – Præsidenten for det franske parti Solidarité et Progrès, Jacques Cheminade, mangeårig ven til Lyndon LaRouche, sagde til Sputnik, at Frankrig ikke kan forblive i NATO-alliancen, hvis Tyrkiet får lov til at blive, efter Ankaras kompromisløse nedskydning af et russisk bombefly over Syrien, hvor russerne har været engageret i kampen mod ISIS på invitation af den syriske præsident.

Her følger teksten fra den engelsksprogede nyhed fra Sputnik, der blev udlagt i går med titlen, »Frankrig bør forlade NATO, hvis Tyrkiet bevarer sit medlemskab i alliancen efter nedskydningen af et russisk Su-24 fly.«  
<http://sputniknews.com/europe/20151127/1030888909/nato-france-downing-turkey.html>

*Moskva (Sputnik)* – Frankrig bør forlade NATO, hvis Tyrkiet bevarer sit medlemskab i alliancen efter nedskydningen af et russisk Su-24 fly, sagde lederen af det franske parti

Solidaritet & Fremskridt til Sputnik Frankrig fredag.

»Enten bør Frankrig forlade NATO på dette tidspunkt, eller forlange suspension eller eksklusion af Tyrkiet [fra alliancemedlemmerne] som en del af NATO«, sagde Jacques Cheminade.

SU-24 bombeflyet styrtede tirsdag ned i Syrien. Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin sagde, at flyet blev nedskudt af et luft-til-luft-missil, affyret af et tyrkisk F-16 fly over syriske territorium, og faldt ned 4 kilometer fra den tyrkiske grænse. Putin beskrev det tyrkiske angreb som »et knivstik i ryggen« udført af »terroristernes medskyldige«.

Efter hændelsen gav NATO udtryk for solidaritet med Tyrkiet og tilbød støtte til Ankara og sagde, at alliancens vurdering af hændelsen var i overensstemmelse med information, den havde fået fra landet, der hævdede, at det russiske fly kortvarigt havde krænket tyrkisk luftrum.

Franske myndigheder har ændret deres syn på Syriens rolle i kampen imod Islamisk Stats militante gruppe, sagde Jacques Cheminade.

Tidligere på dagen sagde den franske udenrigsminister Laurent Fabius til RTL radio, at tropper, der var loyale over for den syriske præsident Bashar Assad, sammen med den Frie Syriske Hær og kurderne, kunne bruges til at bekæmpe ISIL på jorden.

»En ændring af Frankrigs holdning er åbenlys. Selv Fabius foreslog, at den syriske hær kunne deltage i kampen imod IS«, sagde Jacques Cheminade.

Han tilføjede, at den franske præsident François Hollande formodede, at den syriske hær ville tilslutte sig koalitionen imod ISIL-gruppen, på trods af Hollandes negative holdning til Assads regering.

Den syriske hær og nogle lokale militser bekæmper ISIL i

Syrien på jorden.

Tidligere på måneden annoncerede Hollande sine planer om at skabe en bred antiterror-koalition til at bekæmpe ISIL-jihadister.

*Foto: Jacques Cheminade interviewes af Sputnik.*

---

## **Andreas Mogensen til EIR: Hvorfor samarbejde med det russiske rumagentur er vigtigt**

København, 16. september 2015 – Andreas Mogensen, den første dansker til at foretage en rejse i Rummet, ankom til Danmark i dag efter sin netop overståede 10-dages IRISS-mission til ISS (Den Internationale Rumstation, med start 2. sept.). EIR fik mulighed for at stille det første spørgsmål på en pressekonference, som Andreas Mogensen holdt i Industriens Hus. Pressekonferencen blev sendt live over den nationale kanal TV2, og en del af hans svar til EIR var leder på den artikel, der kom på TV2's hjemmeside, med overskriften: »Andreas Mogensen: Der er ingen grænser set fra rummet«. EIR's spørgsmål kommer efter ca. 13 minutter.

**EIR:** Identifikation. "Da du holdt din pressekonference i oktober 2014, spurgte jeg dig om, at forberedelsen til din rumrejse fandt sted under en voksende spænding mellem Rusland, på den ene side, og USA og Europa på den anden side, hvor du

fastslog, at det var meget vigtigt at beholde videnskabeligt og rumfartsmæssigt samarbejde. Så nu, efter at du har været i rummet på en Soyuz-raket sammen med en russisk kosmonaut fra Baikonor, hvad siger du om, hvorfor det er vigtigt at beholde samarbejdet mellem det russiske rumagentur, og ESA og NASA?"

**Andreas Mogensen:** "Det er kun gennem samarbejde og kommunikation, at vi kan løse nogle af de problemer, som eksisterer. Det, jeg kan sige er, at, ombord på rumstationen er der ingen problemer mellem nationaliteterne.

Vi er mennesker, der drager i Rummet sammen for at løse fælles problemer. Måske er det første indtryk man får, når man kigger på Jorden, at det er én Jord. Man kan ikke se landegrænser fra Rummet, og man får meget hurtigt en fornemmelse af, at det er noget menneskeskabt, landegrænser. Vi er allesammen mennesker med de samme drømme, med de samme ønsker, med de samme behov, og vi lever på den samme planet, så derfor er det samarbejde, der ligger bag rumstationen, så vigtigt.

Og jeg tror, at det i fremtiden bliver endnu vigtigere, fordi det er et eksempel på, hvordan vi i fællesskab kan løse problemer. I fremtiden vil flere og flere af vores problemer være på en skala, som gør det nødvendigt, at vi arbejder på tværs af landegrænser, og på tværs af kulturer. Det er rigtig, rigtig vigtigt, og et godt eksempel på, hvad vi kan opnå, når vi arbejder sammen og samarbejder."

Mens han var i Rummet, udførte Andreas Mogensen mange eksperimenter, af hvilke den mest spændende var, som en del af »Thor-eksperimentet«, at se, hvad det er, der sker under tordenvejr oven over skyerne, og han filmede, for første gang, »blå kæmpelyn«, der lynede op i gentagne lysudbrud, fra kuplen på toppen af den russiske sektion af ISS. Han fortalte, hvor spændende det var, da han fandt ud af, at dette var første gang, fænomenet var blevet opdaget og filmet.

I morgen vil Andreas Mogensen holde et foredrag på Københavns

Universitet og møde børn på Planetarieret.

Se også video og interview fra oktober 2014:  
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=7717>

---

## **Leder, 29. november 2015: »Spær Obama inde bag lås og slå for at afværge den umiddelbare fare for atomkrig«**

### **STOP 3. VERDENSKRIG:**

Følgende erklæring blev udlagt på LaRouchePAC websiden her til aften, den 28. nov.:

Lyndon LaRouche gentog i dag sin tidligere advarsel, der nu er endnu mere overhængende nødvendig, om, at den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama er fast besluttet på at følge en kurs mod atomkrig og omgående må fjernes fra embedet. Advarslen kommer som respons på optrapningen af Obamas igangværende politik for en atomar konfrontation med Rusland, som det eksemplificeres af nedskydningen af et russisk militærfly over Syrien af medlem af NATO og USA's allierede, Tyrkiet. Tyrkiets handling kunne kun være forekommet med Obamas velsignelse. LaRouches advarsler understreges af amerikanske

sikkerhedseksperter vurderinger. Alligevel er der en tåbelig tilbageholdenhed med hensyn til at kræve det eneste middel, der kan trække verden tilbage fra truslen om atomkrig – at fjerne Obama fra kontrollen over USA's atomstyrker ved at stille ham for en rigsret, eller ved at aktivere det 25. tillæg til den amerikanske Forfatning.

Den seneste advarsel om en mulig umiddelbart overhængende atomkrig er netop blevet publiceret i *Politico Magazine* af en tidligere atommissil-affyringsofficer, Bruce G. Blair, med titlen »**Kunne spændinger mellem USA og Rusland eskalere atomart?**«. Blair påpeger Obamaregeringens politik med affyrpå-varsel (launch on warning) og den korte responstid til at træffe beslutningen om at lancere atomstyrker. Han erklærer, at dette sætter verden på en hårs bredde fra atomkrig, der er farligere end under den Kolde Krig.

