

Udvikling i den amerikanske Kongres imod Obamas ikke-erklærede krig i Syrien

7. november, 2015 – I går sendte en tværpolitisk gruppe bestående af 35 medlemmer fra Repræsentanternes Hus, under ledelse af kongresmedlemmerne Jim McGovern (D-Mass.), Tom Cole, (R-Okla.), Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), Walter Jones (R-N.C.), Peter Welch (D-Vt.), og John Lewis (D-Ga.), et brev til den nyligt valgte formand for Repræsentanternes Hus, Paul Ryan, og opfordrede ham til som det første at beramme en debat og en afstemning om at bemyndige anvendelse af militærmagt i Syrien og Irak.

To dage tidligere, i Senatet, genintroducerede senatorerne Tom Udall (D-N.M.), Mike Lee (R-Utah) og Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) et lovforslag, som de første gang introducerede for to år siden, og som ville forbyde forsyning af militær hjælp af enhver art til enhver gruppering, der kæmper i Syrien. "Vi genfremstiller lovforslaget for at forhindre yderligere optrapning, der trækker USA dybere ind i borgerkrigen", sagde Udall i en udtalelse. "Ikke alene er amerikanske tropper i fare for selve de våben, vi har leveret – under det fejlslagne uddan- og udstyr-program – til militante grupper, der nu er tilknyttet al Qaeda eller andre jihadist-grupper, men vi er også på gyngende grund juridisk, både under Loven om Bemyndigelse til Krigsførelse og international lov. Vi er ikke blevet inviteret af Syrien, som vi er i Irak, til at tilvejebringe støtte for grupper, der er modstandere af ISIL. Jeg støtter præsidentens indsats for at finde en diplomatisk og politisk løsning, men vi har også behov for at reevaluere vores strategi i regionen for fortsat at besejre ISIL uden at risikere amerikansk involvering i en kompleks borgerkrig med flere væbnede styrker, der er fjendtlige over for amerikanske interesser."

Her følger den fulde ordlyd af McGovern's brev:

"Blandt de spørgsmål, der kræver presserende opmærksomhed fra Repræsentanternes Hus, er spørgsmålet om omfanget af det amerikanske militærs involvering i krigen mod Islamisk Stat i Irak og Syrien. I betragtning af præsident Obamas nylige annoncering af en intensiveret indblanding i Syrien og Irak, er det af afgørende betydning, at Huset berammer og debatterer en Bemyndigelse til Anvendelse af Militærmagt (AUMF) så hurtigt som muligt.

I sidste uge gav præsidenten meddelelse om initiativer, der optrapper USA's engagement i kampoperationer i Syrien og Irak. Specifikt vil USA deployere et kontingent specialstyrker til det nordlige Syrien til at indgå sammen med og rådgive militante oprørsstyrker i regionen; og amerikanske militærrådgivere og specialstyrker, der allerede er i Irak, vil indgå sammen med kurdiske og irakiske styrker på kampens frontlinjer. Forsvarsminister Carter udtalte også, at de amerikanske luft-operationer i både Syrien og Irak vil forøge deres bombekampagner. Alt i alt repræsenterer dette en betydelig optrapning af amerikanske militæroperationer i regionen og placerer amerikansk militær-personel på kampens frontlinjer.

Vi er ikke enige i de samme politiske forskrifter for det amerikanske, militære engagement i regionen, men vi er enige i troen på, at det er på høje tid, Kongressen opfylder sin forfatningsmæssige forpligtelse og stemmer om en AUMF, der klart afstikker bemyndigelse og begrænsning, hvis disse skal gives, for det amerikanske militærs engagement i Irak, Syrien og omkringliggende regioner. Amerikanske bombekampagner har fundet sted igennem mere end et år, og amerikanske tropper på landjorden har i stigende grad været tæt på, eller er blevet trukket ind i, kampoperationer, inklusive det nylige dødsfald under kamp af en soldat fra specialstyrkerne i Irak.

I overensstemmelse med Deres løfte om at vende tilbage til sædvanlig orden, tilskynder vi Dem til at instruere de udvalg, der har jurisdiktionen, om at lave udkast til og omdele en AUMF så hurtigt som muligt. Vi tror ikke på illusionen om en bemyndigelse ved samtykke, noget, der kun sjældent sker. Vi mener ikke, at Kongressen kan bede vore gode militærmænd og -kvinder om at fortsætte med at tjene under farefulde forhold, alt imens vi forsømmer at udføre vores forfatningsmæssige ansvar i spørgsmålet om krig og fred.

Så længe, Huset ikke hævder sine forfatningsmæssige, eksklusive rettigheder og sin forfatningsmæssige myndighed, kunne regeringen fortsætte med at udvide de amerikanske bevæbnede styrkers mission og grad af engagement i hele regionen. Vi opfordrer Dem kraftigt, hr. formand, til at fremlægge en AUMF til debat og afstemning i Huset så hurtigt som muligt.”

5. november 2015: Lyndon LaRouche diskuterer med aktivister:

»Hvordan man åbner porten til økonomisk genrejsning?«

**»Vi må smide Obama ud af embedet;
vi må smide Wall Street ud i grøften!«**

Vejen til løsningen er *at lukke Wall Street ned*. Simpelt hen lukke det ned. Hvad betyder så det? Det betyder, at vi ikke længere betaler Wall Street. Vi bemyndiger ikke anvendelsen af Wall Street-penge som USA's valuta. Det bliver løftet fra USA's valuta. Det bruges ikke længere som valuta i og af USA. *Vi stopper det!* Bare sådan! Og det er vidunderligt. Det er smukt. Hvad sker der så? Ja, man må tilbage til Franklin Roosevelt og det, han gjorde, hans reform mod Wall Street. Så vi har et fint, lille fortilfælde. Luk Wall Street ned. Betal dem ikke noget som helst! Erklær dem bankerot! Vi vil ikke have dem! Vi har ikke brug for dem i USA, vil ikke have dem i USA! Måske kan vi lære dem at lave tønder, eller sådan noget, eller at lave noget nyttigt; men Wall Street fortjener *ingen som helst understøttelse*. Ingen som helst finansiel understøttelse *overhovedet!* Når vi først sparker Wall Streets praksis ud, kan menneskeheden begynde at fungere.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

LPAC Fredags-Webcast 6. november 2015: Obama beordrer medieicensur af Drone-papirer – Læger uden Grænser udgiver egen rapport om Kunduz – Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina tilsigter 3. Verdenskrig. O.m.a.

Dette webcast: Obama beordrer medieicensur af dækning af afsløringer af Drone-papirerne. Seneste afsløringer om bombing af LuG's hospital i Kunduz – LuG udgiver egen rapport. Hundrede tusinder af flygtninge pga. Obamas ulovlige krige i Sydvestasien og Nordafrika. Faren for global udslettelse i 3. Verdenskrig vokser, pga. Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina. O.m.a. Engelsk udskrift.

TRANSCRIPT:

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 6, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly broadcast here from larouchepac.com of our international Friday night webcast. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*, as well as Megan Beets of the LaRouche PAC Science and Research Team.

Now, the three of us did have a chance to meet with Helga and Lyndon LaRouche just a few hours ago; so that has definitely

informed the content of the broadcast that you'll hear tonight. What you will hear tonight is a thorough exposition of the continually building case for immediate legal action to be taken against the murderous policies of the Barack Obama Presidency. The case against him continues to snowball. You'll hear about the media censorship that was ordered directly from the Obama White House to eliminate any coverage in the leading newspapers of record of the United States, including the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, of the damning story that was broken by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill in *The Intercept* of the so-called "Drone Papers"; which exposes the lurid details of Obama's weekly kill sessions, which have routinely resulted in innumerable innocent civilian deaths. You'll hear about the most recent revelations in the case of the bombardment of the Doctors Without Borders hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan; in which it is now being revealed that doctors and other medical personnel who were fleeing the hospital, fleeing the bombardment of this medical facility, were systematically gunned down by US military gunships. [This is] further building the case that this is indeed an intentional targetting of a medical facility, and amounts to nothing less than a war crime. You'll hear about the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been fleeing the illegal wars that have been perpetrated by the Obama administration in the Middle East and northern Africa, resulting in the massive social displacement of entire portions of these populations as well as widespread death and destruction, as Obama continues to lend his support to the overthrow, by radical jihadists, of sitting sovereign governments in this region. You'll hear about the shocking statistics of the rise in the death rates, rising dramatically throughout the United States; particularly among the former skilled, industrial and manufacturing labor force, who were sacrificed at the altar of the bail-out of the bankrupt Wall Street banks by first the Bush and now the Obama administrations. One of the leading causes of this increase in death rates across the United States, and especially in this formerly productive sector of the American labor force, is an

unbelievable surge in deaths from heroin and related drug overdoses; not only among the inner city minority populations, but also now among suburban middle and upper class white populations, surpassing automobile and firearms rates of mortality and now reaching an epidemic level as characterized by the Centers of Disease Control.

And finally, you'll hear about the continuing mounting danger of global extinction warfare as the Obama administration continues to attempt to provoke World War III confrontations with both Russia and China. Now, this final item was the explicit discussion at a landmark event that occurred earlier this past Wednesday on Capitol Hill; which I personally had the opportunity to attend and to be an eyewitness to. This extraordinary event was set up as an informal hearing by Representative John Conyers, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee and the dean of the House of Representatives – the longest serving member of Congress on the House side. Also in attendance were a number of other Congressmen, including Representatives Barbara Lee, Alan Grayson, Charlie Rangel, Sheila Jackson Lee, and Congressman Walter Jones among others. The distinguished members of the panel at this informal hearing were all founders of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord, including: former US Ambassador Jack Matlock, who was ambassador to the Soviet Union under President Ronald Reagan; NYU Professor Steven Cohen; and John Pepper, a leading businessman and former CEO of Proctor & Gamble. The subject of this hearing was none other than the fact that the Obama policies are on the verge of provoking a thermonuclear confrontation with Russia; a subject which was explicitly presented in those terms, and the fact that without a drastic change in US-Russian relations which must be induced, there is no way that this World War III confrontation can be avoided.

The invitation to this event, which was published by the Committee on East-West Accord and was circulated by the office

of Congressman John Conyers, read in part as follows: "The Ukrainian crisis represents a low in US-Russia relations not seen since the fall of the Soviet Union. And the recent Russian involvement in the Syrian situation is now making the danger even worse. American and Russian jets flying bombing missions in close proximity to one another, raises the possibility of a military accident between two nuclear-armed powers. As the *New York Times* warned, the complicated and shifting landscape of alliances leaves us 'edging closer to an all-out proxy war between the United States and Russia.' The majority of Americans never lived through the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 or the darkest days of the Cold War. They have led lives without the looming specter of nuclear war, but the areas of conflict between our nations are growing. The conflict in Ukraine, the expansion of NATO, Russia's involvement in Syria, and other lesser issues are driving a new wedge between the US and Russia. While most would agree that conflict between the United States and Russia benefits no one, the likelihood of such a conflict, as well as the serious consequences that it would bring, is not being discussed on Capitol Hill."

In the interest of fostering more robust debate on US-Russia relations, Representative Conyers has convened an informal hearing featuring four eminent American experts on this subject, and those four members were the members that I named: the members of the board of the recently re-established American Committee for East-West Accord.

Now each member of this panel, and a number of the Congressmen, each in their own way referred to the darkest days of the Cold War, which they all remembered as members of the senior statesmen of this country. John Conyers being the dean of the House of Representatives, Jack Matlock being a former ambassador and a close collaborator of President Ronald Reagan – they referred to the Cuban Missile Crisis. They recalled the experience of duck and cover, hiding under one's

desk, nuclear air raid drills, underground bomb shelters, nuclear bunkers, and stated that although the situation at that time seemed bad, the situation today is as bad, or worse; and that unless the direct provocations against Russia are halted, there is very real possibility which exists of open nuclear warfare breaking out, and exterminating the human race.

Ambassador Matlock echoed much of what he had stated previously during previous appearances in Washington, D.C., but also especially during his recent appearance on the same dais as President Vladimir Putin at the Valdai discussion club in Sochi, Russia two weeks ago. Matlock elaborated the 20-year process of broken promises and outright lies and deceptions that resulted in the Eastward expansion of NATO all the way up to Russia's borders, which has an immediate and calculated threat to Russia's domestic security, worse than, in fact, as Matlock pointed out, the Berlin crisis of 1961. The fact that Berlin was not directly on Russia's borders, but now you have the immediate proximity of Ukraine, and other countries right on the borders of Russian territory.

Steven Cohen underscored Matlock's remarks and warned point-blank, in no uncertain terms, that the placement of one more base on Russia's borders, or the incorporation of one more country in Eastern Europe into the NATO security alliance, military alliance, would mean war between the U.S. and Russia, and everything that entails. He pointed out that Michael McFaul's blog has shifted from what he called "Mickey Mouse democracy promotion" to now, all-out strident calls for outright warfare and regime change provocations. Cohen emphasized that the danger of war today is far worse than at any time during the Cold War, mostly because of this cross-partisan 100% close-to-consensus when it comes to the demonization of Putin, and Russia, and the lack of any substantial pushback from among the corridors of power in Washington, against this narrative, especially from within

Congress – although this was something which, he noted, was changing with this historic event, changing in front of the eyes of all those who attended this event, over a packed audience, standing room only, with this hearing that was sponsored by John Conyers and other members of Congress: the first open discussion of this kind in a forum such as this by *anyone* on Capitol Hill.

And finally, John Pepper made a very impassioned call for a completely new paradigm in U.S.-Russia relations, one which is founded on a concept of common security, and a creation of a mutual common security architecture, against what he identified as the *real* enemies, as opposed to the made-up enemies: the real enemies of both the United States and of Russia. Number one: international terrorism, and ISIS, in specific. And number two: what he identified as the greatest enemy of all mankind, which is thermonuclear warfare itself. He stated, the true enemy that we must guard ourselves against is the enemy of nuclear annihilation, and I think we can all find common cause in that.

So, as I said, this was really an extraordinary event, especially when you juxtapose it to another event which was happening literally simultaneously on Capitol Hill, just a few doors down from this hearing room. And this was a hearing featuring none other than Victoria Nuland herself, and that counterposition was pointed out very clearly by numerous participants in this event, both members of the panel, and members of the audience, as representative of the two stark choices that are facing the American people right now: Obama's World War III and thermonuclear annihilation, or a new international policy of cooperation and partnership with Russia, as well as with China. Which means the immediate end of the murderous and deadly policies of the Obama administration.

So, with that said, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to come to the podium for the next segment of tonight's broadcast, to

elaborate a little bit more on what I've just covered.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. There was obviously some important things that were said during that John Conyers event on Wednesday afternoon up on Capitol Hill, but I think it's critical to recognize that there was one thing that was *not* said, and that was that the only viable solution is the removal of President Obama through either impeachment, or invoking of the 25th Amendment, or some combination of actions, as happened with Richard Nixon, to force his immediate resignation.

The fact of the matter is that you had prominent American diplomats, prominent American scholars, leading members of Congress, standing there, and saying to the American people that the President of the United States is pushing the world towards thermonuclear annihilation, and yet nobody took it to the logical conclusion, which is that we've got to get this guy out of office.

Now in our discussion earlier today with Lyn and Helga LaRouche, Mr. LaRouche really was reflecting on where we stand, in terms of the dangers represented to, really, the survival of the entire trans-Atlantic region. Because that's really what's on the table right now. Assuming we even avoid the immediate threat of thermonuclear war and annihilation, the simple fact is that if the current trendlines continue, without a reversal, in a very short period of time the entire trans-Atlantic region will be doomed, will be finished, will not resemble anything like what Europe and the United States historically represented, particularly the United States.

