

Den russiske præsident Putin diskuterer planlægning og mål for Syrien-kampagnen på Rossiya-Tv

11. oktober 2015 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin sagde i et interview søndag til Rossiya 1 Tv, at Rusland ikke har planer om at lancere en landoffensiv i Syrien («uanset, hvad der sker, så gør vi ikke dette»), og at Ruslands formål er »at stabilisere dette lands legitime myndighed og skabe betingelser for at søge et politisk kompromis«.

Putin understregede også, at der forud for de syriske luftangreb blev foretaget grundige overvågninger med satellit og fly; »derfor er alt det, der sker i luften og på jorden, ikke resultat af en spontan handling, men virkeliggørelsen af planer, der er lagt forudgående.«

Tv-journalist Vladimir Solovyov spurgte Putin om angrebet med krydsermissiler fra det Kaspiske Hav og kommenterede, at amerikansk efterretning var ophørt med at virke fra dette tidspunkt at regne, til hvilket den russiske præsident svarede:

»Lad os nu ikke kaste med sten. Amerikansk efterretning er en af de mest magtfulde i verden, og dog ved den ikke alt – og bør ikke vide alt, for den sags skyld.« Med hensyn til krydsermissilerne, så »har disse missiler ikke været i brug ret længe – fra 2012. Deres rækkevidde er 1.500 kilometer, og de repræsenterer moderne, højteknologiske højpræcisionsvåben.«

Putin understregede også, at Rusland ikke har nogen imperieambitioner: »Vi har hverken brug for fremmede territorier eller naturlige ressourcer. Vi har alt i overflod. Vi er et selvforsynende land ... vi må imidlertid forsvare vores

uafhængighed og suverænitet. Det har vi gjort før, og det vil vi gøre i fremtiden.«

Han udtrykte ligeledes sin stærke fordømmelse af den dobbelte terrorbombning i Tyrkiet og kaldte det et »åbenlyst« forsøg på at destabilisere Tyrkiet, og han tilbød Ruslands hjælp til at bekæmpe terrorismen. »Det er nødvendigt at forene indsatsen imod denne ondskab. Det, der skete i Tyrkiet ... er helt bestemt et skamløst terrorangreb, en terroristforbrydelse med snesevis af ofre.«

Rhodos-konference, »Dialog mellem Civilisationer«: Ruslands Yakunin meddeler skabelse af nyt forskningsinstitut til fremme af global infrastruktur

11. oktober 2015 – Vladimir Yakunin, præsident og medstifter af Verdensforummet »Dialog mellem Civilisationer« (eller Rhodos Forum), på hvilket Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har talt gentagne gange i årenes løb – åbnede det 13. årlige Rhodos Forum den 10. okt. ved at meddele lanceringen af en ny, stor global tænketank, der fokuserer på globale infrastrukturprojekter.

Yakunin, der indtil for nylig også var chef for Russiske Jernbaner, brugte sine indledende bemærkninger til et kraftigt angreb på geopolitisk tankegang og faren for krig. »Vi har set, at en verden, der er domineret af en enkelt civilisation, ikke fungerer. Nylige konflikter i Afghanistan, Irak, Libyen og Syrien har vist, at Vestens interventionspolitik er en fiasko. Det står ud fra den aktuelle tilstand med konflikt i hele verden klart, at interkulturel dialog er af vital betydning.«

Blandt de fremtrædende talere på Rhodos var Jayshree Sengupta, økonom, Observer Research Foundation, fra New Delhi, Indien, der også talte på Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris i juni 2015. I sine bemærkninger på Rhodos understregede hun betydningen af infrastruktur og opfordrede især til samarbejde med Kina. Hun sagde, at der var 700 millioner indere i landsbyer i landdistrikter, der ikke har nogen infrastruktur, men, med BRIKS og dennes Nye Udviklingsbank (NDB), har vi håb om at kunne finansiere vore behov for infrastruktur. I BRIKS er vi alle lige, men det er vi ikke i IMF, udtalte hun. BRIKS' reservevalutafond, CRA, vil tage sig af mange problemer, med overgangslån, når penge begynder at strømme ud. Men ulig IMF stiller CRA ingen forhåndsbetingelser, ingen diktater og ingen forhåndskrav (især om budgetnedskæringer og 'nøjsomhedspolitik' over for befolkningen, -red.).

Under Kinas lederskab, sagde hun, er Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, AIIB, operationel, og Europa har trodset USA og tilsluttet sig. Nogle folk i Indien er nervøse over Kina, idet de er bange for, at den ene stormagt skal afløses af den anden, nemlig Kina. Men jeg siger nej, fastholdt Sengupta: Vi er ligeværdige i AIIB og NDB, og det er grunden til, at jeg støtter dette.

Foto: Vladimir Yakunin åbner det 13. møde i Rhodos Forum

LPAC Fredags-webcast 9. oktober 2015: Skrid til forebyggende handling nu: Glass-Steagall ind, Obama ud. v/Jeffrey Steinberg m.fl.

Jeff Steinberg om Lyndon LaRouches vurdering af udviklingen omkring situationen med Rusland, Syrien, Obama og bombningen af Læger uden Grænser-hospitalet i Kunduz, ud fra et standpunkt om de nødvendige kulturelle ændringer, der skal til for at vende forandringerne i det 20. Århundrede omkring. Engelsk udskrift.

TAKE PRE-EMPTIVE ACTION NOW:

GLASS STEAGALL IN, OBAMA OUT

TRANSCRIPT

MATT OGDEN: Good evening.

You're joining us for LaRouche PAC weekly webcast for October 9, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I will be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence Review, and by Jason Ross of the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and we, together with a number of

others, had the opportunity to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche briefly before filming this recorded webcast.

What I would like to begin with is just to make the point: that this has been a week of mobilization by the LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement across the country, both with our continuing intervention into New York City, and with the deployment of a number of activists into Washington, D.C., including a number of activists from the Manhattan area, who descended onto Capitol hill on Wednesday of this week, to saturate Congress with Mr. LaRouche's newest statement on the urgent necessity for the immediate action to shut down Wall Street with the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall.

This statement had quite a substantial impact on Congress, which is, itself, in the midst of total chaos in the wake of the resignation of John Boehner, and now with the surprise withdrawal of Kevin McCarthy from the Speaker's race, who was the nominated, or assumed heir apparent, of John Boehner to replace him as Speaker of the House. This has thrown the entire Congress into chaos, and they were desperately in need of the leadership that LaRouche PAC was there to provide.

The text of this statement is the following, and I think it's very short, and very concise, and it's worth beginning our broadcast tonight by just reading this in full. It's titled "For the Urgent Attention of Congressmen, Senators, and Other Members of the United States Government":

Oct. 5—Key responsible Congressmen and Senators (and there are some), and other U.S. government representatives must meet at once, to issue Findings of Fact and Statements of Commitment roughly as follows, for immediate enactment into law, and into immediate effect.

1. There is now an acute emergency which threatens to kill millions of Americans, primarily, and also citizens of other countries.

2. This is due immediately to the bankruptcy of Wall Street. Wall Street is totally and irremediably bankrupt. The successive Bush and Obama bailouts and the rounds of "quantitative easing," have only succeeded in making all of Wall Street's values valueless, and finalizing its bankruptcy.
3. If Wall Street is permitted to blow out again on its own terms, as now appears imminent, the result will be the worst panic in history, which will close down everything that remains of the U.S. economy. We will have mass death, on the order of the Black Plague which wiped out one-third of the population of Europe. Another Wall Street bailout, which Obama will demand if he is permitted to remain in office, would trigger a hyper-inflation just as deadly.
4. Hence, Wall Street must be closed down pre-emptively by U.S. Government action, in the spirit of what Franklin Roosevelt would do if he were alive today. (Although the crisis he faced was far milder.) Only activities compatible with a strict Glass-Steagall standard must be allowed to continue.
5. The Federal Government must issue U.S. dollars as credit to preserve the lives of the population and employ all the employable, in the spirit of Roosevelt's kindred actions with Harry Hopkins.
6. Over the slightly longer term, U.S. Federal credit must be used to rapidly raise the level of productivity of U.S. labor, through increased energy-flux density with scientific and technological progress.
7. Finally removing Barack Obama from office would be an excellent starting-point for these urgent reforms.

So that went out all over Capitol Hill this week, and also across the country, with rallies from San Francisco to Manhattan, and elsewhere in between. And Obama is increasingly being isolated and abandoned by members of his own cabinet, vis-a-vis the Russian intervention into Syria; the split by

Hillary on the TPP, distancing herself now, officially, from Obama on that, and also, with the dramatic announcement by Doctors Without Borders that they will be pursuing an independent investigation into whether *war crimes* were committed with regards to the sustained bombing, for over one hour, of the Afghan hospital. And that's something that we will get into later in this broadcast.

So, in that context, I'd like to begin tonight's broadcast by asking Jeff to respond with Mr. LaRouche's remarks on the institutional question for this week, which I'll read as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche. There are strong rumors that Vice President Biden will enter the race. Some observers believe key individuals associated with President Obama are supportive of Biden's nomination. Some Obama campaign veterans are successfully helping Sanders' fundraising campaign. In your view, is there a concerted effort at the White House to find an alternative to Hillary Clinton?"

So, I'll let Jeff give Mr. LaRouche's response to that.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt.

I think the reality of the situation goes way, way, way beyond the question of whether or not the Team Obama, the core group of advisors plus the President himself, have it out for Hillary Clinton, because there's ample evidence that that's absolutely the case. And, in fact, it's been the case since the moment that President Obama offered Hillary Clinton the job of Secretary of State, which she unfortunately, very foolishly accepted. And so, is there animus between the Obama and Clinton machines, and family? No question about it. But we're in a different universe. We're almost on a different planet right now from the standpoint of the upcoming Presidential elections and events that are much more immediately at hand.

President Obama and the entire inner circles at the White House are in an absolutely frantic state of mind, and under those kinds of circumstances, one can expect that this President will make the kinds of colossal blunders, dangerous blunders, which could lead to general war,—and in fact, there are many indications of exacting that trajectory—and alternatively, will result in the kind of meltdown that will finally catalyze the long, long overdue drive to get him out of office.

Recently, when President Obama spoke at the United Nations General Assembly, there was a state of total shock and disbelief among the diplomats present, when they realized that Obama's words were full of nothing but lies and hypocrisy. The United States was engaged in a bombing campaign in Syria, which was in violation of the most fundamental concepts of national security, of national sovereignty. The Syrian government did not invite the United States in. There was no United Nations Security Council action, and in fact, there has been no action by the United States Congress giving the President any authorization to carry out any military operations overseas.

So, in effect, the President's behavior is completely lawless, completely irrational, and generally speaking, sociopathological. And this is nothing new. Back in April of 2009, Lyndon LaRouche, in a nationwide and internationally telecast webcast, warned that the President had a severe narcissist personality disorder, and that the danger was that if he were allowed to continue in office unchecked, this would lead to a complete breakdown, and to a state of general war that could lead to a thermonuclear war of extinction.

Now we're on the very edge of exactly that process. As Matt mentioned, we had a large delegation up on Capitol Hill several days ago, and in that discussion process that occurred with many, many members of Congress—around an outdoor rally and around a lot of private discussions—the striking shift in

mood, particularly among Democrats, was that when we said: Obama must be removed from office, we can't wait out the clock and run out the duration of his Presidency, Wall Street is bankrupt, the system is about to blow, and we are on the verge of thermonuclear war—the general response was no longer “Oh, c'mon, that's impossible. It'll never happen.” Now people wanted to stop and talk, and the question was not *should* it be done, but the question was *how* do we do it.

So, you've got an Obama White House that is increasingly being isolated from the rest of the world. You've had in the past days a pattern of response to the actions taken by Russian President Putin in Syria, where, instead of this pattern of permanent war, never-ending conflict, with no effort whatsoever to actually solve anything in a decisive way—the Russians have come in and are prepared to use military force, combined with diplomacy, to wipe out the Islamic State, and any other allied Salafist, jihadist forces, and this is a different mode of action.

What President Obama represents is the fact that, for the entirety of the Twentieth Century, we've been operating under a continuous degeneration of culture, and of intellectual and moral depth. We're now at the point that we're one and a half decades into the Twenty-First Century, and the disastrous course of the Twentieth Century has not yet been reversed.

You go back to the beginning of the Twentieth Century, the beginning of a century of perpetual war and economic breakdown, a collapse of productivity, and you see that mathematics replaced morality and physics and other science, as the basis for all major policy decisions. Clearly you had moments of exception: the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency in its entirety was a dramatic exception to this. But from the moment that Franklin Roosevelt died, we have been on a downward trajectory. We've lost the ability to expand productivity in the real economy. The levels of morality have gone downward with every successive generation, and now we've reached the

bottom of the barrel, with both the Obama Presidency and with the level of overall cultural morality here in the United States.

Now, in our discussion with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche,—and I should say, by the way, that this is now Thursday late afternoon, and we've prerecorded this broadcast, so there may be events over the next 24 hours before you're viewing this broadcast that change things rather dramatically; it's the nature of the period that we're in, that things are changing on an hourly and daily basis.

But Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche recounted the fact that they were watching a show on German television on Wednesday evening, which was a kind of interview/interrogation of German Angela Merkel. Now as those of you who've been regularly following these broadcasts, and have followed the LaRouche movement over the years, are aware, we've been harshly critical of Frau Merkel: that she's not been an effective Chancellor. She's presided over some of the most disastrous decisions that have been made in Germany in the entire postwar period, such as the complete dismantling of Germany's nuclear power sector.