Blair advarer:

*»Det er især sandt, eftersom offentligheden ikke gør sig klart, hvor lidt tid, der er, for vore ledere til at træffe afgørelsen om at bruge atomvåben, selv i dag – og om noget, så gør atmosfæren det til en endnu mere hårfin udløsermekanisme med truslen om cyberkrig. En affyringsordre er på længde med et tweet. Missilmandskabet transmitterer dernæst en kort strøm af computersignaler, der omgående antænder raketmotorerne til mange hundrede landbaserede missiler. For USA's vedkommende tager dette 1 minut. Som forhenværende atommissil-affyringsofficer har jeg personligt trænet dette hundreder af gange. Vi blev kaldt for Minutmænd. Amerikansk ubådsmandskab bruger lidt længere tid; de kan affyre deres missiler efter 12 minutter.«*

*»I betragtning af den 11- til 30-minutters flyvetid for angrebsmissiler (11 for ubåde, der lurer ud for modpartens kyster, og 30 for raketter, der flyver over polerne til den anden siden af planeten), er beslutningstagningen for atomanvendelse, under 'launch on warning' – altså processen*

*fra varsling til beslutning om handling – ekstremt forceret, følelsesmæssigt højspændt og proforma, drevet frem af checklister. Jeg beskriver det som den mekanisk rutinemæssige iværksættelse af et forberedt manuskript. Under nogle scenarier modtager præsidenten, efter en blot 3 minutter lang vurdering af de første varslingsdata, en 30 sekunder lang briefing om sine atomare responsmuligheder og disses konsekvenser. Han har dernæst nogle få minutter – maksimalt 12, mere sandsynligt 3 til 6 – til at vælge en af dem.»*

I denne sammenhæng kan Obamas deployering af amerikanske og allierede styrker imod Rusland kun ses som en eskalering imod en konflikt med atomvåben. For eksempel nævner Blair deployeringen af amerikanske Aegis-krigsskibe til Sortehavet, armeret med krydsermissiler, der kunne angribe Moskva på få minutter. Eller deployeringen af amerikanske strategiske bombefly, der flyver mod Rusland. Dette tvinger så igen Rusland ind i en optrappende respons.

Blair spørger:

*»Forstår amerikanske ledere, at russerne har grund til at frygte, at en trussel om halshugning (dvs. lamme en regering ved at fjerne dens ledelse, -red.) er ved at vokse frem, og at denne trussel meget vel kunne være den underliggende drivkraft, der hæver indsatsen for Rusland til et niveau med en eksistentiel trussel, der påbyder forberedelse til at anvende atomvåben? Det tvivler jeg på, at de gør.»*

Den skræmmende konklusion, som Blair ikke drager, er imidlertid, at USA's præsident Barack Obama forstår dette og har til hensigt at skabe en eksistentiel krise for Rusland, og således bringe verden ud på randen af atomkrig. Siden begyndelsen af Barack Obamas præsidentskab har LaRouche advaret om, at Obama er en narcissistisk dræber. Alt, hvad Obama sidenhen har gjort, har bevist, at LaRouche havde ret. Man behøver blot se på Obamas indtræden i rollen som global

bøddel, der præsiderer over de regulære tirsdagsmøder, hvor han personligt træffer beslutning om de amerikanske droneangrebs dræberlister. Eller hans konfronterende adfærd mod Rusland i kølvandet på den tyrkiske nedskydning af det russiske militærfly.

Der er ikke tid eller plads til en lang debat om dette spørgsmål. Obamas atomkrigsprovokationer udgør en trussel mod den menneskelige arts eksistens. Han må fjernes nu. Et enkelt medlem af Kongressen kan retmæssigt indlede en rigsretsprocedure. Ansvarlige regeringsfolk i præsidentskabet kan retmæssigt indlede det 25. forfatningstillæg med den begrundelse, at en præsident, der har til hensigt at fremprovokere atomkrig, ikke længere er skikket til embedet.

**Det amerikanske folk må nu agte på LaRouches advarsel. Fjern Obama Nu!**

## **Supplerende materiale:**

Putin og Hollande mødes i Moskva – Aftale om koordinering – Går efter oliesmugling m.m. – Obama på sidelinjen; afsløret

---

**Putin klar til at samarbejde,**



# men også klar til at gå enegang i Syrien

27. november 2015 – Under sit møde med den franske præsident François Hollande gjorde den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin det klart, at Rusland var parat til tæt samarbejde med den amerikansk ledede koalition imod Islamisk Stat. Ikke desto mindre sagde han, at endnu en 'uacceptabel' handling, dvs. nedskydning af russiske fly, ville betyde »en afslutning på samarbejde med nogen som helst«.

»Vi er klar til at samarbejde med koalitionens, der ledes af USA. Men selvfølgelig er hændelser som tilintetgørelsen af vores fly og vore soldaters død ... absolut uacceptabel.« Vi går frem ud fra det standpunkt, at der ikke kommer en gentagelse af dette, ellers vil vi ikke have brug for samarbejde med nogen, nogen koalition eller noget land.«

Putin sagde, at han og Hollande enedes om yderligere militært samarbejde og sagde, at de ville »udveksle informationer om, hvilke territorier, der er besat af den sunde del af oppositionen snarere end terrorister, og vil undgå luftangreb imod dem.«

Hollande sagde, at nedskydningen af det russiske fly satte fokus på behovet for, at lande koordinerer deres militære aktiviteter tættere for at undgå en eventuel gentagelse af det, han kaldte for en »beklagelig hændelse«. Han opfordrede igen til en »deeskalering« af spændingerne mellem Moskva og Ankara.

---

# **Video: Lyndon LaRouche: Om Det amerikanske, økonomiske System. Dansk udskrift**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Mødet mellem Hollande og Putin sprængte det amerikanske, geopolitiske spil om Syrien bort, siger russiske eksperter**

*27. november 2015* – Den Obama-assisterede, tyrkiske nedskydning af et russisk bombefly med det formål at skabe en geopolitisk krise og underminere den russiske indsats for at eliminere ISIS-terroristerne fik et solidt grundstød af mødet i Kreml mellem den russiske præsident Putin og hans franske modpart, præsident Hollande, den 26. nov., sagde nogle russiske sikkerhedseksperter.

Præsidenten for Akademiet for Geopolitiske Spørgsmål, Konstantin Sivkov, der har base i Moskva, sagde i dag til Sputnik: »For første gang i lang tid gik en politiker, der er kontrolleret af USA, op imod amerikansk geopolitik ... Hollande

er skrap og tilsidesætter amerikanske interesser i processen. Ved at promovere bånd med Rusland skaber den franske præsident 'sprækker i NATO's ånd' og opsplitter grundlæggende set den amerikansk ledede koalition. Dette er et alvorligt slag mod amerikansk geopolitik.« Sivkov sagde, at han mener, at mødet kunne føre til reel militær og teknologisk samarbejde mellem Rusland og de vestlige styrker, der er engageret i kampen mod ISIL, rapporterer Sputnik.

Under en rundbordsdiskussion, der afholdtes af Rossiya Segodnya Internationale Informationsagentur i Moskva i dag, beskrev en anden sikkerhedsekspert, Dmitry Suslov, vicedirektør for forskningspolitik, politik for udenrigsråd og forsvarspolitik, aftalen mellem Putin og Hollande som et »kolossalt gennembrud og en kolossal succes«, rapporterede Sputnik. »Det lykkedes os at nå frem til en aftale med Hollande inden for de områder, hvor det ikke lykkedes os med Obama«, bemærkede den politiske analytiker, iflg. Sputnik. Ifølge samme Sputnik-rapportering sagde Suslov, at Hollandes besøg i Moskva også »har gjort en ende på forsøg på at konsolidere den amerikansk ledede koalition imod Rusland og på at ekskludere enhver kontakt mellem Rusland og den vestlige koalition omkring aktiviteter i Syrien«.

---

## **Krigsfaren: Putin og Hollande mødes i Moskva**

# **– Aftale om koordinering – Går efter oliesmugling m.m. – Obama på sidelinjen; afsløret**

*27. november 2015* – Den franske præsident François Hollande og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin mødtes i Moskva i går, efter Hollandes møde med sine tyske, italienske og amerikanske modparter de foregående dage. For Hollande er det en dramatisk kontrast til hans besøg i Det Hvide Hus den 24. nov. – den dag, tyrkerne nedskød det russiske bombefly – med Obama, der fordømte Rusland som en isoleret taber, og så Hollandes møde med Putin i går, hvor de sammen indgik en fælles forpligtelse om at nedkæmpe terrorisme.

Husk Obamas nøjagtige vilde ord den 24. nov. under Obama-Hollande pressebriefingen: »Rusland er netop nu en koalition for to – Iran og Rusland – der støtter Assad ... Rusland er marginaliseret.«

I går kom Putin og Hollande med erklæringer efter deres møde og tog dernæst imod journalisternes spørgsmål.

Putin sagde, at de var »enedes om at optrappe vores fælles indsats inden for antiterrorismen, at forbedre udvekslingen af operationelle informationer i kampen mod terrorisme og etablere konstruktivt arbejde mellem vore militære eksperter for at undgå overlappende handlinger og for at fokusere vores indsats på at sikre, at vores arbejde med at bekæmpe terrorisme er mere effektivt og undgå alle luftangreb imod territorier og bevæbnede styrker, der selv bekæmper terrorister.« Han gav også udtryk for sin overbevisning om, at en politisk afgørelse i Syrien kunne findes, efter at terrorismen var udslettet.