Parts of South America may very well survive, because they're already aligning themselves with the Asia-Pacific region, and with Eurasia more broadly, where countries like China, India, Russia are doing relatively well compared to the complete breakdown process that's inflicted the entire trans-Atlantic region.

Now the problem of not directly addressing the clear and obvious solution to the this crisis, namely the constitutional removal of President Obama from office, is in fact indicative of a much deeper problem, a problem that very few people other than people like Mr. LaRouche think about constantly. The bottom line is that since the very beginning of the 20th Century, since the intervention by Lord Bertrand Russell and others around him to destroy Classical science, and to replace it with mathematics and with the disease of pragmatism, since that process began at the beginning of the 20th Century, we've been on a steady downward trajectory – culturally, economically, philosophically, morally. We've been, throughout the trans-Atlantic region, in a slow but now intensifying complete collapse of society, and when you broach the issue of a President who has committed atrocities, such as his drone kill policy. All you need to do, is go back on the LaRouche PAC website, and review the last three Friday evening webcasts. You'll have all of the details you need to know about that.

The fact that there has not been a move to remove this president from office, is because the disease of pragmatism has infected our political institutions to such a great degree, and has infected our general population to an even greater degree, that the only measure that can prevent the possible annihilation of mankind, is considered to be "unpractical, it's not pragmatic, there's no guarantee that this process will succeed." So, we've been on this long trajectory downward. It's very much like the principle of how you boil a frog. If you put a pot of water on the stove, and get that water boiling to a full boil, and try to throw the frog in the boiling water, the frog's going to jump right out. He'll run away and you'll never find him. If you put the frog in a pot of warm water, comfortably warm water, and have a low flame, then, gradually, that water will reach a boiling point, and the frog won't notice it, because the incremental changes are gradual. That's why you've got to look back and consider

where we are as a trans-Atlantic civilization today, and ask yourself, from that standpoint: can we survive by continuing to cling to pragmatism and avoid taking the necessary urgent measures that can save us from otherwise certain doom?

The drone policy, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion today: it's emblematic of Obama. He's a mass killer. He *boasted* to White House staff, back in 2011, that he was really good at killing. Coming into the office of the Presidency, he had *no idea* how good he was at targeting people to be killed by others. But that's the character of it; that's what the "Drone Papers," like the "Pentagon Papers" earlier, brought down [president] Richard Nixon. The "Drone Papers," alone, are more than sufficient to bring down President Obama. But it has not yet happened, because a few phone calls from the White House to the *New York Times*, to the *Washington Post*, got the word out: this story is taboo; it's not practical to tell the truth about this mass murderer, because we might get cut off from access to the White House. So, you've got this phenomenon.

You have the new reports that Matt just mentioned, that, at the bombing of the Doctors Without Borders [msf] hospital in Kunduz [afghanistan], more and more evidence is coming out that it was a pre-meditated assault on an international medical facility under the lamest of excuses, and that as doctors and nurses and patients were fleeing, they were being shot, on the grounds that anybody who was there was automatically, *de facto*, Taliban and fair game for another mass kill.

But there's many, many more things to consider. You have the conditions of life of the American people, which have been destroyed, systematically, boiling-frog style, over a period of, really, the last 40 years, or you could say even the period going back to the death of [president] Franklin Roosevelt in April of 1945. It's been a largely downward trajectory ever since then, and that is merely a slice of the

process that began right at the turn of the 20th Century, with Bertrand Russell's invasion and assault against science. If you look back at the sweep of the 19th Century, you had some of the greatest accomplishments in culture and in science – in real, physical science. You had [bernhard] Riemann, you had the great classical composers – Beethoven, Brahms. You had the work of Friedrich Schiller, branching over from the 1700s into the 1800s. You had a renaissance underway, particularly in Europe, particularly in Germany, during the end of the 19th Century, covering the whole sweep of that Century. And suddenly, it came it came to a screeching halt, with the British top-down intervention, personified by Bertrand Russell. And we've been on a cultural downslide ever since. If you destroy the culture, you destroy the moral fabric of a society.

So, where are we now? Earlier today, as I'm sure many of you are aware, a series of propagandistic lies were put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, saying that 271,000 jobs were created last month in the United States, and that the unemployment rate is now officially down to 5%. Five percent unemployment is considered to be tantamount to full employment.

Well, those figures are an absolute lie, and I think if any of you think about it, any of you watching this broadcast now, think about whether your conditions of life are better or worse than they were at the start of the Obama presidency, or, even more so, at the end of the Clinton presidency, when Bush and Cheney came in. If you say, "My conditions are better, my prospects for my children and grandchildren are better," then you are in an extremely small minority. The simple reality is that half of the 271,000 jobs claimed to have been created, are *purely fictitious*. They're the result of a mathematical slight-of-hand trick, projecting, on average, death and life rates and starts of new businesses and bankruptcies. But there's nothing normal about the current economy. So, forget

that number! If you take the fact that 94 million working-age Americans, qualified to be in the labor force, are *not* counted as part of the labor force, because they are either chronically unemployed or have never been able to find a job, then if you add those 94 million people, working-age people, in, you find that the actual unemployment rate in the United States, is 23%! That number is on a par with the worst, darkest, days of the Great Depression in the 1930s, before Roosevelt put people back to work.

We have statistics that have come out. A study came out just this past week from Harvard University, indicating that for the first time in a long time, there are more and more Americans dying during their middle-age – their 40s and 50s. And this is due to a combination of job loss, of lack of access to adequate medical care, addiction to drugs and alcohol – again, a reflection of a process of chronic unemployment or under-employment. In rural United States, according to a report in the *New York Times* earlier this week, the rate of suicides is rising astronomically.

In a few moments, Megan will give you a detailed readout on the fact that we're in the midst of a heroin epidemic in the United States, and it's mostly afflicting middle class and upper middle class households all over the country. You have all of the signs there, as if anyone out there needed to be reminded or told about the actual collapse of the conditions of life.

So, this has occurred during the period of the Bush-Cheney administration and during the period of Obama. There's nothing that we can do right now, in particular, about Bush and Cheney, from the standpoint they're out of office. They should have been impeached for a whole range of reasons, and they were not impeached. Yet President Obama is the current President. And he stands guilty of crimes that even go beyond the scope of what Bush and Cheney did. The drone killing policy is a policy of mass murder. In effect, you should be

thinking about President Obama from the standpoint of somebody who is a bigger mass murderer than Charles Manson. How would you feel about having Charles Manson in the White House? Well, guess what? Maybe you do. So, the question is, and this is addressed to the outstanding individual who did appear at that Congressional forum, and it's also addressed to you, the American people. When are you going to shed the disease of pragmatism and face the reality of the situation that you are now living through? This is not something you watch on television, or read about in the newspapers or on your personal computer. This is the life that you are being subjected to; and there's no reason for it.

The trans-Atlantic region is dead; the US economy is dead. The European economy is even more dead in many areas than the US economy is. Yet, Asia is not thriving because of the impact of the trans-Atlantic crisis; but Asia is doing vastly better. There's growth going on. China, India, even Russia; there's growth going on in the entire region. There's a perspective of optimism, about space exploration, about extending the high-speed links from the Asia-Pacific coast on to the Atlantic coast of Europe. The United States and Europe are living as if on a different planet with a different mindset; and that can and must be broken. And one of the first steps that must be taken is that there's got to be a genuine outpouring that says that this President's got to go. That Wall Street has got to be shut down; because one of the greatest crimes that President Obama has committed has been to be a lackey of Wall Street and the City of London. To put their interests above those of the American people.

So, it's time to wake up to your own condition and do something about it, and as I say, there are leading political figures who are scared to death that we are on the cusp of thermonuclear war; they're now talking about it more openly. Don't get me wrong, it's not insignificant that leading American diplomats and members of Congress talked about the

fact that we're on the edge of thermonuclear war at a public forum on Capitol Hill. But how many of you even knew about that before you heard this broadcast tonight? I can assure you, you did not read it on the front page of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*; you didn't hear about it on the six o'clock news. So, it's time to wake up; and those people, who are in responsible leading positions, have got to stop being pragmatic and pulling their punches. And they've got to join us and join Mr. LaRouche in saying "We've got an immediate mission. We've got to bring down this Presidency, and we've got to bring down Wall Street." If you don't do that, then you're not serious about stopping thermonuclear war, and you're not serious about turning around the collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic region.

So, that's the issue on the table. And it was a wonderful event on Wednesday, but this missing ingredient is deadly if it's not actually picked up.

MEGAN BEETS: So, on the topic of Obama being very good at killing, let's take a closer look at what's been done to the working population of the United States over the course of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. As Jeff mentioned, on November 4, the Drug Enforcement Administration released their 2015 National Drug Threat Assessment Report, which paints a similar report released by the CDC in August; a staggering picture of the drug use and drug overdose increases in the United States, which has risen to epidemic levels under the regimes of Bush and Obama. The document reports that drug-related deaths, as Matthew mentioned in the opening, drug-related deaths have risen to become the leading cause of injury death in the United States. More than firearms; more than car accidents. And in 2013 alone, the United States lost 46,470 people to drug overdoses; 46,000 people. That's more than 120 per day. Now among drugs, controlled prescription drugs – mainly opioids and heroin – account for the largest type of drug by

far; and the slight decline of the use of prescription drugs is being steadily replaced by the use of heroin, as people shift over to what's a much more deadly drug. But what's also much cheaper and much, much more widely available.

Now, to illustrate that a little bit, in 2013 there were 169,000 new users of heroin; many of them very young. Between 2013 and 2014, the rate of current heroin use – in other words, people who have used heroin in the past 30 days – rose by 51%. Between 2007 and 2013 – or in other words, during the course of Obama's Presidency – the addiction to heroin rose 150%; and the deaths by overdose of heroin more than tripled.

Now the primary area where this increase of death has occurred, is in the Midwest; the formerly industrial centers that LaRouche took the spear point to save over the course of 2005 and the following years, when under the Bush-Cheney administration the auto industry and related machine tool sectors were gutted and crushed. Now it's the Midwest, followed closely by New England and the New York/New Jersey area; all of these the formerly productive industrial centers of the country which have suffered in every way under Bush and Obama. Now the increase, as you might guess, for the most part is not concentrated in the inner cities; although I will mention that in the city of Baltimore, one in ten people is a heroin user. It's not centered among the poorest people in the country; it's centered in the middle class, the working class. For example, families with an income of \$50,000 or more, for families of that income rate, heroin addiction has risen by 60% in the last 4 years. These are working class, upper class families and their children.

But this picture of the epidemic use of drugs is just part of a broader picture. Death is on the rise under President Obama. A study was released just a few weeks ago in September, which is this week receiving wide coverage, which states that since 1999, over the course of the four terms of Bush and Obama, the death rate among middle-aged white Americans in the age range

of 45-54 has risen dramatically; in an unprecedented way. 10 % overall, and 20 % among the poorer, less educated strata. This increase of the death rate of middle-aged people is not a natural shift in demographics; it's not due to some overall change in disease mortality rates. In fact, for comparison, in comparable industrialized countries around the world, the mortality rate for exactly this class of people has *fallen* by 25 % to 30 %. So, this is purely the result of a conscious policy in the United States by Bush and Obama.

The leading cause is not disease. The leading causes are signs of the complete degeneration and despair among the American population: drug abuse; alcohol abuse. And in fact, the authors of the report note particularly, heroin and other opioid overdoses; suicide. And as Jeff referenced, in rural areas of the United States, the suicide rates since 2004 have risen by 20%.

So here you have an overview of the stark reality of the Obama death policy, so clearly seen in the attack on the hospital in Afghanistan, turned against the American people. When presented with some of these figures the other day, LaRouche responded with this: He said, "Why didn't we, as a nation, respond years back, and take action to stop this from happening? How did people get set up to accept the economic policies of destruction of science, of industry, along with endless bail-outs of Wall Street? How were we induced to submit to do this to ourselves?" So, I'd like to ask Jeff to come to the podium to respond and elaborate.

STEINBERG: I think it goes back to what I said earlier. Slowly, the level of culture, the level of real science that had permeated our culture even here in the United States in the 19th Century has been under steady and constant assault; largely coming from the British, particularly reflected in people like Lord Bertram Russell, who wrote books professing to be about science. He wrote a book in 1951, *The Impact of Science on Society*; he didn't talk about science. He talked

about methods of destruction of young minds by turning the education system into a system that basically drives people into accepting their subservience to be trained, to be submissive, to be non-inquisitive. And again, the disease that Russell imposed from the beginning of the 20th Century, was the disease of replacing physical science with mathematics. Everything comes down to a formula; everything comes down to a probability. If it's not highly probable, then it's not practical, and therefore, don't go there.

So, you've had an assault on education, both from the kindergarten level on up, all the way to the major universities professing to be the great halls of advanced education. You've had a culture that has been destructive in the most unbelievable and egregious way. And the net effect is that even compared to the early 1970s, people have lost a certain sense of fight. They'd rather watch reality television. Our leaders have accepted the idea that there are boundary conditions on what they can even dare think about.

Last week on this broadcast, we talked about former Senator Mike Gravel, who, as a lowly first-term Senator from Alaska, had the audacity to put the Pentagon Papers in the Congressional record. That act in 1971 led to the demise of President Nixon, and contributed mightily to the end of the Vietnam War. So, there are glimmers of recognition among some of our elder statesmen that things used to be different. And so, we've got an enormous challenge on our hands right now. Do we continue to tolerate, even knowing that the President of the United States is sitting down every Tuesday afternoon with a small group of White House advisors and basically ordering the murder of individual citizens from nations all over the world, some of them American citizens, without any kind of oversight, and without any accountability for his actions?

As Megan just said, he's presided over an invasion of drugs, whether it's over the counter, prescription or black-market illegal drugs; we have 94 million citizens of working age who

are not working in the real economy. Clearly not every one of those people is sleeping under a bridge somewhere. How many of them are directly involved in the black market economy that's shoving heroin at a record rate into the arms of American citizens? It's all of a package.

And again, as I said earlier, and as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion this afternoon, Obama's got to go, and the book of evidence is absolutely there. It's comprehensive, it's irrefutable. Some of the crimes that he is documented to be guilty of are crimes that go beyond simply the question of impeachment. They may wind up being the basis for criminal prosecution, because the immunity afforded to elected officials does not extend to outright criminal action.

So, we've got Wall Street, that's a parasite sitting on top of and destroying the U.S. economy. There are straightforward measures that could be taken to eliminate Wall Street, starting with the idea of simply re-instating Glass-Steagall. There are many things that could be done. We could issue credit to rebuild our infrastructure. We could be adopting the model of Franklin Roosevelt from when he first came into office, setting up training programs for young people to give them the necessary skills and to also give them the sense of optimism that they've got a constructive role to play in society, and that they've got a bright future ahead of them.

All of these things could be done. They're all right there. If you go to the LaRouche PAC website, you will see there's a massive amount of material spelling out chapter and verse exactly what kinds of measures can and must be taken to turn this situation around. But ultimately it starts with a very subjective question: Are you prepared to fight for your own vital interests? Are you prepared to hold elected officials to a constitutional standard, and to hold them accountable if they fail to live up to it? These are the issues. These are the questions that are really right now staring us in the face, because we don't have much time left. We don't have a

great deal of time to solve these problems, to tackle these issues, and the question is, are you prepared to give up your pragmatism, to turn off your television, and to do something constructive for your country, for your family, and for your future generations?

That's really the issue and that's the question that should be the burning issue on everybody's mind at this moment.