But, she made the right decision under enormous public pressure, to not go into a xenophobic attack against the urgent needs of the refugees flooding into Europe from North Africa and from the Middle East, escaping the devastating wars that President Obama, and before him President George W. Bush, were absolutely responsible for.

So, Merkel was under vicious attack from some of the interviews on the question of why she was tolerating the flow of these Middle East refugees into Germany. And why didn't they just simply create refugee camps on the outskirts of Europe in the Middle East; virtually concentration camps? And so Merkel, in her own quiet way, held her ground; and Mr. LaRouche's comment was that basically she steadfastly maintained the view of the majority of Germans. If you didn't

have Putin taking the actions that he has taken in Syria and elsewhere, and if you didn't have a majority of the population in Germany sticking with the view that it's time to open your arms and help out these refugees who are fleeing from wars that are not of their own making, but came from the disastrous policies of the West – particularly from Britain and the United States – we would be on the very edge of war; if not already in a general warfare situation at this moment.

You've got a stark contrast in personal experience and personal morality between President Obama and President Putin. Obama was brutalized as a very young child by his Indonesian stepfather; who was by all accounts himself a killer, and who brutalized both Obama's mother and himself to the point that eventually the mother decided to get him out of there and send him back to Hawaii. These kinds of experiences can run very deep in your psyche; and can produce the kinds of socio-pathological behavior that we've seen. The case of the bombing of the hospital in Afghanistan, which we'll take up a bit later, is but one example of this.

So, we're faced with a degenerate culture; we're faced with a Wall Street that is thoroughly and completely bankrupt; and must be put through bankruptcy elimination. It's got to be completely shut down. And we've got the problem, that, on the Republican Party side, you have a sick spectacle of candidates running for office. And on the Democratic Party side, while you have individuals who have certain credibility and talent – Martin O'Malley quite clearly is aware of the immediate urgency of Glass-Steagall and the need to put Wall Street in its place; but there is an enormous gap – Mr. LaRouche emphasized this, that there is no one candidate who can be counted on to actually do the job. To present a comprehensive solution to the gravest crises, that this nation and the world have faced in memory. And therefore, what you need is an array of candidates who bring a certain kind of view and talent to the table; so that we can establish a Presidency

under very grave circumstances that assembles the kind of necessary talent to be able to do the job.

Now in fact, certain things must happen immediately; and cannot wait for the Presidential primary elections, the conventions, and the elections in November of 2016. What we need immediately – right now – as preemptively action before Wall Street blows out; we need to reinstate Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall is by no means the total solution; but it is the indispensable first step. Glass-Steagall reinstated; full and complete bank separation will accomplish two things immediately. It will wipe out Wall Street, because once you separate out legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling activity, and make it clear gambling debts will no longer be bailed out by taxpayers; at that moment, that entire Wall Street gambling bubble will evaporate. It'll be clear that nobody is going to bail it out; that it could never, ever be bailed out. It would be an act of moral horror to bail it out; and therefore, it will just disappear. And under those circumstances, it will almost certainly mean the immediate demise of Obama. Either Obama signs Glass-Steagall into law, which is highly unlikely; or his effort to block it on behalf of a Wall Street that's already dead, will mean that he will be drummed out of office. He will cause such an enormous backlash, that's been building and building and building for so long already; that he'll be gone. So, Glass-Steagall as a first step towards adopting the entire array of Franklin Roosevelt American System solutions to this crisis, is absolutely indispensable in the short term.

And the mood in the country is shifting, particularly among certain patriotic institutions. The Pentagon is well aware that President Obama represents an horrific danger of war confrontation with Russia. And now the center of gravity of that danger has shifted from eastern Ukraine to Syria; but the danger remains the same. Secretary of State Kerry is trying to do certain things with the Russians to maintain a certain

war prevention, war avoidance dynamic. And he has institutional backing for those actions; otherwise, I doubt he would be simply taking them on his own. But all of these measures, as useful as they are, are simply holding back the tide. Wall Street must be put out of its misery; Obama must be removed from office. The 25th Amendment, which provides for the means to remove a President who is no longer mentally fit to serve, is the most efficient means to carry this out.

But we are talking about events and actions that are going to have to be taken right away; immediately in the coming days ahead. Because if those measures are not taken, and if the holding line actions being taken by people like Angela Merkel, with all of her flaws and weaknesses, in Germany; if there were to be a pushback against what President Putin is doing in Syria right now, then we'd go over the edge. And the driving factor in all of this, again, is that Wall Street is finished; it's bankrupt, it's doomed, it can never be put back together again. And either Wall Street is put out of its misery, or we're headed for a moment of total and absolute chaos. You had, for example, in Thursday's *Washington Post*, an article by none other than Larry Summers – who was the architect of the end of Glass-Steagall; and he has an article called "The Global Economy in Peril". In the article, he says that the whole policy of QE [quantitative easing] can't be done again; interest rates are at zero, the Fed has no ability to do anything. The only option is to begin investing in capital investment in the real economy. Now, Larry Summers is a numbskull; and the idea that he's even acknowledging the desperation of the present situation, tells you where things really stand right now. So, we need Glass-Steagall immediately; that will bring about the end of the Obama tyranny, the Obama Presidency. And nothing short of those measures is going to even remotely come close to solving the problems that are staring us right in the face.

ROSS: Well, let's take up the bombing of the hospital in

Afghanistan. As I'm sure everyone is aware, on Saturday, the U.S. military struck a hospital that was run by Doctors without Borders; commonly known by its French acronym MSF (Medecins sans Frontieres), in Kunduz, Afghanistan. Destroying part of it, killing 10 staff members, 10 patients, including 3 children, and injuring 37. This is a hospital that the coordinates of it had been communicated by MSF repeatedly to the U.S. military, Afghanistan, NATO – including only a short period before the attack. After the bombing started, MSF tried to alert the U.S. military and yet the bombing continued for another 30 minutes. So, I wanted to read some portions of a speech that was given by Dr. Joanne Liu, the President of Doctors without Borders, and ask Jeff to comment; put this into context for us. So, Dr. Liu said:

“On Saturday morning, MSF patients and staff killed in Kunduz joined the countless number of people who have been killed around the world in conflict zones and referred to as ‘collateral damage’ or as an ‘inevitable consequence of war’. International humanitarian law is not about ‘mistakes’. It is about intention, facts and why.

“The U.S. attack on the MSF hospital in Kunduz was the biggest loss of life for our organization in an airstrike. Tens of thousands of people in Kunduz can no longer receive medical care now when they need it most. Today we say: Enough. Even war has rules.”

Dr. Liu said, “This was not just an attack on our hospital – it was an attack on the Geneva Conventions. This cannot be tolerated. These Conventions govern the rules of war and were established to protect civilians in conflicts – including patients, medical workers, and facilities. They bring some humanity into what is otherwise an inhumane situation.”

She said, “It is precisely because attacking hospitals in war zones is prohibited that we expected to be protected. And yet, 10 patients including 3 children, and 12 MSF staff were killed

in the aerial raids.

“The facts and circumstances of this attack must be investigated independently and impartially, particularly given the inconsistencies in the U.S. and Afghan accounts of what happened over recent days. We cannot rely on only internal military investigations by the U.S., NATO, and Afghan forces.”

She said, “Today we announce that we are seeking an investigation into the Kunduz attack by the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission. This Commission was established in the Additional Protocols of the Geneva Conventions and is the only permanent body set up specifically to investigate violations of international humanitarian law.”

So, I'd like to ask Jeff to put this into context, and let us know how to think about this.

STEINBERG: First of all, Mr. LaRouche completely endorses the need for the kind of investigation that will presumably be carried out by this body under the Geneva Convention; because it would be a terrible tragic mistake to carry out an investigation that works from the bottom up. This was a policy action, and ultimately it was a policy action of the Obama administration; and as Mr. LaRouche put it, it is characteristic of the state of mind of the President himself. I don't have to remind regular viewers of this broadcast about the Tuesday kill list sessions; or about the fact that at least four American citizens have been willfully put on those kill lists and murdered without any due process whatsoever. These are crimes against the U.S. Constitution, crimes against humanity.

So, that's the character of what we're dealing with. Remember the decision that was consciously made by President Obama, Prime Minister Cameron, and former French President Sarkozy, when they had Muammar Qaddafi actually ready to be detained; and the decision instead was made to kill him. To have him

murdered in cold blood in order to accelerate the kind of chaos that ensued; and particularly the targeting of Russia and China that followed off of that. So, these are important contextual factors to take into account, that cry for a full-scale actual independent investigation.

Now, one that I think must be factored in, as this serious investigation goes forward, is that there's a recent prehistory of relations between President Obama and Doctors without Borders. Back six months ago, during an earlier phase of the negotiations around the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), Doctors without Borders put out a policy statement in which they said that unless the entire TPP agenda relating to pharmaceuticals was changed, they would campaign aggressively against it; because the agreements that were under discussion – some of which were leaked by Wikileaks, and that's about the only transparent public revelation about what this treaty actually says – but in the section relating to pharmaceutical patents, effectively they shut out the ability of generic drug manufacturers to actually do their job. And the Doctors without Borders estimate was that one-half billion people would be shut out of access to vital, lifesaving generic drugs under the terms of TPP. To my knowledge, there's been no change in that aspect of the treaty, which the Obama administration rammed through earlier in the week. So, you've got a context here, where what happened with Doctors without Borders, issuing a clarion call to defeat one of President Obama's signature legacy efforts cannot be ignored when you have to deal with taking into account the psychology of this President.

Now, I think it's also very important to once again look at the events that are going on, the backdrop – the psychological context – for understanding this brutal attack in Kunduz. Because look, the initial comments coming out of the administration; they made no attempt whatsoever to deny what happened. They just simply tried to issue a blanket statement

that the Taliban took over Kunduz, and therefore, everyone living in that city could be presumed to be a terrorist. Now, I mean, that kind of madness is, again, unfortunately typical of the kinds of squirming logic that are used by this White House, this President to justify actions that do belong before the International Court of Justice for War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity.

So, then in contrast to that, you've got the actions that the Russians have taken in Syria. They've been invited in officially by the Syrian government; they have formed a treaty agreement, in effect; a Memorandum of Understanding among Syria, Russia, Iran, and Iraq, to decisively go after and wipe out the Islamic State, the Army of Conquest, the al-Nusra Front – all of the groups that share a radical Salafist, jihadist commitment. And so, whereas the United States and the so-called coalition of 60 countries has been playing both sides of the fence; carrying out minor little incidental attacks against the Islamic State, supporting the Kurds here a little bit, doing certain other things. Those same countries have been instrumental in actually going after and supporting the Islamic State, because as President Bush said way back in the summer of 2011, "Assad must go." The Saudis are behind the Army of Conquest; they created it, they've poured money and weapons into it. They're part of the so-called coalition against the Islamic State; but the core of the Army of Conquest – backed by the Saudis – is the al-Nusra Front, which is al-Qaeda. So, in other words, the United States is part of a coalition which has absolutely no intention whatsoever of eliminating the threat to humanity posed by the Islamic State.

You have members of Congress – most recently Tulsi Gabbard – who said, look you might not like everything that Russia does, but back in World War II, there was an agreement that the threat to mankind represented by Hitler and the Axis powers was so great, that the only viable option was to work with the Soviet Union, to work with Stalin, to defeat Hitler and defeat

the Nazi cause. And as Mr. LaRouche emphasized, it was in fact the Soviet involvement that was decisive in defeating Hitler. If it were not for the suffering of the Russian people – 22 million killed, for starters – and if it were not for the kinds of actions at places like Stalingrad, the outcome of World War II would probably have been very different; even despite Roosevelt's Arsenal of Democracy.

So, now you've got Russia moving into Syria. And very clearly, if you study the 2nd Chechen war, which took place soon after Putin became President, if you look at the 2008 Georgia war, you know that the Russians aren't going in there to fight to a stalemate. They are going in there for a total victory; whereas the United States has not even entertained the concept of total victory in the period following the death of Franklin Roosevelt. We had a total victory concept in World War II; we abandoned it. Vietnam was the new Rand Corporation conflict resolution, systems analysis mode of warfare; where mathematics are the dominant factor. Never a concept of victory. The real crisis going on right now between the United States and Russia in Syria has nothing to do with no-fly zones, or areas of operation, or anything like that. The difference is that Russia is going in for absolute, decisive victory over the terrorists; and as Lavrov said pointblank in his discussions with Secretary of State Kerry very recently, he said, "If it walks like a terrorist, if it quacks like a terrorist, then it is a terrorist; and we're going to treat it that way." So, these shades of gray differences between al-Nusra, the Army of Conquest, and ISIS, are outside the Russian concept of war.

So, Putin is going in for the kill. Over the last 48 hours, Russia – in conjunction with Syrian military, as well as Iraq and Iran – has launched an air-land-sea total offensive against the terrorist infrastructure in Syria. It's changed the rules decisively; it's changed the likely outcome of the entire situation. And since the Obama administration and

President Obama personally never abandoned the idea that the first priority is to get rid of President Assad and worry later about the consequences, what the Russians have done has stolen the moment completely. In warfare, victory is very often measured by the ability to anticipate and know what the other command is thinking and doing; and to move on a flanking basis way out ahead of them and catch them by surprise. That's what happened this week. The fact that the Russians have launched cruise missile strikes on terrorist targets inside Syria from 900 miles away, from four ships in the middle of the Caspian Sea accessing Iranian and Iraqi airspace *en route* into Syria, indicates that there is a serious military operation here. Yesterday, the *New York Times* finally acknowledged that the Russian war plan in Syria has been mapped out in partnership with Iran and Iraq and Syria, and probably with Hezbollah, for at least the past four to six months. The United States was blindsided by and large to these developments, because President Obama – in his supreme arrogance – presumed that the “coalition” was the only game in town.