Hollande understregede, at enhed er afgørende, men ikke nok. Der må også være handling. Nationer må tage ansvar, som Frankrig gør med udstationeringen af Charles de Gaulle hangarskibet. Han understregede også betydningen af en overgangsproces i Syrien, og denne understregning er stort set på linje med Wien-dokumentet, men han tilføjede, at »det er unødvendigt at sige, at Assad ikke har nogen rolle at spille i sit lands fremtid«. På trods af dette er det, for at overgangen kan lykkes, »bydende nødvendigt, at Rusland spiller hovedrollen, en af hovedrollerne, i denne proces.« Med hensyn til detaljerne i det fransk-russiske samarbejde sagde Hollande, at de var enedes om tre punkter: 1) optrappet efterretningssamarbejde; 2) koordinering af intensiverede angreb mod ISIS; og 3) at koncentrere disse angreb mod ISIS og terroristgrupper.

Som svar på spørgsmål langede Putin igen hårdt ud efter oliesmuglingen fra ISIS-kontrolleret territorium og ind i Tyrkiet. Han påpegede, at, under G20-topmødet i Tyrkiet kun få dage før nedskydningen, havde han vist de andre G20-ledere fotos taget fra russiske fly af kolonner af olielastbiler, der strakte sig ud i horisonten.

»Olie leveres fra territorier, der kontrolleres af terrorister i Syrien, på industriel skala. Det kommer fra disse territorier, ikke andre steder fra«, sagde Putin. »Vi kan oppefra se, hvor disse lastbiler er på vej hen. De kører mod Tyrkiet, dag og nat. Jeg kan formode, at Tyrkiets topledere ikke er klar over dette. Det ville være vanskeligt at tro på, men det er teoretisk muligt. Det betyder imidlertid ikke, at de tyrkiske myndigheder ikke bør afskære disse illegale transaktioner.« Og hvis Tyrkiet destruerer al denne olie, som den tyrkiske præsident RecepTayyip Erdogan påstår, »så kan vi ikke se nogen røg eller flammer« fra det.

Putin rejste også spørgsmålet: hvilket formål tjener Forståelsesmemoet fra 20. oktober mellem Rusland og USA, hvis USA ikke udelukker sådanne hændelser som angrebet på det

russiske fly den 24. nov.?

»Vi udveksler information med dem, men nu er vi meget bekymrede for arten af denne udveksling og resultaterne af dette samarbejde«, sagde han. »Hør her, vi informerede vore amerikanske partnere i forvejen om, hvornår vore piloter skulle i aktion og hvor, og i hvilke luftkorridorer. Den amerikanske side, der leder koalitionen, som Tyrkiet er en del af, kendte til sted og tid for vores operation. Og dette er præcist, hvor vi blev angrebet.« Det spørgsmål, der opstår, er derfor, »hvorfor gav vi amerikanerne denne information? Enten har de ikke kontrol med, hvad deres allierede foretager sig, eller også giver de denne information ud kritikløst, uden at forstå implikationerne.«

---

## **Info-video: Hvad er det danske retsforbehold?**

med Christian Bechmann Olesen.

Se også: Stem NEJ den 3. december: Tale af Tom Gillesberg m. fl.

---

# **International LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast den 27. november 2015: LaRouche: »Med mindre, og indtil, Obama smides ud, står verden på en knivsæg til atomkrig. Strategisk analyse med Jeff Steinberg m. fl.**

*Lyndon LaRouche har hele vejen utvetydigt sagt, at med mindre, og indtil, Obama smides ud, står verden på en knivsæg til atomkrig. Spøgelset af denne fare sås skarpt i tirsdags med Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk fly, der var engageret i bombetogt nær den tyrkisk-syriske grænse. LaRouche kom omgående med en offentlig erklæring, der sagde, »Obama har organiseret en krigshandling, og således sat USA, såvel som resten af menneskeheden, i fare«. Han sagde, at det »var et overlagt forsøg fra Obamas side på at fremtvinge generel krig«. Engelsk udskrift.*

MEGAN BEETS: Good evening. It's November 27, 2015. My name is Megan Beets, and I'd like to welcome all of you to our regular Friday evening broadcast here at LaRouche PAC. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jason Ross and I'm also joined, via video, by Jeffrey Steinberg.

Now in discussions earlier this week, Mr. LaRouche made it very, very clear that the key issue facing all of us, is whether

the people of the United States, in particular, both the people

in positions of leadership, such as the Congress, but also the population in general, have the guts to stop compromising with Obama, to tell the truth, and to throw him out. Now, what we've

seen shaping up over the past weeks is a very dramatically and a

very rapidly shifting world strategic situation, including ongoing Russian military intervention into Syria; also including

the recent wave of terrorist attacks, such as the bombing of the

Russian plane over Egypt, and of course, the terrorist attacks which occurred just two weeks ago in Paris, which was followed by

a shift in dynamic among world leaders, away from the failed Obama policy, and toward a broader collaboration with the Russians to defeat ISIS.

However, throughout all of this, Mr. LaRouche has been unequivocal that unless, and until you get Obama out of the U.S.

presidency, the world stands on a razor's edge of thermonuclear war.

Now the spectre of that danger arose sharply this Tuesday, with the Turkish shooting down of a Russian plane which was involved in operations near the Turkish-Syria border. And Mr. LaRouche immediately issued a statement, a public statement, which said that "Obama has organized an act of war, and thus endangered the United States, as well as all humanity." He said

that it "was a deliberate attempt by Obama to force general warfare."



Now, this act by Turkey and by Obama, and the aftermath, has catalyzed a very significant change in the world global dynamic,

which we're seeing manifest, for example, in Europe, among other

places. This shift is also the subject of tonight's institutional

question, which makes reference to the ongoing talks in Vienna,

which are aimed at resolving the situation in Syria. The question

reads as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche, please give us your view of how Russia and Turkey can move once again to collaborate to save Syria under the

Vienna process?" So now I'm going to turn it over to Jeff to give

Mr. LaRouche's response to that question, as well as an elaboration of the general strategic picture.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Megan. Can you hear me there?

Well I think that the starting point must be to tell the truth as

we know it about the events of last Tuesday. It was immediately

understood by leading political and military circles in the United States, in Europe, and most emphatically in Russia, that

the action that was undertaken by the Turkish in shooting down that Russian SU-24 over a border area on the Turkey-Syria border

right along the Mediterranean coast, that this was something that

1) was order top down in Turkey from President Erdogan, and 2) Erdogan would never have undertaken such an action if he did not

have advance approval from Obama and the British.

So, for the Russians, this represented a major act of war,

and I can tell you that within the U.S. governing institutions, there was a deep and profound split that reflected immediately in actions that were diametrically opposite. Secretary of State John Kerry, leading circles within the Pentagon all the way up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, immediately activated channels with Russia, knowing full well that there was a very real prospect that Russia would retaliate immediately after this unwarranted military provocation. And so, you have one element of the U.S. command that is not under British control, that moved immediately to at least temporarily forestall a situation that was potentially moments away from a general war between NATO and Russia. And as we've been saying, as Mr. LaRouche has been warning since virtually the beginning of the Obama presidency, any such war between NATO and Russia would very rapidly devolve into a thermonuclear war, in which the overwhelming majority of humankind would likely not survive.

So you had actions. There was red phone line communications activated immediately, between those elements in the U.S. Command that were not on the British line, and top Russian officials. And the first objective was simply to secure a commitment that the situation would not immediately go to a hot war. In other words, this was the most dangerous situation since, and probably more so, than even the Cuban Missile crisis. Because in the Cuban missile crisis, there was no shoot down of an American or a Soviet ship or a plane.

On the other hand, President Obama, who was closer to Erdogan than virtually any foreign leader, perhaps with the

sole

exception of David Cameron in Britain, immediately got on the phone with Erdogan and then issued public statements certifying

that, in his mind, Turkey acted perfectly within their sovereign

rights to shoot down a plane flying over its territory.

Now, never mind the fact that there are serious questions and disputes of whether that plane, that Russian plane, actually

ever even entered Turkish airspace. The fact is that, if it passed through Turkish air space at all, number one, there was never any intent—and nobody in Turkey even claimed there was any

intent on the part of the Russians—to carry out any kind of military action or provocation against Turkey. And secondly, even

after the first 24 hours following the shoot-down, the Turks were

even acknowledging that that plane, if it ever in fact crossed into Turkish territory, was there only for a matter of brief seconds, and no longer.