MATT OGDEN: Now, our final question for this evening is our institutional question, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the Russian-operated Airbus A321M crashed last Saturday shortly after taking off from the Red Sea resort of Sharm al-Sheikh, on its way to St. Petersburg, killing all 224 people on board. There are strong but unconfirmed reports that the plane had been downed by a bomb, a claim contested by both Egypt and Russia. British Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond, however, said that Britain had weighed the whole information picture, including the Islamic State's claim of responsibility after the crash, and had concluded that there is a significant possibility. If these reports are substantiated through examination of the plane wreckage, what actions do you suggest the Russian government should take against the perpetrators of this tragic crime?"

STEINBERG: First of all, I think the actions taken by the British Foreign Secretary were obnoxious and egregious. The British have no role whatsoever in this investigation. If they had communications intercepts suggesting that terrorists were planning such an attack, then the obvious question is why didn't they inform the Egyptian and Russian authorities, if they knew this was happening? The fact of the matter is that the British basically staged an ambush for Egyptian President el-Sisi, because it was upon his arrival in London for a long-scheduled state visit that Hammond made these comments, and basically announced at the same time that British Airways was suspending flights into Egypt.

So, you've got a British game being played here, and an Obama game, because an unnamed Obama Administration official immediately came out and told Reuters that the U.S. is in agreement with the British in terms of jumping the gun, and drawing these hasty and perhaps completely false conclusions.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said is, first of all, you've got to let the Russians conduct the investigation. The Russians are perfectly capable of conducting a thorough and honest and comprehensive forensic investigation to determine what happened. And because of the nature of the area where the crash occurred, namely, in the Sinai desert, all of the remains of the plane have been recovered. The black boxes have been recovered, with a little bit of damage to one of them. All of the bodies by and large have been recovered. And therefore, because you're dealing with people who have competence, and who have a vested interest in finding out what really happened, Mr. LaRouche emphasized, let the Russians do their job. Don't jam them. Don't try to speed it up. Patiently wait for the investigation to be concluded.

And I should say that the head of the Russian FSB, their intelligence service, Alexander Bortnikov, issued a statement today. I'll just read it—it's brief—but it goes very much to the point that Mr. LaRouche just made. Bortnikov said, and it was publicized on Channel 1 TV in Russia today:

"We need to obtain absolutely objective and verified data on the reasons for the crash of the plane. This is necessary for purposes of investigating the cause of this disaster, and for informing the public. This work must be done in the most meticulous fashion, taking as much time as may be required, and I want to state that until we determine the actual causes of what happened, I think it is appropriate to halt Russian civil aviation flights to Egypt. This chiefly involves tourism. At the same time, we find it necessary to cooperate actively with the Egyptian authorities in joint work on the investigation of the causes of this disaster. Now, Russia 1

then quoted the official spokesman for President Putin, Mr. Peskov, who said the President concurred with Bortnikov's recommendations; and he added "Halting the flights does not yet mean that the version that it was an act of terrorism is being viewed as the main one in the investigation of this air disaster. Experts continue to exclude nothing, including the possibility of a bomb explosion onboard the plane." So, this is the beginnings of an investigation into a serious tragedy; 224 people were killed in it. And it's not known yet; we don't have the results of that forensic investigation.

Now as the question of what the Russians should do, I think the answer is, pretty obviously, that they're already doing it. The Russians, as of September 30, are carrying out a systematic, targeted campaign against the terrorist networks that are operating inside Syria. They are, at the same time, aggressively pursuing a diplomatic track to try to bring an end to this 5-year horror inside Syria; and that will obviously have major implications for the situation next door in Iraq, in Lebanon, in other parts of the entire Middle East region. So, in effect, Putin already made a command decision and launched the flanking operation against the Islamic State and allied jihadist groups and their sponsors in countries like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Turkey. So, it would be a mistake to veer off what is already an extremely effective and ongoing flanking operation. If it turns out – and again, it's premature to make any judgement on this – but if it does turn out that the Islamic State or some affiliate or spin-off was involved in planting a bomb on that plane, then that's another story; and you've got to carry it several steps further. What was the infrastructure through which that operation was conducted, if it proves to have been a bomb rather than a mechanical failure? Now, if you're talking about the Islamic State, if you're talking about Nusra, if you're talking about al-Qaeda, then ultimately, face it; you're talking about operations that were allowed to grow and allowed to fester as a result of the policies of the Bush and now Obama

Presidencies, and the Blair and Cameron governments in Britain.

So, ultimately, all roads lead back to what we've been discussing throughout the entire evening broadcast tonight; namely, as the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [dia], General Mike Flynn, told al-Jazeera, and has subsequently repeated in interviews with American and Russian media; the President, the administration were warned that the actions that the US was taking in places like Benghazi, was fueling the growth of jihadist organizations. And it was not an oversight, or that the warnings were ignored, as General Flynn said, it was in pursuit of the ongoing current policy that they made a willful decision to keep doing what they were doing, having been fully informed that this was fueling the growth of not just al-Qaeda. But back in 2012, DIA was already looking at the prospects of the creation of a jihadist caliphate in the area on the territory of parts of Iraq and Syria.

So, in other words, the head of the DIA has said openly and publicly President Obama willfully pursued a policy that created ISIS. So, let me ask you, if – and we're not there yet by any means – but if it turns out that this was a bomb; if it turns out that the Islamic State was involved in it, then let's go higher up the political and logistical chain of command. Are we not talking about the consequences of Bush and Obama administration policies and certainly the policies of the parallel British government? So, that's another dimension of what I want you to think about this evening. And I hope that you've been disturbed enough by what we've discussed tonight that you'll lose a bit of sleep and think about what's required to end the tyranny of pragmatism. To end the tyranny of basically "go along to get along"; and what it will take to actually solve these crises before they bring the entire trans-Atlantic region down, or may ultimately lead to thermonuclear annihilation.

OGDEN: So, as I said at the outset of this broadcast, the evidence has continued to accumulate. The case against Obama has now begun to snowball; the avalanche is ready to begin. It is now incumbent on those who are in responsible positions of leadership to take the legal and Constitutional actions which must be taken to protect the American people and to protect the people of the entire world from the deadly consequences of the continuation of the policies of the Obama Presidency.

So with that said, we want to thank you for joining us here tonight. Please, stay tuned to larouchepac.com, and please circulate this video and the discussion that Mr. LaRouche continues to have with activists in Manhattan and with people across the entire nation in his weekly Fireside Chats, as widely as you possibly can.

Thank you for joining us, and good night.

Bagom New York Times' overskrift "Dødsfald blandt midaldrende"

4. november 2015 – Det er en bred vifte af faktorer, der har bidraget til resultaterne i den nyligt offentliggjorte rapport fra Harvard Universitet, som viser en markant stigning i dødsfald blandt midaldrende i USA. Kort sagt har det amerikanske folk gennemgået 15 års helvede, siden Bill Clinton forlod præsidentposten, svarende til, hvad Rusland måtte lide i løbet af '90'ernes "forspildte årti" under Boris Jeltsin. Demografisk set afspejler de seneste 15 års udvikling i USA

ødelæggelsen af Rusland. Siden 2001 er prisen for at blive sygeforsikret steget med 20-30 % om året også under "Obamacare", og mange amerikanere har simpelthen ikke fuld adgang til sundhedsvæsenet.

Fra 2001 og frem har USA været i permanent krig i Irak, Afghanistan og nu Syrien. Stressfaktoren for de soldaters familier, der har været flere gange i krig, har været enorm, med mange aspekter, der er svære at sætte tal på, f.eks. effekten på et barn, der vokser op med en forælder, der lever under konstant økonomisk pres og altid er bekymret for, at partneren bliver skadet eller omkommer i kamp. Antallet af krigsveteraner, der vender hjem med PTSD [posttraumatisk belastningsreaktion], gør kun problemet større.

Fattigdom spiller en stigende rolle. Antallet af fattige stiger f.eks. med 5-12 % blandt unge mænd i Washington, D.C. I New York City lever 60 % af befolkningen på eller under fattigdomsgrænsen, når man medregner den reelle inflation, boligomkostninger og andre udgifter.

Pensionister og familier, der forsøger at spare op til alderdommen, er blevet udplyndret af FED's [den amerikanske centralbank] politik, der indbefatter en indlånsrente på 0 %. Som alternativ er de blevet trukket ind i børshandel og andre spekulative investeringer, som gør dem sårbare over for pengegribbenes direkte tyveri.

Rapporten fra Havard beskriver en forøgelse af dødsfald blandt midaldrende, forårsaget af narko- og alkoholmisbrug, som er ved at være hverdag [i USA dør en person af overdosis hver 12. minut]. I juli offentliggjorde de amerikanske sundhedsmyndigheder (CDC) en rapport, som viste, at antallet af heroinmisbrugere i USA er eksploderet mellem 2011-2014, med den største forøgelse blandt kvinder og ikke-latinamerikanske hvide. Blandt familier med en indkomst på 50.000 USD eller mere steg antallet af misbrugere med 60 % i denne periode. I Baltimore, som er kendt som "USA's heroinhovedstad", er en ud

af ti beboere heroinmisbrugere. Væksten i heroinmisbrug blandt middelklassen blev af CDC kædet sammen med det øgede forbrug af receptpligtigt smertestillende medicin som f.eks. "OxyContin". Personer, der er blevet afhængige af smertestillende medicin, skifter i stigende grad medicinen ud med heroin, som kan anskaffes til en fjerdedel af prisen på receptpligtigt smertestillende medicin, og som nu er umiddelbart tilgængeligt over hele landet. Rapporten slår fast, at personer, der bruger receptpligtigt smertestillende medicin, har en 40 gange så høj risiko for at blive heroinmisbrugere. Antallet af heroinmisbrugere er øget med 150 % i USA siden 2007, hvilket bl.a. skyldes en massiv forøgelse i importen af billig og kraftig heroin fra Sydamerika som supplement til strømmen af mexicansk og asiatisk heroin.

Samme dag, som New York Times offentliggjorde artiklen om rapporten fra Harvard omkring eksplosionen i dødsfald blandt midaldrende, offentliggjorde avisen også en artikel, omhandlende en alarmerende forøgelse i antallet af selvmord. Avisen viste med tal fra en rapport offentliggjort i maj, 2015 af tidsskriftet Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), at selvmord i landdistrikter er steget med 20 % og i byområder med 7 % fra 2004-2013.

Leder, 7. november 2015: Du skal ikke kalde Obama for en morder – Du

kunne blive den næste; og Hillary er en del af Obamas team

Læger uden Grænser (LuG) lagde til det allerede overvældende materiale, der beviser, at den amerikanske ødelæggelse af deres hospital i Kunduz, Afghanistan, hvor læger og patienter blev dræbt den 3. okt., var endnu et planlagt Obama-mord, med deres rapport, som de præsenterede i Kabul i dag (5. nov.). LuG's internationale præsidenet, dr. Joanne Liu, afslørede, at, efter at hospitalets Intensivafdeling blev præcisionsbombet flere gange, blev læger og patienter »skudt af de cirkulerende 'flyvende kanonbåde', mens de flygtede fra den brændende bygning«. LuG's rapport registrerede også, at hospitalet den 1. okt. af en amerikansk regeringsperson i Washington var blevet udspurgt, om LuG's forskellige faciliteter havde et stort antal talibanere, der »søgte tilflugt«.

Kendgerningen, som Obama udmærket er klar over, er, at LuG behandler et stort antal patienter uden hensynstagen til deres politik, og tillader ingen våben på deres områder.

Vi må nu cirkulere dette materiale i hele USA, for at blive Obama kvit. Dette beviser, at han gjorde det, med fuldt vidende; der er ingen undskyldning, han er absolut skyldig. Obama har konsekvent beordret drab, lige fra sin første embedsperiodes allerførste dage og frem til i dag. Enhver, der støtter Obama, er enten meget dum, eller selv skyldig i at støtte mord.

Samtidig er det nu kommet frem, at Obama lagde pres på *NY Times* og *Washington Kom-posten* for, at de skulle nægte at publicere noget som helst om Drone-papirerne, afsløringen fra 15. okt. af Obamas dronedrab, der var baseret på hemmelige

dokumenter, der blev lækket af en ny Edward Snowden. *NY Times* begravede nyheden i afsnit 23 af en historie om Obama, der bevarede tropper i Afghanistan; *Kom-posten* publicerede intet overhovedet. Da *NY Times'* ombudsmand rettede forespørgsel til redaktørerne, sagde de, at de med interesse havde læst *The Intercepts* Drone-papirer og var enige i, at der var nye detaljer. »Men de så det ikke som noget, der krævede sin egen historie, i hvert fald ikke lige nu«, rapporterede John Hanrahan i går i *Consortium News*. Vil man nu tro det? Kendsgerningen er, at hvis man kalder Obama for en morder, kunne man selv blive den næste!

En anden måde, hvorpå Obama myrder amerikanere, er gennem at få heroinafhængighed til at stige voldsomt, takket være de mexicanske narkokarteller, Obamas venner, der styres af Dronningen af England, og som hun brugte til at finansiere Obamas falske nomineringssejr i 2008. Det seneste Skøn over den Nationale Narkotrussel, der blev udgivet i går af Afdelingen for Håndhævelse af Narkotika-lovgivningen, viser, at narkoforskyldte dødsfald (overdosis) er blevet så langt den hyppigste dødsårsag som følge af ulykker og i antal langt overstiger både trafikulykker og ulykker med skydevåben. Et hundrede og tyve amerikanere dør hver dag som følge af en overdosis narko. Og, mellem 2013 og 2014 steg antallet af nuværende heroinmisbrugere med 51 %, idet de blev drevet ud i misbruget af arbejdsløshed og fortvivlelse, forårsaget af Obamas politik.

Og Hillary (Clinton) er en del af Obama-teamet. Sådan er det; det er nødvendigt at sige det. Hun er en del af Obamas team og har været det, lige siden hun begyndte at lyve for Obamas skyld.

Sig det! Det vil være med til at accelerere den kommende, rivende strøm fra O'Malley.

Pointen er, at hun altid har løjet, og hun har løjet på basis af at lyve for Obama. Og alt har været i denne form. Vi ved,

at hun er lakaj for Obama – en kronisk lakaj for en løgner. Obama er en løgner, og derfor er Hillary en løgner. Hvorfor er hun en løgner? Fordi hun arbejder for Obama!

Hillary er en løgnagtig advokat. Hun har vedvarende løjet for Obama – lige siden hans illegale krig i Libyen.

Malaysia og ASEAN yder modstand imod Obamas trusler i det Sydkinesiske Hav

4. november 2015 – Mødet i ASEAN-Plus (Sammenslutningen af sydøstasiatiske nationer) med forsvarsministre faldt fra hinanden i dag, da Malaysia, der har formandsskabet for mødet i Kuala Lumpur, og de fleste af ASEAN-nationerne, gjorde modstand mod Obamas krigsmager-bølletaktik (gennem sin forsvarsminister Ash Carter), og nægtede at bøje sig for Carters krav om, at slutkommunikéet skulle inkludere en ordlyd, som var godkendt af amerikanerne, vedrørende det Sydkinesiske Hav.

Informationskontoret i Kinas Nationale Forsvarsministerium sagde, at "Kina er nået til enighed med Malaysia og andre ASEAN-lande om indholdet" af det foreslåede fælles kommuniké, som værtslandet Malaysia havde lavet udkastet til, hvilket vil sige, at de havde fundet en måde at adressere spørgsmålet om det Sydkinesiske Hav på, der var acceptabel for Filippinerne og Vietnam (eftersom alle ASEAN-afgørelser træffes ved

konsensus), eller også ville stridspunktet blive udeladt helt og aldeles. Carter forkastede imidlertid udkastet og krævede (med japansk og australsk støtte, ifølge presserapporter), at Malaysia fremlægger et nyt udkast, der fordømmer Kina for dets aktiviteter i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Dette afviste Malaysia og i det mindste det meste af ASEAN, idet de var langt mere interesseret i det reelle problem med ISIS og terrorisme og samarbejdet med Kina om både forsvar og økonomisk udvikling. Som et resultat heraf blev der slet ikke udstedt et slutkommuniké.