So, now the Russians have stolen the march, and are committed to a dynamically different policy; and there is a very strong possibility that the Russians will succeed, because they're committed to victory. Whereas, the policies coming from the Obama administration and the Bush administration before that, were simply a commitment to perpetual wars; wars that ultimately get measured in the body count. How many people are killed? How long is the war sustained? How much infrastructure and economic capacity can be permanently destroyed? Already, much of the middle class of Syria, which was a modern secular large middle class country, have been driven out. So that the brain drain on Syria is in itself another major kind of crisis. These are the kinds of calculations that have dominated the thinking of the 20th Century: population wars; Malthusian methods of reducing population in absolute terms; breaking down any prospects for

genuine scientific and technological progress and advancement; no increase – in fact a net collapse – of real productivity. That's been going on pretty much nonstop since the death of Roosevelt.

So, Obama is carrying out a policy that's doomed to fail; and could very well bring the world to the very brink of thermonuclear war. The Russians are carrying out a strategic and military flanking operation with a large element of diplomacy thrown in as well. Turkey has already worked out de-confliction agreements with Russia; and the acting Prime Minister of Turkey, Davutoglu, said yesterday that Russian/Turkish relations are perfectly fine. Syria will not interfere with the Russian and Turkish neighborly cooperation. There was a high-level military delegation from Russia in Israel, talking about the fact that Israel no longer has carte blanche to carry out bombing attacks inside Syrian territory against Hezbollah targets. So, you've got Iraq now saying that they want Russia to come in as the primary ally in the war against the Islamic State.

The former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA], Gen. Michael Flynn – whom we've talked about on a number of our recent shows – who came out and blew the whistle on the fact that Obama supported the growth of al-Qaeda in Iraq, and ultimately the Islamic State, and refused to take DIA warnings seriously because it interfered with his plans of overthrowing Assad; even if it meant being in bed with the very people who did the 9/11 attacks in 2001, and then did the Benghazi. So, General Flynn was interviewed several days ago on Russia Today; and he said pointblank "We must be working with Russia. Russia has more strategic interests in defeating the Islamic State in Syria than the United States does by far." There are thousands – an estimate of 2500 to 5000 – Chechen and other Russian Muslims who've been recruited into the Islamic State, the al-Nusra Front, and are now fighting in Iraq and Syria. And if they are not defeated right there in

the Middle East, they will go back to Russia; and Russia will be facing an absolute hellish situation. So Putin, whose parents suffered greatly during the 2nd World War, as almost all Russians did; Putin, who lost a brother in the 2nd World War, has that kind of sense of morality to be willing to wage a total war to defeat an enemy that is clearly the enemy of humanity.

So, if you put all of those elements together, and then go back to the question of the investigation, and the need for an investigation, into the hospital bombing in Kunduz; I think it's very clear that the findings of that investigation, if they are allowed to consider the full top-down implications, will be extremely important and will be extremely bad news for President Obama.

OGDEN: Well, with that said, I want to bring a conclusion to this evening's broadcast. I want to thank both Jeff and Jason for joining me here in the studio. And I think we can proceed with a substantial amount of clarity as to the dramatic nature of the current situation, and how important the intervention that LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement nationally have at this present time. So, the mobilization that we initiated this week I think will continue into this following week; and if you haven't yet, please take the statement that I read at the beginning of the broadcast tonight – the Urgent Message to Congressmen and Other National Leaders – and circulate it as widely as you can. We need to continue to spread this as widely as is possible; and take the proceedings of also the Fireside Chat that Mr. LaRouche continues to do on Thursday nights and his discussion with the group up in Manhattan on Saturdays. And make sure that you are getting as many people as you can to study this in dept and to join our mobilization.

So, with that, I'd like to thank you all for listening; and stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Russiske angreb med krydsermissiler afslører hidtil ukendte evner

8. oktober 2015 – Alt imens Obamaregeringen og dens ligesindede i Washingtons tænketank-verden højlydt skræpper op og klager over den russiske, militære offensiv i Syrien, så afslører denne imidlertid seriøse, russiske, militære evner, der hidtil har været lidet forstået, hvis de da overhovedet har været kendt. Daniel Fielding, medarbejder i skrivestaben for *Russia Insider*, pointerer dette kortfattet i en artikel, der blev publiceret i går. Han skriver, at missilangrebene bekræfter to ting: »(1) at russerne atter engang har demonstreret en evne, som kun USA hidtil har haft; og (2) at den koalition, de har skabt med Syrien, Iran og Irak, er en fuldt operationel realitet, der er i stand til at rådslå om og aftale missilangreb.«

Kritikerne klager, at Rusland let kunne have ramt de samme mål ved at benytte de fly, det har med base i Latakia, men Fielding skriver, at, »at supplere fly-angrebsstyrken med langtrækkende missiler øger den taktiske fleksibilitet meget og gør det muligt at angribe et stort antal mål«. Det vil sige, at missilerne er passende våben til at gå efter store, fikserede mål, hvilket frigør flystyrken til at gå efter mere mobile mål, såsom lastbiler eller artilleri. »Subsoniske krydsermissiler er exceptionelt vanskelige at observere og spore – og nedskyde – så overraskelseselementet øges. Islamisk Stat ved nu, at de kan blive angrebet hvor som helst og hvornår som helst – dag og nat – uden varsel.«

Med hensyn til, hvorfor affyringen fandt sted fra det Kaspiske

Hav, snarere end fra Middelhavet, hvor den russiske flåde har en stor specialenhed, skriver Fielding: »USA – såvel som også USA's allierede, som Israel – har meget stærke flåde- og efterretningsaktiver i Middelhavet. At lancere deres missiler fra det Kaspiske Hav gør det muligt for russerne at gøre dette, uden udefrakommende observering eller indgriben.«

I Moskva bekræftede generaloberst Andrei Kartapolov, chef for Den Russiske Generalstabs Hoveddirektorat for Operationer, at missilangrebet var blevet koordineret med både Teheran og Bagdad, eftersom missilerne måtte flyve flere hundrede kilometer gennem disse to landes luftrum for at nå deres mål i Syrien. Han understregede, at alle målene var blevet grundigt analyseret ved brug af data fra rum- og radiorekognoscering, aflytning af kommunikationer og fotos, der var taget af UAV'er (ubemandede luftfartøjer). Data, indsamlet af Syrien, Iran og Irak, inklusive data indsamlet af personer, blev også brugt, og alle mål blev bekræftet, iflg. en pressemeddelelse udlagt af det Russiske Forsvarsministerium.

Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium: USA bekæmper ikke ISIS

8. oktober 2015 – »USA's Luftvåben og andre parter har udført luftangreb i et år. Vi har grund til at mene, at de ikke ofte rammer terroristmål, eller rettere, gør det yderst sjældent«, sagde Igor Konashenkov, talsmand for det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, til RT.

Viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov sagde: »USA's afvisning af at dele efterretninger om terrorister bekræfter blot endnu

engang, hvad vi har vidst fra begyndelsen, nemlig, at USA's mål i Syrien har meget lidt at gøre med at skabe betingelserne for en politisk proces og national forsoning. Jeg vil løbe den risiko at sige, at, ved at gøre dette, har USA og de lande, der gik med i den USA-ledede koalition, anbragt sig i en politisk set tvivlsom position. Spørgsmålet er: Hvilken side kæmper I for, i denne krig?»

Ryabkov sagde, at Rusland ville klare sig udmærket uden amerikanske efterretninger, da det har masser af andre kilder. »Vi har vore egne midler til rekognoscering. Vi modtager efterretninger fra flere andre lande og koordinerer denne strøm gennem det fælles efterretningscenter i Bagdad«, sagde han.

Foto: Den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov

Syrisk-russisk offensiv i gang

8. oktober 2015 – Syriske landtropper har, i samarbejde med kontingentet fra det russiske flyvevåben, der er baseret i Latakia, lanceret en offensiv imod islamistiske militantgrupper i provinserne Aleppo, Latakia og Hama. Nyhedsrapporteringer indikerer, at offensiven begyndte i går i kølvandet på det krydsermissilangreb, der blev lanceret fra russiske skibe i det Kaspiske Hav. Stabschef for den syriske hær, general Ali Abdullah Ayoub, gik på syrisk fjernsyn i dag for at rapportere, at hæren har »taget tømmerne i de militære operationer« for at danne det 4. Angrebskorps, i kølvandet på syriske og russiske luftangreb, der har dræbt hundreder af

terrorister i de tre, ovenfor anførte provinser. Iflg. det officielle nyhedsbureau SANA meddelte Ayoub, at de syriske væbnede styrker i dag har indledt et storstilet angreb, der tilsigter at rive forsamlingerne af terrorister op med rode og fordrive dem fra de områder og byer, der har lidt under terrorismens ulykker og forbrydelser.

Ifølge *Wall Street Journal*, der citerer en oprørskommandant i området, begyndte det syriske angreb på land ved daggry i går, på multiple fronter, med luftangreb og en spærreild fra raketter og artilleri.

Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium rapporterede i dag, at dets kampfly i Syrien havde ramt 27 mål under 22 flyveoperationer natten over. »De russiske bombefly sigtede på 8 militante bastioner i provinsen Homs. De militante oprøreres fortifikationer blev totalt ødelagt af angrebene«, sagde talsmand for det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, Igor Konashenkov.

Titelfoto: Krydsermissiler, affyret fra russiske krigsskibe i det Kaspiske Hav mod Syrien, indledte den aktuelle offensiv mod terroristerne i Syrien.

**Amerikansk-russisk krise
synes at være den alvorligste**

hidtil, siger bekymret, højtplaceret russisk diplomat

7. oktober 2015 – I en tale til Det russisk-amerikanske Partnerskab i Stillehavsområdet (RAPP) 20. årlige møde, der blev afholdt i Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, hovedstaden i Sakhalin Oblast i den fjernøstlige del af Rusland (øen Sakhalin[1]), opfordrede sekretær for den russiske side af den Amerikansk-Russiske Bilaterale Præsidentielle Kommission, Vladimir Vinokurov, til en tættere og mere aktiv interaktion mellem ikke-statslige kontakter i disse to lande. Idet han gav udtryk for bekymring over de forværrede relationer, der skyldes gennemtvungelsen af sanktioner mod Rusland over Ukraine-spørgsmålet, sagde Vinokurov, der er ambassadør i almindelighed (dvs., som ikke er tildelt et specifikt land, - red.) i Udenrigsministeriet: »Jeg har arbejdet med en orientering mod Amerika i mange år og været igennem flere kriser i de bilaterale relationer, men denne synes at være den hidtil alvorligste«, rapporterer TASS i dag.

Vinokurov udtrykte også håb om, at de ikke-statslige kontakter, som RAPP repræsenterer, vil blive bevaret som et vigtigt element. »Almindelig sund fornuft vinder i det lange løb, og landene kommer tilbage til normalt samarbejde. Det er derfor, ikke-statslige kontakter er meget vigtige. Russiske regioner, ligesom amerikanske delstater i det vestlige USA, ligger langt væk fra hovedstæderne og bør udvise større uafhængighed mht. gensidigt fordelagtigt samarbejde«, sagde han.



Det Russisk-Amerikanske Partnerskab i Stillehavsområdet er et bilateralt forum, der beskæftiger sig med privatsektoren og

regeringssektoren med det formål at identificere og adressere barrierer for forretning og handel mellem Østrusland og USA, iflg. Rådet for amerikansk-russiske Relationers webside. Det er også det ældste og eneste interregionale forum mellem Rusland og USA og blev oprettet for at udnytte fremvoksende økonomiske muligheder for at udvikle større samarbejde mellem Østrusland og Vest-USA. Partnerskabet forener privatsektorens interesser med regionale og føderale regeringer med et mål om at udvide handel og samarbejde. Rådet mødes en gang om året i Rusland og USA efter tur. RAPP bringer repræsentanter for 13 regioner i Østrusland og fem delstater på USA's Vestkyst sammen, iflg. TASS-rapporten. Det aktuelle møde finder sted over to dage, den 7.-8. oktober.

[1] I *EIR's* rapport om Verdenslandbroen, der netop er udgivet på kinesisk, er der planlagt en forbindelse til hovedlandet; [se kort i vores Nyhedsorientering Oktober](#)

Titelfoto: Isskulptur i byen Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, til den traditionelle fejring af Nytåret. I baggrunden en statue af Lenin.

**Leder, 9. oktober 2015:
De sagde, det aldrig kunne
ske; men
LaRouche holdt skansen, og nu**

er det sket

»Russerne er her for at vinde krigen; dette ved alle.« Ali Hashem, chefnhedskorrespondent for Al Mayadeen News Network, skrev disse ord den 7. oktober i *Al-Monitor*, idet han citerede en af sine libanesiske kilder. Jo, det er absolut sandt, og det ved enhver, der har nogen bevidsthed om dette. Efter måneders planlægning er Putin gået ind i krigen for at vinde. Dette finder amerikanere endnu umuligt at tro på, for vores land har været i krig i de fleste år, siden Anden Verdenskrig – men ikke for at vinde. Aldrig for at vinde. Faktisk det stik modsatte – de krige, som Det britiske Imperium har kastet os ud i, som f.eks. via Barack Obama, har været evindelige krige, hvis formål var at skabe kaos, befolkningsreduktion og De forenede Staters ødelæggelse. Ingen sejrs-krige. Men ikke desto mindre, så gik Putin faktisk ind i krigen for at vinde; det er hans plan at vinde.