Now that also tells you that to shoot down that plane, was a premeditated, pre-determined decision. There was not enough time

for the Turkish air force to consult up the chain of command all

the way to President Erdogan, and to then get response orders back, and to fire at the Russian plane – all within a matter of

a timeframe that at most has been characterized as 17 seconds.

So, again, it was a premeditated act of war; and Erdogan on his

own never would have undertaken that. It was done in conjunction

with both Obama and the British; and therefore, the responsibility lies there.

Now, let's again visit what the immediate context was of this incident. It occurred last Tuesday at a point that French President Hollande was in Washington to attempt to organize President Obama to join a trilateral military alliance of France, Russia, and the United States, to wipe out the threat of ISIS and Nusra, and all allied organizations inside Syria and inside Iraq primarily. And so, the events that took place just as Obama and Hollande were sitting down, hijacked the agenda of that discussion. All you have to do is read the transcript, or even better, watch the video of the press conference that took place later that same day between Obama and Hollande; and you'll see towards the end, Obama launching into a typical Obama tirade against Putin and against Russia. Obama was lying pathologically in saying that the United States is leading a coalition of over 60 countries, and that Russia, when it comes to fighting against the Islamic State is "the outlier"; and it went on from there. So, statements soon after that, again from the White House, fully endorsed and adopted the Turkish line on what happened. So, here you've got a situation where an act of war, an act of military aggression took place, carried out by Turkey – a NATO member – and was done with the full at least tacit backing of the President of the United States, with the full support of the British. How close do you have to get to provoking thermonuclear war before enough people in Congress and in the American population wake up and recognize that Lyndon LaRouche has been right for years in warning about the menace that

President Obama represents if he's allowed to continue to remain in office? We're down to the final 14 or so months of his Presidency, but you can see the kind of developments that can occur on literally a moment's notice. And so, there is no option any longer other than removing the President from office by Constitutional means immediately. That means that the leading members of Congress and at least leading elements within the American population have got to finally wake up to strategic reality.

Now, to put an added punctuation mark on the situation, let's not forget that there was another major series of provocations directed against Russia over the same recent timeframe of the last week. You had the Right Sector, the neo-Nazi apparatus in Ukraine, that is openly backed and promoted by the Obama administration principally through Victoria Nuland, the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, who carried out a bombing campaign against the power grid of Crimea; and has effectively shut off almost all power to the entire Crimean peninsula. When Russian repair units attempted to get to the sites to re-establish the power links, they were fired on by Right Sector militias; and to make matters even worse, at the end of last week, it was announced by Nuland's pet prime minister, Yatsenyuk, that henceforth all Russian flights over Ukrainian airspace were cancelled. Now, that's tantamount to a threat of yet a second country, a major ally of the US and the British, threatening to carry out unprovoked strikes against Russian aircraft flying over Ukrainian airspace.

So, you've got a clear pattern here. You have – as Megan

indicated – a phase shift with the series of ISIS terrorist attacks over the last several weeks, that began with the bombing of the Russian Metro Jet over the Sinai; followed with a series of suicide bombings on the southern portions of Beirut in Lebanon, targetting the Shi'ite area of that city. And then the Paris attacks. The world was energized to finally launch an all-out serious campaign against the Islamic State. Russia escalated the bombing campaign against the Islamic State and knocked out an estimated 1000 of the tanker trucks that have been smuggling oil from the ISIS-controlled areas of northern Syria into Turkey, where they've been sold on the black market; and these funds have been fueling the operations of the Islamic State.

At the G-20 summit meeting that ironically took place in Turkey just days before the Turkish air force shot down the Russian SU-24, President Putin made very clear that Russia has aerial photographs showing lengthy caravans of these oil tanker trucks crossing the border into Turkey from northern Syria; and furthermore, he said he has the names of financial agents in 40 countries, including a number of the G-20 member countries, that are involved in financing the Islamic State through black market cooperation. So, the case is unambiguous. If you wanted to attribute narrow motives, you could say that Erdogan was furious at the Russians for bombing these Turkish smuggling trucks, since we know that the funds generated on the Turkish side from this black market activity largely go into the coffers of the

ruling

AKP Party. We know that the son of President Erdogan is himself

one of the major people involved in this black market operation.

But in a very real sense, that's a much too narrow understanding of what happened here. It eliminates the crucial question, which is that Obama and the British were behind this,

and it was an attempt on a much grander scale to not just simply

sabotage the Vienna initiatives; but it was an attempt to trigger

a potential world war. And for that crime alone, despite the fact

that there is a long list of Constitutional violations and other

crimes committed by this President, for that reason alone he must

be immediately removed from office. And therefore, every person

listening to this broadcast, all of your friends, all of your neighbors, all of your political associates, your co-workers, are

going to have to do some serious soul searching; because we came

inches away from world war last Tuesday morning, with the Turkish

actions. And it was only a matter of intervention, but particularly restraint on the part of Russian President Putin and

the Russian military that averted that. There is still clearly an

option, and lessons to be learned from this provocation, that could and must lead to reaching an agreement in Vienna to end the

five-year war and tragedy in Syria. But that must start with

the  
kind of blunt truth which we have been discussing here over  
the  
last few minutes; and it cannot go forward so long as  
President  
Obama remains in office. So, there are urgent issues that must  
be  
taken up by the Congress and by the American people, if we are  
going to avert a war; because I can assure you, if those  
critical  
actions are not taken in the immediate days ahead, then the  
chances that there will be {another} incident; {another}  
provocation, whether by Ukraine, whether by Erdogan and the  
Turks, whether by ISIS, and if actions aren't taken to solve  
the  
problem at its roots, we will be staring at the prospect of  
world  
war in the immediate days, perhaps hours ahead.

BEETS: Okay, thank you very much, Jeff. Now, upcoming this  
Monday, November 30th, we have the beginning of a two-week  
long  
genocidal COP21 depopulation climate conference, which is  
occurring in Paris, and despite the actual danger to humanity  
which Jeff just outlined in detail, and especially in the wake  
of  
the terrorist attacks in Paris just two weeks ago, this  
absolutely insane conference is going ahead as scheduled, to  
be  
attended by approximately 140 heads of state, along with  
thousands of other government, NGO, and other officials,  
notably  
Britain's Prince Charles, the dysfunctional and inbred son of  
Queen Elizabeth and her walking-dead husband, Prince Philip,  
will  
be one of the keynote speakers.  
Now, as we addressed in this webcast last week, if anyone



involved had any morality, we would completely change the nature of the conference, to address the actual dangers and threats to humanity, such as the refugee crisis, the conditions of poverty around the world, and the lack of development that are actually threatening billions of people. So what I'd like to do now, is ask Jason to come to the podium to address this upcoming conference in the context of what Jeff just presented.

JASON ROSS: This is almost like the worst joke you could imagine, holding this conference in Paris. This conference which, starting in a few days – we've been opposing this, and we've got a leaflet, a resolution that we've been getting out on this, called, "We Say No to the Paris COP21 CO2 Reduction Scheme." I want to read the bookmarks of this, the bookends. It opens, "The conditions for life of billions of people depend upon rejecting the agenda being presented at the 2015 climate change conference to be held in Paris this December. The COP21 Paris initiative to adopt a legally-binding agreement to reduce CO2 emissions must be rejected on two grounds: the scientific reality, that mankind's activity, is {not} going to cause catastrophic climate change, and the very real lethal consequences of the CO2 reduction programs being demanded." It ends, that "Energy-intensive scientific, technological, and economic growth is essential to human existence. This can be measured by transitions to higher levels of energy-flux density per-capita and per-area. Such

progress, growth, and development, is the universal right of man, and CO2 emissions are presently a vital part of that process for the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The adoption of a legally-binding CO2 reduction scheme at the COP21 conference in Paris will condemn billions of people to a lower quality of life, with higher death-rates, greater poverty, and no ability to exercise their inherent human right to participate in the creation of a better condition for society as a whole. This is deeply immoral. For these reasons, the CO2 reduction scheme of the COP21 conference in Paris must be rejected.”

So on the grounds of the fakery of the science, and the very, very real human costs of trying to meet the CO2 reduction goals, this can't go forward. However, obviously the push is there, the conference is going ahead despite the state of emergency currently in France, the terrorized population of Paris, changes in some of the agenda, but it's going ahead, and as a matter of fact, this conference is getting a kick-start over the weekend – today and the rest of the weekend – the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting is taking place in Malta. So this is where all the members of the former British Empire, now called the British Commonwealth, get together to – as in this case – hear speeches from the Queen and others about why they need to reduce CO2.