Det kinesiske Forsvarsministerium sagde, at "nogle individuelle lande uden for regionen ignorerede den eksisterende konsensus og forsøgte eftertrykkeligt at tilføje indhold til deklARATIONEN, der ikke var blevet diskuteret under mødet. En sådan fremfærd afveg totalt fra formålet med og principperne i ADMM-Plus (ASEAN Forsvarsministres Møde Plus) og skadede ASEAN's centrale og dominerende rolle i denne mekanisme.

Selvsagt gav USA Kina skylden for mødets sammenbrud. De hævdede, at det var Kinas indvindings-aktiviteter, der er ansvarlige for stridighederne, og at det var Kina, der brugte sin økonomiske gennemslagskraft til at vride armen om på ASEAN-nationerne.

Den kendsgerning, at det var Malaysia, der førte kampen imod USA's krigspolitik, er meget betydningsfuldt. Malaysia har også krav i det Sydkinesiske Hav og har udtrykt sin betænkelighed over Kinas krav på hele området. Desuden er premierminister Najib i dybe vanskeligheder over en kæmpe korrupsionsanklage over en statslig investeringsfond, hvor milliarder af dollars mangler, og mange troede på forhånd, at Najib ville gå Obamas ærinde for at bevare amerikansk støtte i krisen.

Men det gjorde han ikke. Vi kan forvente nogle ubehagelige operationer imod Malaysia som et resultat af deres

modige forsvar af fred og udvikling.

Ash Carter benyttede også lejligheden, hvor han mødtes med den kinesiske forsvarsminister Chang Wanquan ved dette forum i Kuala Lumpur, til, ifølge Carters assistent, at bralre op om, at "USA vil fortsætte med at flyve, sejle og operere, hvor som helst international lov tillader det", og at "det Sydkinesiske Hav ikke ville være nogen undtagelse". Dette demonstrerer igen, at Obama simpelthen lyver igen, når han siger, at USA ikke tager stilling til spørgsmålet om suverænitet over det Sydkinesiske Hav, eftersom den amerikanske destroyers krænkelse af 12-mile grænsen omkring de kinesiske øer d. 27. oktober klart viser, at de har taget stilling imod Kina og truer med krig.

Morderen Obama: Amerikanske 'flyvende kanonbåde' dræbte hospitaletspersonel i Kunduz, da de flygtede ud af den brændende hospitalsbygning

5. november 2015 – Læger uden Grænser udgav i dag sit interne dokument med en gennemgang af de »amerikanske styrkers nådesløse og brutale angreb« på LuG's 140 sengepladser store

Kunduz Traumecenter (KTC) i Afghanistan. LuG's internationale præsident, dr. Joanne Liu, afslørede i sit brev, der introducerer rapporten, den rædselsvækkende kendsgerning, at »nogle patienter brændte ihjel i deres senge, læge- og sygeplejepersonale blev halshugget og mistede lemmer, og andre blev skudt ned af cirkulerende AC-130 'flyvende kanonbåde' [1], mens de flygtede ud af den brændende bygning«. [fremhævelse tilføjet]

Dr. Liu påpeger, at selv om LuG har krævet en uafhængig undersøgelse af International Humanitarian Fact Finding Commission (IHFFC) (den internationale humanitære kommission til udredning af faktiske kendsgerninger), så er denne endnu ikke indledt, fordi USA og Afghanistan ikke har givet deres samtykke. I dag, tilføjede hun, »overgiver vi denne interne rapport til både offentligheden og IHFFC«. I dag sagde talsmand for Pentagon, kaptajn Jeff Davis, at Forsvarsministeriet har modtaget LuG's rapport, men fortsætter sin egen undersøgelse og ikke har nogen kommentar til rapporten.

LuG gennemgår i detaljer hver dag, der førte op til angrebet den 3. oktober, inklusive en telefonopringning den 1. okt., som de modtog fra en amerikansk regeringsperson i Washington, der forespurgte, om hospitalet »eller nogen anden af LuG's faciliteter havde et stort antal talibanere, der »søgte ly«. LuG svarede, at personalet arbejdede for fuld kapacitet, og at hospitalet var fuldt af patienter, inklusive sårede Taliban-kæmpere. LuG skriver i sin konklusion, at dets regler i hospitalet »blev gennemført og respekteret, inklusive politikken med 'ingen våben'«, og at LuG »havde total kontrol over hospitalet på det tidspunkt, hvor angrebet fandt sted ... Der var ingen bevæbnede kæmpere inden for hospitalets område, og der fandt ingen kampe sted ud fra, eller i direkte nærhed af KTC på tidspunktet for luftangrebene«.

På trods heraf »var hospitalets hovedbygning målet for en række af flere, præcise og vedvarende luftangreb og lod de

øvrige bygninger på LuG's område relativt uberørte«. Det første lokale, der blev ramt, var Intensive Care Unit, ICU (Intensivafdelingen); dernæst fortsatte luftangrebene fra den østlige til den vestlige del af hospitalets hovedbygning og ødelagde ICU, arkivet, laboratoriet, skadestuen, røntgenafdelingen, ambulatoriet, afdelingerne for psykiske lidelser og fysioterapi, såvel som også alle operationsstuer. Angrebet »ødelagde vores evne til at behandle patienter, når de har allermest brug for det«, sagde dr. Liu. »Et hospital i drift, der behandler patienter, kan ikke ganske enkelt miste sin beskyttede status og blive angrebet.«

[1] Amr. 'gunship': Bevæbnet fly (eller skib), som en helikopter. Det amerikanske militær bruger disse 'flyvende kanonbåde' til tæt luftstøtte og skræk-og-rædsel-missioner.

Leder, 5. november 2015: Dump Obama nu, eller stå over for et atomart Holocaust

Menneskehedens skæbne ligger nu i vægtskålene, og det centrale spørgsmål, nu mere end nogen sinde før, er, hvorvidt det amerikanske folk samt en håndfuld valgte regeringsfolk har det fornødne mod til at gennemtvinge præsident Obamas fjernelse fra embedet. Drone-papirerne er at sammenligne med Pentagon-papirerne, anno 2015, og som dokumenterer, at USA's præsident er den største massemander i amerikansk historie.

Det faktum, at de amerikanske massemedier har mørklagt betydningen af Drone-papirerne, var forventeligt. Det

forringer ikke i mindste måde beviserne, ej heller gør det Obama mindre skyldig i krigsforbrydelser og forbrydelser mod menneskeheden.

Han sidder på toppen af en klart defineret, kriminel kommandovej, der har kommissioneret mord over hele verden, inklusive imod amerikanske borgere. Forbrydelserne er klart dokumenteret i Drone-papirerne, der inkluderer en høring i Kongressens Efterretningskomite om CIA's og Fælleskommandoen for Specialoperationers drone-programmer til mange milliarder dollar om året, og som viser, at der ikke er nogen kontrol med dem, og at uskyldige civile rutinemæssigt bliver dræbt, for blot posthumt at blive kategoriseret som fjender, dræbt under kamp, for at skjule forbrydelseernes omfang.

Obama fortsætter stædigt med at mørklægge bombningen af Læger uden Grænser-hospitalet i Kunduz, Afghanistan, og afviser gruppens krav om en uvildig undersøgelse under Genevekonventionen. Obama er en dræber, der er på mordtogt, og han må stoppes af den relevante, forfatningsmæssige handling, enten gennem en rigsretssag eller gennem det 25. Forfatningstillæg.

Der er en voksende stemning i landet for netop en sådan handling – under forudsætning af, at man kan opmarchere det rigtige lederskab, der kan få det til at ske. Onsdag eftermiddag fandt et usædvanligt møde sted på Capitol Hill med kongresmedlemmerne John Conyers, Walter Jones og Alan Grayson, samt fhv. amerikanske ambassadør Jack Matlock, NYU-professor Stephen Cohen og selskabsdir. Joseph Pepper. De advarede enstemmigt om, at Obamas opførsel er i færd med at føre verden ud i en atomkatastrofe og krævede, at der skulle sættes en stopper for Obamas provokationer imod Rusland og Putin. Den ene taler efter den anden genkaldte Koldkrigsoplevelsen, hvor man levede under truslen om en umiddelbart forestående atomar udslettelse, og advarede om, at den nuværende situation, som et resultat af Obamas handlinger, er endnu mere farlig.

Vi har nu et mulighedens øjeblik. Ved at fjerne Obama gennem de relevante, forfatningsmæssige midler, og ved samtidig at tage skridt til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og omgående igangsætte en reel, økonomisk genrejsning i Franklin Roosevelts ånd, kan vi genrejse USA til sin historiske rolle som en nation, der leder ved sit eksempel og ikke ved imperial politik og krig.

Alternativet blev skåret ud i pap på Capitol Hill og var en gentagelse af de advarsler, som Lyndon LaRouche har udtalt fra Obama-præsidentskabets allerførste dage. At tillade, at en farlig narcissist forbliver i embedet én eneste dag til, er at sætte selveste menneskehedens overlevelse på spil.

Det amerikanske folk har lidt under 15 års Bush- og Obamaregeringer, og konsekvenserne har allerede været ødelæggende. Fattigdom, arbejdsløshed, narkomani, selvmord – dette er de menneskelige konsekvenser af Bush' og Obamas ødelæggelse af den amerikanske økonomi. Og nu har præsident Obama bragt verden til selveste randen af en mulig, atomar udslettelse.

Det er USA versus Kina i det Sydkinesiske Hav

3. november 2015 – USA under Barack Obama planlægger åbenlyst flere provokationer i det Sydkinesiske Hav, som den i sidste uge, hvor destroyeren USS Lassen sejlede indenfor 12 mile grænsen af territorialfarvandet af en ø, over hvilken Kina

hævder suverænitet. En unavngiven amerikansk forsvarsmedarbejder sagde til Reuters i går, at USA planlægger at gennemføre to provokationer i det Sydkinesiske Hav omtrent to gange i kvartalet, "for at påminde Kina og andre lande om USA's rettigheder under international lov", sagde han. "Det er den rette frekvens for at gøre det regelmæssigt uden at være en konstant 'torn i øjet'. Det lever op til intentionen om regelmæssigt at udøve vore rettigheder under international lovgivning og minde kineserne og andre om vores synspunkt" sagde embedsmanden.

Yi Xiaoguang, vice-generalstabschef for den kinesiske hær (PLA – People's Liberation Army), henstillede i mandags til USA om "ikke at gøre ting, der undergraver den større sammenhæng i det kinesisk-amerikanske forhold", da han blev spurgt om den amerikanske flådes potentielle, fremtidige aktioner i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Yi fortalte til 'China Daily', at Kina "vil tage alle nødvendige forholdsregler til at hævde national suverænitet". Angående det fremtidige forhold mellem de to landes militær, foreslog Yi, at de først "etablerer indbyrdes strategisk tillid, fremmer forståelse og forhindrer misforståelser og fejlbedømmelser". Han sagde, at de to landes militær forventes "at respektere hinandens nationale suverænitet og sikkerhedsanliggender" og "indgå en højtidelig forpligtelse til ikke at provokere eller skabe problemer over ingenting".

Kommandør admiral Harry Harris fra den amerikanske Stillehavskommando forsøgte at forsvare USA's provokerende handling i det Sydkinesiske Hav som et forsvar af princippet om fri sejlads under et besøg i Beijing i går og i dag, men blev affejet af sine værter. Både Fan Changlong, viceformand for Kinas Militære Centralkommission, og Fang Fenghui, generalstabschef for den kinesiske hær (PLA), protesterede imod den amerikanske handling under deres møder med Harris og advarede om, at sådanne provokationer truer Kinas nationale sikkerhed og regionens stabilitet.

“Det, der har udfoldet sig på det seneste, er ligesom at overvære et selv-orkestreret, selv-instrueret, selv-opført show” sagde talskvinde for det kinesiske Udenrigsministerium Hua Chunying under en ordinær briefing tirsdag. Hun anslog, at 100.000 skibe sejler ”sikkert og frit” gennem det Sydkinesiske Hav om året, inklusive millioner af tønder olie om dagen. ”De løber ikke ind i problemer overhovedet” sagde hun.

Som et yderligere budskab fløj kinesiske kampfly, ifølge en redegørelse fra RT, i sidste weekend træningsmissioner over det samme område, som Lassen havde passeret igennem. Jetflyene fløj fra en nyligt konstrueret landingsbane på en af øerne i regionen. Pensioneret kinesiske general Xu Guangyu kommenterede ifølge *South China Morning Post*: ”Både Forsvars- og Udenrigsministeriet har sagt, at Kina har modtræk, når dets sø-rettigheder krænkes. Sådanne demonstrative handlinger må følges op af reelle handlinger. Det er et signal, Kina sender til USA om, at det tager sine krav alvorligt. Dette er minimumsniveauet for, hvad kinesisk respons bør være, ellers vil det svigte sit folks forventninger.”

Foto: US Lassen sejlede tæt på en af de kinesiske småøer, som Kina gør krav på som sit suveræne territorium

COP21- ‘Bulldozer’ kan ikke lukke munden på Frankrigs klima-skeptiske vejrmand.

2. nov. 2015 – En hektisk fransk præsident François Hollande har optrappet sin internationale lobbyvirksomhed, der tilsigter at sikre en bindende international klimaaftale på den internationale COP21-konference, der åbner i Paris ved

udgangen af denne måned. I dag bearbejdede han Xi Jinping i Beijing, d. 10. november er det de afrikanske statsoverhoveder i Malta, d. 15. november er det G20-topmødet i Tyrkiet, så Ø-Nationernes statsoverhoveder; og endelig, d. 27. nov. slutter han sig til den engelske Dronning, hendes gemal Prins Philip og deres skøre kugle af en søn Prins Charles, i en paradeopstilling af Mødet af Det britiske Statssamfunds Statsoverhoveder (CHOGM-2015) i Malta, til støtte for klimaforandringsvindlen til reduktion af verdens befolkning med seks milliarder mennesker eller mere.

Men som han satte ud på sin udenlandske lobbyvirksomhed, blev hans regerings fyring af den mest populære TV-meteorolog i Frankrig, fordi denne stejlede imod COP21's klimaforandringsløgne, til en celeber sag derhjemme. Philippe Verdier blev midt i måneden suspenderet som chef-meteorolog for det statsdrevne 'France Télévisions', efter han publicerede en bog, '*Klimaundersøgelser*', der flår klimaskræmpekampagnen fra hinanden og beskylder statsstøttede klimaforandrings-forskere for at være "manipulerede" og "politiserede".

Verdier fortalte RTL-radio i oktober, at han havde "lagt sig i vejen for COP21, der er en bulldozer, og at dette var resultatet". Han fortalte en anden fransk journalist, at han skrev bogen efter at være blevet "forfærdet", da Hollandes udenrigsminister Laurent Fabius indkaldte TV-meteorologer til et møde for at beordre dem til at fremhæve klimaforandringsproblemerne i deres udsendelser.

Verdier optrappede i den forgangne weekend, idet han opslog en kort online video, hvor han rapporterer, at han er blevet bandlyst fra TV, siden han publicerede sin bog, '*Klimaundersøgelser*' og derefter tavst "foran Dem, i ytrings- og oplysningsfrihedens navn for os alle", åbner konvolutten indeholdende den officielle meddelelse om, at han er blevet fyret af France Télévisions, en måned før COP21."