I dag er Dag 2 i en »storslået offensiv«, som den Syriske Hær udtrykker det, hvor russiske flystyrker for første gang direkte har leveret støtte til syriske tropper i kamp.

Og det drejer sig ikke engang blot om krigen som sådan. Hvad vigtigere er, så har denne alliance fuldstændig givet Syrien nyt liv.

Nej, intet er som før. Alt har ændret sig.

Det, der nu sker i Syrien, og i realiteten meget mere bredt, er nøjagtigt, hvad LaRouche sagde, måtte ske. Alle andre sagde, »Jeg er enig i, at det skal til, men det kan ikke ske«. LaRouche havde ret. Nu siger de, »Ja, Wall Street må lukkes ned – jeg er enig i, at det skal til – men det kan ikke ske«. Hvem vil, til slut, vise sig at have haft ret?

Det vil Lyndon LaRouche. Under et møde med medarbejdere anvendte han i store træk følgende vendinger.

Obamas flippen ud fortsætter med at spinde ud af kontrol; alt, hvad han gør, sprænges i stykker. Der er panik i Det Hvide Hus: man kan forvente selvpåførte skader og afstraffelser. Obama må bringes til fald! Luk Wall Street ned, og man lukker samtidig Obama ned.

Som helhed er USA's lederskab afskyeligt. Sammenlign det med den moralske stemning, der er vokset frem i Tyskland som svar på flygtningekrisen. Havde det ikke været for Putin, ville vi alle have været døde. Ved roden til problemet med USA finder vi det faktum, at det er et forbryderisk, råddent samfund. Men samtidig er der nogle amerikanere, såsom nogle af vore militære kommandoofficerer, der har en ophøjet ansvarsfølelse, som undertiden går langt ud over deres formelle ansvar. Som for eksempel, at gå imod Obama.

Kan man fortælle Obama sandheden? Nej. Merkel er mere lydør, men det ligger på falderebet, om hun kan bevare magten, eller om hun vil blive erstattet af kræfter, der er langt værre end selv finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble.

Problemet er, at det tyvende århundredes ideologi ikke virker. Det tyvende århundrede har erstattet moralitet med matematik.

Obamas indflydelse over Hillary Clinton er ved at kollapse, og hun er ved at forlade ham. Han bliver afvist af demokrater og andre; der er ingen, der forsvarer ham. Når vi siger til dem, at han må fjernes, så, i stedet for at sige »Nej«, som de gjorde før, siger de nu, at de er enige og spørger, hvordan det kan gøres.

Alt dette lå bare og ventede på at ske, frem til det øjeblik, hvor det hele blev udløst af Putins dristige handling. Det, Putin har gjort, er tydeligt – se blot på hans familiebaggrund i Anden Verdenskrig, med den måde, han ser tingene på. Dette er generelt atypisk for Europa. Han er en mand, der har en følelse af et moralsk formål og en mission, og som ikke kan afledes eller køres ud på et sidespor. Putin gør i Syrien det,

som LaRouche forventede, han ville gøre.

I mellemtiden er der, i den amerikanske, præsidentielle udvælgelsesproces, ingen enkelt kandidat, der træder frem som en person, der er klar til at gøre, hvad der er nødvendigt. Vi må have en proces, der involverer flere kandidater, der kan bidrage hertil. Vi må opbygge et forenet, præsidentielt team omkring en mission, snarere end omkring en bestemt person.

Kerry er i stand til at handle i modstrid med Obamas sindssyge politik, fordi han ved, at han har støtte til det, og at Obama er blevet vraget. Vi må nu bringe dette videre til næste trin.

Rusland advarer om, at Obama kan flippe ud og forsøge at starte nye krigsprovokationer via 'farvede revolutioner'

7. oktober 2015 – Rostislav Ishchenko, en ukrainsk, strategisk analytiker, der nu er i Moskva, skrev en advarsel i den russiske publikation *MIA Rossiya Segodnya*, om, at den russiske præsident Putins nylige diplomatiske gennembrud kunne drive Obama til at forsøge nye provokationer mod Rusland. Ishchenko nævnte tre nylige, diplomatiske kup udført af Putin: Hans tale til FN's Generalforsamling, hans flankemanøvre i Syrien og hans topmøder efter Normandiet-formatet, hvor han opnåede tysk og fransk støtte til Minsk-aftalerne.

Ishchenko skrev, at »hvis Minsk-aftalerne krænkes under betingelser, hvor Paris og Berlin har nægtet at skyde skylden på Rusland, så kan Kiev hurtigt besejres i det sydlige Ukraine; hvis våbenstilstanden er væk, genoptages krigen, men Kiev er i øjeblikket ikke i stand til at føre krig. Desuden står Kiev over for betalingsstandsning (statsbankerot), hvilket fører til yderligere, dyb forarmelse af befolkningen, såvel som også en manglende mulighed for at få yderligere kredit fra Vesten.«

Forfatteren fortsatte med at sætte fokus på fire brændpunkter, ud over det østlige Ukraine, som kunne detoneres af Obama imod Rusland, begyndende med situationerne i Moldova og Transnistrien, hvor der er en trussel om en Maidan-revolte, og hvor Sektor Højre truer med en blokade af forsyninger til de russiske fredsbevarende styrker i Transnistrien. »Det eneste, USA behøver gøre, er at udløse de moldoviske og ukrainske radikale elementer, og så vil der være en ny konfliktzone, der ikke dækkes af Minsk-aftalerne, og som Rusland ubønhørligt vil blive trukket ind i.« Ishchenko konkluderede, at »Moskva sandsynligvis ville arrangere en luftbro til Transnistrien, og dette ville samtidig sætte scenen for, at Ukraine forsøger at lukke sit luftrum, nedskyder russiske fly osv.«

I Kaukasus-regionen advarede Ishchenko om en genopblussen af Karabak-konflikten, indebyrden af hundreder af tjetjenske kæmpere i ISIS og muligheden af ustabilitet i Armenien, hvor der allerede er protester over elektricitet.

Centralasien er et andet brændpunkt, efter at Taliban har taget initiativ til at kontrollere områder af Afghanistan på grænsen mod Tadsjikistan, hvor Rusland har militære kontingenter. Der er lignende trusler imod Kasakhstan fra jihadistister, der passerer igennem Afghanistan ind i Centralasien.

Ishchenko nævnte også valgene den 11. oktober i Belarus, som kunne udgøre en udløsermekanisme for endnu et forsøg på at

gennemføre en 'farvet revolution', på trods af præsident Lukasjenkos tilsyneladende stærke position.

Artiklen sluttede med en advarsel: »Efter at Obama har opgjort Putins sejr på alle fronter i oktober, må vi således forvente et snarligt forsøg fra Obamas side på at genvinde det tabte land ... Jeg forventer en optrapning af IS' brutalitet i Syrien, aggressive handlinger fra Kiev-regimets side og aktivering af amerikanske agenter omkring alle følsomme punkter for Rusland i det postsovjetiske område.«

NYHEDSORIENTERING OKTOBER: Løsninger til flygtningekrisen og det truende finanskarak

Den voksende europæiske flygtningekrise havde fundet vej til statsminister Lars Løkke-Rasmussens åbningstale til Folketinget den 6. oktober, men ellers var den totalt forandrede internationale situation, der er afgørende for Danmarks fremtid, ikke på dagsordenen: Wall Street og verdens finansmarkeder er bankerot, og spekulanterne kræver en hjælpepakke, der er endnu større end i 2008, for at overleve.

En sådan hjælpepakke vil dræbe det, der er tilbage af realøkonomien og befolkningens levestandard i USA og mange andre steder. Derfor skal der omgående gennemføres en lang række økonomiske tiltag, begyndende med en genindførelse af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og en ordnet afvikling af Wall Street og den globale finansspekulation.

Leder, 8. oktober 2015: Fyr omgående Obama!

Rusland har nu lanceret en dynamisk luft-, land- og vandoffensiv i Syrien, sammen med den Syriske Hær, og med opbakning fra Hezbollah og IRGC-styrker (Den iranske Revolutionshær). De primære mål er Islamisk Stat og Erobringshæren, der er en saudisk skabelse domineret af al-Qaeda (Nusra Front). I går mødtes præsident Putin med forsvarsminister Shoigu, og deres møde blev delvist vist i fjernsynet. Shoigu meddelte, at den Russiske Flåde havde sluttet sig til kampen mod ISIS, med fire, russiske flåde fartøjer i det Kaspiske Hav, der affyrede 26 krydsermissiler på en afstand af 900 mil mod ISIS-mål i det nordlige Syrien.

Irak har indikeret, at det vil bede Rusland om at påbegynde bombeoperationer imod ISIS inde på irakisk jord. Tyrkiet har, i modstrid med NATO's og Obamaregeringens højtravende snak, meddelt, at relationerne med Rusland er fine, og at man har etableret en militær kanal for at sikre, at der ikke opstår nogen hændelser mellem russiske og tyrkiske fly i området langs den syriske grænse. Fungerende premierminister Davutoglu sagde til reportere onsdag, at russisk-tyrkiske relationer er venskabelige og udviser godt naboskab, og at der ikke vil komme nogen tyrkisk-russisk konflikt ud af situationen i Syrien.

Obama er blevet grundigt udmanøvreret og trængt op i en krog af de russiske handlinger, der har udløst et betydningsfuldt

brud væk fra Obama af traditionelle amerikanske nøgleallierede i Europa og Mellemøsten. For at føje spot til skade, så kom fhv. udenrigsminister Hillary Clinton, under sin valgkampagne i Iowa, i onsdags med en udtalelse om, at hun var imod Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Det betyder, at alle de tre, vigtigste, demokratiske præsidentkandidater har brudt med Obama over TPP.

Obama er blevet overgivet af alle sine »gamle venner«, med saudierne som eneste undtagelse.

Alt imens Obama fejrede TPP-aftalen i weekenden, så bliver det mere og mere sandsynligt, at det vil slå tilbage mod ham som en boomerang og kunne katalysere alle hans fjender til en enkelt styrke, der slår ham ned over TPP.

Lyndon LaRouche har understreget, at det er tydeligt, at Obama nu overgives af alle sine tidligere venner, inklusive Hillary Clinton. Han kan, og må, fjernes fra embedet, i dette øjeblik, hvor spørgsmålet om krig of fred ligger på vippen. Fra Rusland lyder der advarsler om, at Obama totalt kunne flippe ud over Putins diplomatiske successer i de seneste uger og kunne forsøge at starte nye krigsprovokationer med 'farvede revolutioner' imod Rusland. Disse provokationer kunne komme i det østlige Ukraine, i Moldova, i enklaven Transnistrien, eller i det armensk-aserbajdsjanske område omkring det Kaspiske Hav.

Obama sidder i kviksand op til navlen, men han er stadig en trussel, og intet mindre end hans fjernelse fra embedet vil fuldt ud løse krisen.

Timing er af afgørende betydning. Wall Street og London er irreversibelt bankerot, og en hvilken som helst udløser, kunne detonere hele systemets nedsmeltning. Glass-Steagall må vedtages, før denne nedsmeltning. Federal Reserve står magtesløs og hænger på en regnskabsopgørelse på 5,2 billioner dollars, takket være bailout (bankredning) via kvantitativ

lempelse og en nulrentepolitik, der yderligere har næret boblen.

Obamas fjernelse, gerne under det 25. forfatningstillæg, samtidig med vedtagelse af en lovgivning, der genindfører Glass-Steagall, repræsenterer den eneste, fornuftige mulighed. Putins flankoperationer i Syrien har skabt den nødvendige åbning for at bringe hele dette Obama-rod til fald. Gå ikke glip af denne historiske chance. Den kommer måske ikke igen.

RADIO SCHILLER den 5. oktober 2015: Et nyt lederskab for en ny verdensorden: Putin inden for strategi, Xi Jinping inden for økonomisk udvikling

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

LPAC Fredags-webcast 2.

OKTOBER 2015:

Verden er et bedre og tryggere sted uden Wall Street

Helga Zepp-LaRouche-pressekonference i Kina: "Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk. Wall Street er dømt til snarlig undergang, færdig; Indfør omgående Glass-Steagall, forebyggende! LaRouche om koalitionen mod ISIS: Gør det! Der er en global, strategisk alliance: En Geneve III-politisk løsning på krisen i Syrien vil nu være mulig. Engelsk udskift.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 2, 2015

[proofed against the audio]

The World Is a Better and Safer Place Without Wall Street:
Dump Wall Street, Get Glass-Steagall, Bring Back Hamilton

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's October 2, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here

from larouchepac.com. We are recording here a few hours before live show time, just to let you know, in case anything drastic changes, but we are fresh from a discussion which we had with Mr.

LaRouche earlier today. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Scientific Team.