Prince Charles – who has been basically waiting for his mother to die for a half century to get a job – he said that the terrorism that we're seeing, the conflicts that we're seeing, are

not because of conflict, not because of ISIS, not because of the  
Brits and Saudi Arabia helping ISIS, instead, Prince Charles  
said, "In fact, there is very good evidence indeed that one of  
the major reasons for this horror in Syria was a drought that  
lasted for about 5 or 6 years, which meant that huge numbers  
of  
people in the end had to leave the land." This is the guy that  
they're asking to give the keynote address at the COP21  
conference – a man whose understanding of Syria seems to be  
that  
all of the conflict is because of a drought which was caused  
by  
climate change. It's insane, and it's knowingly evil on his  
part.  
So, what should be done instead, is re-purposing the  
conference would be a good thing, you know, recycling what's  
going to be done there. As Megan said, of course, addressing  
the  
refugee crisis, which is all over Europe at present, and  
beyond  
– that's worth discussing. Really, what's worth discussing is  
a  
solution to this whole problem, which would be excellent if  
the  
Congress were to release the 28 pages, put them in the record,  
as  
Senator Gravel did with the Pentagon Papers, to be able to  
attack  
the cause of this conflict at its source, which as Jeff went  
through, as LaRouche has been stressing, is Obama, who by his  
nature as a killer personality, has qualified himself to be  
inserted into his role as President. That that is the cause of  
the conflicts. Releasing the 28 pages, discussing how to  
actually  
shut down terrorism in the region, working {with} Russia on  
this

– you know, Russia is serious about this – you know, that would be worth discussing.

And really, what would it mean to develop the world into the Silk Road? You know, EIR released, about a year ago now, “The New

Silk Road Becomes the World Landbridge.” It’s a 300 and – almost

400 page report. It goes through in incredible detail, with maps

and everything, what it would mean for China’s One Belt One Road

project, its New Silk Road project, to continue its extension into a worldwide paradigm of development. What would those projects look like? And this is a policy that the LaRouches have

been promoting for decades, and Helga LaRouche in her visits to

China is acknowledged as “the Silk Road Lady,” for her role in bringing this outlook into the current fruition that it’s finding. So what would it mean for the U.S. to join the Silk Road? What would it mean for us to get our act together?

Well, we’ve been working on a report on this, in terms of what a U.S. recovery would look like, and there’s a lot of aspects to this. I mean, if you think about the kinds of projects

that have, many, been on the books, and the kinds of projects that will drive us into the future, you recognize that it would

not be very difficult to create millions of jobs in a very short

period of time – meaningful, productive jobs – that lay the groundwork for a durable new, more productive economy for the future. Doing that will require eliminating Wall Street, getting

Glass-Steagall re-implemented, having those provisions back in place, shutting down Wall Street which we do not need.

## Gambling

is not an essential part of economy. The productive process, science, creativity, the development of human beings and infrastructure – that is essential. Gambling is not.

So with Wall Street out of the way, with federal financing, with federal credit made available, some of the projects are things that we've discussed quite a bit. Take, for example, the

Bering Strait. Crossing the Bering Strait with a tunnel or a bridge, as engineers decide, would be a very key role, a very key

project, to put the U.S. on the Silk Road, literally, making it

possible to get from the West Coast of the U.S., into Eurasia, much more quickly than by sending a ship across the ocean, with

the added benefit that rail, or transportation corridors on land

overall, allow for the ability to develop regions along the way. Something that a ship crossing the ocean doesn't do.

Ships

don't create wealth, or the potential to create it, as they cross

the waters. Land connections do.

So the Bering Strait tunnel – that would be a key project.

Overall, transportation has a tremendous way to go in the U.S.

You know, China, which is a nation very similar in size to the United States, currently has 11,000 miles of high-speed rail, with plans to have 30,000 by 2020, and they'll do it – they do what they say. In contrast, we have under 500 miles of high-speed

rail, and that's being very generous in counting the Acela service as high-speed. What we should have is 42,000 miles of electrified, decent rail in the United States, bringing down the

costs of transportation, and of production throughout the nation,

making it more possible to move intermediate goods from place to place, to move people, to move products in a way that will have a tremendous savings in time, and in energy costs. Currently over half of rail-freight in the U.S. is coal. You know, in a nuclear economy we obviously wouldn't need so much coal, but it also goes to show how little else is being done with the system as it is, and maybe some idea of what it could be like in the future.

Along with the development of the basics which we naturally think of – things like transportation, rail, repairing roadways, power plants, water systems, which I'll get into in a moment – the other aspect is cities. Now, India has committed itself to building scores of new cities across the country. Russia has created science cities. The United States – imagine the potential, not to keep adding more and more sprawl to the outsides of our current cities, but developing legitimately new cities, actual cities, planned in a sensible way, with part of a transportation backbone underlying it, with infrastructure that's needed, canals and aqueducts as necessary, water, power, that sort of thing. But then also where the cities and where life is oriented around the most key of economic processes – the creation of wealth by improving the productive powers of labor, by the cultural role that can be played by a city. So in addition to the ability to move goods and people easily, the density you find in a real city, where different members of the household can do their various things that anyone

having an hour and a half commute can't, you also have the other

role of the city itself as a social institution.

So, in a very interesting article that LaRouche wrote some decades ago, in a program for the development of Africa, he discusses the central role of the city, and the presence of a research and educational complex, a pedagogical museum where people, kids, their parents, etc. would be able to step themselves through how discoveries had been made in the past in a

hands-on way, doing experiments, themselves witnessing and understanding very directly how humanity has gotten where it is,

making it possible to have workers able to master new technologies, and scientists able to reflect on what science has

done in the past, to create the new discoveries needed in the future.

This sort of educational center of the city will be more than a museum retailing the past; it will be more than looking backwards. LaRouche wrote that to give vitality and direction to

the process, the educational zone of a new city must be engaged

in some aspect of scientific research which is itself of world importance. He says that "a modern nation has achieved true sovereignty in spirit, only if it achieves excellence in some important aspect of advancement of human knowledge generally.

A people which can point to several institutions of its own nation,

and can identify several important contributions to human knowledge associated with such institutions, is a people which knows that its children are capable of equalling in importance to

humanity, the children of any other nation. To teach science is

to teach the principles of discovery.”

So, with cities, with this as an included basis, cities of finite size ( no more than one or two million people), with the

development made potential by rail, by water, by developing fusion power on a crash basis, and implementing the already-discovered abilities which have been improved on building

nuclear fission plants, we'll be able to dramatically increase the power, electrical power, available in the nation; to power transportation; to power manufacturing. And to do all of this, we're also going to need revival of machine tools themselves.

Now, machine tools – now not everyone's actually seen one of these in person. These are things like lathes, like mills, shapers – these are the devices that make everything that's required, that create metal, that shape metal to do machining.

To

the extent that you are able to innovate in this area, as has been done with new technologies over the decades – like electric

discharge machining around the time of the Apollo program, or electron-beam welding; or the more recent developments of laser

and plasma cutting, and the ability for these computer-controlled

machine tools to create things that would have taken ten times longer in earlier eras: to the extent that this technology improves, and to the extent that purchases are made, and as part

of an industrialization, the capital stock is increasingly of newer, and more productive machine tools, the entire economy sees

the benefits from them, by making easier, reducing the cost, of

all other production.

So, this machine tool principle is, in the small, an image of what it means to take discoveries and then implement them



into

an economy, for new thought, new engineering, or scientific idea,

to become manifest in the economy. And this is a field that needs

motion on. As I said earlier, power; fusion research, which has

been starved of funding deliberately for decades, preventing the

kind of breakthroughs that would make power, as has been said, too cheap to meter – or even if not that cheap, remarkably abundant power able to bring the next generation of production technologies into play. To transform our relationship with raw materials, and with reshaping those materials. Things like the plasma torch.

So, in this kind of economy, we can then re-approach such subjects as water. California is in what's called a water crisis,

despite being right next to the Pacific Ocean. Why do we not have

the power and the plants in place to be able to desalinate? To at

least provide for much of the needs in California? Why have we not done more research on how weather actually functions?

You know, one of the ironies of the global warming alarmists, hysterics, whatever you want to call them, is that this supposedly scientific outlook is actually stifling science.

Hypotheses about what's causing climate change over time, hypotheses about how cosmic radiation coming from our Galaxy, or

even beyond, plays a role in creating the cloud condensation nuclei to form clouds, to effect precipitation, to change the albedo, the reflectants of the Earth, and therefore its temperature – that's real science that's being held back by the

global warming mafia, who reject this kind of approach because

it

doesn't come to the conclusion that they want: namely, that human-made CO2 is {the} determining factor in global climate. It's just not true.

So, as was said in that resolution I read at the beginning, and as is covered in this other EIR special report, "Global Warming Scare is Population Reduction, Not Science," the science

is clear. We are not causing catastrophic warming of the planet.