En underskriftsindsamling lanceret til forsvar af Verdier af Frankrigs energiske minoritet af "klimaskeptikere", havde allerede 15.000 underskrifter d. 1. nov., inklusive underskrifter fra 10 parlamentarikere, rapporterede RTL-radio. Frankrigs videnskabelige modstand mod den store løgn, inklusive videnskabsfolk, der arbejder sammen med Schiller Instituttet imod denne folkemorderiske svindel, kalder sig for "klimaoptimister." De mobiliserer, og de får en vis mediedækning.

En undersøgelse, udført i kølvandet på Verdiers suspendering, foretaget af den dybdeborende website Arretsurimages, afslørede, at mindst halvdelen af Frankrigs meteorologer er enige med Verdier og "optimist"-forskerne.

Klima-"optimister" i USA er i færd med at se på, hvad de kan mobilisere for at stikke en kæp i hjulet på præsident Obamas plan om at bruge Paris COP21-konferencen til at gøre det af med den amerikanske økonomi. November-udgaven af Heartland Institute's *'Nyhedsbrev for Miljø og Klima'* citerer forslag af jurist Chris Horner fra 'Competitive Enterprise Institute' om, at det amerikanske Senat før pariserkonferencen skal vedtage en resolution, kaldet 'Senatets mening' (Sense of Senate), der erklærer, at enhver aftale, der forhandles i Paris, skal ratificeres af Senatet for at træde i kraft. "Den altafgørende pointe er at sikre, at der ikke findes nogen rimelig påstand om, at 'Verden' med rimelighed kunne have troet på, at Obamaregeringen binder USA til noget som helst i Paris." Resolutionen kunne udstedes ved en simpel flertalsafstemning. Obamaregeringen forhindrer ethvert forsøg på at kræve ansvarlighed og afviste at tillade embedsfolk at vidne for høringen om internationale klimaforhandlinger, der blev afholdt d. 20. oktober af Senatets Komite for Miljø og Offentlige Arbejder, med senator James Inhofe som formand.

Obamas optrapning i Syrien

31. oktober 2015 – En højtplaceret forsvars-embedsmand, der briefede reportere i Pentagon i går, sagde, at præsident Obamas nye strategi i Syrien består af fem komponenter:

1) at assistere den irakiske regering i at generobre Ramadi og Baiji og afgøre vilkårene i Mosul;

2) I Syrien, at muliggøre for nye og yderligere lokale styrker at presse, indtage og sluttelig holde ISIL's erklærede bastion i Raqqa – hovedbyen i Raqqa, med rådgivning og assistance med op til 50 amerikanske specialstyrketropper, deployeret ind i Syrien;

3) sikring af grænsen mellem Syrien og Tyrkiet for drastisk at reducere indstrømningen af udenlandske kæmpere, materiel og penge, der finder vej til ISIL. Dette vil inkludere deployering af op til et dusin amerikanske F-15 kampfly til Incirlik-flyvebasen i Tyrkiet, såvel som kampfly til alle andre lande, som USA kan overbevise om at deltage.;

4) tværs over både Irak og Syrien, at degradere ISIL's interne kommunikations- og forsyningslinjer; og

5) at forstærke det jordanske og libanesiske forsvar, efterhånden som ISIL presses mod syd og vest under det forøgede pres.

Brieferen insisterede på, at specialoperatørerne vil holde sig til det nordlige Syrien, og ikke vil deltage i angrebene, som deres modstykker i Irak har gjort, delvis, fordi USA ikke har de samme relationer med lokale styrker på jorden, som de har med sikkerhedsstyrker i Irak, selv om dette kunne ændre sig i fremtiden.

USA har heller ingen planer om at koordinere sine deployeringer ind i Syrien med det russiske militære kontingent, der flyver fra Latakia i det vestlige Syrien. »Det område, hvor vi har planlagt at placere denne (styrke til specialoperationer), er ikke et område, hvor de har angrebet, og heller ikke får brug for at angribe«, sagde han. Det er ikke ISIL, og det er ikke regime-kontrolleret. Så vi forventer ingen problemer. Vi har ikke adviseret dem, og føler ikke noget behov for at advisere dem, om deres placering.« Hvis styrkerne til specialoperationernes sikkerhed kommer i fare, »hvis dette inkluderer potentielt at tale med russerne, så er vi åben for det«, sagde embedsmanden.

USA's udenrigsminister Kerry: USA, Rusland og Kina bør samarbejde om økonomisk udvikling

2. november 2015 – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry satte i dag forbindelse mellem økonomisk udvikling og effektiv bekæmpelse af terrorisme i Centralasien og talte om samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at opnå dette, samt anden indsats, i sit interview med Mir-Tv i Astana, Kasakhstan, dagen efter, at han havde mødt udenrigsministrene fra Kasakhstan, Kirgisistan, Tadsjikistan, Turkmenistan og Usbekistan.

Ulig det spin, som køres af medie-hyænerne (læs: Wall Street Journal), insisterede Kerry på, at ingen skulle betragte hans besøg som havende »noget som helst at gøre med« en indsats for

at få disse nationer til at vælge mellem Rusland, Kina eller USA. »Vi er parat til at samarbejde med alle, hvad enten det drejer sig om lokale områder, nabolande eller lande, der ligger langt væk, som Korea eller Japan, der ønsker at blive involveret. Vi ønsker at hjælpe denne region med at udvikles på regional basis, fordi vi mener, der er et enorm potentiale for vækst og udvikling, og det hjælper stabilitet, sikkerhed og fremgang for folk.«

Mir-Tv, der sender til de tidligere Sovjetrepublikker, der tilsammen danner Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater, forstod Kerrys erklæring som en afvisning af imperiale kampe over denne region, kampe, der rent historisk har fået det berygtede navn »det Store Spil«.

»Så intet 'Stort Spil', men stort spil?«

Kerry var enig: »Det er en god måde at sige det på. Det synes jeg om. Nej, slet ikke noget stort spil. Dette handler om, at alle får gavn, inklusive Rusland og Kina og andre lande. Vi har alle gavn af det, når mennesker løftes op, og jeg mener, at især Kasakhstan har ført en meget imponerende politik med at forsøge ikke at blive presset til at vælge mellem folk, men at ønske at udvikles på basis af et bredt grundlag. Og jeg har sagt til præsident Putin, og til præsident Xi, at vi må samarbejde om spørgsmål om udvikling. Det er vi begyndt på med Kina. Vi ønsker selvfølgelig at gøre mere med andre partnere.«

Forespurgt om Obamas deployering af specialstyrker ind i Syrien, og om de ville operere i samarbejde med de russiske luftstyrker, ignorerede Kerry referencen til de amerikanske specialstyrker fuldstændigt og talte om, at det er »meget vigtigt at operere i samarbejde, når man har stormagter, der har særdeles kapable luftstyrker. Man ønsker ikke at flyve i det samme luftrum uden en koordinering. Så selvfølgelig koordinerer vi, og vi vil fortsat koordinere med Rusland.«

Han nævnte mødet om Syrien den 30. okt. i Wien:

»Udenrigsminister Lavrov (Rusland) var der; han var med som med-formand for mødet, og sammen hjalp Rusland og USA med at støbe et skridt fremad, håber jeg, som kunne begynde at udforme muligheden for fred.«

»Vi ville selvfølgelig gerne samarbejde« med Rusland, sagde Kerry endnu to gange i interviewet, og hver gang med en tilføjelse af det, man kunne kalde »Obama«-advarslen om, at Rusland må træffe beslutning om, »hvorvidt de er der for at finde en politisk løsning, eller om de er der for simpelt hen at støtte Assad-regimet. Hvis det kun er for regimet, er der et problem, for Tyrkiet, Katar, Saudi-Arabien og andre lande, samt oppositionen, vil ikke stoppe med at bekæmpe Assad. Måden at slutte krigen på er at bede Assad være behjælpelig med en overgang til en ny regering, og han kan være med til at redde sit land. Men hvis det hele handler om ham, så er der et problem.«

**RADIO SCHILLER den 2.
november 2015.**

**Syrien: Gennembrud på topmøde
i Wien;**

**men Obama sender
militærrådgivere til Syrien!**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Russisk advarsel på højt niveau: Obama-strategier overvejer global krig

Søndag, 1. november 2015 – Ruslands vicepremierminister leverede en offentlig advarsel den 30. okt. om, at Obamaregeringen overvejer en verdenskrig imod Rusland.

Dmitri Rogozin talte til journalister efter et møde i det Russiske Nationale Sikkerhedsråd, der muligvis har drøftet spørgsmålet, og fordømte USA's »nuværende Prompt Global Strike-doktrin«, en strategi, der går ud på at undertrykke en modstanders (Ruslands eller Kinas) evne til at udføre et angreb som gengældelse for et førsteangreb. Rogozin kaldte dette for »illusorisk«, men i vendinger, der ikke kunne misforstås.

»USA's strategier er for første gang begyndt at have illusoriske visioner om, at de kan opnå sejr over en atommagt i en ikke-atomar krig. Dette er nonsens, dette vil aldrig ske«, sagde Rogozin efter mødet, refereret af TASS.

Rogozin syntes imidlertid at advare om en atomkrig med diskussioner om planer for at genoplive »civilforsvar« i Rusland. »Men konfronteret med en sådan trussel er opgaven at beskytte befolkningen«, sagde han. »Grundlæggende set må vi atter bygge civilt forsvar og sikkerhedsfaciliteter til befolkningen, og hvad vigtigst er, så må denne handling udføres på en ordentlig, strømlinet måde.«

Rogozin kom med denne advarsel i en situation, hvor den største NATO-øvelse i mange år, »Trident Juncture«, er i gang og inkluderer en øvelse i et førsteangreb på russiske styrker.

Mens stemmer i USA's Demokratiske Parti begynder at angribe Obamas »illegale og forfatningsstridige« krigsplaner, så har EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche under hele Obamas anden embedsperiode understreget, at han (Obama) er i stand til, og med sandsynlighed vil, lancere atomkrig imod Rusland og/eller Kina, med mindre han fjernes fra præsidentembedet, for hvilket han ikke er skikket.

Foto: Dmitri Rogozin, fra tidligere på året.

Leder, 2. november 2015: Luk Wall Street ned nu, eller stå over for et kædereaktions-krak, der dræber

En omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall var fokus for en magtfuld intervention i et offentligt arrangement, afholdt af det Demokratiske Parti i New York City søndag, hvor lokale folk fra partiet forsøgte at repræsentere forskellige præsidentkandidater, men som af tilhørerne blev tvunget til at måle disse kandidater op imod en standard, der hedder at bringe Glass-Steagall tilbage og bryde Wall Street-bankerne op. Repræsentanter fra LaRouchePAC indledte interventionen og fik dernæst tilslutning af mange andre, der spurgte: »Vil I genindføre Glass-Steagall, og vil I gøre det nu?«

Aktivisterne fra LaRouchePAC krævede også handling for at

fjerne morderen Obama fra præsidentskabet for sine krigsforbrydelser.

Spørgsmålet blev atter stillet af Lyndon LaRouche senere på dagen: »Hvis vi ikke lukker Wall Street ned, vil vi se et krak uden fortilfælde. Amerikanere og europæere mister ikke bare deres lønninger, deres jobs. Køb ikke Wall Streets 'forecasts for muligheder' for det, der nu er ved at ske. Vi taler om et pludseligt kædereaktions-kollaps, med mindre vi griber ind for at lukke Wall Street-institutionerne ned.

Og dette kollaps bliver en dræber. Det økonomiske kollaps accelererer og dømmes amerikanere til døden. I Europa er det lige så slemt, eller værre. Det mest iøjnefaldende træk ved det transatlantiske system lige nu er dødsraten blandt børn.«

Men den virkelige krise, understregede han, er tabet af intelligens i Kongressen og folket, omkring det, der hurtigt må gøres, og erstatningen af intelligens med fejhed omkring at gøre det, der må gøres.

Kravet går ikke alene ud på at lukke Wall Streets og dets spekulative svindelnumre ned. Kravet er at fjerne det fra den amerikanske økonomi og erstatte det med en buffer af ny statskredit for at opretholde produktivitet, beskæftigelse og mennesker.

Vi kan løse det her, som LaRouche understreger, med de fremgangsmåder, præsident Franklin Roosevelt brugte. Men først skal vi tage Wall Street af bordet. Vi skal lukke svindeløkonomien ned, før den eksploderer i en kædereaktion. Det betyder at begynde med en omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Dernæst skal realøkonomien genopbygges.

Dette venter ikke på, at en ny præsident vælges. Det må gøres nu, af folket og dets repræsentanter, eller de vil miste alt, før de vælger en ny præsident.

Luk Wall Streets økonomiske krav ned, før de slår os ihjel.

EIR Forum i Washington: En afslutning af permanente krige og finansiel panik: Glass-Steagall og den Globale Silkevej. Hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Jeg mener, at vi er i virkelig fare, hvis et kollaps af systemet sker uden en reform af Glass-Steagall for at beskytte den almindelige befolkning fra dette, vi kunne virkelig ende med massive drab af hidtil usete dimensioner. Jeg mener, at hvis dette skete i Europa, oven i flygtningekrisen, så tror jeg, at vi kunne få borgerkrig i Europa, og vi ville sandsynligvis få en borgerkrig i USA.

Så jeg mener, at incitamentet for at ændre politik, mens der endnu er tid, er gigantisk, og den optimistiske tone er, at alternativet allerede er på plads.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

EIR: Hvorfor amerikanerne nu må tislutte sig Vladimir Putins initiativer

Havde det ikke været for Vladimir Putins intervention, ville menneskeheden have været færdig. – *Lyndon LaRouche.*

25. oktober 2015 – Lyndon LaRouche taler om diskontinuiteter, afbrydelser – om afgørende vendepunkter – der fundamentalt har ændret kursen og den potentielle retning af menneskets historie til enten det bedre eller værre.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**LPAC Fredags-Webcast, 30. oktober 2015:
Hvordan vil du agere som aktør på menneskehedens historiske scene for at konfrontere denne store prøve på**

menneskets moralske evne til at overleve? Inkl. dramatiske optagelser fra flygtningekrisen.

I kølvandet på den banebry-dende pressekonference med Helga Zepp-LaRouche og fhv. Senator og præsidentkandidat Mike Gravel må amerikanerne stille sig selv det spørgsmål: kendsgerningerne er fremlagt, den presserende virkelighed står klart, hvordan vil du agere som en aktør på menneskehedens historiske scene for at konfron-tere denne store prøve på menneskets moralske evne til at overleve?

English Transcript

MATTHEW OGDEN: It's October 30, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our regular weekly Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*; and the two of us did have an opportunity to have an extensive meeting with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, during which we had the opportunity to discuss at length the contents of tonight's broadcast.

Now, we're going to begin tonight's proceedings with a short, condensed excerpt of the video of a quite extraordinary and ground-breaking event which occurred earlier this week; on Tuesday, to be precise. This was the really quite historic press conference that was held at the National Press Club, sponsored by *Executive Intelligence Review*; featuring Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute and the chair of the German Büro Party, as well as former

Democratic Senator from Alaska Mike Gravel, who was also a candidate for the United States Presidency in 2008. Senator Gravel, of course, is famous for his incredibly courageous actions in June of 1971, in reading the so-called "Pentagon Papers" concerning the true extent of US military operations in Vietnam and in neighboring countries into the *Congressional Record*; thus releasing the contents of this heretofore priorly [sic] classified report to the US public. And catalyzing a very dramatic backlash among the American people against the policies of the Nixon administration and the continuation of the Vietnam War at that time. Much more will be said in detail by Jeff Steinberg concerning this historic action by Senator Gravel after we see this video excerpt; and Jeff, I know, will elaborate on its direct implications for today.