Obviously, we're convening here at a very momentous time in history. This is a week which began with the events at the United

Nations General Assembly meeting, most significantly, the speeches on Monday by both Vladimir Putin and President Xi

Jinping of China. Now that was happening on the inside of the United Nations building. On the outside, and in the entire general area of Manhattan, the LaRouche movement was making a very significant intervention which had a significant impact on

the proceedings of the United Nations, and the discussions around

that. And those of you who listened to, or had the opportunity to

listen to the 20th Fireside Chat with Mr. LaRouche that occurred

last night, Thursday night, you heard a short report by one of the LaRouchePAC activists about what those interventions have been. [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=imkd4v0hiiY>]

Now, simultaneous with the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York City, another significant leader of the LaRouche movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, was in China. She was participating in a series of meetings, and very significantly, got to participate in a press conference announcing the publication of the {Executive Intelligence Review} Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," which

was now published in Chinese, and is available in the Chinese language, and we can be sure is already beginning to circulate widely in China.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20150930/eirs-silk-road-report-chinese-presented-beijing-press-conference>]

In the days subsequent to the beginning of this week, we've seen a very significant, dramatic shift in world events, and I know this is something which will be elaborated a little bit later in our broadcast. But obviously we've seen the Russian air

strikes against ISIS in Syria, and this has created really a chasm, a schism, inside the United States, where Obama himself is

finding himself completely edged out, and isolated, whereas

significant leadership inside the senior leadership of the United States, including John Kerry and others, and also other members of Obama's own Democratic Party—Congressman Tulsi Gabbard is one significant example of this—have distanced themselves, and distinguished themselves, from Obama, and have said, this is a necessary action on the part of Vladimir Putin, and one that should be supported.

Mr. LaRouche was also clear to point out that Europe is beginning to realign itself as well vis-à-vis these actions by Russia.

Now, the primary point that Mr. LaRouche wanted us to begin tonight's broadcast with, was the implosion of the Wall Street-based financial system. And this is what I'm going to ask

Jeffrey Steinberg to elaborate on, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

Let me just paraphrase a little bit of what Mr. LaRouche had to say in our meeting earlier, before I ask Jeff to come to the

podium. What Mr. LaRouche emphatically stated was that this financial system is on the verge of a total implosion. It's not

just a crash, but the entire thing is about to cease to exist. And that means the entire system must be changed. What do we say?

Dump Wall Street! We need a total reorganization of this entire

bankrupt system, because we're experiencing a general breakdown

of both the U.S. and the European financial systems.

Therefore,

action must be taken to shut this thing down. Nothing can be done

to save it, he said.

The United States, as a nation, isn't bankrupt, but Wall Street is, and there's no solution within the current form of this financial system. The entire system must be put into receivership. He said, either way, Wall Street is finished. Either finished on its own accord, or finished because of a decisive action that's taken by patriots within the United States government. It's intrinsically bankrupt, according to any rational physical economic standard of measurement, and all you have to do is look at the facts. It's happening now, and that's not a bad thing. It's actually good, and we should make the point that Wall Street disappearing is good for the future of the American people. It should have happened a long time ago; it just needs to be cleaned up. The garbage has to be taken out, so that we can get our people back to productive work. So that was a short paraphrase of what Mr. LaRouche had to say. I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium, elaborate a little bit more on the context of this, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

JEFF STEINBERG: Last week a number of leading figures in both Wall Street and the City of London were bracing themselves, waiting to see whether the Federal Open Market Committee at the Fed was going to begin the process of normalizing interest rates, by raising them for the first time in seven or eight years by one-quarter of 1%. There was {absolute} panic and pandemonium over the prospect of that taking place, and statements were issued from the City of London, the IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde, saying that if the Fed raises rates, it may very well trigger a blowout of the entire system, and then the

Fed will be holding the bag, taking the blame for a financial blowout.

Well, the simple fact of the matter is that the Wall Street system is bankrupt, and by Wall Street system, I mean the extended system of gambling that exists on Wall Street, that dominates the City of London. You would go around the globe. You've got Frankfurt. You've got Paris. You've got Dubai in the

Middle East. You've got Macao and Hong Kong in the Pacific region.

These are all centers in which there is virtually no connection

any more between the activities in the real economy, and the gambling and churning of gambling money that's going on in the financial sector.

So there is nothing that can be done to avoid the fact that at some point very soon, there will be a trigger incident. It could be virtually anything. And it could be the beginning of a

very rapid, total evaporation of this entire mountain of debt, and what Mr. LaRouche has also been emphasizing, is that the danger in this situation is that if there is not immediate pre-emptive action, before that blowout occurs, then what you're

likely to see is a period of total chaos, in which the bankruptcy

of the financial bubble creates a system of chaos in the real economy, where you wind up with very destructive developments, with social chaos, in which the real people of the United States

and other parts of the world become once again, but on a much more dangerous scale, the victims of this kind of chaos.

So the point is very simple. There's got to be pre-emptive action now to put Wall Street in its entirety out of its misery.

And the simple first step to be taken in that direction is to reinstate Glass-Steagall. By reinstating Glass-Steagall, and

making it clear, that this mountain of gambling debt will never again be bailed out by taxpayers' funds. The simple fact of stating that means, that the entire Wall Street system will immediately blow out. Someone is going to panic; someone is going to make a margin call, because so much of this gambling debt, is built on borrowed money that the whole thing will evaporate. But the crucial thing is that you've got to first create a clean and total separation between commercial banking, which does impact on the real economy and this gambling debt; this mountain of gambling debt that's sitting there as a parasite on the real economy. If you make that separation by passing Glass-Steagall in the United States, this will be the basis for immediate action in other parts of the world. So in effect, by acting here in the United States, we will create the conditions for a global Glass-Steagall separation, and then all of this gambling debt can just evaporate. Now, an illustrative case of this: Back in 1998, when you had the beginnings of a whole sequence of debt blow-outs, in Japan, you had a large number of Japanese banks that were basically bankrupt and were going to have to be put through bankruptcy reorganization. Under those conditions, those banks posed a systemic risk, not just in Japan, but globally. There were some people in the Japanese Finance Ministry who understood, and still had a memory of the difference between productive investment, legitimate commercial banking activity, and the gambling activities that had infected the whole international banking system.

And so, those banks were basically audited, and all of the derivative contracts, all of the international gambling contracts that those banks had were simply cancelled. The counterparties were contacted and given the option, of netting out those contracts; or facing the consequences of losing those funds, those gambling debts that nobody had sufficient funds to be able to even remotely cover. So, in the case of Japan, the gambling debts were cancelled, and then the banks were put through reorganization; there was no systemic risk. At the same time, in the Summer of 1998, Alan Greenspan – who was in the final phases of the elimination of Glass-Steagall as the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and formerly a senior partner at JP Morgan when the plan was hatched in the mid-'80s to wipe out Glass-Steagall. Instead what Greenspan did was, he called in all of the counterparties of Long Term Capital Management [LTCM], a relatively small, offshore hedge fund located in the Dutch Antilles. But they had derivative contracts tied to the Russian debt, which the Russians defaulted on, the famous GKO scandal of 1998. And so, LCTM, rather than being put through an orderly reorganization by netting out those derivatives contracts; Greenspan called in all of the counterparties, and wouldn't let them leave the room until they bailed out LTCM. So, on the one hand, you had a cancellation of the derivatives; on the other hand, you had a hyperinflationary bail-out. Really just the beginning of a hyperinflationary process that went off the charts a year later, when Glass-Steagall was repealed. And then it was really off to the races; with everything invested in gambling

and virtually nothing going into the real economy. So now here we are, it's October of 2015. We had a shake-out of the bubble in 2008, and now it's back once again with a vengeance, because there was no change in policy. The Dodd-Frank bill with the Volcker Rule was a sick joke; it did nothing to change anything. So now, the too-big-to-fail banks have accrued a greater amount of gambling debt than they previously had. That debt cannot and will not ever be paid. So, by any scientific measurement, all of Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt; and so long as you remain in the trap of the current system, nothing can be done about that. And we're headed very soon – perhaps in a matter of days or weeks or months – to a point where the entire system blows out; the entire trans-Atlantic system evaporates, literally overnight. And then you've got social chaos on a very, very broad and dangerous scale. So, there is no money. Your money, your personal investments in mutual funds or Wall Street stocks, or anything like that; there's nothing there to protect. It can't be protected; and in fact, what's going on right now on the eve of the annual Autumn meeting of the IMF, scheduled to take place in the next few weeks in Peru, are calls all over the place for a new surge of hyperinflationary quantitative easing. You've got the European Central Bank about to extend its QE program towards the end of 2018; in other words, a massive hyperinflationary bail-out that will further erode the real economy. So, Wall Street is dead; the funeral should have already taken place long ago. And now we're at a point where that system

must be completely shut down. Cancel out all the derivatives; separate the banks under Glass-Steagall, into commercial banks and let everything fall off the edge of the cliff. Because it's unpayable, it's illegal, it's commingled with massive amounts of criminal money; it serves no purpose whatsoever. The world is a better and safer place without those Wall Street activities; without the City of London, without the activities in Frankfurt and Paris and these other parasitical financial capitals. Glass-Steagall right now, immediately. And we've got a political context in which President Obama, although he is not down all together, is greatly weakened. And you can put a `{fait accompli}` on his desk and force the signing of Glass-Steagall. If he refuses to do that, then he's out under the 25th Amendment; because to not do it, in the face of this imminent blow-out of Wall Street, would be an act of criminal insanity that warrants his removal from office. So, that's the story. Wall Street is doomed. If you listen to idiots like Christine Lagarde, or Ambrose Evans-Pritchard over at the London `{Daily Telegraph}`, they're saying, "Gee, we're not sure if this is a systemic crisis, or some minor cyclical problem that we can just weather by printing a bit more money." They're either idiots, or criminal liars, or both. The fact of the matter is, Wall Street is dead; it's dead in the water. Nothing can be done to save it. And the question is, do you want that doom to spread to the real economy; to the

real
population that's already suffering enough? Or, are you
prepared
to fight to insure that the right preemptive measures are
taken
now? Because a week from now may be too late; we don't know
how
close we are to the edge. Well-informed insiders from London
and
Wall Street thought that we were about to blow out a week and
a
half ago, had the Fed gone through the small step of simply
raising interest rates and shifting the directionality.
There's
a million and one potential small triggers out there, but the
triggers are not the real issue. The real issue is that the
entire system is doomed; and we've got to take the right
remedial
action before the doom spreads into the real world of real
people, and then it's too late.
Franklin Roosevelt had an understanding of the kinds of
measures that have to be taken. On the one hand, the
Glass-Steagall Act and other measures that secured depositors
funds in the commercial banks; shut out the gambling debt.
But
then Franklin Roosevelt also moved on for massive credit
emissions into the real economy. He did the TVA; he created a
massive number of jobs through various public works programs,
much of which became the kind of infrastructure-building
projects, major dam projects, municipal buildings, roads; all
the kinds of things that were the necessary preparations and
foundations for what became the "arsenal of democracy," the
enormous economic surge that occurred, when the United States
was
on the verge of entering into war, against Nazi Germany and
Japan. So, Roosevelt had the formula.
The situation today is far more dangerous, far more severe,

than it was at the time of Roosevelt. But the principles, the American System principles, that Roosevelt understood and acted

on, are the recipe for success today. But the starting point is

to simply face the reality and act preemptively on the fact that

Wall Street's dead. Give it a decent funeral, but pay no respect

whatsoever to this quadrillions of dollars, of strictly gambling

debt that have been built up since the repeal of Glass-Steagall

in particular.

What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that this process goes back—really the beginning of the decline in actual productivity

in the U.S. economy, started with the death of Franklin Roosevelt. It accelerated tremendously after the assassination of

John Kennedy, and particularly after Nixon took the world off the

Bretton Woods fixed- exchange-rate system. That was the era when

people like George H.W. Bush and his underlings began to come in

and greatly accelerated the process of take-down of the real economy.

So, we're at the point now: Wall Street's doomed; it's finished. So, let's do the right thing.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jeff. Now for the second element of our show today, I'm going to shift to the dramatic and ongoing

change in the world strategic framework, specifically with the situation in and around Syria, as the major focal point for

this
shift.

Now, this is the subject of the institutional question which has been posed to Mr. LaRouche this week. But before posing that

question and asking Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, I'd

like to add just a little bit of background.

Over the recent few weeks, we have been seeing the development of a very clear and decisive break with Barack Obama.

This has been coming from, really, around the entire world, coming from Russia, coming from China, coming from Europe, and as

Matthew mentioned in the opening, as well as from within institutions of the United States. And I think it's important to

recall, that it was just a few months ago, in late July, that the

former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, Gen. Michael Flynn, in an interview with Al Jazeera, had said that for

years President Obama has been willfully ignoring the DIA's warnings about the growing threat of radical jihadist-terrorist

networks in Iraq and Syria, the forces which have subsequently become what we now call ISIS. General Flynn made it absolutely clear that this was not just negligence or a failure, but this has been the conscious policy of the Obama White House, in effect

protecting and supporting the growth and the solidification of ISIS.

Now, at the same time, in this recent period, there's been an increasing recognition that this massive surge of refugees fleeing into Europe, are actually running from the effect of Obama's policies; that Obama's policies have been responsible for

driving this refugee crisis.

In this context, just this past Wednesday at the United Nations Security Council, there was a meeting to discuss how to

combat the growing threat of terrorism. And both the Chinese and

Russian foreign ministers have made very clear, that in this fight against terrorism—what's happening in the Middle East—the

sovereignty of the Syrian nation must be respected, obviously in

direct contradiction and conflict with Obama's calls for regime

change in Syria, and the removal of the government there.

Also this week, we saw more signs of support of this shift, also coming from Europe, with the Swiss foreign minister saying

that the Syrian government needs to be included in a broad dialogue to settle the conflict there, and the president of the

European Parliament calling for the inclusion of Russia and Iran

in an international coalition to resolve the conflict in Syria.

Perhaps most dramatic, as, again, Matthew referenced in the beginning, and as I'm sure all of you have seen, Russia has now

initiated a series of coordinated air campaigns and strategic bombings against ISIS and other terrorist elements which have been otherwise, frankly, operating under the protection of Obama's policies.