Mankind is not a virus destroying the Earth. What is destroying

the planet is oligarchism; the outlook that human beings are a disease, the anti-growth and enforced poverty promoted by the City of London, by Wall Street, by that system which has to be removed. In its place, as far as an actual concept of humanity,

let me read another quote from LaRouche here. He says, "Every infant born in any part of the world has the potential for development of his or her mental powers to the level sufficient

for adult competence in use of modern technology." And this also

means real technology, not iPhones. "That child can achieve at least an approximation for practice of the highest levels of productive powers of labor in the world generally today. It is that potential development which is the only source of wealth."

Let's remember that; the source of wealth, the increasing of the

productive powers of labor, as Hamilton put it, lies in that ability for human beings creatively to develop new understandings

about nature, and thereby reform the economy in an entire way. That's real economic science, and with that approach, the programs that are needed, the development projects which we can

implement, the jobs that will create; this can all follow from an outlook of what economics truly is, and breaking free from the false ideas about it which have been promoted by Wall Street and which have affected, unfortunately, a very great number of our fellow citizens.

BEETS: Thanks, Jason. Two days ago, on Wednesday of this week, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of Einstein's publication of his paper on general relativity. Now, LaRouche has reiterated many times in the recent period that Einstein was the only true scientist in the 20th Century; someone who held out against the corruption in thinking that was ushered in 1900 by Bertrand Russell. And someone who was attacked and isolated for his commitment to the paradigm of thinking which represents the actual human mind; the paradigm which was responsible for all of human progress up to this point. So, what I'd like to do is ask Jason to come back to the podium and ask him this question: Given the task ahead of us today to rebuild society, rebuild civilization, and to create a new paradigm for mankind, I'd like to ask Jason to give us a sense of the importance of Einstein's work and his commitment.

ROSS: Sure. I think what Einstein accomplished represents a key concept under which science can be understood; that of metaphor. LaRouche has repeatedly stressed the importance of metaphor as the key to science; meaning the development of

language in such a way that you express a new scientific truth in a way that could not even have been stated in the preceding language. It's not something mathematical; it's not a formula or an expression. Discoveries in their true form can't be. After the fact, you might be able to write them down; but what makes them a discovery is an overthrowing of the past, the development of a new basis for thinking incompatible with what came before. That's the kernel of what a discovery is. None of these thoughts are really eternal; what is, is that process of developing new ones. Which is the incredible error in science education today, based upon understanding how to apply the fruits of discovery to specific problems; but not going through how they were developed. So, 100 years ago, 1915, Einstein successfully expanded his special theory of relativity, which he had developed in 1905, into a more general form; making it the general theory of relativity. So, I do want to say a bit about what Einstein did; I think it would be wrong not to; and then get into what it would mean for us today, what's the relevance. Einstein's not just someone to idolize, or say, "Wow, he was a real genius." Figure out what he did. So, going back ten years earlier to 1905 – 110 years ago – Einstein, in his what's now called special theory of relativity, changed the basis on which scientific thought was based. At that time, the prevailing view was of a Newtonian outlook to space

and

time. Isaac Newton had said that space and time were independent

of things within them; space is space, within it, things exist and take place, or occur in different relations to each other. According to Newton, time flows on its own, without reference to

the things in it; they take place over time, but time is an independent existence.

Well, Einstein tore that apart in 1905; in some ways with rather simple thoughts. For example, he demonstrated that the concept of simultaneity does not exist; that depending on who it

is that you ask, and their motion with respect to two events that

are occurring, that observer might say yes they occurred at the

same time. Meaning the light from those two events reaching them,

to make a determination which one occurred first, or second, or

whether they occurred simultaneously, depending on the motion of

an observer, they might appear to occur at the same time or not.

He gave the example of someone on a train witnessing two lightning bolts, versus someone on the ground witnessing two lightning bolts. To someone on the ground, two lightning bolts

occurring at equal distances in either direction, the light will

come and reach the person at the same time. To someone on a train, who is at the middle of that platform right when the bolts

occur, at the same time according to the person on the platform,

because of the train's motion, they're going to see this bolt

before the other one. Who's right? What does it really mean to say "at the same time"? Because all the laws of nature work the

same, whether you're standing still supposedly, or you're in constant motion, there's no way to say who's right; what the right time should be. And the idea of having a universality of simultaneity, to say "at this moment in the universe" disappears,

and it becomes relative to the observer.

What does that mean? It means that time itself no longer exists as a basis for thought in the way that it had before.

There's still time, but it's no longer an untouchable permanence;

the same thing is the case for space. Where space and time are skewed, and distances have to take place or be considered in space-time, rather than in only one or the other. So, by then, by

1905 in his special theory of relativity, Einstein had replaced

the concepts of space and time as a basis for physics with something physical; light's motion. In this way, he was implementing the revolutions in physics that Riemann said would

take place; that our understanding of geometry would take place

not by looking at geometry, but by an understanding of those binding forces of nature which give rise to what is then observed. A bent space; a curved space; a skewed space.

With his general theory of relativity in 1915, Einstein went beyond frames of reference which are either at rest with respect

to each other or in uniform motion; and he considered acceleration. He considered the fact that there is a relativistic

equivalence between somebody in a room where they feel the floor

pushing up against their feet, or their feet pushing down

against

the floor, that without reference to what's outside that room, they might be sitting on the Earth, or they might be out in space, where the top of the building is attached to a rope which

is being pulled at an accelerating rate, constantly pulling the

building up against their feet. No experiment, nothing you could

do inside the room, would be able to distinguish the one from the

other. From this equivalence then, Einstein derived his general

theory of relativity, by which not only motion, but gravitation

changes the shape of space and time.

This was a very, and still is, a very wild shocking idea.

Space and time were considered to be such fundamental things that

the possibility of them even being curved was rejected out of hand by people like Immanuel Kant, Isaac Newton, Bertrand Russell.

So, what Einstein was able to do, though, is demonstrate that he was right. Two quick examples. One was the orbit of Mercury. Every orbit, every planet, has a place that's farthest

from the Sun, and one where it's closest to the Sun. You draw the

line through them. That line for the orbit doesn't stay stationary. It actually moves over time. For Mercury that line moves a degree and a half every century. And based on calculations and gravity, as it was understood, people were able

to explain almost all of that change. There remained a very, very

small – about .01 degree per century – change in Mercury's orbit that no one had explained, but which Einstein was able

to

explain with his theory.

Also his prediction about how light would bend going around large objects, was borne out in the experiments around the eclipse of 1919, in which photographs taken of stars near the eclipsed Sun – since the Sun was covered, you could actually see

stars near the Sun, which you can't ordinarily do in the daytime,

because you can't see anything – and comparing those same stars

when the Sun was not in the sky near them, showed again that Einstein was right; that the path of light coming from the stars

towards us was deformed, was shaped, by the presence of the Sun

in the way.

So, these are the things that people are most familiar with about Einstein, things that are indisputably advances that he made. But there's more to him than that. I think that the great

importance that LaRouche attributes to him in what Megan was bringing up about calling him the only scientist we had here in

the Twentieth Century, the only one who stuck to science, lies elsewhere as well.

The other great work that Einstein had done was on the quantum. So in 1905, in addition to Special Relativity, he also

wrote a paper to explain the photo-electric effect, and it was actually this that got him his Nobel Prize later. This expanded

the theories of Planck in showing how light itself must come in

pieces: that it's not purely a wave phenomenon; that there's something particle-like about it. Experiments, however, required



light to also have wave-like properties, making it impossible to in a simple way decide on this question. Is light a particle, or is light a wave? This is one of the difficulties of quantum physics.

What Einstein held out against was the interpretation by scientists in his day, led by Bohr, mainly, Neils Bohr the Dane,

to say that science had reached a limit; that to ask why was really no longer admissible, and that in the quantum world, physics, instead of saying what nature is, is limited to describing how nature appears. Against that Einstein – Einstein

would not accept that. Einstein never accepted the idea that we

had reached an end to the ability to know things, and that quantum theory as it was known at that time, was final, complete.

Something that's never been true of, really, any theory in history.

This is seen now with the ongoing difficulties around completing quantum theory, and also the anomalies in the fields

of life and the potential for a higher understanding of these quantum processes in the fields of cognition. It's also seen in

his own work, with the theory of gravitation; with the difficulties – I hope you've been watching the series of presentations our colleague Ben Deniston has been doing on the Galaxy on this website every other Wednesday – it's also seen in

the difficulty in understanding the speed of rotation of galaxies. The basis for hypotheses that people make about dark matter now. A lot of what this can indicate is that we have simply reached the limits to the applicability of our physical theories, and need to go beyond them.

That's not done mathematically by positing ways to keep our old laws, to explain the new phenomena, but it can require going beyond it.

So, we don't have answers to these questions. We shouldn't fool ourselves into thinking that we do already have the answers

to these questions. And the importance of Einstein for us today,

is that of a successful discoverer who overthrew what had been thought, developed a higher theory to explain things, and was guided by an understanding of the role of the human mind in developing new, successful concepts about nature. With that as a

basis for how we relate to other human beings, with that as a basis for social relations, we can forge a much higher level of

cooperation on this planet, and develop a culture that's really

suitable for human beings that participate in it.

MEGAN BEETS: Thank you very much, Jason. With that, I'm going to bring our broadcast to a close. I would like to thank Jason for joining me, and Jeff for joining us via video, and I'd

like to thank all of you for watching tonight. Please stay tuned

to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

# **Delegerede på COP21: Her er det klima-spørgsmål, I bør diskutere: Terrorismen og flygtninge- krise i en kold vinter!**

*Klimakonferencen i Paris må fokusere på de reelle og umiddelbare farer for menneskeheden: denne hastigt voksende flygtningekrise, de afgrundsdybe EU-økonomier og tab af arbejdspladser, samt de milliarder af mennesker over hele verden, der stadig lider under manglen på tilstrækkelig, stabil og billig energi, som er nødvendig for at gøre en ende på deres knusende fattigdom, fejllærning, sygdom og tidlige død ved at sikre rent vand, ordentlige sanitære forhold, moderne hospitaler, lys, køleskabe og rigelig mad. Klimakonferencedeltagerne må adressere de følgende, langt mere presserende nødvendige spørgsmål.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Valgsejr til gribbefondenes kandidat i Argentina signalerer angreb på BRIKS**

*23. november 2015 – City of London og dens allierede gribbefonde hoverer over, at en af deres egne, den neoliberale*

Mauricio Macri fra Cambienos-koalitionen, vandt første runde af Argentinas præsidentvalg, der blev afholdt d. 22. november, om end med en snæver sejr, 51,4 % af stemmerne, mod 48,6 % til kandidaten fra Victory Front, Daniel Sciolo, som af præsident Cristina Fernández de Kirchner var udvalgt til at være hendes efterfølger.

Som talerør for City of London, *The Economist*, kagtede i sin dækning i dag, så "markerer Macris sejr et skifte væk fra populisme for Argentina – og Sydamerika", hvormed menes en tilbagevenden til den destruktive frimarkeds-monetarisme, der plyndrede Argentina i 1990'erne, og som førte til landets misligholdelse af gælden (betalingsstandsning), der indtil da aldrig var forekommet. Macri forventes at forsøge hurtigt at lave en aftale med de rovgriske gribbefonde, der i mere end et årti har ført krig mod Argentina, for således at "vende tilbage til de internationale finansmarkeder" og begynde at påtage sig ny, udenlandsk gæld. Dette vil, som han siger, atter gøre Argentina til et "forudsigeligt" land.

Den ugentlige London-avis var ligeledes henrykt over, at Macri har til hensigt at "genjustere" Argentinas udenrigspolitik væk fra BRIKS-nationerne Rusland og Kina, som præsident Fernández har etableret et tæt samarbejdsforhold med, til fordel for "normale" relationer med USA og Europa. Cristina Fernández har haft gentagne sammenstød med Barack Obama om hans britisk-imperialistiske udenrigspolitik. *The Economist* forudsiger, at Argentina, ved at vælge Macri, muligvis "sætter en præcedens for resten af regionen," gennem hvilken andre "venstreorienterede" statsoverhoveder kunne blive væltet. BRIKS-medlemmet Brasilien, hvis præsident Dilma Rousseff er under politisk angreb, er et primært mål.

I en pressekonference her til morgen gjorde Macri det klart, at han påtænker ikke alene at afvikle nøgleaspekter af præsident Fernández' økonomiske politik, såsom valuta- og kurskontrol, men også at lancere en retslig vendetta imod medlemmer af Kirchner-regeringen for påstået "korrupsion".

Ingen kunne misforstå budskabet om, hvem, der var målet, i forbindelse med Macris løfte om, at han har til hensigt at give retsvæsenet – Macri er politisk allieret med en beskidt fraktion af dette retsvæsen, der også har forsøgt at styrte præsident Fernandez – ”al den frihed, der skal til for at gå grundigt til værks over for dem, der har begået handlinger i strid med loven.”

*Foto: Mauricio Macri, kandidaten fra Cambiemos, fejrer valgsejren den 22. november.*

---

## **EIR: Den virkelige krise: Det er krigen, ikke klimaet!**

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche, formand for det tyske, politiske parti Bündnis (Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet), er den eneste, tyske leder, der har fremlagt løsningen: Tyskland må omgående trække sig ud af briternes og Obamas politik med regimeskift og krig og droppe den grønne dagsorden, til fordel for en total accept af den kinesisk anførte bevægelse for global opbygning gennem en Ny Silkevej. I denne ånd har Zepp-LaRouche helhjertet støttet opfordringen fra videnskabsfolkene Paul Dreissen og Joe D'Aleo om at forvandle topmødet i Paris til en begivenhed til mobilisering til fordel for at redde*

*flygtningene med en reel, økonomisk genopbygningsplan.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Kinas præsident Xi Jinping til Afrika efter COP21 for at fremme udvikling i Afrika**

*26. november 2015* – Kinas præsident Xi Jinping vil foretage endnu en rejse til Afrika i december, hvor han vil tilbringe 1.-2. dec. i Zimbabwe for at mødes med præsident Robert Mugabe, og dernæst rejser videre til Sydafrika for at mødes med præsident Jacob Zuma 2.-3. dec. Han vil deltage i Forum for Kina-Afrika Samarbejde (FOCAC) i Sydafrika den 4.-5. dec., hvor han vil holde hovedtalen den 4. dec. Det er første gang, FOCAC-mødet afholdes i Afrika, og det er første gang, mødet afholdes, siden Xi Jinping blev statschef.

Xi rejser til Afrika umiddelbart efter at have tilbragt to dage på COP21, og han vil tale om udvikling, som Det afrikanske Kontinents største handelspartner.

Det kinesiske *Peoples Daily Online* annoncerede i dag, at Kina vil tilbyde nultoldsbehandling for 97 % af varer fra Nepal og syv afrikanske lande, med start den 7. dec. Disse afrikanske lande er Comorerne, Mauretanien, Togo, Liberia, Rwanda, Angola og Zambia.

*Foto: Sydafrikas præsident Jacob Zuma og Kinas præsident Xi Jinping.*

---

# **Verdensbanken vil promovere en fond for Afrika på COP21 for at håndtere klimachok**

26. november 2015 – Verdensbanken annoncerede den 24. nov. en Klimaforretningsplan til 16 milliard dollar, der skal hjælpe Afrika håndtere »presserende klimaudfordringer«. Planen, der skal fremlægges den 30. nov. på COP21-folkemordskonferencen, vil yde minimal finansiering for at hjælpe Afrika opbygge, hvad den kalder »modstandsdygtighed over for klimachok«, i stedet for at fremme den vækst i infrastruktur, som Afrika har brug for at udvikle.

Præsidenten for Verdensbankgruppen Jim Yong Kim sagde, at »Sub-Sahara Afrika er yderst sårbart over for klimachok«. Det er planen at yde hjælp til at håndtere malaria, tørke og fødevaremangel – der alle angiveligt skyldes klimaforandring, og ikke manglende udvikling. Planen foreslår at hjælpe Afrika med at tilpasse sig klimaforandringer samtidig med en reduktion af udledning af 'drivhusgasser' ved at opgradere energikilder med lavt kulstofindhold.

Et af planens mål for handling er at »muliggøre modstandsdygtighed ved at yde afgørende data, information og redskaber til politisk beslutningstagning om klima-modstandsdygtig udvikling«.

Verdensbanken påstår, at denne anti-udviklingsplan vil »levere klima-smart udvikling«.

## Forslag til fordybelse:

“Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur”, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

“Et økonomisk mirakel for Sydeuropa, Middelhavsområdet og Det afrikanske Kontinent”, Schiller Institut Specialrapport

“Skræmmekampagnen om global opvarmning handler om befolkningsreduktion – ikke videnskab”

---

## Berlineravis fordømmer Obama

26. november 2015 – I sin faste spalte i Berlineravisen *Der Tagesspiegel*, angriber Stephan-Andreas Casdorff Obama for de netop forlængede sanktioner mod Rusland for at være det stik modsatte af en konstruktiv verdenspolitik. Obamas træk er kontrær til det presserende nødvendige behov for at få signaler om en øst-vest-afspænding (detente) og samarbejde med Rusland imod IS, skriver Casdorff og tilføjer, at russerne har bedre efterretninger om noget som helst, der finder sted i Syrien, end nogen anden, og at de ved, hvad de gør, til forskel fra de andre magter, der ikke ved, hvad de gør.

---



# Cypriotiske ledere fordømmer Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske fly som værende »uacceptabelt«

26. november 2015 – Cyperns præsident Nicos Anastasiades og andre cypriotiske politiske ledere har skarpt fordømt nedskydningen af det russiske SU24-fly som værende »uacceptabelt« og som en demonstration af, at Tyrkiet støtter Islamisk Stat.

Iflg. *Cyprus Mail* gav Anastasiades onsdag udtryk for sin »dybe bekymring« over den situation, der blev skabt efter »det tyrkiske luftvåbens uacceptable nedskydning af et russisk bombefly«.

»Alt imens indsatsen for koordineret handling i det internationale samfund for at bekæmpe terrorisme er i gang, så underminerer gårsdagens episode enhver indsats for magter som USA, Rusland og EU for at arbejde sammen om at opnå dette mål.« Erklæringen udtrykte også kondolence til Rusland for en af dets piloters død.

Selv om Cypern ikke er medlem af NATO, så er landet medlem af EU. Anastasiades, der er konservativ, er en af de få, om nogen, europæiske ledere, der direkte angriber nedskydningen af flyet. Hans erklæring kommer på et tidspunkt, hvor både græske og tyrkiske cyprioter forhandler om en genforening af øen, der har været delt siden den tyrkiske hær invaderede den i 1974. Tyrkiet har fortsat tusinder af tropper i den tyrkisk besatte zone.

Andre cypriotiske partier fordømte Tyrkiet. Det Cypriotiske Grønne Parti, Borgeralliancen, og det tidligere regeringsparti AKEL, opfordrede kraftigt den cypriotiske regering til ikke at

lade sig influere af »pres fra den anglo-amerikanske akse, der støtter Tyrkiet imod Rusland. Præsident Anastasiades må reflektere, efter Tyrkiets aggressive handling. Det er med dette land, han forhandler om ophævelse af Republikken«, sagde Alliancen.

Erklæringen fra AKEL sagde, at NATO har glemt, at den virkelige fjende er Islamisk Stat. »Tværtimod viser alle beviserne, at Tyrkiet fortsat støtter Islamisk Stat«, lød erklæringen.

*Foto: Den cypriotiske præsident Nicos Anastasiades.*

---

## **Firstjernet tysk NATO-general: Inkluder Rusland i enhver løsning**

26. november 2015 – Den firstjernede general Egon Ramms var den højest rangerende, tyske NATO-general. I går gav han et interview til *Rheinische Post online* (rp-online), hvor han kritiserede den tyrkiske flynedskydning, krævede, at man atter indkaldte til en samling i NATO-Rusland-rådet[1] og sagde, at, for at nedkæmpe ISIS, så har man brug for 100.000 tropper.

NATO-Rusland-rådet »må som en presserende nødvendighed genoplives. Hvis man vil træffe politiske diskussioner i Europa, må Rusland involveres. Russiske øjne er mere rettet mod Europa end mod Asien, selv om Vladimir Putin ikke altid vil indrømme det.«

Rusland har været partner med Syrien i årtier, har brug for en

basis i Middelhavsområdet og »gennem den aktive involvering i den syriske konflikt kom Rusland tilbage på den politiske verdensscene. Vi må tale med Rusland. Uden Rusland findes der ingen løsning på det syriske problem.«

IS kan nedkæmpes militært, men »luftrangreb må integreres med landtropper for at bekæmpe IS fra vest til øst. Dernæst må man sikre, at der sker en genopbygning, sikre, at det civile samfund fungerer og stille muligheder til rådighed for folket. Til den første del og maksimalt i en overgangsperiode ville man behøve flere end 100.000 landtropper.«

Gernot Erler, den tyske regeringsperson, der er ansvarlig for Ruslandspolitikken, sagde ligeledes i et interview med *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung*, at »NATO-Rusland-rådet omsider atter skal begynde at arbejde i fuldt omfang.«

*Foto: Pensionerede firstjernede general Egon Ramms.*

[1] Et råd mellem Nato og Rusland blev etableret i Rom i 2002. Romdeklarationen bygger på mål og principper fra Nato-Rusland aftalen "founding act" fra 1997 om fælles relationer, samarbejde og sikkerhed, som er grundlaget for forholdet.

Der er normalt møder i rådet en gang om måneden på ambassadørniveau, to gange om året på ministerniveau og en gang imellem på topmødeniveau, hvor stats- og regeringscheferne for Rusland og Nato-landene er til stede.

Nato med Anders Fogh Rasmussen i spidsen opsagde samarbejdet med Rusland i april 2014, til fordel for et tættere samarbejde med Ukraine.

---

# Rusland: Alt samarbejde med Tyrkiet om forsvar er blevet stoppet

*26. november 2015* – I en række af bevidst beherskede russiske svar på Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk militærfly og drab af russisk militærpersonel meddelte Rusland den 26. nov., at alt samarbejde med Tyrkiet om forsvar er blevet stoppet. Et regeringsmøde samme dag, præsideret af premierminister Medvedev, sagde, at en række økonomiske og finansielle restriktioner mod Tyrkiet vil blive meddelt inden for to dage.

---

## Leder, 27. november 2015: I har meget lidt tid til at ændre jeres tankegang

*... LaRouche refererede herefter til et møde tirsdag aften, hvor han havde insisteret på, at Obama omgående må ydmyges og degraderes i en grad, hvor han ikke længere vil være i stand til at gennemtvinge de sidste, tilbageværende, korte skridt mod en atomkrig, og heller ikke vil være i stand til at forhindre, at han brat tvinges fra embedet. Dette er et spørgsmål om liv eller død for menneskeheden – ikke uger ud i fremtiden, men lige nu, på Thanksgiving Day, og fredag morgen.*

Under en telefonkonference onsdag morgen, den 25. nov., med

sin Politiske Komite sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Jeg mener ikke, vi befinder os i en god tid. Vi er i en desorganiseret tid, en tid med nederlag. Vi er ikke særligt effektive lige nu. Vores organisation som helhed lykkes ikke, med hensyn til vores præstationer; dette må vi rette op på.«

LaRouche refererede herefter til et møde tirsdag aften, hvor han havde insisteret på, at Obama omgående må ydmyges og degraderes i en grad, hvor han ikke længere vil være i stand til at gennemtvinge de sidste, tilbageværende, korte skridt mod en atomkrig, og heller ikke vil være i stand til at forhindre, at han brat tvinges fra embedet. Dette er et spørgsmål om liv eller død for menneskeheden – ikke uger ud i fremtiden, men lige nu, på Thanksgiving Day[1], og fredag morgen.

For alle, der stadig er i tvivl, så blev det offentligt indrømmet denne tirsdag morgen, at de fleste af jer ikke har denne tankegang, og derfor ikke præsterer denne adfærd.

Under sin haste-diskussion med aktivister i hele USA, (den såkaldte 'Fireside Chat') om aftenen den 25. kom det sidste spørgsmål fra en texaner, som sagde, at en rigsretssag mod Obama var udelukket, eftersom dette kræver to tredjedele af Senatet, og aldrig før er sket. Obama burde smides ud i et militærkup efter krav fra befolkningen, ligesom den egyptiske diktator Morsi, fortsatte spørgeren, men dette er ikke muligt, eftersom Obama har fyret alle de gode generaler. Hvordan kan vi få det amerikanske folk til at rejse sig en masse og kræve Obamas afsættelse, spurgte han?

LaRouche svarede, at der ikke er noget systemisk princip, der forhindrer dette. Folk må mobiliseres til at uddanne sig selv på den rette måde. De værdier, man har lært dem at tilpasse sig til, har fordærvet dem. Det er ikke kun et spørgsmål om at fjerne skidt fra folks hoveder: de må bringes til at forstå de sygdomme, som de har inficeret deres egne hjerner med. Det vil virke.

Hvis man ønsker at kontrollere samfundet, korrumperer (fordærver) man samfundet; man inducerer folk til at tro på noget, der ikke er sandt; hvorimod sandfærdig viden ikke er alment praktiseret. Dette skyldes, at vore regeringssystemer så ofte er korrupte.

Man må få folk til at se på sig selv og sige, »Hvad gør jeg forkert?« De kan forstå dette, men de må begynde et studie af sig selv og gennemgå, hvad det er, de burde tænke på, med de rette ideer. Dette kan gøres, men den eneste måde, det kan gøres på, er ved, at folk inspicerer sig selv meget grundigt. At de genovervejer, hvad det er, de har vedtaget som deres mening. Under visse omstændigheder er dette sket med held. Det har vi nu igen brug for.

[1] I USA en overvejende sekulariseret helligdag den fjerde torsdag i november, der er blevet fejret lige siden de første europæere kom til Den nye Verden; oprindeligt en taksigelse for årets høst.