But let me use the example of Senator Gravel before we view this excerpt here tonight; both the example of what Senator Gravel did at that time, but also the example of what you will see he continues to do today to make a point which will be hopefully thematic over the course of this show. The point being, for those of you who are viewing this broadcast here tonight, the persistent question that you must ask is: What does this imply for me? The facts have been presented, the case has been made, the evidence has been thoroughly exposed; none of these are in question. The question, however, will remain – What will the American people do to respond? How will you react to that which is shown to you here tonight? What must we do, collectively, to pull this story off of the television screen and to put these facts that will have been presented here tonight into action, to change the course of history? What sort of political activism, what sort of intellectual leadership, what sort of courage will be required to do justice to this moment of human history that we now find ourselves in? Senator Gravel, of course, is an outstanding example of this sort of courage; but more of us are now required to be like him, and to be like Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, as you will also see here tonight. As Mr. LaRouche

emphasized during our discussion with him, and as he has emphasized repeatedly before, just as in the Classical Shakespearean theater, the most important individual in the room is not any of the actors who are on stage; but rather, that member of the audience for whom the play is being performed. We ask you, therefore, to indulge us here tonight as you become our audience in this great historical drama which is about to unfold before you. So, without further ado, let me present to you the excerpt of this week's press conference with Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Senator Gravel.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Thank you.

Well, let me welcome all of you. I think most people in the world right now are aware that we are really experiencing a civilizational crisis, not only a financial crisis. Many military crises around the world, wars, terrorism, hunger, refugees, it's just an enormous amount of simultaneous crises. And while all of these individual crises have local causes, which trigger them and cause them, I think it's fair to say that the underlying cause of the strategic, civilizational crisis, is the fact that trans-Atlantic financial system is hopelessly bankrupt. And it is that dynamic which is behind the war danger, which is behind local crises, and which is the biggest threat to the world right now.

So, an instant collapse into chaos is really the danger we are talking about. Now, there is a remedy to that. The remedy is to introduce Glass-Steagall, the banking separation law which was introduced in 1933 by Franklin D. Roosevelt, in response to the economic crisis of the early '30s, and there are several motions in the U.S. Congress and in the Senate – there is actually legislation with the exact, same text in the Congress and the Senate. So if the political will could be mobilized, that problem could be solved. But it has to be solved. There is no other way than to shut down the casino economy of the Wall Street.

So now we are hit with an additional problem: the refugee crisis in Europe. Now, I know people in America think this is very far away, but I tell you, this is becoming a key strategic factor, also affecting the United States.

It is now publicly debated in Europe, that this refugee crisis was caused by U.S. and British wars in the Middle East, by a policy of regime change, by a policy of playing the so-called "Islamic card" going back to Brzezinski in 1975, when he initiated this policy; and then having a policy of always supporting the "good rebels," training them, only to see that the good rebels join the terrorists; then you have to make a new war against the terrorists, then you have to bet on the "good rebels," and so forth and so on!

This has now led to a situation where basically millions of people are trying to get into Europe. Germany probably will have, minimum, 1 million this year. The UN Human Rights report says that there are presently 60 million in flight right now. So we're not talking about a temporary refugee crisis. We're talking about a large migration of people running away from war, hunger, epidemics, mainly from Southwest Asia, but also to a certain extent from Africa.

And it is very clear, this will not stop! This will not stop, and you see right now the effect: The EU has completely failed. They ignored this problem since many years, because they left Italy and Greece completely alone for years; there were hundreds of people drowning in the Mediterranean for years! Some of them arriving in Lampedusa in Italy, and the EU said, "that's an Italian problem." The same with Greece.

But now with the recent developments in Syria, this is really exploding and you see the pictures. And the pictures are horrible! There is no unity in Europe; there is no solidarity, there is no Europe. It now turns out that something, which was transformed into an interest group for the banks – namely, the EU after the Maastricht Treaty – that

you cannot pretend to have “union,” which is bound together by nothing other than the defense of the banks and the defense of the high-speculation system.

And the biggest threat right now is the maintenance of the present financial policies of Wall Street, the City of London, the ECB, which is reflected by the finance minister Schäuble, who says “We must protect the so-called ‘black zero’, which is a synonym for balanced budgets, which is the idea that no matter how many expenses you have to spend for the refugees, the budget must remain balanced, and that means you have to cut in other areas, like social expenditures, kindergarten, schools, health system; and naturally, for the people who are in a precarious economic situation already, like the unemployed, like the people who have a low but precarious income, they feel threatened. And therefore, Schäuble’s “black zero” fuels the kind of xenophobic reactions which you have heard about, that already this year 500 housing projects for the refugees have been attacked or burned down, and right-wing violence is on the increase.

You see now that President Putin was absolutely when he said several months ago, or even a year ago, that the big mistake of the West to support Nazis in Ukraine, in the form of the Right Sector, has the danger that this Nazism is spreading to other European countries.

So the only solution is, obviously, to change the economic policy, to stop what is high-risk speculation for the United States on Wall Street; to stop what is the “black zero” policy of Schäuble in Europe. And, fortunately, there is an alternative.

Now, very little known, because the Western media in Europe and the United States are generally not reporting it, or if they report it, they misrepresent it, there is an alternative economic system, which has developed. It started, really – well, it started 25 years ago, when we proposed the New Silk

Road as a response to the collapse of the Soviet Union; but it was put again energetically on the table by the Chinese government in 2013, when President Xi Jinping announced a New Silk Road to become the policy of China in Kazakhstan in September. And in the meantime, this dynamic, of building a New Silk Road in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road – meaning an exchange not only of culture, of goods, of ideas, but also of technologies, of improving the relation among nations, this has spread like wildfire!

And what you see now is the unfolding of an alternative economic system which is completely based on different principles than the trans-Atlantic high-risk and high-profit speculation. It is based on real investment in infrastructure, on uplifting populations out of poverty, like China has done in lifting 600 million people out of poverty in the last 30 years; and it is offering now, in reality, the Chinese economic miracle, to other countries that participate in the construction of this New Silk Road.

It has reached a point where mankind is challenged, that either we change the paradigm and establish an order in which all people on this planet can live as human beings, or we will not make it, and we will vanish as the dinosaurs did 65 million years ago because we have proven we are not any smarter.

Now, I think the human species is smarter, and therefore, I'm confident that if we put this question on the table.., which is eminently possible through the approach we have taken by this report, which says "The Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," by simply extending the existing New Silk Road development into all of these areas.

Now I think the whole world is waiting for that, and what we are trying to do, is we are trying to cause this shift to happen. We just have to evoke the better tradition of America to make that happen.

So that is where I think we are. I think we are really in danger, if a collapse of the system happens without the reform of Glass-Steagall protecting the normal population from that, we could really end up in mass killings of an unprecedented dimension. If this would happen in Europe, on top of the refugee crisis, I think we would have civil war in Europe, and we probably would have civil war in the United States.

So I think the incentive to change policy, as long as there is time, is gigantic, and the optimistic note is that the alternative is already in place. Thank you.

Gravel: Thank you very much. Wasn't that a fantastic expose by Helga LaRouche? [applause] It leaves no room for me to talk!

All I can do is underscore her comments in this way: Stop and think that in the world today, you have really two choices. You can either grow and prosper as a result of growth; or you can turn around and follow a different path of militarism. As an American citizen, I say it all the time, I'm very patriotic; I love my country, I love the world more, but I do love my country. And I'm embarrassed, absolutely embarrassed at the conduct of my country for the last 40 years. And your choices are very simple, when you look at what China is offering with the Silk Road vision, it's an offer to unify the world economically through mutual growth; addressing the problems that are so vital to our personal benefit as human beings. That's what China offers. And now, what does the United States offer? We try to sabotage institutions that will be able to finance growth; we turn around – and I'll go deeply into this – we try to antagonize China.

Now, you read in the American press, particularly this morning there was in the paper about the – and Helga referred to this – about a destroyer that was sailing very close to this Spratly Islands, an island just bordering the 12-mile limit. Why are we doing that? These are silly boys playing with silly toys! That's really what it is. It makes no sense at

all. This destroyer came out of Japan, and so this is a provocation. So, this is our approach, the American approach, to dealing with the crises of the world, is to provoke China. Because of what? China is in the ascendancy economically in the world; there's just no question that with their present plans that China will be the country of the 21st Century. And its vision, to share that growth, with the rest of the world, it's just awesome as a vision, and will define what the 21st Century is all about.

And it won't be the American Century. And I would only hope, and it just stands to logic, that if the United States would join forces and hold hands with China and proceed to develop the entire world; boy, would this be a human accomplishment nonpareil.

Now, when I look at what's happened in the Middle East, I'm reminded of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: that's our foreign policy. For those of you who may forget, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Famine; War; Destruction; Death. That's our foreign policy! You can call it, Obama has the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, and he's riding it like a chariot. When you really in depth look at these elements, it just breaks your heart. Because as Helga just outlined, it's so easy to pursue the other course; it's so much more humane to produce the other course.

And when you look at what we've done here; you read the American press, and of course, everything is Putin has been demonized. We are demonizing China and to some degree Xi Jinping; and this is wrong. These people shouldn't be demonized; they're heads of governments. You don't see them demonizing Obama; you see people like myself demonizing Obama, and rightly so.

And I do this because, you have heard the cliché, "my country, right or wrong." Well, for me, that's the most immoral statement you can make. If you love your country, and you see

it doing something wrong, *you should do something to correct it*. And that's where I have charted my course in life; and at my age, I hope I have another five, six years, and I'm going to try to raise as much billy hell as I can, on our foreign policy. Because that foreign policy is wrong, and as I said earlier, it's a policy of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

And so what can we do about it? Well, the first thing that I'm going to try to do, I get into very many causes as a result of this, and I have become a spokesman or endorser of these various causes, like endorsing what the LaRouche organization is doing with China.

I'm delighted to be associated with the LaRouche organization and the wisdom they've brought forward in a leadership role. And here, I'm taking a page out of their book, suggesting that the leadership of China should take the initiative and bring the Silk Road to the commons of the China Sea. Thank you very much. [applause]

STEINBERG: Senator Mike Gravel is 85 years old. Lyndon LaRouche is 93 years old. They are two of the last stalwarts of the generation that grew up as children under Franklin Roosevelt, and directly participated in the Second World War. They have a certain level of moral commitment and moral authority that is sadly lacking in most of the leadership of our nation today. I just want to tell you a bit more about Senator Gravel's actions back in 1971, in releasing the "Pentagon Papers." Because it's of great relevance today, and it really puts an onus on not only every member of Congress, but every individual who considers himself a patriotic American citizen, to hold yourself and your fellow citizens up to the standard, to hold your elected officials, up to the standard that was reflected in what proved to be an historic action by a lone individual in the U.S. Senate. Now, in 1971, the war in Vietnam was raging out of control. Richard Nixon was a highly popular president, and months later, in the 1972 elections, he would win an absolute landslide victory. Yet,

the consequences of Vietnam, the consequences of Nixon's ending of the Franklin Roosevelt Bretton Woods system, that began this slide into economic decay in 1971, was something that had to be dealt with. The U.S. Congress commissioned a whole series of documents from the Pentagon on the status of the war in Vietnam. Those documents were maintained under strict control, under lock and key, and were basically barred from being presented to the American people. Under those circumstances, a handful of patriots, who would be vilified for their actions, decided that they had to do something. Sen. Gravel, who I had the pleasure of spending a day earlier this week up on Capitol Hill with, recounted the story. He received a cryptic call in his office from a man named Daniel Ellsberg, who at that time was a national security official working directly under Henry Kissinger, had access to the copies of what came to be known as the "Pentagon Papers." One evening, he called up Sen. Gravel, and simply asked him, "If I provide you with a copy of these papers, will you make them public?" Sen. Gravel said, "Yes!" and said "Let's not talk about this on the phone." There's a whole, basically, a cloak and dagger story, that I won't bother to go into here, but suffice it to say that Sen. Gravel was provided with a hard copy of something like 7,000 pages of Pentagon documents that showed that the Vietnam War, contrary to media coverage, contrary to statements by most elected officials, was not going well. Yes, the body-count was piling up, but the United States was losing the war, and it was known, certainly before 1971 that that was the case. But the American people were kept in the dark. Much of the Congress was kept in the dark. And so Sen. Gravel took the courageous act of releasing the "Pentagon Papers." He used the opportunity of chairing a late-night subcommittee on buildings and maintenance to come up with the proper formulation for releasing those documents. He knew that under the strict principles of the U.S. Constitution that it was perfectly legal, because members of the Congress – members of the House, members of the Senate – in fulfilling their obligations to the American people to keep the population

fully informed, was given absolute immunity from any kind of criminal prosecution for any sort of release of data, no matter how its classified "Top Secret," if the data is released as part of the normal business transactions of the United States Congress. Now, in point of fact, the courageous release of the "Pentagon Papers" – the efforts of Daniel Ellsberg, the efforts of Sen. Gravel – resulted in a bright light being shined on the fiasco of Vietnam, and it began the process of forcing a fundamental reversal of U.S. policy. Within a period of time, Richard Nixon, soon after his landslide victory, was on his way out the door. And, it was in the context of the "Pentagon Papers" that some of the worse crimes of Nixon in fact took place. For example, one of the break-ins, in addition to the Democratic Party's national headquarters, that was ordered out of the Nixon White House, was the break-in to Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office, to try to obtain discrediting information on Ellsberg. This is not the way the Constitution provides for the U.S. government to function. So, Sen. Gravel took an action, and the Supreme Court, in one of the rare instances of a unanimous decision on a critical constitutional issue, ruled that Sen. Gravel's actions were completely legal, were completely constitutional, and that therefore he was protected from any vindictive action coming from Nixon, or anyone else, as a result of what he did. That started the ball rolling, for bringing an end to one of the most disastrous chapters in modern American history, probably the single most disastrous event in the post-World War II period, right up until the point of the Bush administration's invasion of Iraq. Now, one of the things, that is immediately begged by reflecting back on what Sen. Gravel did, is the obvious fact that we've been talking through these Friday night webcasts for quite some time about the role of the British and the Saudis in the original 9/11 attack. We've told you about the 28 pages from the original joint Congressional inquiry into 9/11, that were blacked out and declared secret by George W Bush, and have been maintained secret by President Barack Obama. These are vital facts in

these 28 pages that reveal an aspect of action on the part of the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and by extension our so-called British allies in organizing and supporting the most heinous crime that's been committed on American soil since Pearl Harbor; namely, the 9/11 attacks in New York and at the Pentagon here in Washington. So, you've got to ask yourself. The information is out there. Where is Senator Mike Gravel today? Why is it that no members of the US Congress, who have read those 28 pages, have used the precedent of the Supreme Court's unanimous 9-0 ruling in the Gravel case to say, "We are completely free to tell the American people the truth about 9/11."? Why is it? And we've been harping on this issue on this broadcast for the last two weeks. Why is it that the blood on President Obama's hands, through his drone-kill policy, has not led to the convening of impeachment proceedings in the House of Representatives? How is it that the American people and our elected representatives have become so callous to the reality, and so committed to "going along to get along", as President John F Kennedy warned about in his famous *Profiles in Courage* book? How is it, that there is not a single individual in government, how is it that there are not millions of people in the street taking up these issues?

Now, you've just seen some of the photographs of the refugees who are flooding into Europe. And in every instance, these are refugees from regime-change wars that were either initiated by the Bush administration in partnership with the British, or in some instances with the French; or regime-change operations initiated by the Obama administration. How is it that these millions of refugees flooding into Europe, who are creating a tremendous instability; as Helga warned, creating a potential new Hitler moment in Europe? How is it that there is no action in Washington? How is it that it's possible that the US actions, which directly led to this humanitarian nightmare, are being ignored by you the American people and by our elected representatives? There is a

callousness; there is a fear; there is an avoidance of reality that permeates our entire system and our entire culture right now.

And the bottom line is that we are facing an imminent danger of war; potentially thermonuclear war. You, just in the last days, had a US Navy ship entering into territory that China claims as sovereign Chinese waters in the Spratly Islands. You've had just in the last 24 hours, General Philip Breedlove, the commander of NATO, basically saying under no circumstances is he prepared to cooperate with Russia. [that] Russia is carrying out a diversion in Syria, because the fundamental issue is actually Ukraine. How can these kinds of statements and these kinds of actions, which could bring us to the very brink of thermonuclear war under a President who has been consistently pursuing policies of mass kill; how can this be tolerated? What is it in you, the American people? What is it in our elected representatives that has created these conditions where the evidence is mounting by the day that we've lost the moral fitness to survive as a nation? And if we continue to tolerate for one moment more, the danger is that we will be staring down the barrel of thermonuclear weapons; or that the kind of absolute chaos that Helga warned about in the press conference earlier this week, in Europe and here in the United States, is about to erupt.

This is a fundamental moral flaw that can and must be addressed and reversed. The moment for toleration of criminality on the part of the President of the United States has come to an end. There were ample grounds for the impeachment of George W Bush and Dick Cheney, for the lies that led to the Iraq War and many, many other things. There were bills of impeachment that were being drawn up by Representative John Conyers, by his staff on the House Judiciary Committee, during the Bush period. And a deal was struck between the two parties, where the famous quote from Nancy Pelosi was, "Impeachment is off the table." Well, that

deal has carried forward as President Obama has carried out similar crimes, and in some respects, even more egregious crimes. The idea that every Tuesday afternoon there is a meeting at the White House, chaired by the President, where he signs off on the latest list of targets to be stalked and executed; to be murdered in cold blood by drone strikes. The toleration for this has now reached the point where it's absolutely intolerable.

Over the past several weeks, we've provided you with the facts; there's no need to provide any more details. The facts are available; they're in the public light. You can read them on the LaRouche PAC or EIR websites; you can go to The Intercept and read the primary documents themselves. But clearly, that's not the issue. The issue is that we've lost our moral compass; and that we're now at the point that unless there is a fundamental moral change in the fabric of our people, it may just be too late.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, I'm going to read the brief institutional question that came in for us this week. And this was presented to Mr. LaRouche when we had a chance to meet with him. The question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, what is your view of the current state of the US economy, and do you think the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should raise the interest rates?" Now, I know how I would respond. I think instead of hiking the interest rates, the Governors of the Federal Reserve System themselves should take a hike; but I'll let Jeff deliver Mr. LaRouche's response.

STEINBERG: A number of years ago, Mr. LaRouche regularly repeated a kind of a irony, a metaphor for the state of mind of the American people. He said, "Your typical American walks out on the street, gets hit by a car; breaks his leg and then crawls back inside and turns on the television. And until he sees on the local news that his leg has been broken, he's not quite certain that it's actually happened." Well, I think as

for the state of the US economy, there's a great similarity to the situation we're dealing with right now. Again, it's obvious to most of you out there, if you simply ask yourselves a very simple question: Are your conditions of life better today than they were 15 years ago, before we entered into this prolonged period of an abysmal control, a British control over the US Presidency, first under Bush and now under Obama? Do you still have an optimistic view about the future? Can you honestly look at your children and grandchildren, and assure them that their conditions of life will be better than yours, and that what you did with your life in some small way, contributed to the idea that future generations will be better educated, better clothed, better fed, with more leisure time to pursue real culture? I think for the overwhelming majority of Americans, the answer to that question is a resounding "No."

So, let's just consider a few facts that have just come out in the last week about what the actual state of the American economy is, and maybe presenting the sort of gross picture, and taking it out of the domain of "I'll get by, I'll struggle through; as long as I can watch television and take my mind off of the problems of the real world, I'll somehow be able to make it."

Today in the United States, there are 16 million children living in households that on a regular basis, face severe food shortages, meaning that you've got a rampant outbreak of malnutrition among young people in this country. That 16 million figure, by the way, represents 21% of all of the children in the United States. Across the board, in every corner of society, 25% of all American men are living either at, or near, the official poverty level, and that level is abysmally low; does not really reflect, even closely, the horrors that these people are living through.

And if you think that this is something that largely involves our elderly, our senior citizens, people nearing retirement,

no. Among 18-34 year olds, in the United States today – men, that is – 33% are at or near poverty. You have 22 million Americans living in what is officially defined as deep poverty, which means living at, or below, one half the official poverty rate. To give you an idea of that: The official poverty rate is, for a family of four, to be merely \$24,000 a year. Think about what kind of family of four could possibly live on that amount of money.

There's 1.5 million households in the United States which have absolutely no cash income whatsoever, meaning that they are living 100% on government social safety net programs, and can't survive on that.

Yet you read in the newspaper that the official unemployment rate is 5.1% or 5.2% and that the jobless rate at the peak of the "recession" back after 2008 has been cut in half. Well, the only reason that that number has been reduced is because there are now 94 million working-age Americans who are not counted in the labor force. That's not because they're disabled, and unable to work. It's because they've either never been able to find a job, or they have been unemployed for such a long period of time, that they don't even appear in the statistics any longer.

So, that's a brief snapshot of what has happened in our nation. You know it. Probably a majority of people out there watching this broadcast now are personally experiencing it, and feeling it. And the fact is, there is something you can do about it. You can change your behavior. You can continue going along as you are in a fantasy world, or you can decide, now is the time to put your foot down. We live in what was once a great republic, and therefore, we can make those changes. We can force our elected representatives to take the kinds of emergency actions.

Helga talked about the re-instatement of Glass-Steagall. That means Bankrupt Wall Street. It's got to happen now, it's got

to happen immediately, if there's to be any kind of reversal of the real state of economic collapse and poverty.

Now, to just contrast the downward spiral and the financial bankruptcy of the United States, and really the whole trans-Atlantic region, let's consider what, in human terms, has been the result of the Chinese policies that both Helga and Senator Gravel were talking about on Tuesday. Over the last 30 years in China, 600 million people have been lifted out of poverty. At the same time, during that same 30-year period, we've been in a persistent downward spiral, and that spiral is now exponentially escalating towards a complete crash, over the last 15 years, under the Obama war Presidency and the Bush war Presidency before it.

So again, the issue is not sufficient facts. You know that. You know it in your own mind and your own heart what's actually going on. The question is, will you act and will you act in time?

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff.

Now, as a consequence of you watching what has just been presented here tonight, *you* are now an actor on this stage, the stage of human history, for the reason that you are now faced with a decision: What will you do with what has just been presented to you? How will you respond? With the clarity of the historical decision that is now facing us to be made, how do we take what has just been presented, and literally, pull it off of the screen, as Mr. LaRouche termed it, and put the necessary actions in place, as Jeff has just outlined them in detail.

Now that you have seen, and you have assimilated the case that has been put before you tonight, you have now become one of the actors, one of the active players, in this great Shakespearean drama of today. The question lies not in the fact of the case; the facts are all there. The facts are all

clear. But rather, the question lies in how we respond. How will we act on the stage of history today? What will we *do* with the reality as it now faces us, and act to shape a future which is worthy of what the human species uniquely can, and must, be?

And for those of you who have also been participating in the weekly Fireside chat discussions with Mr. LaRouche, and especially the Manhattan meetings, which Mr. LaRouche has been addressing on a consistent basis every Saturday, you know that this is taking hold, and this is what Mr. LaRouche has been discussing with you, and is becoming a movement within the American people, at least those intellectually courageous few who have been engaged with this, and have made these crucial decisions.

So with that I would like to bring a conclusion to this broadcast here tonight. If you haven't viewed the press conference featuring Mrs. Helga LaRouche and Senator Mike Gravel in full, it is available on the front page of the larouchepac.com website, and by all means, please circulate this as widely as you possibly can. This was a very significant event.

So I would like to thank Jeff for joining me here in the studio tonight, and I would like to thank you all for joining us here as our audience this evening. Please consider what you've seen here tonight, and what that implies for you. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Obama gør fremstød for tre krige samtidig

29. oktober 2015 – Præsident Obama bevæger USA stadig nærmere til global krig mod Rusland i Europa og Mellemøsten og mod Kina i Asien. Han ønsker at myrde et massivt antal mennesker, og han gør det gennem udflugter og 'snigende missioner' (dvs. missioner, der gennemføres i smug, uden nogen debat og uden korrekt bemyndigelse, -red.) med det formål at sabotere enhver reel diskussion i USA. I stedet for at komme med regulære erklæringer om den vedtagne politik fra Det Hvide Hus, gør Obama det i form af lækker gennem anonyme regeringsfolk længere ned på rangskalaen til diverse nyhedsorganisationer. Hvis Obama ikke bliver stoppet gennem en forfatningsmæssig fjernelse fra embedet, vil en atomkrig blive resultatet af en eller flere af disse konfrontationer:

* *Wall Street Journal* rapporterede i går, at NATO overvejer at udsende på en fremskreden post et stort troppekontingent i Polen og de tre baltiske stater. Den plan, der er under overvejelse, omfatter udsendelse af en bataljon, omkring 800-1.000 mand, under NATO-kommando i hvert af de tre lande. En light-version af planen går ud på at sprede en enkelt bataljon hen over alle fire lande, men 15-20 % af soldaterne ville i alle tilfælde være amerikanske. Det forlyder, at tyske regeringsfolk giver udtryk for tilbageholdenhed og under private diskussion siger til deres allierede, at de ikke vil true Moskva som en permanent fjende, eller smække Moskva ude af Europa. Begge versioner af planen vil i Moskva blive opfattet som en provokation, hvad tyskerne meget vel ved, men artiklen henviser til unavngivne amerikanske regeringsfolk som kilde, en indikation på, at det er Obama, der har indledt en diskussion om dette fremstød hen imod atomkrig.

*I en anden artikel, der bygger på anonyme lækker fra Obamaregeringen, rapporterer Reuters, at det var Pentagon, der

gjorde fremstød for provokationen i Det sydkinesiske Hav, under hvilken destroyeren USS Lassen sejlede frem til inden for 12 sømil fra de kunstige øer den 26. okt. i en »frihed for sejlads«-øvelse. De siger, at Pentagonfolk har krævet en sådan aktion for at udfordre Kina siden maj måned, men at det var Det Hvide Hus og Udenrigsministeriet, der »bremsede« det indtil denne uge. Men aktionen byggede på en anmodning om »muligheder« fra forsvarsministeren Ash Carter – der trods alt er udnævnt af Obama – angiveligt for at respondere til den hurtige opbygning af disse øer. Det er den samme kampagne hen imod atomkrig, som Obama er engageret i, i Europa.

* Underhåndsudvidelsen af USA's krig i Mellemøsten følger den samme fremgangsmåde, hvor Obama overvejer at udvide USA's militære operationer i Syrien og risikere et sammenstød med Rusland; og i Irak, hvor regeringen hævder, at amerikanske tropper ikke er involveret i kamp, selv om en amerikansk soldat er blevet dræbt og fem andre såret i kamp, og med Carter, der lover mere af samme slags.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 29.
oktober 2015:**

**Flygtningekrisen: kræves:
handling nu//**

**Obama truer Kina med militære
midler**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

NY Times leder retter hård kritik mod Obamas militære optrapning i Syrien: Det kunne "føre USA ud i en direkte krig med Rusland"

28. oktober 2015 – Leder i New York Times den 28. oktober retter hård kritik mod, hvad den kalder Obamaregeringens "militære optrapning i Irak og Syrien", fordømmer Kongressen for ikke at modsætte sig det faktum, at Obama er gået i krig uden Kongressens godkendelse og advarer om, at det kan føre til en direkte krig med Rusland.

"Obamaregeringen tager skridt til at udvide en militær-kampagne, som stadig er blottet for strategisk sammenhæng", fastslår lederen i Times. "I stedet for at modsætte sig en optrapning af amerikanske militær-styrker i den syriske krig, kræver flere fremtrædende medlemmer af Kongressen uansvarligt endnu hårdere fremgangsmåder ... Pentagon fortsætter med at kalde militær-kampagnen i Syrien og Irak for en 'rådgivnings- og hjælpe'-mission, en beskrivelse, som var misvisende i starten af kampagnen, og som nu er absurd. Ved trinvist at øge sin militære rolle i en omfattende, kompliceret slagmark, bliver USA suget ind i en ny krig i Mellempøsten."

Lederen siger derefter, at Obamas politik "mangler juridiske rammer samt et opnåeligt mål", og tilføjer: "Med nogle få undtagelser, synes lovgiverne totalt uanfægtede over, at de tillader en præsident at gå i krig uden udtrykkelig tilladelse fra Kongressen ... Brugen af hr. Assad, en morderisk leder, som

har mistet enhver legitimitet, har i princippet en indlysende appel. Men sådan en fremgangsmåde vil næsten med sikkerhed være katastrofal, fordi det vil føre USA ud i en direkte krig med Rusland og Iran, som støtter ham militært. Selvom det skulle lykkes Washington at tvinge ham fra magten, kunne det tjene den islamiske stats fremmarch, noget, som kun vil føre til mere blodbad.

Kinas ambassadør til USA undsiger Obamas krigs- provokationer

28. oktober, 2015—Kinas ambassadør til USA, Cui Tiankai fordømmer i dag direkte Obamas åbenlyse trussel om krig mod Kina med den provokation det er at sende krigsskibe ind på Kinas suveræne territorium.

"Jeg mener, at det USA gør, er en meget alvorlig politisk og militær provokation" siger Cui i et interview med det amerikanske tv-nyhedsnetværk CNN. "Det er et klart forsøg på at eskalere situationen og at militarisere regionen. Så vi er meget bekymrede over det".

Cui kaldte den amerikanske aktion en "absurd og endog hyklerisk holdning" om at bede andre om ikke at militarisere regionen, samtidig med, at USA selv så hyppigt sender militære fartøjer dertil, ifølge CNN.

Han siger at handlingen blev foretaget "i total ligegyldighed i forhold til international lov". I FN-konventionen om

Havretsloven er der klare regler om sikkerhed for sejlads, sejladsfrihed og uskyldig transit, sagde Cui, idet han noterede at Kina har underskrevet UNCLOS, men at De Forenede Stater ikke har. "Det, USA gør, er totalt imod reglerne, ordlyden og ånden i konventionen.

Cui sagde, at USA's handling i virkeligheden vil tvinge Kina til at indsætte militære styrker i regionen: "Vi er nødt til at sikre os, at vi har tilstrækkelige midler til at sikre vores suverænitet der, at beskytte vores legale rettigheder der, og ... at opretholde fred og stabilitet der, og at ingen vil have nogen illusioner om at kunne fortsætte med at provokere", sagde han.

"Og det vil bestemt ikke svække vores holdning og engagement i at udvikle et sundt og stærkt forhold til USA. Men det er et tovejs spor, og vi er nødt til at se gensidige handlinger fra USA" tilføjede han.

USA's presse bifaldt hadefuldt og brovtent Obamas ageren over for kineserne. David Ignatius fra Washington Post udgav ovenikøbet en fantasi om, at Xi Jinping blev mødt med trusler om mord og opstande internt i Kina på grund af sin udrensning af korrupte medlemmer af det kinesiske kommunistparti.

Ikke desto mindre, rapporter Japans NHK-presse, vil øverstbefalende for U.S. Pacific Command, admiral Harry Harris, besøge Kina næste mandag for forhandlinger med det kinesiske militær. Forhandlingerne var planlagt, før USA sendte en destroyer ind i kinesisk suverænt område.

Global Times, det regerende kommunistpartis officielle avis, udgav et mere giftigt svar. Idet de rådede Kina til "at forholde sig roligt", angiver de den nødvendige kurs: "Som modsvar mod de amerikanske chikanerier bør Kina omgås Washington taktfuldt og være forberedt på det værste. Det kan overbevise Det Hvide Hus om, at Kina, på trods af uvilje, ikke er bange for at udkæmpe en krig med USA i regionen, og er fast

besluttet på at tage vare på dets nationale sikkerhed og værdighed. Beijing bør udføre anti-chikane operationer. Vi skal først observere de amerikanske krigsskibe. Hvis de, i stedet for at passere forbi, stopper for yderligere handlinger, er det nødvendigt for os at indlede elektroniske indgreb, og endda sende krigsskibe, fastlåse dem med radarinformation til affyringskommandoen og flyve over de amerikanske skibe”.

Leder, 29. oktober 2015: Sandheden er afgørende: Obama er en morder, og han må fjernes fra embedet nu

I går udstedte Lyndon LaRouche på ny et presserende nødvendigt krav om, at Barack Obama omgående må fjernes fra USA's præsidentskab ved forfatningsmæssige tiltag, for at han ikke skal føre hele planeten ud i en atomar udslettelseskrig. LaRouche henviste til Obamas seneste runde med militære provokationer imod Kina i Det sydkinesiske Hav, hans eskalerende krig i Syrien og hans masseorderiske droneprogram – blandt andre – som typiske eksempler på den politik, der som en skrigende nødvendighed må bringes til ophør.

LaRouche erklærede under en diskussion i dag med LPAC Policy Committee:

»Jeg mener, at problemet her ligger i det faktum, at Obama ... Obama er grundlæggende set i færd med at foretage træk, som han gør med operationerne ved Kina osv., og han er fast besluttet på at lancere en atomkrig. Og alle tendenser i hans adfærd går i den retning. For eksempel som angrebet på den medicinske facilitet [i Kunduz, Afghanistan]. Fyren er i virkeligheden en morder. Han er slet og ret en morder, og han bør smides ud af embedet.«

»Og hvis vi ikke siger dette og fører en kampagne omkring dette, så mener jeg, at verden som helhed, verdens folk som helhed, står på randen. Se blot på, hvad Obama er i færd med at foretage sig i Kina, med angrebet på Kina, som er en absolut forfalsket operation.«

»Obama viser sine fæle poter, eller sine blodige poter, i diverse operationer. Denne mand må trækkes ud, hans embedsperiode må annulleres! Vi har et præsidentielt princip, under hvilket han må klassificeres, og under hvilket han må fjernes fra embedet. Hvis vi ikke fjerner ham fra embedet, så vil vi komme ud i en meget farlig situation.«

»Den anden side af sagen er, at vi ikke har en Kongres, der er kompetent til at udtrykke sig, som det er nødvendigt. Gå tilbage til præsidentskaberne før denne. Vi har før haft disse. Man kan ikke være useriøs med dette og behandle det ved at sige: 'Vi må forhandle os igennem det her.'«

»Vi må sige, 'Nej!' Og jeg mener, at vores organisation har evnen til at sige 'nej'. Og jeg mener, at vi må sige nej ved simpelt hen at opregne nogle af de forbrydelser, han har begået. Og sige: Disse forbrydelser, alt imens de ikke er afgjort mht. en endelig afgørelse, så er faktum, at kravet er, at han må underkastes undersøgelse for at demonstrere, hvorfor han ikke skal smides ud af embedet. Det er der beviser nok til.«

Den seneste tids række af forbrydelser, som Obama har begået, inkluderer bl.a.:

- Provokationen den 27. okt. med at sende et amerikansk krigsskib ind i Det sydkinesiske Hav, mens han lover at fortsætte med lignede provokationer til vands og i luften i den nærmeste fremtid. En direkte militær nærkontakt mellem USA og Kina bliver højst sandsynlig, hvis dette fortsætter.
- Lækken fra Obamaregeringen den 27. okt. til *Washington Post*, Reuters og andre medier om, at hans regering har en operationel plan på bordet om at sende amerikanske specialtropper og andre tropper ind i Syrien – en total overtrædelse af USA's Forfatning og af International Lov – der blot venter på grønt lys fra præsidenten. Dette kunne føre til en direkte militær konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland på den mellemøstlige arena.
- Det amerikanske militærs overlagte bombing den 3. okt. af et Læger uden Grænser-hospital i Kunduz, Afghanistan, der resulterede i over 30 dødsfald, til trods for, at der på forhånd var udgivet fuld information om koordinaterne for dette hospital. Dette udgør en krigsforbrydelse, der berettiger til retsforfølgelse. Obamaregeringens skamløshed opmuntrede tydeligvis Det saudiske Kongerige til at udføre en lignende grusomhed imod et LuG-hospital i Yemen den 26. oktober.
- Det løbske, illegale droneprogram for drab, under hvilket Obama personligt udvælger og ved sin underskrift godkender det koldblodige mord på mistænkte terrorister og uskyldige tilskuere over en kam, som det for nyligt er blevet afsløret af websiden The Intercept.
- Obamas fortsatte og ubøjelige engagerende forpligtelse til at redde (bailout) det bankerotte Wall Street-system ved at tage livet af Amerikas fysiske økonomi og Amerikas befolkning – et system, der i stedet bør fjernes og erstattes med LaRouches økonomiske program med Verdenslandbroen.

- Obamas principielle ansvar for at skabe den flygtningekrise, der har bragt Europa til den yderste klippekant, gennem de illegale krige, som han og hans forgænger George Bush lancerede i hele regionen, og senest i Syrien.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede i sine bemærkninger ved konferencen i Washington den 27. okt. med fhv. senator Mike Gravel, så har denne flygtningekrise nu nået kogepunktet og har konfronteret Europa med en knald-eller-fald-situation for sin blotte eksistens. Hele den Europæiske Union er ved at smuldre, stedt over for krisen, der er meget mere end en flygtningekrise: det er en massemigration og en eksistentiel krise. Den eneste løsning, understregede Zepp-LaRouche, er at bringe reel udvikling ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika ved at forlænge Verdenslandbroen ind i disse områder. USA og Storbritannien bør deltage i at sikre denne løsning, erklærede hun. Eftersom det var Det britiske Monarki, og i USA Bush- og Obamaregeringerne, der var årsag til krisen.

I går understregede LaRouche:

»Denne karl Obama må holdes tilbage, og hvis han ikke bliver det, er I alle døde, det er den risiko, vi løber. Og jeg mener, at vores fremgangsmåde må defineres ud fra disse referencerammer. Jeg mener, at vi må gøre dette drone-spørgsmål til det absolutte topspørgsmål. Hvis der er nogen, der siger, at det kan retfærdiggøres, er det en løgn – du narres til at godtage en løgn. Når man myrder folk, så myrder man dem! Og man siger 'du myrder dem'.

Og Obama er grundlæggende set en morder; han er en masseorder. Den aktuelle præsident for USA er en masseorder! Hvis man vil redde USA, så må man sige dette. Hvis man ikke siger dette, ja, så kunne du være den næste, der ryger.«

Med hensyn til dem, der har været så bange for Obama, at de

har været paralyseret til handlingslammelse og til at tolerere hans nazistiske forbrydelser, erklærede LaRouche:

»Sandheden er af afgørende betydning: Obama er en morder, punktum. Hvis man ønsker, at civilisationen skal overleve, må man lukke ned for Obama. Ikke på længere sigt; lige nu.«

Leder, 28. oktober 2015: Briterne er totalt bankerotte: Tiden er inde til at dumpe Obama, Schäuble og Wall Street

Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings besøg i Storbritannien fandt sted på et tidspunkt, hvor den britiske økonomi er totalt kollapsede, de britiske banker totalt bankerotte, det britiske monarki i en tilstand af opløsning og hele det globale, anglo-hollandske system på randen af total disintegration. Kineserne er udmærket klar over alle disse kendsgerninger, og handler i overensstemmelse hermed.

Ud fra Vestens standpunkt er tiden inde til en grundig hovedrengøring, før de britisk-ejede desperadoer, såsom præsident Obama, starter den verdenskrig, som de har prøvet på at fremprovokere, siden afsættelsen og mordet på Libyens Gaddafi i slutningen af 2011. Drivkraften bag deres fremstød for krig er deres bankerotte tilstand og deres umiddelbart

forestående tab af magten. Det afgørende spørgsmål er nu, om verden, med begyndelse i den transatlantiske sektor, vil styrte ud i kaos, eller om der i tide kan ske en reguleret afslutning på det britiske system gennem en genoplivning, med begyndelse i USA, af Hamiltons økonomiske principper.

Den amerikanske Kongres er dysfunktionel, som det er blevet bevist af den kendsgerning, at Kongressen ikke har foretaget sig noget for at imødegå Obamas politik med Dronedrab, selv uger efter, at *The Intercept* har udgivet »Drone-papirerne« (den tyske Forbundsdag har allerede afholdt høringer med whistleblowers, der er fhv. amerikanske dronepiloter). Kongressen er gennemgribende korrump, især republikanerne, med ganske få undtagelser. Wall Streets blotte eksistens sikrer fortsættelsen af denne korrupsion. Udslet Wall Street, der allerede er håbløst bankerot, og så vil Kongressen kunne føres tilbage til sit forfatningsmæssige mandat. Udslet Wall Street, og Obama er væk.

I Europa er den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble hovedpersonen bag promoveringen af nedskæringspolitikken, der fører til folkemord, og som i Tyskland går under betegnelsen »det sorte nul«. Tysklands næststørste tabloidavis, *Welt am Sonntag*, kom i sin søndagsudgave med et åbent krav om, at den tyske kansler Angela Merkel skulle dumpes pga. sin bløde holdning til flygtningepolitikken og i stedet erstattes med Schäuble. Hvis Europa skal overleve, må Schäuble, ligesom Obama, omgående afsættes.

Selve USA's økonomi er, efter 15 år med britisk-ejede præsidenter, i en tilstand af fysisk-økonomisk sammenbrud. Sammenbruddet i den amerikanske, produktive økonomi accelererer enormt, som det ses af de seneste rapporter om den voksende fattigdom, samt af ti måneders konsekutiv nedgang i den industrielle produktion. Vitale sektorer, som boliger, konstruktion, transport og maskinværktøj følger en accelererende, nedadgående kurve. Dette har Obama ansvaret for. Han ødelagde med overlæg den amerikanske økonomi på vegne

af Wall Street og London – og med størstedelen af Kongressen som medskyldig. Kongressen bør modtage en betinget opsigelse: Før I dumper Obama og nedlukker Wall Street, få I ingen løn. I fortjener ingen løn. Find jer en produktiv beskæftigelse andetsteds, eller, hvad der er bedre, gør jeres arbejde ved at afsætte Obama og gøre en ende på Wall Streets elendighed, gennem vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall og en genoplivning af statskredit i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton (Det unge USA's første finansminister, -red.), for en genoplivning af arbejdskraftens produktive evne, gennem investeringer i infrastruktur og programmer, der drives frem af nye videnskabelige opdagelser.

Foto: Den tyske finansminister, Wolfgang 'det sorte nul' Schäuble

USA: Økonomisk udvikling og Den nye Silkevej rammer Washington, D.C. (incl. video and english transcript): EIR Forum: Ending Permanent Warfare and Financial Panic

27. oktober 2015 – **EIR** leverede et nødvendigt chok til Washington, D.C. i dag på National Press Club, under titlen:

»En afslutning på permanent krig og finansiel panik: Glass-Steagall og den Globale Silkevej«. Blandt mange andre gæster hørte og debatterede 35 personer fra ambassadestabe fra lande i hele verden præsentationer ved Schiller Instituttets stifter Helga Zepp-LaRouche og fhv. senator til den amerikanske Kongres Mike Gravel fra delstaten Alaska.

Missionen var at præsentere det umiddelbart tilgængelige, håndgribelige alternativ til krisen i den transatlantiske verden med økonomisk forfald og endeløse krige. Dette i en amerikansk hovedstad, der lider under økonomisk nedtrykthed og krigslede, og som skal vedtage nedskæringer af pensions- og sundhedsydelse samtidig med, at beskatningen af en befolkning, der er ved at gå under økonomisk, skal øges. Zepp-LaRouche og senator Gravel gjorde det klart, at, med genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall i den transatlantiske sektor, sammen med en opkobling til den udviklingspolitik, som repræsenteres af Den nye Silkevej, samt en afslutning af Barack Obamas katastrofale rolle som præsident, kan krisen i USA og Europa vendes til en økonomisk genrejsning.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche er hovedperson bag og forfatter til *EIR's* udførlige specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, der har fået opbakning fra mange økonomiske institutioner i Kina og nu er **udgivet som kinesisk bog, der nyder bred cirkulation i Kina.**

Mike Gravel var den senator, der brød Washington-reglen, da han i 1971 i Kongressen oplæste de såkaldte »Pentagon-papirer« om Vietnamkrigen (og således sikrede, at disse oplysninger blev optaget i Senatets journal, -red.), og som i 2007, under en præsidentkandidatdebat, udfordrede Barack Obama ved, med stor forudseenhed, at kalde denne for en kandidat for krig, inklusive atomkrig.

Gravel udfordrer sine kolleger i den aktuelle søvngænger-Kongres til at åbne op for Obamas hemmelige dronekrige, hans

uautoriserede, evindelige krige i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, samt krigskonfrontationer rettet mod Rusland og Kina. Han sagde til forsamlingen, at han samarbejder med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, fordi han støtter konceptet med Silkevejens globale infrastrukturudvikling og den måde, hvorpå LaRouche-parret organiserer til fordel for dette. Han sagde:

»Vi befinder os i en 'Augusts Kanoner'-situation: Vi må have en fremgangsmåde over for Den nye Silkevej, som med en Marshall-plan.«

Med en beskrivelse af den forværende flygtningekrise i Europa, som er skabt af Obama som det direkte resultat af hans krige, kaldte Helga Zepp-LaRouche dette for »de brændende skjorters tid«, [1] hvor ledernes skjorter brænder pga. krise, og hvor »en ny æra for menneskehedens fælles mål« kan initieres.

Under den timelange diskussion og debat fik gæsterne EIR-specialrapporter og tegnede abonnementer på EIR Alert-service. Zepp-LaRouche, Gravel samt Lyndon LaRouche blev interviewet af amerikanske og udenlandske medier.

I en senere diskussion efter forummets afslutning fokuserede Lyndon LaRouche på forummets centrale betydning som værende missionsorienteret. Han sagde:

»Hvad gør du for at skabe et højere udviklingsniveau for de levende og for dem, der følger efter? – Det er målestokken for din moralitet.«

»Wall Street er i færd med at ødelægge USA's befolkning. Det påtvinger den amerikanske befolkning mere og mere fattigdom – ikke blot år for år, og sæson efter sæson! Det er en gift; skaf jer af med det. Obama er en morder af uskyldige civile, en krigsmager og en tyv. Hvad vil du gøre for at redde menneskeheden fra disse udyr?«

»Forsøm ikke, af mangel på lidenskab, at bringe i orden,

hvad du burde have bragt i orden i din levetid.«

[1] Fra gr. Mytologi; den forgiftede skjorte, der brændte Herakles og fik ham til at kaste sig på ligbålet; en 'destruktiv kraft eller sonings-indflydelse'.

Her følger det engelske udskrift af hovedtaler v/ Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Mike Gravel: (en dansk oversættelse af Helgas tale kommer snarest):

Download (PDF, Unknown)