So, in this context of a whole array of moves indicating a shift in the world situation, around this pivot in Syria, the following institutional question was posed to Mr. LaRouche:

"At the special UN Security Council session on terrorism this week, China's Foreign Minister Wang Yi called for the convening of a Geneva III conference on Syria, with no

preconditions, and with participation of all interested parties.

What are your thoughts on China's proposal at the UN Security Council?"

I'd like to invite Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response to this question.

STEINBERG: The short answer that Mr. LaRouche gave to the question, was two simple words: "Do it!" I'll elaborate a bit. You've had a policy, as Ben just indicated, of tolerance for the growth and expansion of the Islamic State, of the Nusra Front, of other similar jihadist-Salafist organizations; you've got the so-called Army of Conquest, of which Nusra is now a part—all of them operating inside Iraq and inside Syria. Despite the fact that there's a supposed coalition of 60 countries waging combat against these organizations, they seem to miraculously continue to expand their territorial holds. Despite the fact that they're under attack and under surveillance and scrutiny, they keep managing, somehow or other, to get new recruits slipping across the international borders, into Syria, into Iraq, to the point, that several months back, the CIA estimated that the Islamic State had 15,000 fighters total; and just in the last several weeks, they've revised that number up to at least 25,000, perhaps 30,000. In other words, if you factor in the fact that some of them are being killed, through the bombings, through combat operations, — particularly the Kurds have been quite effective against ISIS—they've obviously been swelling their ranks, with very little to stand in the way. Now, here you have a coalition. Some of the leading players

in the, quote, "U.S.-led coalition," are Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait; and it's well-known, that the major entrée point

for foreign fighters coming into Syria, is across the border from

Turkey. There's a very lucrative black-market smuggling route, that runs between Turkey and Raqqa , which is the capital city of

the ISIS area in northern Syria. The Turkish government, the ruling party, the AKP, and particularly, the immediate circles around President Erdogan, are making money hands-over-fist through these black-market dealings with the Nusra Front, with the Islamic State, and with these other Salafist terrorist networks.

So, a simple question is: What coalition against ISIS? It doesn't exist! It's been a fraud from the beginning.

So now the Russians have stepped in, and they've done it within the framework of international law. There was a formal authorization for the use of military force, that the Russian Federation Council voted up unanimously to President Putin.

So,

in other words, unlike President Obama, who never went to Congress, the Russian state structures have given authorization.

The Syrian government of Bashar Assad formally invited Russia to

participate. Russia has established an information-sharing center

that will be up and functioning within a matter of days or weeks

in Bagdad, with Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Russia participating.

So,

in other words, all the elements are being put in place for an actual serious assault against this terrorist infrastructure.

And

last night overnight, Russian bombers carried out 18 sorties against Raqqa, which is the province and the capital city of

the

entire ISIS-controlled area inside northern Syria and Iraq. So, in other words, you're seeing a serious military operation for the first time. And the Syrian armed forces have been depleted dramatically by four years, four and a half years,

of combat against a force that's been continuously beefed up, armed, supplied with new recruits, from an entire jihadist apparatus from around the world.

And the Russians know, by the way, that there are now an estimated 5,000 Chechen fighters in the ranks of the Islamic State, fighting inside Iraq and Syria. And so this poses an immediate serious, really grave security threat to Russia. So Russia is not sitting back, is not running a phony war. Russia is in there. They're serious, and this is a strategic game-changer.

The reason that the White House is hysterical over this is that there is this so-called coalition. The United States is protecting Saudi Arabia, and by extension, protecting the British-Saudi Arabian dirty deals that have created this jihadist problem in the first place. Qatar, Turkey, all supposed members of the Obama-led coalition, are all on the other side. They're all actively supporting the spreading of the Islamic State and the Nusra Front.

General David Petraeus, the so-called hero of the surge, who is now an official adviser to the Obama White House and the National Security Council, has called for the United States to openly support the Nusra Front. That's to say, openly support al-Qaeda, the same al-Qaeda that did 9/11; the same al-Qaeda that

in 2012 killed the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, and three other American diplomats. But fortunately, that noise, that policy from

the Obama White House, has been substantially suppressed.

There are other elements in the U.S. military that are

prepared very much to work with the Russians. Secretary of State

John Kerry has become the point person for a different U.S. policy, a policy that he's been working out for months in coordination with the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, and back

during his meeting in the spring in Sochi, directly with President Putin. So Kerry in a CNN interview several days ago, made it clear: He said, there is a new policy. And the new policy

is, we are not insisting on instantaneous regime change. We're not going to go there. We're not going to do a Saddam Hussein. We're not going to do a Muammar Qaddafi. There's going to be a transition. The governing institutions are going to be preserved.

We're going to be patient. We're not going to allow Syria to fall

into chaos, and we'll work with the Russians militarily.

So the Russians are making it clear. They're carrying out real combat operations, and they are out for blood. They're going

to wipe out the Islamic State, and increasingly, China, India, Germany, France, many of the countries in Europe that are now overwhelmed by the refugee flow from ISIS, from Nusra, they're onboard.

So you have a global strategic realignment, which means, yes, the prospects of a Geneva III political solution to the Syria crisis is now viable, and feasible. You've got China, Russia, India, Germany, France somewhat more reluctantly, all ready to go on this, and you're got Iran, Syria, and elements within the United States who have basically sidelined, but not yet eliminated the Obama presidency, who are ready to go with this.

Again, as Mr. LaRouche said very simply, "Do it!"

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. So with those two elements of the current strategic picture presented to you

here,

before I conclude this webcast, I just want to go back and re-emphasize what Mr. LaRouche asked us to open this broadcast with. And I want to do so by reading a short passage from what Mr. LaRouche had to say last night on the National Activists' telephone call, the so-called Thursday night Fireside Chat. And

this is what Mr. LaRouche said about Wall Street:

"The United States economy is about to collapse, and it's a real collapse. All of Wall Street is bankrupt, and worthless. If

the United States were to try and go along, and try to do business with Wall Street, and Wall Street institutions, that would be a disaster. Because Wall Street would itself collapse,

since it's already in a state of collapse. If we let Wall Street

go ahead, and do its own collapsing, the result would be a disaster for most of the people of the United States on a very large scale.

"So we have to get rid of Wall Street, immediately. We have to junk it. Point out the fact that it's worthless, that it's only a complete fraud. It has no economic value whatsoever, except that of trash. And so therefore, we're going to have to get a radical change in the organization of the financial system

of the United States for two reasons: first of all, to maintain

an economy that will function for the United States population;

second of all, to protect the United States {against} the influence of Wall Street. Because if Wall Street goes on its own,

and takes the dive that it will take, automatically, under those

circumstances the people of the United States may be starving all

over the place. Because if the United States collapses, then the U.S. economy will itself be in a disastrous condition. That is,

the financial system will collapse.

“And therefore, we have to get rid of the Wall Street system, and {we} have to collapse it in a controlled way. And then use that method of controlled action against Wall Street, in

order to make the kind of re-organization that Franklin Roosevelt

did in dealing with Wall Street in an earlier period. And that’s

what has to happen.”

So, with that said, I’d like to encourage everybody, if you haven’t heard it yet, go back and listen to this discussion with

Mr. LaRouche last night. This is the 20th Fireside Chat. Mr. LaRouche will also be engaging in his weekly discussion with activists in New York City tomorrow, and the intervention of the

LaRouche movement on the streets of Manhattan is continuing, as

we come out of this week, and into the following.

So, I’d like to thank you for joining us here tonight, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Rusland udsender et nyt udkast til en resolution

for FN's sikkerhedsråds bekæmpelse af terrorisme

1. oktober 2015 – Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov begyndte i går ved FN's sikkerhedsråds møde at sende et udkast rundt til en resolution, der er baseret på Ruslands tidligere resolution i FN's sikkerhedsråd for bekæmpelse af terrorisme, som USA har afvist.

□ Lavrov understregede, at krisen i Syrien kan løses gennem en koordineret indsats mod ISIS ved at understøtte Staffan de Mistura, Ban Ki-moons FN-udsending, og ved at involvere andre nationer i bestræbelserne, inklusiv Saudi-Arabien, Rusland, Jordan, Katar, Kina og USA. Syriens udenrigsminister Walid al-Moallem sagde til sikkerhedsrådet, at koalitionen anført af USA havde fejlet i at dæmme op for ISIS i Syrien, og at deres indsats var i strid med international lovgivning, eftersom de trænger ind i syrisk territorium uden regeringens godkendelse. Dette rapporterede avisen Newsday i dag.

□ Under mødet advarede Lavrov om, at Islamisk Stat er i besiddelse af dele til masseødelæggelsesvåben, og opfordrede til, at ISIS blev inkluderet som et selvstændigt emne på FN's liste over sanktioner mod terrorisme. »Indenfor store områder af Irak og Syrien har Islamisk Stat faktisk skabt en ekstremistisk semi-stat, som råder over et effektivt, undertrykkende styre, stabile indkomstkilder, en veludrustet hær og dele til masseødelæggelsesvåben,« sagde han ifølge RT. Lavrov understregede, at situationen i området er blevet forværret i løbet af det sidste år, og tilføjede, at »ophobningen af krisepotentiale er kommet tæt på det punkt, hvor vi kan tale om ødelæggelsen af det politiske kort i området.«

□ Den russiske leder sagde til forsamlingen: »Jeg præsenterer i dag medlemmerne af sikkerhedsrådet for et udkast til en resolution. Den er baseret på dokumenter, der tidligere er blevet godkendt af rådet, og lægger vægt på konsekvente

handlinger mod terrorisme baseret på normer og principper, der følger international lovgivning.« Ifølge en kopi af udkastet, som Associated Press er i besiddelse af, opfordrer det landende til at »koordinere deres aktiviteter med tilladelse fra de stater, på hvis territorier disse aktiviteter finder sted.« Lavrov sagde med henvisning til flygtningestrømmene ind i Europa, at krisen ikke kan løses uden at lave »en fast barriere mod Islamisk Stats bestræbelser på at underlægge området et middelalderligt diktatur. Det er ikke flygtningene, som skal stoppes, men terroristerne, krigene og konflikterne, som afføder dem.«

Kerry bekræfter, at USA har ændret politik overfor Syrien og Assad

30. september 2015 – I et interview med CNN, hvoraf første del blev sendt tirsdag og anden del i dag, gjorde udenrigsminister John Kerry det klart, at USA og den USA-ledede koalition har ændret politik og ikke længere kræver Assads omgående afsættelse. Kerry indrømmede, at Obama-regeringen »dengang, for længe siden« udtalte, at Assads afsættelse måtte være første skridt. Dette er ikke længere politikken. Nu er USA kommet frem til, at det er nødvendigt at forhandle sig frem til en glidende overgang for at undgå »et vakuum eller et kollaps«, som det skete i Irak, efter USA invaderede landet og væltede Saddam Hussein.

»Vi har brug for en ordnet overgang, en organiseret overgang, så man ikke behøver at frygte oprør, mistede liv, hævn,« sagde Kerry og tilskyndede til en ændring af lederskabet over en »rimelig tidsperiode.«

Kerry gjorde det i interviewet klart, at han ser Ruslands indgriben i Syrien som en »chance« så længe, at russerne erkender, at sunni-muslimske kræfter i området skal have del i overgangen.

I tirsdags gjorde Kerry klart i et interview til MSNBC, at han forestiller sig, at Syrien i fremtiden skal være en samlet og sekulær stat. Kerry udtalte, idet han refererede til USA og Ruslands fælles indsats for at nå til en overgang i Syrien, »så jo, omkring de mest grundlæggende principper, som vi kunne blive enige om, burde vi være i stand til at finde frem til noget.«

New York Times bemærkede i dag i en profilering af Kerrys diplomatiske indsats omkring Syrien, at Kerry altid har bibeholdt en dialog med Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, selv mens præsident Obama aldeles havde afbrudt kontakten med Ruslands præsident Putin. New York Times rapporterede, at Kerry ofte ville tale flere timer med Lavrov, nogle gange flere gange om dagen.

Kilder fra den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste noterede sig i denne uge, at mødet mellem Obama og Putin ansigt til ansigt i mandags i New York var frugten af Kerrys og Lavrovs vedholdende indsats, der nåede et nyt niveau efter Kerrys besøg i foråret til Sotji, hvor han mødtes med Putin og Lavrov. Putin lavede i juni et telefonopkald til Obama, som yderligere åbnede mulighederne og førte direkte til mødet i New York, og til, at diplomatiske og militære kanaler er blevet genåbnet mellem de to lande.

Leder, 2. oktober 2015:

Gør nedlukning af Wall Street til en integreret del af alt, hvad vi gør!

Torsdag den 1. oktober, 2015 – Lavrov og Kerry, der holdt deres fjerde møde torsdag på sidelinjen af FN, må holde momentet ved lige gennem uophørlig kontakt, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. Der er nu en udvikling i gang, og det må tilskyndes gennem deres fortsatte dialog og arbejde. Meningsdannere må fastholde et uophørligt fokus på amerikansk-russisk samarbejde, mens Obama må holdes ude af billedet så meget som muligt. Hold det russisk-amerikanske samarbejde i gang, og bloker Obamas muligheder for at indlede indirekte handlinger imod det. Obama gør stadig sit beskudte arbejde, selv om han nu er tvunget til at gøre det fra bag scenen; se nøje på, hvad Obama indirekte gør. Han er gået i skjul, men han fortsætter med at operere, som under forklædning. Obama er blevet slået tilbage, men han er ikke helt færdig endnu. Presset på Obama må ikke lempes et eneste øjeblik. Forøg presset på Obama.

Alt imens fokus på det amerikansk-russiske samarbejde er vigtigt, så må der være presserende nødvendig opmærksomhed på det sårbare svælg, som er økonomien. Lige siden Franklin Roosevelts død har der foreligget et forbud mod enhver stigning i den amerikanske produktivitet. Dette udgør stadig en dødbringende trussel. Låget blev især lagt på, efter Reagan blev skudt den 30. marts 1981, 69 dage inde i hans præsidentembede. Derefter optrappede George H.W. Bush som vicepræsident, og dernæst som præsident, nedturen. Men der var allerede en dyb fordærvelse i begyndelsen af 1970'erne, som det reflekteredes i reaktionen på Lyns sejr over Abba Lerner i den berømte debat på Queens College i december 1971. Bagefter leverede Sidney Hook truslen mod LaRouche. Ikke alene sagde han, »du vandt, men vi vil aldrig igen lade dig deltage i en

offentlig debat«. Han sagde, at de ville gå til modangreb, og det gjorde de. LaRouche blev aldrig tilgivet for det, han havde gjort. Alle må forstå implikationerne af dette fra 1971 og fremefter.

Vi må lancere en generel kampagne omgående, med højeste prioritet, og gøre nedlukningen af Wall Street til en integreret del af alt, hvad vi gør. Obama er blevet slået tilbage – presset på ham må ikke lattes. Vi må nedlukke Wall Street, ellers får vi en katastrofe for USA og andre nationer. Vi må have en energisk og aggressiv fremgangsmåde. Wall Street er død og må begravnes, for stanken er overvældende.

FDR havde øje for problemet, men situationen går langt, langt ud over noget, han var konfronteret med i 1930'erne. Wall Street må nedlukkes, så en effektiv fysisk-økonomisk genrejsning af USA kan lanceres.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 1. oktober 2015: Putin tager lederskab i Syrien, Obama er fortid

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: (tilgængelig senere i dag, den 2. oktober)

Lyd:

Leder 30. september 2015: Obama – udmanøvreret, skubbet af scenen, kørt ud på et sidespor, men ... Stadig i embedet

I den nye lederskabsdynamik, der demonstreredes på FN's Generalforsamling, og som anføres af præsident Putin, præsident Xi og andre BRIKS-nationer og samarbejdspartnere, er præsident Obama og hans herrer på dramatisk vis blevet udmanøvreret og skubbet af scenen. Faren består i, at Obama stadig er i embedet. Dette definerer amerikanernes fortsatte opgave, som den blev gentaget i fuld offentlighed under et livligt gademøde, der blev afholdt af **aktivister fra LPAC's Manhattan-projekt mandag ved FN Plaza**, med det klare budskab på deres bannere, som dette: »Obama: Hjælp med Verdensfreden: Gå af i dag!«

Et foto af denne planche, samt et andet: »Putins stopper Obamas Holocaust; Smid Obama ud«, blev sendt ud i hele verden af Sputnik News i løbet af de seneste 48 timer. Sputnik-Amerika dækkede fhv. senator Mike Gravel i går, under overskriften, **»Obama burde tilslutte sig Putin i en forenet indsats i Syrien – fhv. amerikansk senator«**.

Med hensyn til Syrien, så var den ene, umiddelbare og konkrete ting, der kom ud af det 90 minutter lange møde mandag aften mellem Putin og Obama, en bekræftelse på, at det amerikanske og russiske militær ville kommunikere med hinanden med det formål at fremme »de-konfliktion« i deres militære

operationer. Det er ironisk, eftersom netop denne proces blev indledt den 18. sept. i en telefonsamtale mellem den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigu og den amerikanske forsvarsminister Carter, men kort tid efter blev afvist af Obamaregeringen. Dette er typisk, og farligt. Kerry og Lavrov skal også mødes onsdag for yderligere at gå i dybden med de russiske, diplomatiske initiativer. Ifølge en amerikansk kilde, så dominerede Putin diskussionen med Obama med konkrete forslag til en reel krig, med FN-mandat, for at udslette Islamisk Stat, og han fik for første gang fornemmelsen af, at Obama var blevet tvunget til at høre efter.

Men, som Lyndon LaRouche gentog tirsdag, så findes der ingen tryghed, før Obama er fuldstændig fjernet fra magten.

Efter Putin-Obama-mødet førte Putin omgående en lang, åben dialog med russiske journalister ([tilgængelig i fuld længde på Kremls webside](#)).

Men Obama forlod mødet uden et ord.

Putin gentog til reporterne det, han tidligere på dagen havde sagt til FN's Generalforsamling: de amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, uden et mandat fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd eller en invitation fra den syriske regering. Vi må i stedet handle efter streng »overholdelse af normerne for international lov ... «

Putin opfordrer til samarbejde om Syrien for at bekæmpe terrorisme, og han opfordrede til, at der afholdes et møde mellem alle de berørte parter i oktober måned. Der har været flere russiske initiativer om dette, forud for denne uges møde i FN. Det fælles efterretningscenter i Bagdad (Rusland, Iran, Irak og Syrien) blev lanceret og vil være operationelt i oktober; der er en parallel, bilateral kanal mellem Rusland og Israel; og sluttelig mødtes Rusland, Kina og Indien for nogen tid siden i Beijing for at iværksætte et omfattende samarbejde om international terrorisme inden for rammerne af FN's

Sikkerhedsråd.

Midt i alle disse vigtige handlinger kommer et særligt, strategisk initiativ imod de grønne fascister. Under præsident Putins tale den 28. sept. til FN's Generalforsamling fremkom han med det tilbud, at Rusland, sammen med FN, ville ko-sponsorere en global konference om »biosfæren og tekno-sfæren« for at behandle nye, avancerede teknologier, der kan løse problemet med ressource-udtømmning og forbedre planetens miljø. Hertil kommer, at den indiske premierminister Modi har genoptaget sit angreb på den udviklede sektors intriger, der blev lanceret i København (COP15), og advarede om, at Indien ikke vil acceptere nogen såkaldte aftaler om klimaforandring, der udelukker nationerne i udviklingssektoren fra reel, videnskabsdrevet, økonomisk vækst. Under et møde på tomandshånd med Modi fik præsident Obama efter sigende et stilfærdigt vredesanfald over Modis modstand og vil sende amerikanske regeringsekskursioner til New Delhi for at klemme Indien, forud for klimatopmødet i december i Paris (COP21).

Obama/Putin-mødet i NY: Vred Obama tvunget til at befatte sig med Ruslands Putin

29. september 2015 – Det 90 minutter lange møde mellem præsidenterne Obama og Putin, der endelig blev afholdt i går (mandag), var ikke et møde på tomandshånd, men en formel affære med fem eller seks regeringsfolk fra hver nation – her

iblandt udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry – der flankerede deres præsident, som sad i hver sin ende af et langt bord.

Obama sagde intet om mødet bagefter og overlod det til en unavngiven »højtplaceret regeringsperson« at give en kort rapport senere samme aften om, at mødet havde været »produktivt« og »fokuseret« og mest omhandlede Ukraine og Syrien. Den unavngivne regeringsperson rapporterede imidlertid, at den amerikansk-russiske koordinering vedr. operationer i Syrien, som Obamas Hvide Hus tidligere havde skudt ned, vil blive etableret. Som nationale, statslige radiokanaler opsummerede regeringspersonens rapport, så »aftalte de to præsidenter, at deres militær skulle bevare kommunikation med henblik på 'de-konfliktion'« af operationer i Syrien.

Ulig Det Hvide Hus udlagde Kreml billeder af mødet, og præsident Putin afholdt en pressekonference med russiske journalister ved De forenede Nationer bagefter. Også Putin karakteriserede mødet som »meget konstruktivt, forretningsmæssigt og overraskende nok meget åbenhjertigt«, og han gav udtryk for sit synspunkt om, at det var meget nyttigt, men han var ligefrem om den fortsat farlige tilstand af de russisk-amerikanske relationer, og om hvem, der er ansvarlig for denne tilstand:

»Desværre befinder relationerne mellem Rusland og USA sig på et temmelig lavt punkt; dette er indlysende uden mine kommentarer. Men, det var ikke vores initiativ, der forårsagede en sådan lavkonjunktur i relationerne mellem Rusland og USA. Det er vore amerikanske partners holdning. Er det godt eller dårligt? Jeg mener, det er dårligt, både for bilaterale relationer og globale anliggender. Men det er det valg, USA har truffet.

Vi er altid parat til at udvikle kontakter og genoprette relationer i fuld skala«, tilføjede han. »Med hensyn til mødet

i dag, så var det meget nyttigt, og, hvilket især er glædeligt, så var det meget oprigtigt. Jeg mener, at vore amerikanske partnere forklarede deres holdning ganske klart i mange spørgsmål, inklusive afgørelsen af situationen i Ukraine og Syrien, så vel som i Mellemøsten generelt. Vi har, selv om det kan synes overraskende, mange sammenfaldende punkter og meninger i alle disse spørgsmål. Vi er også uenige om nogle ting, som vi har aftalt at arbejde på i fællesskab. Jeg håber, at dette arbejde vil blive konstruktivt ... «

Putin understregede betydningen af Minsk-processen i Ukraine-spørgsmålet; med hensyn til Syrien gjorde han det klart, at Obamas politik for regimeskifte og hans insistensen på, at Bashar al-Assad må fjernes fra embedet før alt andet, fortsat udgør et centralt punkt i deres uenighed.

Putin gentog til de russiske journalister, at Rusland ikke vil bøje sig mht. princippet om national suverænitet. Han rapporterede, at han med Obama havde drøftet den kendsgerning, at amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, da der hverken foreligger en resolution fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd, og heller ikke en invitation fra den legitime regering, der bakker disse handlinger op. Med hensyn til Assad: »Jeg har stor respekt for mine kolleger – både den amerikanske præsident og den franske præsident – men de er imidlertid, så vidt jeg ved, ikke borgere i Den syriske Republik, og bør derfor ikke tage del i at beslutte en anden stats fremtidige lederskab. Dette er syrernes anliggende.«

Rusland »vil ikke udelukke noget, men hvis vi handler, så bliver det i streng overensstemmelse med normerne for international lov«, sagde Putin.

Tysk fjernsyn og Kreml reagerer på trussel om genoprustning med atomvåben i Europa

23. september, 2015 – Frontal21, et tysk nyhedsmagasin på ZDF, Tysklands TV2, stillede i går spørgsmål ved de nye taktiske atomvåben, som skal stationeres i Tyskland. Det er første gang, at en udsendelse i den bedste sendetid har taget spørgsmålet op om faren forbundet med USA's genoprustningspolitik med atomvåben i Europa. Udsendelsen har allerede udløst en udtalelse fra Kreml og vil eventuelt have indflydelse på stemningen omkring emnet i Tyskland.

Frontal21 slog alarm: Ifølge en officiel skriftlig udmelding fra Pentagon vil tyske »Tornado«-jagerfly på militærbasen i Büchel begynde at blive »tilpasset« de nye B61 målstyrede atombomber i tredje kvartal af 2015. De nye bomber, der skal erstatte de nuværende B61 bomber, besidder nye evner som taktiske atomvåben. Det betyder, at en genoprustning med atomvåben allerede er begyndt.

(NB: »tilpasset« betyder ikke, at bomberne er monteret på flyene: Det betyder, at flyene er ved at blive forberedt til, at bomberne kan monteres på dem. Det er begyndelsen på en procedure, som betyder, at bomberne vil blive leveret på et tidspunkt.)

Udsendelsen konfronterede på en pressekonference Angela Merkel med spørgsmålene (i omvendt rækkefølge): »Støtter regeringen genoprustning med atomvåben her i Tyskland«?

Merkel: »Vi vil tale med USA om det. Måske har forsvarsministeriet allerede indledt samtaler, jeg ved det ikke. Jeg vil undersøge det for mig selv, hvorefter I vil blive informeret på et passende tidspunkt«.

ZDF spurgte også Merkel om, hvorfor hun havde brudt aftalen med regeringskoalitionen fra 2009, da CDU og FDP blev enige om at gennemtvinge tilbagetrækningen af USA's atomvåben fra militærbasen i Büchel.

Merkel: »Min opfattelse af koalitionsaftalen fra 2009 har hele tiden været, at vi skulle overveje konsekvenserne. Vi må indse, at hvis der udstationeres atomvåben andre steder, og der ikke er nogen i Tyskland, bør man spørge sig selv: Tjener det til bedre sikkerhed og balance«?

Merkels svar dækker over den kendsgerning, afsløret af Frontal21, at hun har bedraget sine koalitions partnere. I november 2009 mødtes hun med den amerikanske ambassadørs sikkerhedsrådgivere på den amerikanske ambassade. Efter mødet blev der sendt en melding til Washington: Merkel ønsker ikke tilbagetrækning af atomvåben. »Aftalen om tilbagetrækning af atomvåben blev påtvunget kanslerens kontor af daværende udenrigsminister Westerwelle ... det giver ingen mening ensidigt at tilbagetrække de 20 taktiske atomvåben«.

Et andet fokus i TV dokumentaren var Natos såkaldte »atomvåbendeling«, en praksis, der fører til, at tyske »Tornados« fløjet af tyske piloter vil blive udstyret med B61-bomber og beordret til at deltage i et eventuelt angreb.

Tidligere viceforsvarsminister Willy Wimmer fortæller, hvordan han var involveret i den sidste Wintex-Cimex øvelse før Berlinmurens fald, hvor det på et tidspunkt var meningen, at han skulle trykke på knappen, der ville have sendt bombefly med atomvåben af sted for at udslette Dresden og Potsdam i det daværende Østtyskland. Han rådførte sig med kansleren og nægtede at gøre det, hvilket afbrød øvelsen.

Med atomvåbendeling kan tyske piloter i dag blive beordret til at affyre den nye B61-bombe.

En fredsaktivist, der bor i nærheden af Büchelbasen, hvor de gamle bomber befinder sig og de nye skal installeres, citeres for følgende: »Man kunne gå ud fra, at de gamle B61-bomber aldrig ville blive taget i brug, fordi deres formål var afskrækkelse. Men de nye, planlagte våben er bygget på en måde, så de kan bruges. Og dette forøger i mine øjne risikoen for en atomkrig.«

Frontal21 beskrev med rette den nye B61 som et nyt våben. Derfor er der her tale om et brud på Aftalen om ikke-spredning af atomvåben. De interviewer så en talsmand fra det russiske udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, som siger: »Vi er bekymrede for, at lande, der ikke er i besiddelse af atomvåben, under Natos atomvåbendeling træner til at bruge atomvåben. Dette er et brud på ikke-spredningsaftalens artikel 1 og 2.«

I dag offentliggjorde Kreml et svar: talsmand Dmitry Peskov citeres af Sputnik for at have sagt: »Dette er endnu et skridt, og desværre et meget alvorligt skridt, mod en yderligere optrapning af spændingerne på det europæiske kontinent. Hvis disse planer bliver realiseret, hvor man jo må tage den tyske Forbundsdays beslutning osv. i betragtning, må man desværre sige, at de urokkeligt bevæger sig i retning af at gøre dette. Dette kan naturligvis føre til en strategisk ubalance i Europa, hvilket selvfølgelig vil få Rusland til at tage de nødvendige modforanstaltninger for at genoprette balancen, for dette er naturligvis ikke et skridt mod at forøge stabiliteten, tilliden eller sikkerheden i Europa.«

»Dette er skridt, som Rusland nødvendigvis må tage for den nationale sikkerheds skyld«, tilføjede Peskov.

Hele ZDF's rapport kan læses på tysk på <http://www.zdf.de/ZDF/zdfportal/blob/40229212/1/data.pdf>

Titelfoto: Forbundshærens flybase i Büchel, 6 dage siden.

Præsident Putins fulde tale i FN 28. sept. – video, engelsk voice over

Obamas tale i FN afslører ham – rapport og video

I dag, den 28. sept., udspyrede Obama sit krigsgale snavs over de samlede repræsentanter for verden på FN's Generalforsamling. Blot få minutter senere fastslog Putins fremlæggelse med syvtommersøm den usminkede sandhed: at Obama er færdig.

Mens han på hyklerisk vis nævnte »regering ved international

lov« og ondskaben i »magt er ret«, gjorde Obama Putin og Syriens Bashar al-Assad til direkte målskive for anklager om, at de var roden til alt ondt i verden i dag og hævdede endda, at Assad er årsagen til ISIS-rædslen i Irak og Syrien. »Lad os huske på, hvordan det begyndte«, fantaserede han.

»Assad reagerede på fredelige protester ved at optrappe undertrykkelse og drab, som igen skabte vilkårene for den aktuelle strid. Og Assad og hans allierede kan således ikke simpelt hen pacificere det store befolkningsflertal, der er blevet brutaliseret af kemiske våben og hensynsløse bombardementer.«

Han sagde, at »visse stormagter hævder sig på måder, der er i modstrid med international lov«, hvilket må have fået tilhørerne til at gispe efter vejret; dernæst klagede han over, at disse samme magter fremfører, at, for at bekæmpe terrorisme,

»må vi støtte tyranner som Bashar al-Assad, der kaster tøndebomber for at massakrere uskyldige børn, fordi alternativet sikkert er værre«.

Han skød dernæst brystet frem:

»Jeg er leder for det stærkeste militær, verden nogen sinde har kendt, og jeg vil aldrig tøve med at beskytte mit land eller vore allierede, ensidigt og ved hjælp af magt, om nødvendigt.«

(Senere fremdrog Putin ødelæggelsen af Libyen og Irak, lande, der bestemt ikke truede nogen, samt Obamas ensidige tilsidesættelse af FN's charter og international lov.)

Obamas diskussion blev mere direkte med hensyn til Ukraine:

»Se på Ruslands annektering af Krim og yderligere aggression i Ukraine ... Vi kan ikke passivt se til, når en nations suverænitet og territoriale integritet åbenlyst krænkes.«(!)

Idet han tydeligvis følte presset, sagde han klagende:

»Det er ikke en sammensværgelse af amerikansk-støttede NGO'er, der afslører korrupsion og sætter befolkningens forventninger op i hele verden; dens teknologi, sociale medier og ønsket, der ikke kan indskrænkes, hos folk overalt om at træffe deres egne valg om, hvordan de ønsker at blive regeret.«

Rusland har, sagde han hysterisk, startet en ny kold krig, og er nu ved at kollapse.

Obama vendte gentagne gange tilbage til situationen i Syrien, men omtalte aldrig russernes flanke-initiativ, hvorved de intervenserer militært og skaber en ægte, international koalition for at knuse ISIS, hvilket er årsagen til Obamas forstillelse foran hele FN.

Se hele Obamas tale i FN her:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e3V9I2Dx7vk>

**Leder, 29. september 2015:
Putin har netop demonstreret**

princippet om flanken

“Vi kan ikke længere udholde verdens tilstand” – Vladimir Putin i De forenede Nationer.

Indenfor, udenfor og i stor afstand fra FN på Manhattans østside var det i dag åbenlyst, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin er i færd med at ændre den strategiske form af verdensbegivenhederne, og også har betydelig støtte blandt amerikanere for en reel, international koalition til bekæmpelse af terrorisme.

Putins tale i FN, hvor han forsvarede denne organisations charter, der havde Franklin Roosevelt som sin oprindelse, var ligefrem og effektiv. Han sagde, at der var blevet skabt en terrorisme, der hastigt bredte sig, og skabt forarmelse og tab af respekt for livet i hele Mellemøsten, Nordafrika og Sydasiens, gennem krige for regimeskift, eller »demokrati-krige«, der krænker dette FN-charter og international lov, og at denne ødelæggelse ville brede sig, indtil den blev standset.

»Vi kan ikke længere udholde verdens tilstand.«

Et heldags demonstrationsmøde uden for FN med 40 aktivister fra LaRouchePAC oplevede en usædvanlig modtagelighed for sit banner-budskab: »Obama: Hjælp verdensfreden. Gå af.« Den totalt falske krig, som Obamas »60-nationer stor koalition« angiveligt skulle udkæmpe imod ISIS-terroristerne, er gået ned til at være et par luftangreb om dagen, mens tilfangetagne amerikanske våben og USA's »allieredes« støtte til ISIS/al-Qaeda har fået terroristernes kamprækker til at svulme op til 30.000 alene i Syrien og Irak.

Som »ud af den blå luft« er en ny koalition, der rent faktisk vil bekæmpe terroristerne, imidlertid hastigt ved at vokse frem omkring Putins russiske initiativ ind i Syrien, med støtte fra Kina. Også hen over Europa, såvel som i

Mellemøsten, fejer der et skift med hensyn til accept af dette initiativ.

EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche blev af medier bedt om at kommentere Putins 2 timer lange CBS-interview. Under diskussioner med **LaRouchePAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi mandag** sagde LaRouche, at der er ved at fremkomme et fundamentalt skift, som er revolutionært, i den politiske strategi. Wall Street kolliderer også. Verden vil snart repræsentere noget andet for menneskeheden, sagde han. Og dette i en periode, hvor man ikke længere tror på opdagelsen af fundamentalt nye principper – fysiske, økonomiske eller politiske!

Putin, sagde han, har netop demonstreret princippet om flanken – imod et afgørende punkt for den totale fiasko for Obamas politik, og har kastet Obamas Hvide Hus ud i forvirring og vrede.

I mellemtiden bekendtgjorde Kinas præsident Xi endnu en forpligtelse til 100 mia. dollars, gennem FN, til international infrastrukturudvikling. Kinas »win-win«-politik, eller konfucianske politik for økonomisk udvikling, er en integreret del af det globale skift, der er i gang.

Obamas mest effektive bidrag hertil? Gå af.

Leder, 28. september 2015:

Krig eller fred står på spil i Manhattan i dag

I dag, mandag den 28. sept., er en afgørende mærkedag i historien, med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der kommer til Manhattan for at fremlægge sin flankemanøvre imod præsident Obama og hans herrer i London og på Wall Street. Det er et opgør mellem kreativitet og sindssyge, mellem global udvikling og global disintegration; mellem krig og fred. Putin er allerede begyndt at deployere ekstensivt militærudstyr i Syrien, på anmodning fra den legitime, syriske regering under præsident Assad. Som han sagde til Charlie Rose i et interview, der skal sendes i afsnit mellem søndag nat og tirsdag, så er han forpligtende engageret til at forsvare denne legitime regering, eftersom »alle andre handlinger i modsat retning« ville skabe en katastrofe, »som vi nu ser det« i Libyen. Han påpegede, at denne deployering var helt i overensstemmelse med international lov, ulig tilsvarende deployeringer fra præsident Obamas side, hvis

»levering af militær støtte til illegale strukturer er i modstrid med principperne i moderne, international lov og De forenede Nationers Charter«.

Der er panik i Det Hvide Hus under Obamas forberedelser til at mødes privat med Putin, efter at de begge taler til Generalforsamlingen i dag. En afvisning af Putins forslag om en international koalition mellem nationer for at beskytte den suveræne stat Syrien, og verden, mod det barbariske ISIS, vil afsløre Obama som en åbenlys støtte af præcis disse terroristnetværk – nøjagtig som general Michael Flynn, den tidligere chef for det amerikanske Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA), sagde den 31. juli til Al Jazeera, hvor han anklagede Obama for »bevidst« at støtte al-Qaeda for at opnå et regimeskift i Libyen og Irak.

TASS rapporterede søndag, at Irak, Iran, Syrien og Rusland allerede har etableret et center i Bagdad for koordinering af efterretninger og operationer imod ISIS, og som skal ledes af repræsentanter for disse nationers generalstabe. Vil Obama modsætte sig denne indsats?

Præsident Xi Jinping sendte yderligere chokbølger gennem FN i lørdags, hvor han fremlagde kinesiske planer om yderligere flere store udviklingsprojekter i hele verden, med en alvorlig kritik af den eksisterende politik, hvor der kun gives hjælp til de lande, der lydigt følger de vestlige magters ordre. Kina, sagde han, vil, i sine udviklingsprojekter, sætte »retfærdighed over interesser«.

Og den tredje leder af Rusland-Kina-Indien-trekanten, der anfører BRIKS-nationerne i skabelsen af et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling, sprængte hul i den grønne fascistdagsordens planer om at bruge svindelen med global opvarmning til at nedlukke udvikling over hele verden. Den indiske premierminister Narendra Modi sagde til FN's generalsekretær, Ban Ki-moon, at der bestod et »tillidsunderskud« over for de udviklede lande, der bruger klimaspørgsmålet til at afholde udviklingslandene fra at forbedre deres befolkningers levestandard, under påskuddet om kontrol af CO₂-udledning. Det var Indien og Kina, der førte an i den heldige afvisning af tvungen nedbringelse af CO₂, og som ødelagde Klimakonferencen i København i 2009, »COP15«, og det er sandsynligt, at vi kan vente det samme ved »COP21«, Klimakonferencen i Paris i december måned.

EIR's nye Specialrapport, *Skræmmekampagne om 'Global Opvarmning' er Befolkningsreduktion, ikke Videnskab[1]*, må læses og distribueres for at sikre netop et sådant resultat.

I lørdags blev **Lyndon LaRouche**, under en konference i **Manhattan**, spurgt, hvilken fremgangsmåde, man skulle anvende for at mobilisere folk på et tidspunkt, hvor faren, som nu, er så alvorlig. Han svar var, i uddrag:

»Obama var på randen af at lancere en atomkrig fra selve USA. Det var, hvad han var helliget til. Og Putin blokerede det! Hvordan blokerede han det? Han gik over til en anden kæde og ændrede spørgsmålet og kom ind i et helt område, som ikke var det europæiske område i den almindelige forstand. Og hele dette område, fra Tyskland, og fra andre dele af Europa, begyndte at respondere til det, Putin havde gjort!

Pointen er derfor, at vi på alle punkter altid må søge menneskehedens fremskridt, i den forstand, at vi søger efter menneskelig udødelighed i de mennesker, der vil tage vores plads, når de skal tage vores plads, ud fra den antagelse, at de vil være i stand til, som en gruppe mennesker, som et samfund, at skabe evnen til ægte menneskelighed i fremtiden, eller i nutiden og ind i fremtiden.

Og det er denne optimisme, der giver folk inspiration til at hellige deres liv til det, der ligger forude, selv, hvis de skulle stå over for en trussel om døden. Og de inspireres af den kendsgerning, at de har folk, der bidrager til udviklingen af en mere fremskreden grad af udvikling af samfundet, end de nogen sinde tidligere har kendt.«

Titelbillede: St. Georg dragedræberen

[1] Se: [Rapport fra pressekonferencen i anledning af rapportens udgivelse](#)

Samt også: [Introduktion til EIR's rapport v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche, »Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur«](#)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
september 2015:
Optakt til Obama-Putin møde
ved FN/
Xi Jinpings statsbesøg i USA**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg