

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

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

**TAKE PRE-EMPTIVE ACTION NOW:**

**GLASS STEAGALL IN, OBAMA OUT**

**TRANSCRIPT**

**MATT OGDEN:** Good evening.

You're joining us for LaRouche PAC weekly webcast for October 9, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I will be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence Review, and by Jason Ross of the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and we, together with a number of others, had the opportunity to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche briefly before filming this recorded webcast.

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

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

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

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

1. There is now an acute emergency which threatens to kill millions of Americans, primarily, and also citizens of other countries.
2. This is due immediately to the bankruptcy of Wall Street. Wall Street is totally and irremediably bankrupt. The successive Bush and Obama bailouts and the

rounds of “quantitative easing,” have only succeeded in making all of Wall Street’s values valueless, and finalizing its bankruptcy.

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

So that went out all over Capitol Hill this week, and also across the country, with rallies from San Francisco to Manhattan, and elsewhere in between. And Obama *is* increasingly being isolated and abandoned by members of his own cabinet, vis-a-vis the Russian intervention into Syria; the split by Hillary on the TPP, distancing herself now, officially, from Obama on that, and also, with the dramatic announcement by Doctors Without Borders that they will be pursuing an

independent investigation into whether *war crimes* were committed with regards to the sustained bombing, for over one hour, of the Afghan hospital. And that's something that we will get into later in this broadcast.

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

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

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

**JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt.**

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

President Obama and the entire inner circles at the White House are in an absolutely frantic state of mind, and under those kinds of circumstances, one can expect that this

President will make the kinds of colossal blunders, dangerous blunders, which could lead to general war,—and in fact, there are many indications of exacting that trajectory—and alternatively, will result in the kind of meltdown that will finally catalyze the long, long overdue drive to get him out of office.

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

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

Now we're on the very edge of exactly that process. As Matt mentioned, we had a large delegation up on Capitol Hill several days ago, and in that discussion process that occurred with many, many members of Congress—around an outdoor rally and around a lot of private discussions—the striking shift in mood, particularly among Democrats, was that when we said: Obama must be removed from office, we can't wait out the clock and run out the duration of his Presidency, Wall Street is

bankrupt, the system is about to blow, and we are on the verge of thermonuclear war—the general response was no longer “Oh, c’mon, that’s impossible. It’ll never happen.” Now people wanted to stop and talk, and the question was not *should* it be done, but the question was *how* do we do it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, Merkel was under vicious attack from some of the interviews on the question of why she was tolerating the flow of these Middle East refugees into Germany. And why didn't they just simply create refugee camps on the outskirts of Europe in the Middle East; virtually concentration camps? And so Merkel, in her own quiet way, held her ground; and Mr. LaRouche's comment was that basically she steadfastly maintained the view of the majority of Germans. If you didn't have Putin taking the actions that he has taken in Syria and elsewhere, and if you didn't have a majority of the population in Germany sticking with the view that it's time to open your arms and help out these refugees who are fleeing from wars

that are not of their own making, but came from the disastrous policies of the West – particularly from Britain and the United States – we would be on the very edge of war; if not already in a general warfare situation at this moment.

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

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

Now in fact, certain things must happen immediately; and cannot wait for the Presidential primary elections, the



conventions, and the elections in November of 2016. What we need immediately – right now – as preemptive action before Wall Street blows out; we need to reinstate Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall is by no means the total solution; but it is the indispensable first step. Glass-Steagall reinstated; full and complete bank separation will accomplish two things immediately. It will wipe out Wall Street, because once you separate out legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling activity, and make it clear gambling debts will no longer be bailed out by taxpayers; at that moment, that entire Wall Street gambling bubble will evaporate. It'll be clear that nobody is going to bail it out; that it could never, ever be bailed out. It would be an act of moral horror to bail it out; and therefore, it will just disappear. And under those circumstances, it will almost certainly mean the immediate demise of Obama. Either Obama signs Glass-Steagall into law, which is highly unlikely; or his effort to block it on behalf of a Wall Street that's already dead, will mean that he will be drummed out of office. He will cause such an enormous backlash, that's been building and building and building for so long already; that he'll be gone. So, Glass-Steagall as a first step towards adopting the entire array of Franklin Roosevelt American System solutions to this crisis, is absolutely indispensable in the short term.

And the mood in the country is shifting, particularly among certain patriotic institutions. The Pentagon is well aware that President Obama represents an horrific danger of war confrontation with Russia. And now the center of gravity of that danger has shifted from eastern Ukraine to Syria; but the danger remains the same. Secretary of State Kerry is trying to do certain things with the Russians to maintain a certain war prevention, war avoidance dynamic. And he has institutional backing for those actions; otherwise, I doubt he would be simply taking them on his own. But all of these measures, as useful as they are, are simply holding back the tide. Wall Street must be put out of its misery; Obama must

be removed from office. The 25th Amendment, which provides for the means to remove a President who is no longer mentally fit to serve, is the most efficient means to carry this out.

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

**ROSS:** Well, let's take up the bombing of the hospital in Afghanistan. As I'm sure everyone is aware, on Saturday, the U.S. military struck a hospital that was run by Doctors without Borders; commonly known by its French acronym MSF (Medecins sans Frontieres), in Kunduz, Afghanistan. Destroying part of it, killing 10 staff members, 10 patients,

including 3 children, and injuring 37. This is a hospital that the coordinates of it had been communicated by MSF repeatedly to the U.S. military, Afghanistan, NATO – including only a short period before the attack. After the bombing started, MSF tried to alert the U.S. military and yet the bombing continued for another 30 minutes. So, I wanted to read some portions of a speech that was given by Dr. Joanne Liu, the President of Doctors without Borders, and ask Jeff to comment; put this into context for us. So, Dr. Liu said:

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

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

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

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

“The facts and circumstances of this attack must be investigated independently and impartially, particularly given the inconsistencies in the U.S. and Afghan accounts of what

happened over recent days. We cannot rely on only internal military investigations by the U.S., NATO, and Afghan forces.”

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

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

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

So, that’s the character of what we’re dealing with. Remember the decision that was consciously made by President Obama, Prime Minister Cameron, and former French President Sarkozy, when they had Muammar Qaddafi actually ready to be detained; and the decision instead was made to kill him. To have him murdered in cold blood in order to accelerate the kind of chaos that ensued; and particularly the targeting of Russia and China that followed off of that. So, these are important contextual factors to take into account, that cry for a full-scale actual independent investigation.

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

Now, I think it's also very important to once again look at the events that are going on, the backdrop – the psychological context – for understanding this brutal attack in Kunduz. Because look, the initial comments coming out of the administration; they made no attempt whatsoever to deny what happened. They just simply tried to issue a blanket statement that the Taliban took over Kunduz, and therefore, everyone living in that city could be presumed to be a terrorist. Now, I mean, that kind of madness is, again, unfortunately typical of the kinds of squirming logic that are used by this White House, this President to justify actions that do belong before the International Court of Justice for War Crimes and Crimes

Against Humanity.

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

You have members of Congress – most recently Tulsi Gabbard – who said, look you might not like everything that Russia does, but back in World War II, there was an agreement that the threat to mankind represented by Hitler and the Axis powers was so great, that the only viable option was to work with the Soviet Union, to work with Stalin, to defeat Hitler and defeat the Nazi cause. And as Mr. LaRouche emphasized, it was in fact the Soviet involvement that was decisive in defeating Hitler. If it were not for the suffering of the Russian people – 22 million killed, for starters – and if it were not for the kinds of actions at places like Stalingrad, the outcome of World War II would probably have been very

different; even despite Roosevelt's Arsenal of Democracy.

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

So, Putin is going in for the kill. Over the last 48 hours, Russia – in conjunction with Syrian military, as well as Iraq and Iran – has launched an air-land-sea total offensive against the terrorist infrastructure in Syria. It's changed the rules decisively; it's changed the likely outcome of the entire situation. And since the Obama administration and President Obama personally never abandoned the idea that the first priority is to get rid of President Assad and worry later about the consequences, what the Russians have done has stolen the moment completely. In warfare, victory is very often measured by the ability to anticipate and know what the other command is thinking and doing; and to move on a flanking

basis way out ahead of them and catch them by surprise. That's what happened this week. The fact that the Russians have launched cruise missile strikes on terrorist targets inside Syria from 900 miles away, from four ships in the middle of the Caspian Sea accessing Iranian and Iraqi airspace *en route* into Syria, indicates that there is a serious military operation here. Yesterday, the *New York Times* finally acknowledged that the Russian war plan in Syria has been mapped out in partnership with Iran and Iraq and Syria, and probably with Hezbollah, for at least the past four to six months. The United States was blindsided by and large to these developments, because President Obama – in his supreme arrogance – presumed that the “coalition” was the only game in town.

So, now the Russians have stolen the march, and are committed to a dynamically different policy; and there is a very strong possibility that the Russians will succeed, because they're committed to victory. Whereas, the policies coming from the Obama administration and the Bush administration before that, were simply a commitment to perpetual wars; wars that ultimately get measured in the body count. How many people are killed? How long is the war sustained? How much infrastructure and economic capacity can be permanently destroyed? Already, much of the middle class of Syria, which was a modern secular large middle class country, have been driven out. So that the brain drain on Syria is in itself another major kind of crisis. These are the kinds of calculations that have dominated the thinking of the 20th Century: population wars; Malthusian methods of reducing population in absolute terms; breaking down any prospects for genuine scientific and technological progress and advancement; no increase – in fact a net collapse – of real productivity. That's been going on pretty much nonstop since the death of Roosevelt.

So, Obama is carrying out a policy that's doomed to fail; and



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

The former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA], Gen. Michael Flynn – whom we've talked about on a number of our recent shows – who came out and blew the whistle on the fact that Obama supported the growth of al-Qaeda in Iraq, and ultimately the Islamic State, and refused to take DIA warnings seriously because it interfered with his plans of overthrowing Assad; even if it meant being in bed with the very people who did the 9/11 attacks in 2001, and then did the Benghazi. So, General Flynn was interviewed several days ago on Russia Today; and he said pointblank "We must be working with Russia. Russia has more strategic interests in defeating the Islamic State in Syria than the United States does by far." There are thousands – an estimate of 2500 to 5000 – Chechen and other Russian Muslims who've been recruited into the Islamic State, the al-Nusra Front, and are now fighting in Iraq and Syria. And if they are not defeated right there in the Middle East, they will go back to Russia; and Russia will be facing an absolute hellish situation. So Putin, whose parents suffered greatly during the 2nd World War, as almost all Russians did; Putin, who lost a brother in the 2nd World War, has that kind of sense of morality to be willing to wage a total war to defeat an enemy that is clearly the enemy of

humanity.

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

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

So, with that, I'd like to thank you all for listening; and stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

# **USA: Larry Summers kræver massiv, global, finansiel 'kvantitativ lempelse' for at afværge international finansiel nedsmeltning**

8. oktober 2015 – Larry Summers, der spillede en central rolle i ødelæggelsen af Glass-Steagall fra sine stillinger i USA's Finansministerium fra 1995-2001, har skrevet en lang kronik, der er publiceret i dagens *Financial Times*, *Washington Post* og andre publikationer, og hvor han udsteder et presserende krav om »substantielle ændringer i verdens økonomiske strategi« for at håndtere den fremstormende nedsmeltning.

For altid en fortaler for aggressiv kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), lægger Summers nu stemme til den udprægede panik, der fejer hen over finanskredse, ved at sige, at en sådan »traditionel kvantitativ lempelse« i den monetære politik ikke længere ville have nogen virkning på krisen. Han kræver udløsningen af, hvad der svarer til en finansiel, udvidet kvantitativ lempelse og opfordrer indtrængende regeringer på begge sider Atlanten, og især de såkaldte fremvoksende økonomier, til at påtage sig rene bjerge af ny gæld ved, at de selv og deres centralbanker direkte opkøber junk-obligationer i halsbrækkende tempo. Man skal ikke bekymre sig om gæld-til-BNP på 60 % og mere, erklærer han; »et langt højere tal er bestemt passende i dag«.

Man bør erindre sig, at Summers, der var USA's vicefinansminister under Robert Rubin fra 1995-1999, og dernæst selv finansminister fra 1999-2001, da Glass-Steagall formelt blev ophævet, i dag er en af Hillary Clintons vigtigste rådgivere i økonomisk politik. Hans artikel

opfordrer til, at hans klinisk hysteriske forslag diskuteres på det årlige IMF-møde med verdens finansministre og centralbanker, der vil finde sted den 9. okt. i Lima, Peru.

---

**Lyndon LaRouche: Der  
eksisterer nu en AKUT  
NØDTILSTAND:  
7 punkter til omgående  
behandling af kongres-  
medlemmer, senatorer og andre  
medlemmer af USA's regering**

*5. oktober 2015:*

*1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.*

*2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. ..*

*3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at*

***nedsmelte ... vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik ... Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning...***

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **USA: Rand Paul til GOP og Clinton: »Flyveforbudszone« betyder krig med Rusland**

8. oktober 2015 – I et interview med *Washington Post* fordømte Rand Paul kravet om en flyveforbudszone i Syrien som værende »en rædselsfuld idé«, der kunne »føre til Tredje Verdenskrig«, hvis der var nogen, der var dum nok til at gøre det. Flere af de republikanske kandidater ('GOP', 'Grand Old Party', -red.), såvel som også Hillary Clinton, har krævet en flyveforbudszone.

»Det er at trække en rød streg i luften«, sagde Paul. »Når man først trækker en rød streg, og folk overskrider den, hvad sker

der så? Vi taler nu om en hændelse, der kunne føre til Tredje Verdenskrig. Vi klarede os i 70 år med åbne kommunikationskanaler med russerne i et forsøg på at undgå, at den ene side skød modpartens fly ned. Jeg mener, at de personer, der kræver en flyveforbudszone, er naive. I øjeblikket er Rusland faktisk blevet inviteret af to af nabolandene, af Irak og Syrien. Vi vil så sige, at vi vil forhindre Rusland i at overflyve området, når to af de lande, der bliver overfløjet, har inviteret Rusland til at gøre det? Dette stiller spørgsmålet, om vi ønsker at isolere os diplomatisk, eller om vi ønsker at engagere os diplomatisk.«

*WP* rapporterede, at Paul fortsatte med at angribe galskaben med at fremprovokere krig med Rusland i et interview med Fox News: »Vil I drive Rusland ud af Syrien?« spurgte han interviewereren. »Vil I have en landkrig med Rusland? Der findes ikke noget scenario, hvor Amerika kan stille sig op og sige: Forsvind, Rusland!«

---

## **Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium: USA bekæmper ikke ISIS**

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

sagde Igor Konashenkov, talsmand for det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, til RT.

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

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

*Foto: Den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov*

---

## **Obama siger stædigt Nej til samarbejde med russerne**

8. oktober 2015 – Regeringsfolk i Pentagon og i Udenrigsministeriet gjorde det i går klart, idet de herved reflekterer præsidentens synspunkter, at Obamaregeringen ikke vil dele efterretninger med russerne om ISIS, eller samarbejde med Rusland imod ISIS på nogen anden måde.

»Jeg ved ikke, hvordan man skulle dele efterretninger, når man ikke deler et fælles mål«, sagde talsmand for Udenrigsministeriet John Kirby. Det »fælles mål«, som russerne ikke deler, er afsættelsen af Syriens legitime valgte præsident, Bashar al-Assad.

»Hvis der findes nogle styrker, der også bærer våben, og som befinder sig på jorden, hvor de kæmper, som koalitionen siger, med Islamisk Stat, og de ikke må røres, jamen, så fint«, sagde Maria Zakharova, talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium. »Giv os en liste, og giv os identifikations-tegnene for disse folk, fortæl os, hvor de er, og forklar os, hvorfor de ikke må røres. Denne information er vi ikke i besiddelse af.«

Det amerikanske svar på det russiske tilbud er, i realiteten, »aldrig i livet«. Unavngivne amerikanske regeringsfolk sagde til *New York Times*, at det sidste, de ville gøre, var at levere koordinater for, hvor de amerikansk-støttede oppositionsgrupper var, for at de ikke skulle blive bombarderet af russerne som en del af Moskvas angivelige »indsats for at støtte Assad«.

USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carter, mens han var i Italien i går, gik så vidt som til at beskrive Ruslands strategi som »på tragisk vis behæftet med fejl« og til at hævde, at USA af denne grund ikke kunne samarbejde med den russiske kampagne.

»Vi mener, at Rusland har en forkert strategi. De fortsætter med at ramme mål, der ikke er ISIL. Vi mener, at dette er en fundamental fejltagelse«, sagde Carter. »Vi vil ikke samarbejde om en strategi, der er tragisk behæftet med fejl, og derfor er det, jeg sagde, at USA ikke vil samarbejde med Rusland.«

*Foto: USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carter*



---

# Amerikansk-russisk krise synes at være den alvorligste hidtil, siger bekymret, højtplaceret russisk diplomat

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

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

uafhængighed mht. gensidigt fordelagtigt samarbejde«, sagde han.



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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Det, der nu sker i Syrien, og i realiteten meget mere bredt, er nøjagtigt, hvad LaRouche sagde, måtte ske. Alle andre

sagde, »Jeg er enig i, at det skal til, men det kan ikke ske«. LaRouche havde ret. Nu siger de, »Ja, Wall Street må lukkes ned – jeg er enig i, at det skal til – men det kan ikke ske«. Hvem vil, til slut, vise sig at have haft ret?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

*7. oktober 2015* – Rostislav Ishchenko, en ukrainsk, strategisk analytiker, der nu er i Moskva, skrev en advarsel i den

russiske publikation *MIA Rossiya Segodnya*, om, at den russiske præsident Putins nylige diplomatiske gennembrud kunne drive Obama til at forsøge nye provokationer mod Rusland. Ishchenko nævnte tre nylige, diplomatiske kup udført af Putin: Hans tale til FN's Generalforsamling, hans flankemanøvre i Syrien og hans topmøder efter Normandiet-formatet, hvor han opnåede tysk og fransk støtte til Minsk-aftalerne.

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

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

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

Centralasien er et andet brændpunkt, efter at Taliban har

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

Ishchenko nævnte også valgene den 11. oktober i Belarus, som kunne udgøre en udløsermekanisme for endnu et forsøg på at gennemføre en 'farvet revolution', på trods af præsident Lukasjenkos tilsyneladende stærke position.

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

---

## **NYHEDSORIENTERING OKTOBER: Løsninger til flygtningekrisen og det truende finanskrak**

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

overleve.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Leder, 8. oktober 2015: Fyr omgående Obama!**

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

Irak har indikeret, at det vil bede Rusland om at påbegynde bombeoperationer imod ISIS inde på irakisk jord. Tyrkiet har, i modstrid med NATO's og Obamaregeringens højtravende snak, meddelt, at relationerne med Rusland er fine, og at man har etableret en militær kanal for at sikre, at der ikke opstår



nogen hændelser mellem russiske og tyrkiske fly i området langs den syriske grænse. Fungerende premierminister Davutoglu sagde til reportere onsdag, at russisk-tyrkiske relationer er venskabelige og udviser godt naboskab, og at der ikke vil komme nogen tyrkisk-russisk konflikt ud af situationen i Syrien.

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

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

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

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

Obama sidder i kviksand op til navlen, men han er stadig en

trussel, og intet mindre end hans fjernelse fra embedet vil fuldt ud løse krisen.

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

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

---

## **Leder, 7. oktober 2015: LaRouche mobiliserer for at lukke Wall Street ned, mens bankierer hylér, »Systemet bryder sammen«**

Mens du læser denne rapport, er en stærk delegation af LaRouchePAC-aktivister fra New York City – garvede veteraner fra Lyndon LaRouches »Manhattan-projekt« – ankommet til

Washington, D.C. for at lede dagens mobilisering og lobbyvirksomhed på Capitol Hill den 7. okt., for indtrængende at opfordre ansvarlige nøglepersoner blandt kongresmedlemmerne og senatorerne til omgående at tage skridt til at lukke Wall Street ned og gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall. Som det specificeres i LPAC's 7-punktserklæring, **»Til kongresmedlemmer, senatorer og andre medlemmer af USA's regering, til omgående handling«:**

*»En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande,«*

hvilket kræver handling nu, i denne uge.

Panikken blandt bankierer på Wall Street og i City of London er mærkbar, lige under overfladen. Lederen i 3. okt.-udgaven af *The Economist*, medieflagskibet for City of Londons finansinteresser, advarer om, at »systemet er ved at bryde sammen« og kræver en massiv indsats for at understøtte boblen med nye bølger af kvantitativ lempelse – nøjagtig, som Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at deres plan går ud på. På samme måde klynker magasinet *Forbes*, at »der er for over 600 billioner dollar i udestående OTC-derivater (over-the-counter; 'over disken') på storbankernes regnskaber (selv om det virkelige tal sandsynligvis er det dobbelte), som kunne sprænge hele systemet i stykker, når et stormløb først tager fat.

*»For sådanne som JP Morgan, Bank of Amerika, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs og Morgan Stanley er disse ting fortsat et spørgsmål om liv og død.«*

Det britiske Imperium er også i panik, fordi deres bydreng Barack Obama er ved at synke, og det hurtigt, både internt i USA og internationalt. Virkningen af FN's Generalforsamling og den russiske præsidents dristige handlinger i Syrien ruller kloden rundt, og folk er ved at vågne op til den kendsgerning,

at et ny, international orden er mulig. De har set på, mens Putin hængte Obama til tørre i Syrien, og ikke alene overlevede til at fortælle historien, men er i fin form, mens Obama smøler frustreret omkring. Ideen om, at

*»vi måske ikke behøver at tolerere Obama mere; måske ikke længere behøver underkaste os Wall Street og se på, at vore nationer dør«,*

er en voksende kraft over hele planeten.

Dette er et historisk øjeblik, der er svangert med potentiale, har Helga Zepp-LaRouche understreget. Det er et øjeblik, hvor vi ikke alene kan sænke Wall Street og genindføre Glass-Steagall, men også skifte radikalt over til en politik med Verdenslandbroen og global genopbygning. Det faktum, at ledende, akademiske lærde, folk fra tænketanke og andre i Kina offentligt har støtte LaRouche-parrets Landbro-politik; at verdens andenstørste økonomi grundlæggende set har vedtaget denne politik, er af dramatisk, global betydning. Nu, hvor **den kinesiske udgave af EIR's bog, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«**, er blevet udgivet med så magtfuld opbakning, vil vi bringe dette budskab med tilbage til USA, med et stort oplag af Specialrapporten til en pris, der muliggør bred cirkulation i hele landet.

Lyndon LaRouche erklærede, hvad der står på spil her, den 5. okt. i sin ugentlige webcast med LPAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi:

*»Vi kan ikke længere tolerere de risici, der er involveret med en fornyelse af Wall Streets betingelser. Vi må derfor, af denne grund, lukke Wall Street ned for at beskytte USA's befolkning ... Vi må handle forebyggende. Det, vi har gjort, og det, som jeg har presset på for, er at få en omgående beslutning fra relevante medlemmer af Kongressen om at afholde et møde og håndtere situationen som sådan. Denne situation påbyder at lukke Wall Street, uden at de får en*

*indsats for en bailout (bankredning). For, at give endnu en mulighed for en bailout til Wall Street ville næsten med sikkerhed garantere en stor katastrofe for befolkningen i USA.«*

*»Vi må derfor beskytte befolkningen. Vi må annullere Wall Street. Og vi må fortsætte fremefter med at omstrukturere organiseringen af vores beskæftigelse med den hensigt at rent faktisk få produktive processer sat i gang, grundlæggende set, et krav, der er mere presserende end det, Franklin Roosevelt gjorde. Men det, som Franklin Roosevelt udstod, og måtte konfrontere og håndtere, er ubetydeligt, sammenlignet med de vilkår, der hersker i USA netop nu.«*

## ***Supplerende dokumentation:***

### **Wall Street bankierer diskuterer åbenlyst det kommende krak:**

#### **»Systemet er ved at bryde sammen«**

Samtidig med, at LaRouche-bevægelsen skifter til højeste gear for at lukke Wall Street ned og vende tilbage til Glass-Steagall, før krakket slår til, diskuterer bankierer på Wall Street og i City of London nu åbenlyst det kommende krak ... og er i stille panik over, hvordan de skal håndtere det.

Lederen i 3. oktober-udgaven af *The Economist*, medieflagskibet for City of Londons finansinteresser, advarer om, at »systemet er ved at bryde sammen« og kræver en massiv indsats for at understøtte boblen med nye bølger af såkaldt kvantitativ lempelse – nøjagtig, som Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at deres plan går ud på. Artiklen klynker imidlertid, at denne hyperinflationsskabende bailout-politik muligvis ikke vil

virke, som den gjorde i 2008, fordi Den amerikanske Kongres måske i stedet vil gå ind for mere regulering af bankerne – selv om artiklen omhyggeligt undgår at nævne de frygtede ord, »Glass-Steagall«.

Et stort problem i dag, skriver *The Economist*,

»er manglen på en opbakning til det oversøiske dollarsystem, hvis det står over for en krise. I 2008-09 kom Federal Reserve modvilligt til hjælp og optrådte som den sidste lånemulighed ved at tilbyde dollarlikviditet til 1 billion til udenlandske banker og centralbanker. De summer, der vil være involveret i en fremtidig krise, ville være langt højere. Den oversøiske dollarverden er omtrent dobbelt så stor, som den var i 2007. I år 2020 kunne den være lige så stor som Amerikas bankindustri. Siden 2008-09 er Kongressen blevet forsigtig med Feds nødlån. I den næste krise kan Feds planer om at udstede udstrakte swaplinjer muligvis blive mødt med modstand fra lovgivning og Kongres.«

Artiklen i *The Economist* slutter:

»Der er ting, som Amerika kan gøre for at påtage sig mere ansvar – f.eks. ved at etablere større nød-swaplinjer til flere centralbanker. En splittelse af systemet er mere sandsynlig, med andre lande, der vælger at isolere sig fra Feds beslutninger ved at indføre begrænsninger på finanstransaktioner. Dollaren har ingen ligemand. Men det system, som det forankrer, er ved at bryde sammen.«

På samme måde skrev magasinet *Forbes'* Antoine Gara den 2. okt. om faren for en ny nedsmeltning, og indrømmer som noget usædvanligt, at det underliggende problem er den gigantiske bunke af derivater, der yderligere er knyttet til utallige nominelle gældsbobler. Gara forsøger at lade, som om alt er i skønneste orden, og fremfører, at »Glencores opløsning ikke vil udvikle sig til det næste Lehman Brothers-tilfælde«. Han siger, at det skyldes, at Glencore ikke har den samme

eksponering til derivater, som Lehman havde.

Men, indrømmer han,

*»hvis Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley eller en anden, stor investeringsbank skulle blive kastet ud i de samme vanskeligheder, som Glencore nu befinder sig i, ville der være god grund til at være bekymret for en Lehman 2. Der er over 600 billioner dollar i udestående OTC-derivater (faktisk er der nok det dobbelte, -red.), et beløb, der er større end før krisen, og mange af disse kontrakter fortsætter med at handle bilateralt mellem banker og forbinder firmaer.*

Gara slutter:

*»For sådanne som JP Morgan, Bank of Amerika, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs og Morgan Stanley er disse ting fortsat et spørgsmål om liv og død. I sidste kvartal viste hvert selskab for billioner, hvis ikke et titals billioner af udestående OTC-derivatkontrakter. Ingen mængde af rejst, tilbageholdt kapital ville beskytte disse selskaber, hvis der kom en grim, Lehman-lignende bankerot.«*

---

**Fhv. chef for det amerikanske  
Forsvarets  
Efterretningstjeneste general**

# Flynn håner Obamas udtalelse om, at Putin gik ind i Syrien af svaghed

4. oktober 2015 – Den tidligere chef for USA's Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) – som tidligere har angrebet præsident Obama hårdt for at forfølge en politik i Syrien med bevæbning af anti-Assad-oprørere, som skabte Islamisk Stat og Nusra Front – blev i sidste uge interviewet af Fox News og fortsatte her sin stærke kritik af præsidentens politik i Mellemøsten.

Fox spurgte general Flynn om præsident Obamas afskedigelse i august 2014 af ham, og om det var udløst af Flynns forklaring til Kongressen, hvor han afslørede regeringens krigsplaner imod Islamisk Stat. Flynn svarede: »Jeg mener, at de analyser, som præsident Obama har fået i de seneste år, har været temmelig korrekte. Det, min tjeneste leverede, var meget præcist ... Vi har netop set russerne gå ind i Mellemøsten på en storstilet måde, og jeg er ikke enig i det, præsidenten sagde i dag. Det er ikke af svaghed, det demonstrerede en masse dygtighed og snuhed. Det skyldes flere ting.«

Flynn tilføjede: »De andre ting, vi netop har fundet ud af, er de ikke-omtalte røde linjer, som Putin havde haft i Mellemøsten: Assads fald og den syriske hær's potentielle smuldren over for ISIS. Så vi må beslutte os til, hvad den største fare, vi her står overfor, er.

Og det er disse radikale, islamiske militanter. Det er nummer ét«, sagde han.

General Flynn satte spørgsmålstegn ved påstandene om, at russerne har dræbt syriske oprørere, de er uddannet af USA og



sagde simpelt hen til Fox: »Jeg ved det ikke ... vi må vente og se.« Forespurgt om, hvad USA burde gøre, svarede han: »Lige i øjeblikket har vi en fælles, kendt fjende, og det er de radikale islamister, der er i ISIL eller ISIS ... Vi må beslutte, at dette i øjeblikket er den større trussel, på trods af alle de problemer, der er med en fyr som Assad.«

Forespurgt om, hvad han ville respondere til ubekræftede rapporter om, at Putin havde sagt til USA, at de skulle forlade Syrien, svarede Flynn: »Jeg mener overhovedet ikke, at vi skal lytte til Putin, når det kommer dertil. Jeg mener, at vi, i vendinger, der ikke kan misforstås, skal fortælle ham, hvordan vi vil operere, hvad vi må gøre, og alt det her med flyveforbudszoner, det er vi ligesom kommet ud over. Nogle af disse ting kan stadig diskuteres, men vi har netop passeret en betydningsfuld, en stor milepæl her med eskaleringen af konflikten i Mellemøsten, og det vil blive værre, før det bliver bedre. Og jeg mener ikke, vi skal spørge hr. Putin om noget som helst.

Jeg mener, at vi bør fortælle russerne, hvad det er, vi vil gøre for at gennemføre vores mission. Og jeg mener også, at på dette tidspunkt, for russerne – jeg mener, du har ret i, at russerne vil beholde Assad ved magten – og det, vi må gøre, er at sige til det internationale samfund, 'vi vil først tage os af truslen fra de radikale islamister'. På et internationalt plan går vi måske efter Assad ved en international domstol eller sådan noget, men denne situation har netop radikalt ændret sig, og der er ingen lette svar. Faktisk kommer vi en større konflikt nærmere, og det, som det medfører, er, at det begrænser det antal operationer, vi har, det forøger vores risiko, og desværre forøger det omkostningerne ved at forsøge at løse dette problem. For, vi gjorde faktisk ingenting«, sagde Flynn.

---

# Obama dræberen forsøger at frasi­ge sig ansvaret for bombning af Læger uden Grænser-hospital

4. oktober 2015 – Sky News leverer en ødelæggende, grafisk rapport over USA's bombning af hospitalet i Kunduz, Afghanistan, under Læger uden Grænser – det eneste akutmedicinske hospital i det nordlige Afghanistan – som viser, hvordan LUG hektisk telefonerede til NATO og Washington inden for 10 minutter efter, at bombardementet var begyndt, og som fortsatte i næsten en time. Men Obama, den gale dræber i sin indonesiske stedfaders fodspor, kom med en erklæring, hvor han forsøgte at fralægge sig USA's ansvar for angrebet, indtil en »fuld undersøgelse« er gennemført. Der er nogle afghanske regeringsfolk, der lyver og siger, at hospitalet var en base for Taliban, og i en erklæring i går beskrev Pentagon den forfærdelige hændelse som »indirekte skader«, der »muligvis« kunne være en følge af bombning af Taliban i Kunduz.

Chefen for FN's Menneskerettigheder Zeid Raad Al Hussein fordømte omgående angrebet som en mulig krigsforbrydelse og sagde: »Denne begivenhed er dybt tragisk, utilgivelig og muligvis endda kriminel.« LUG ønsker en uafhængig undersøgelse, der som udgangspunkt har den præmis, at angrebet var en krigsforbrydelse.

Sky News udlagde denne rapport i dag:

»Læger uden Grænser (LUG) telefonerede hektisk til NATO og Washington, mens bomberne regnede ned over deres personale, der arbejdede i traumecentret i Kunduz.

Et personalemedlem beskrev, hvordan patienter, der ikke kunne flygte, 'brændte ihjel i deres senge'.

Der er tre børn blandt de dræbte, og 37 mennesker er blevet alvorligt såret. De 12 dræbte medlemmer af det lægefaglige personale arbejdede alle for Læger uden Grænser.

Der er stadig mange patienter og medlemmer af personalestaben, som der ikke er gjort rede for, da der på tidspunktet for angrebet befandt sig henved 200 mennesker i bygningen.

Den første bombe landede kl. 2:10 am – og ni minutter senere telefonerede personale fra LUG til NATO's kontorer i Kabul og til militære embedsmænd i Washington. På trods af dette fortsatte bombardementet frem til kl. 3:13 am.

Meinie Nicolai, præsident for LUG, har krævet total gennemskuelse og tilføjede: »Vi kan ikke acceptere, at dette forfærdelige tab af liv ganske enkelt afskrives som 'indirekte skader'.«

»Læger uden Grænser siger, at de flere gange har givet hospitalets koordinater til amerikanske og afghanske styrker – inklusive tidligere på ugen – for at undgå at blive fanget i en krydsild.

'Vores hospital i Kunduz' præcise beliggenhed er kommunikeret til alle parter ved flere lejligheder i løbet af de seneste måneder', sagde gruppen på Twitter.«

Pentagons erklæring om »indirekte skader« blev direkte modsagt af den afghanske indenrigsminister, iflg. Sky News, som hævdede, at faciliteten blev »udset som mål«, fordi Taliban skjulte sig der,

---

# **Leder, 6. oktober 2015:**

## **Til omgående behandling af kongresmedlemmer, senatorer og andre medlemmer af USA's regering**

*1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.*

*2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. ..*

*3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at nedsmelte ... vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik ... Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning...*

\_\_\_\_\_

Ansvarlige hovedpersoner blandt kongresmedlemmer og senatorer

(og sådanne findes), samt andre repræsentanter for den amerikanske regering, må omgående afholde et møde for at udstede faktiske konstateringer og hensigtserklæringer, som i store træk følger nedenstående, til omgående vedtagelse som lov og omgående ikrafttræden.

1) En akut nødtilstand eksisterer nu, der truer med at dræbe millioner af amerikanere, primært, og også borgere i andre lande.

2) Dette skyldes umiddelbart Wall Streets bankerot. Wall Street er totalt og uigenkaldeligt bankerot. Bush- og Obamaregeringernes successive bailouts – bankredninger – samt runderne med »kvantitative lempelser« har blot haft held til at gøre Wall Streets værdier værdiløse og gøre dets bankerot endegyldig.

3) Hvis Wall Street får lov til atter at nedsmelte på sine egne betingelser, hvilket nu synes at være umiddelbart forestående, vil resultatet blive historiens værste panik, som vil lukke alt, hvad der er tilbage af USA's økonomi, ned. Vi vil få massive tabstal, på samme skala som den Sorte Død, der udslettede en tredjedel af Europas befolkning. Endnu en bailout af Wall Street, som Obama vil kræve, hvis han får lov til at blive i embedet, ville udløse en hyperinflation med samme, dødbringende virkning.

4) Det følger heraf, at Wall Street må nedlukkes som en forebyggende foranstaltning gennem en handling fra den amerikanske regering, i samme ånd som det, Franklin Roosevelt ville have gjort, havde han levet i dag. (Selv om den krise, han stod overfor, var langt mildere.) Udelukkende kun aktiviteter, der er i overensstemmelse med en Glass/Steagall-standard, må få lov at fortsætte.

5) USA's regering må udstede amerikanske dollars som kredit for at bevare befolkningens liv og skaffe beskæftigelse til alle, der kan arbejde, i samme ånd, som Roosevelts og Harry

Hopkins' beslægtede handlinger.

6) Hen over et lidt længere tidforløb må statskredit anvendes til en hurtig hævelse af den amerikanske arbejdskrafts produktivitet, gennem en forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed med teknologiske og videnskabelige fremskridt.

7) Den endelige fjernelse af Barack Obama fra embedet ville udgøre et fremragende udgangspunkt for disse presserende nødvendige reformer.

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**Leder, 5. oktober 2015:**

# Putins handlinger i Syrien kan sænke Obama nu – Hastemobilisering for en omgående genindførelse af Glass- Steagall

*Udelukkende kun en hurtig mobilisering, som en del af en plan for sejr, kan ændre situationen. Glass-Steagall må omgående genindføres. En folkelig mobilisering for de eneste, farbare løsninger, på dette fremskredne tidspunkt, haster som højeste prioritet. ... At vente på, at katastrofen skal ramme, er en opskrift på total død og ødelæggelse.*

Den russiske præsident Putins flankoperationer i Syrien har ikke alene allerede leveret et dødbringende slag mod jihadisterne i ISIS og Nusra. De har på afgørende vis demonstreret, at USA's præsident Obama er en egomaniker, der er ude af stand til strategisk tænkning eller planlægning.

Obamas sindssyge er en af faktorerne i den amerikanske regerings totale disintegration. De nye medlemmer af Kongressen, både i Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet, er for det meste også af en tilsvarende, lav kvalitet således, at nationens styrelse befinder sig i en tilstand af disintegration.

Den største, umiddelbare fare som følge af denne disintegration i Washington, er, at det håbløst bankerotte Wall Street vil implodere – før de korrekte forholdsregler, med genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall(1) som den første forholdsregel, kan gennemføres. Dette er en alvorlig fare. Wall Street er allerede død. Den afgørende faktor er, at det

amerikanske folk må mobiliseres til at gennemtvinge en radikal ændring i politikken, før systemet evaporerer og fører til kaos, massiv panik og den totale disintegration af det, der er tilbage af USA's økonomi.

Det betyder nu – ikke i næste uge, ikke i næste måned, men Nu!

Hvis man ikke **genindfører Glass-Steagall** og får smidt Obama ud, før systemet ryger, bliver der total katastrofe. Det er den mest umiddelbare og alvorlige udfordring, der konfronterer os alle. Wall Street er en død institution og må nedlukkes totalt. Det er super-bankerot. En fremgangsmåde som den, Franklin D. Roosevelt anvendte, er, hvad vi omgående har brug for. Det begynder med at genindføre Glass-Steagall, der omgående vil gøre en ende på Wall Streets elendighed. Det amerikanske folk er blevet kollektivt demoraliseret af de seneste 15 års vanrøgtede lederskab og fraværet af enhver strategi for en reel, økonomisk genrejsning.

Den umiddelbare fare er, at USA's almene befolkning hænger på den yderste kant, og de kan knækkes. Obama er ansvarlig for denne katastrofe. Det amerikanske folk er i umiddelbar, overhængende fare. Hele den amerikanske økonomi befinder sig i en tilstand af fremskreden sårbarhed.

Udelukkende kun en hurtig mobilisering, som en del af en plan for sejr, kan ændre situationen. Glass-Steagall må omgående genindføres. En folkelig mobilisering for de eneste, farbare løsninger, på dette fremskredne tidspunkt, haster som højeste prioritet. Opbyg det amerikanske folks mod ved at give dem en retning for sejr. At vente på, at katastrofen skal ramme, er en opskrift på total død og ødelæggelse.

Se på, hvad det var, Putin gjorde med sin deployering i Syrien. Dette har skabt betingelserne for et dramatisk skift i Europa, anført af Tyskland, og som hastigt kan ændre den globale situation.

Obama er et produkt af sin brutale, indonesiske stedfader, der



var en regulær morder, og som forvandlede Obama til en ego-drevet, sindssyg dræber. Se blot på Obamas løgnagtige opførsel, hvor han forsøger at benægte, at USA bombede et hospital under Læger uden Grænser i det nordlige Afghanistan og dræbte et dusin mennesker fra det lægelige personale. Bombningen fortsatte en halv time *efter* hektiske opkald til USA's og NATO's kommandører om at stoppe. Hospitalet blev forvandlet til en ruinhob, og Obama unddrog sig blot ansvaret, »indtil undersøgelsen af hændelsen er fuldført«.

Stik denne grusomhed lige op i Obamas ansigt. Knæk ham nu, og tag omgående initiativ til en økonomisk genrejsning, modelleret efter Franklin Roosevelts politik. Der eksisterer ingen anden mulighed, hvis det amerikanske folk skal reddes fra undergang.

(1) Se også [LPAC's Glass-Steagall-page](#)

**Ja, jeg er parat til at hjælpe med  
kampagnen for vedtagelse af  
Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven i  
Danmark!**

**Kontakt: tlf. 35 43 00 33, eller e-  
mail: [si@schillerinstitut.dk](mailto:si@schillerinstitut.dk)**

---

# Helga Zepp-LaRouche-interview på kinesisk TV, med udgivelsen på kinesisk af EIR's rapport »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen.«

*Zepp-LaRouche: » For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; ... Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret.«*

2. oktober 2015 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, var en af tre panelister på CCTV's show »Dialogue: Ideas Matter« (Dialog: Ideer er vigtige), den 28. september. Vært for showet var Yang Rui, og deltagerne var prof. Jin Canrong fra Kinas Renmin Universitet, der var i studiet sammen med fr. LaRouche, og prof. M.D. Nalapat, formand for UNESCO Peace ved Manipal Universitetet i Indien, over video.

Showet, der varede en halv time, var helliget spørgsmål, der er blevet rejst under det nylige sammentræde af FN's Generalforsamling. Her følger fr. LaRouches interventioner:

## Spørgsmålet om udvikling

Da værten Yang Rui bad fr. LaRouche om at kommentere præsident

Xi's forpligtelse til at yde 2 mia. dollar til fattige nationer i hele verden, svarede hun:

»Jeg mener, at det bør ses i lyset af **den fremragende tale, han holdt i FN**, der var den mest optimistiske, mest opmuntrende tale af alle lederne, efter min mening, fordi han understregede den lovede udvikling for hele verden som en del af Kinas win-win-politik. Han understregede f.eks. innovation. Så disse 2 mia. dollar er blot en slags gestus for den langt bredere politik med win-win-politikken og den kinesiske model, som Kina netop nu tilbyder.«

[... Prof. Nalapat bemærkede, at Kina har bragt 500 mio. mennesker ud af absolut fattigdom i løbet af den seneste generation, samt har fremmet kvinders rettigheder.]

Værten Yang Rui spurgte fr. LaRouche, om Xis og Modis oplevelser af fattigdom tidligt i deres liv har haft, og i hvilken grad, en indflydelse på deres politik.

Zepp-LaRouche: »Meget, tror jeg. Jeg mener, at begge de to ledere virkelig er exceptionelle ud fra et standpunkt om at kere sig om deres befolkning. De har begge givet udtryk for en enorm optimisme for fremtiden. Narendra Modi har f.eks. sagt, at BRIKS-landene er den første alliance af lande, som ikke defineres ud fra deres nuværende kapaciteter, men af deres fremtidige potentiale.

Jeg mener, at de begge, med deres egne erfaringer om fattigdom, og om vanskelige tider – i Xi Jinpings tilfælde var perioden under kulturrevolutionen meget vanskelig ... «  
[afbrydes]

Efter nogen diskussion om den internationale flygtningekrise, spurgte værten Yang Rui alle de tre paneldeltagere om Millennium Udviklingsmålene, der erklærer, at fattigdom på nuværende tidspunkt efter planen angiveligt skulle have været halveret, samt om Pave Frans' holdning til den ukontrollerede grådigheds voldsomhed. Prof. Nalapat rejste spørgsmålet om

præsident Clintons ophævelse af Glass-Steagall og antydede, at dette førte til krakket i 2008 og til store uligheder i indkomster.

Yang: Er Kina et »udviklet« land eller et »udviklingsland«? Værten bemærkede, at der eksisterer et nyt niveau af aftaler mellem Kina og USA, inklusive løfter fra Washington om at støtte AIIB's indsats. Vil Kina yde store bidrag til folkeslagernes udvikling?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Det mener jeg, Kina allerede har gjort. For, i BRIKS-politikken, og i Xi Jinpings win-win-politik, har Kina bidraget til eller taget lederskabet for at skabe en totalt alternativ, økonomisk model; og det på et tidspunkt, hvor det transatlantiske finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at nedsmelte i et krak, der er større end det i 2008.

Jeg mener, at hele verden har tilsluttet sig AIIB, f.eks., fordi den er en mere attraktiv model, fordi den er målrettet mod reel investering, infrastruktur og andre aspekter af realøkonomien, mens den transatlantiske verden står umiddelbart foran en bankerot. De europæiske banker er totalt bankerot; Wall Street er mere end bankerot. Og da nu herren fra Indien nævnte Glass-Steagall – der er i øjeblikket en stor bevægelse for at genindføre Glass-Steagall, hvilket ville betyde at erklære de bankerotte Wall Street-banker bankerot. Det ville være en meget god ting.

Så det er virkelig en gave fra himlen, næsten, at Kina er begyndt at skabe dette alternative system, som en redningsbåd netop, som Titanic er ved at gå ned.

Så alt imens det er godt, at der nu er en bedre forståelse mellem USA og Kina, så løser det ikke problemet med, at USA's tilbøjelighed stadig går i retning af en unipolær verden.

Jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en periode med enorme forandringer. Europa er ved at forandres; der er stor respons på flygtningekrisen, for det har 'prikket hul på boblen' om,

at vi lever i en verden, hvor krige, der begynder i én del af verden ... « [afbrudt]

Yang: De er også forfatter til rapporten, »**Fra Silkevejen til Verdenslandbroen**« [viser den frem], en fantastisk, meget imponerende rapport.



**Se også: "Silkevejen bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk præsenteres på pressekonference i Beijing, 30. sept.**

De ser »Dialog« med fr. LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, og prof. Jin Canrong og prof. M.D. Nalapat. Vi diskuterer spørgsmål fra FN's Generalforsamling New York.

## **Spørgsmålet om kvinders rettigheder**

CCTV-værten Yang rejste spørgsmålet om angrebene på Kina for sin tilstand mht. kvinders rettigheder, og beder om alle paneldeltagernes mening. Efter at de andre havde talt, sagde fr. LaRouche:

Zepp-LaRouche: »Jeg mener, at den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan overvinde kvinders underprivilegerede stilling, er, hvis begge kønnene lever et kreativt liv; for kun, når alle mænd og kvinder opfylder deres skabende potentiale fuldt ud, kan der blive ligestilling.

Og i denne henseende mener jeg, at der i hele verden er behov for at gøre mere, uden tvivl. Men jeg mener, at Kina promoverede kvindelige taikonauter – kvindelige astronauter –

og dette er et godt tegn. Vi har i Tyskland udgivet en bog, hvis forside viser et foto af en kvindelig, kinesisk taikonaut, der kommer tilbage fra rumfartøjet – det er fuldstændig optimistisk.



Det er denne form for rollemodeller, vi har brug for. For det er ønskeligt med et image, hvor kvinder befinder sig i avantgarden af videnskab og kultur: og det mener jeg er meget godt. Det er meget bedre end i mange dele af USA ... «

## **Repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd**

Efter en drøftelse af kravet fra flere lande, inklusive Japan, Indien, Tyskland og Brasilien, om at have en permanent repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, spurgte Yang fr. LaRouche: Bør Tyskland blive permanent medlem af Sikkerhedsrådet?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Ja, det mener jeg, men spørgsmålet rækker ud over dette. For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; men også, at jeg ikke nødvendigvis er enig i, at ideen om en multi-polær verden skulle være særligt meget bedre end en unipolær verden, for det indeholder stadig ideen om geopolitik. Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret. Så jeg mener, at vi må finde en modus operandi, hvor Afrika, Latinamerika og Asien er repræsenteret på en passende måde.

Men jeg mener, at hovedspørgsmålet er, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme, i hvilket hele menneskehedens interesser, menneskeheden som den udødelige art for fremtiden, må være

det, der er vejviser for, hvad alle lande gør. Jeg mener, at tiden er inde til, at et folks legitime interesse, eller endda en gruppe af folkeslags legitime interesse, som et modsætningsforhold til en anden gruppe af folkeslag, nu må tilsidesættes, og at vi i stedet må definere, hvad menneskehedens fælles problemer er, hvilket vil sige at fjerne sult og indføre sikkerhed for energiforsyning og forsyning af råmaterialer.

Her igen mener jeg, at Kina har taget føringen med sit Måneprogram. Kinas Måne missioner viser virkelig, hvordan videnskab og teknologi kan håndtere spørgsmålene om sikkerhed for forsyning af råmaterialer og energi. For, Kina arbejder hen imod at udvinde helium-3 på Månen til brug for, at der i fremtiden endelig kan komme produktion af fusionsenergi på Jorden.

Jeg mener, at det mere er et spørgsmål om en vision for fremtiden. Det er mere et spørgsmål om at definere menneskehedens fælles mål, og dernæst bør repræsentationen reflektere denne holdning.«

[Video med CCTV's program Dialogue kan ses her.](#)

---

**LPAC      Fredags-webcast      2.**  
**OKTOBER 2015:**  
**Verden er et bedre og**

# tryggere sted uden Wall Street

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

**LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 2, 2015**

**[proofed against the audio]**

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

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

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

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

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

Nations General Assembly meeting, most significantly, the speeches on Monday by both Vladimir Putin and President Xi Jinping of China. Now that was happening on the inside of the United Nations building. On the outside, and in the entire general area of Manhattan, the LaRouche movement was making a very significant intervention which had a significant impact



on

the proceedings of the United Nations, and the discussions around

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

finding himself completely edged out, and isolated, whereas significant leadership inside the senior leadership of the United

States, including John Kerry and others, and also other members

of Obama's own Democratic Party—Congressman Tulsi Gabbard is one significant example of this—have distanced themselves, and distinguished themselves, from Obama, and have said, this is a necessary action on the part of Vladimir Putin, and one that should be supported.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

bankrupt system, because we're experiencing a general breakdown

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

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

to save it, he said.

The United States, as a nation, isn't bankrupt, but Wall Street is, and there's no solution within the current form of this financial system. The entire system must be put into receivership. He said, either way, Wall Street is finished.

Either finished on its own accord, or finished because of a decisive action that's taken by patriots within the United States

government. It's intrinsically bankrupt, according to any rational physical economic standard of measurement, and all you

have to do is look at the facts. It's happening now, and that's

not a bad thing. It's actually good, and we should make the point

that Wall Street disappearing is good for the future of the American people. It should have happened a long time ago; it just needs to be cleaned up. The garbage has to be taken out, so

that we can get our people back to productive work.

So that was a short paraphrase of what Mr. LaRouche had to say. I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium, elaborate a little bit more on the context of this, to begin our broadcast here tonight.

**JEFF STEINBERG:** Last week a number of leading figures in both Wall Street and the City of London were bracing themselves,

waiting to see whether the Federal Open Market Committee at the

Fed was going to begin the process of normalizing interest rates,

by raising them for the first time in seven or eight years by one-quarter of 1%. There was {absolute} panic and pandemonium over the prospect of that taking place, and statements were issued from the City of London, the IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde, saying that if the Fed raises rates, it may very well trigger a blowout of the entire system, and then the Fed will be holding the bag, taking the blame for a financial blowout.

Well, the simple fact of the matter is that the Wall Street system is bankrupt, and by Wall Street system, I mean the

extended system of gambling that exists on Wall Street, that dominates the City of London. You would get around the globe. You've got Frankfurt. You've got Paris. You've got Dubai in the Middle East. You've got Macao and Hong Kong in the Pacific region.

These are all centers in which there is virtually no connection any more between the activities in the real economy, and the gambling and churning of gambling money that's going on in the financial sector.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the simple first step to be taken in that direction is to reinstate Glass-Steagall. By reinstating Glass-Steagall, and making it clear, that this mountain of gambling debt will never

again be bailed out by taxpayers' funds.

The simple fact of stating that means, that the entire Wall

Street system will immediately blow out. Someone is going to panic; someone is going to make a margin call, because so much of this gambling debt, is built on borrowed money that the whole thing will evaporate. But the crucial thing is that you've got to first create a clean and total separation between commercial banking, which does impact on the real economy and this gambling debt; this mountain of gambling debt that's sitting there as a parasite on the real economy. If you make that separation by passing Glass-Steagall in the United States, this will be the basis for immediate action in other parts of the world. So in effect, by acting here in the United States, we will create the conditions for a global Glass-Steagall separation, and then all of this gambling debt can just evaporate.

Now, an illustrative case of this: Back in 1998, when you had the beginnings of a whole sequence of debt blow-outs, in Japan, you had a large number of Japanese banks that were basically bankrupt and were going to have to be put through bankruptcy reorganization. Under those conditions, those banks posed a systemic risk, not just in Japan, but globally. There were some people in the Japanese Finance Ministry who understood, and still had a memory of the difference between productive investment, legitimate commercial banking activity, and the gambling activities that had infected the whole international banking system.

And so, those banks were basically audited, and all of the derivative contracts, all of the international gambling contracts that those banks had were simply cancelled. The counterparties were contacted and given the option, of netting

out those contracts; or facing the consequences of losing those funds, those gambling debts that nobody had sufficient funds to be able to even remotely cover. So, in the case of Japan, the gambling debts were cancelled, and then the banks were put through reorganization; there was no systemic risk. At the same time, in the Summer of 1998, Alan Greenspan – who was in the final phases of the elimination of Glass-Steagall as the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and formerly a senior partner at JP Morgan when the plan was hatched in the mid-'80s to wipe out Glass-Steagall. Instead what Greenspan did was, he called in all of the counterparties of Long Term Capital Management [LTCM], a relatively small, offshore hedge fund located in the Dutch Antilles. But they had derivative contracts tied to the Russian debt, which the Russians defaulted on, the famous GKO scandal of 1998. And so, LTCM, rather than being put through an orderly reorganization by netting out those derivatives contracts; Greenspan called in all of the counterparties, and wouldn't let them leave the room until they bailed out LTCM. So, on the one hand, you had a cancellation of the derivatives; on the other hand, you had a hyperinflationary bail-out. Really just the beginning of a hyperinflationary process that went off the charts a year later, when Glass-Steagall was repealed. And then it was really off to the races; with everything invested in gambling and virtually nothing going into the real economy. So now here we are, it's October of 2015. We had a shake-out of the bubble in 2008, and now it's back once again with a vengeance, because there was no change in policy. The

Dodd-Frank bill with the Volcker Rule was a sick joke; it did nothing to change anything. So now, the too-big-to-fail banks have accrued a greater amount of gambling debt than they previously had. That debt cannot and will not ever be paid. So, by any scientific measurement, all of Wall Street is hopelessly bankrupt; and so long as you remain in the trap of the current system, nothing can be done about that. And we're headed very soon – perhaps in a matter of days or weeks or months – to a point where the entire system blows out; the entire trans-Atlantic system evaporates, literally overnight. And then you've got social chaos on a very, very broad and dangerous scale.

So, there is no money. Your money, your personal investments in mutual funds or Wall Street stocks, or anything like that; there's nothing there to protect. It can't be protected; and in fact, what's going on right now on the eve of the annual Autumn meeting of the IMF, scheduled to take place in the next few weeks in Peru, are calls all over the place for a new surge of hyperinflationary quantitative easing. You've got the European Central Bank about to extend its QE program towards the end of 2018; in other words, a massive hyperinflationary bail-out that will further erode the real economy.

So, Wall Street is dead; the funeral should have already taken place long ago. And now we're at a point where that system must be completely shut down. Cancel out all the derivatives; separate the banks under Glass-Steagall, into commercial banks and let everything fall off the edge of the cliff. Because it's

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



taken

now? Because a week from now may be too late; we don't know how

close we are to the edge. Well-informed insiders from London and

Wall Street thought that we were about to blow out a week and a

half ago, had the Fed gone through the small step of simply raising interest rates and shifting the directionality.

There's

a million and one potential small triggers out there, but the triggers are not the real issue. The real issue is that the entire system is doomed; and we've got to take the right remedial

action before the doom spreads into the real world of real people, and then it's too late.

Franklin Roosevelt had an understanding of the kinds of measures that have to be taken. On the one hand, the Glass-Steagall Act and other measures that secured depositors funds in the commercial banks; shut out the gambling debt.

But

then Franklin Roosevelt also moved on for massive credit emissions into the real economy. He did the TVA; he created a massive number of jobs through various public works programs, much of which became the kind of infrastructure-building projects, major dam projects, municipal buildings, roads; all the kinds of things that were the necessary preparations and foundations for what became the "arsenal of democracy," the enormous economic surge that occurred, when the United States was

on the verge of entering into war, against Nazi Germany and Japan. So, Roosevelt had the formula.

The situation today is far more dangerous, far more severe, than it was at the time of Roosevelt. But the principles, the American System principles, that Roosevelt understood and acted

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

is  
to simply face the reality and act preemptively on the fact  
that  
Wall Street's dead. Give it a decent funeral, but pay no  
respect  
whatsoever to this quadrillions of dollars, of strictly  
gambling  
debt that have been built up since the repeal of Glass-  
Steagall  
in particular.

What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that this process goes  
back—really the beginning of the decline in actual  
productivity  
in the U.S. economy, started with the death of Franklin  
Roosevelt. It accelerated tremendously after the assassination  
of

John Kennedy, and particularly after Nixon took the world off  
the  
Bretton Woods fixed- exchange-rate system. That was the era  
when  
people like George H.W. Bush and his underlings began to come  
in  
and greatly accelerated the process of take-down of the real  
economy.

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

**BENJAMIN DENISTON:** Thanks, Jeff. Now for the second element  
of our show today, I'm going to shift to the dramatic and  
ongoing  
change in the world strategic framework, specifically with the  
situation in and around Syria, as the major focal point for  
this  
shift.

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

that

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

like to add just a little bit of background.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

protecting and supporting the growth and the solidification of ISIS.

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

driving this refugee crisis.

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

combat the growing threat of terrorism. And both the Chinese and Russian foreign ministers have made very clear, that in this fight against terrorism—what’s happening in the Middle East—the sovereignty of the Syrian nation must be respected, obviously in direct contradiction and conflict with Obama’s calls for regime change in Syria, and the removal of the government there. Also this week, we saw more signs of support of this shift, also coming from Europe, with the Swiss foreign minister saying that the Syrian government needs to be included in a broad dialogue to settle the conflict there, and the president of the European Parliament calling for the inclusion of Russia and Iran in an international coalition to resolve the conflict in Syria. Perhaps most dramatic, as, again, Matthew referenced in the beginning, and as I’m sure all of you have seen, Russia has now initiated a series of coordinated air campaigns and strategic bombings against ISIS and other terrorist elements which have been otherwise, frankly, operating under the protection of Obama’s policies. So, in this context of a whole array of moves indicating a shift in the world situation, around this pivot in Syria, the following institutional question was posed to Mr. LaRouche: “At the special UN Security Council session on terrorism this week, China’s Foreign Minister Wang Yi called for the convening of a Geneva III conference on Syria, with no preconditions, and with participation of all interested parties. What are your thoughts on China’s proposal at the UN Security Council?”

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

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

from

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

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

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

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

So,

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

The Syrian government of Bashar Assad formally invited Russia to

participate. Russia has established an information-sharing center

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

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

So,

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

And

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

entire ISIS-controlled area inside northern Syria and Iraq.

So, in other words, you're seeing a serious military operation for the first time. And the Syrian armed forces have

been depleted dramatically by four years, four and a half years,

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

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

The reason that the White House is hysterical over this is that there is this so-called coalition. The United States is protecting Saudi Arabia, and by extension, protecting the British-Saudi Arabian dirty deals that have created this jihadist

problem in the first place. Qatar, Turkey, all supposed members

of the Obama-led coalition, are all on the other side. They're all actively supporting the spreading of the Islamic State and the Nusra Front.

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

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

the Obama White House, has been substantially suppressed.

There are other elements in the U.S. military that are prepared very much to work with the Russians. Secretary of State

John Kerry has become the point person for a different U.S. policy, a policy that he's been working out for months in

coordination with the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, and back

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

before I conclude this webcast, I just want to go back and re-emphasize what Mr. LaRouche asked us to open this broadcast with. And I want to do so by reading a short passage from what



Mr. LaRouche had to say last night on the National Activists' telephone call, the so-called Thursday night Fireside Chat. And

this is what Mr. LaRouche said about Wall Street:

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

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

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

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

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

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

an economy that will function for the United States population;

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

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

circumstances the people of the United States may be starving all

over the place. Because if the United States collapses, then the

U.S. economy will itself be in a disastrous condition. That is,

the financial system will collapse.

“And therefore, we have to get rid of the Wall Street system, and {we} have to collapse it in a controlled way. And then use that method of controlled action against Wall Street, in order to make the kind of re-organization that Franklin Roosevelt did in dealing with Wall Street in an earlier period. And that’s what has to happen.”

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

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

LaRouche movement on the streets of Manhattan is continuing, as

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

So, I’d like to thank you for joining us here tonight, and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

---

## **Amerikansk senator Warren: Glass-Steagall »Er præcist det, vi burde gøre«**

Senator Elizabeth Warren holdt den 28. september en tale i Edward M. Kennedy Instituttet i Boston, hvor hun svarede på et spørgsmål om at genindføre Glass-Steagall:

»Tilbage i 30’erne, da vi have den store depression, skete der

noget bemærkelsesværdigt i dette land... at, som et folk sagde vi, at vi ikke behøver at leve i en op- og nedturs-økonomi.«

»Og således gjorde vi tre ting. Vi gjorde det sikkert at sætte penge i banken. Det hedder FDIC [Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] forsikring... Og vi satte en betjent til at holde øje. Det er SEC [Securities and Exchange Commission] for at sikre, at de ikke solgte falske aktier og sådan noget.

»Og det tredje var, at vi adskilte... lønkonti og opsparingskonti fra Wall-Streets høj-risiko, høj-profit, høj-tabs handelsverden; og det var Glass-Steagall.

»Bankerne hadede det, fordi de ville have profitten fra storhandelen. Du kan få de høje CEO lønninger og mere afkast til aktionærerne.«

»Og Wall-Street hadede det, fordi de ville have adgang til pengene på bedstemors opsparingskonto, fordi det er billige penge, og de kræver ikke samme slags afkast.«

Warren benævnte 1930'erne til 80'erne som perioden, hvor Glass-Steagall brandmuren var solid og 1980'erne til 90'erne som den periode, hvor der blev introduceret huller i den, indtil den blev slået ned. »Hvad der skete, var, at i de største finansielle institutioner blev der en større og større koncentration af penge og magt, og det var sådan vi endte op i 2008 med banker, der var for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned, og \$700 milliarder i TARP bankredningen og bogstavelig talt billioner af dollars i bankredningspakker under bordet fra Federal Reserve.«

Mens hun hævdede, at Dodd-Frank siden da har »gjort en masse,« sagde Warren, at genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall vil gøre reguleringen af de store banker »meget lettere... Det ville nedbringe størrelsen på bankerne. Det ville gøre det finansielle system mere sikkert. Men det vil betyde, at de folk, der gerne vil handle med høj risiko, ikke kan få adgang til jeres opsparingskonti, og jeres banker vil ikke lave den slags profitter mere – hvis det er en af de store banker – som de ellers kan lave.«

»Og det er nøjagtigt, hvad vi skulle gøre. Så ja, Glass-Steagall for det 21. århundrede hele vejen. Hele vejen.«

Foto: Senator Elizabeth Warren

---

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

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

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

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

I tirsdags gjorde Kerry klart i et interview til MSNBC, at han forestiller sig, at Syrien i fremtiden skal være en samlet og sekulær stat. Kerry udtalte, idet han refererede til USA og Ruslands fælles indsats for at nå til en overgang i Syrien,

»så jo, omkring de mest grundlæggende principper, som vi kunne blive enige om, burde vi være i stand til at finde frem til noget.«

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

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

---

## **Leder, 2. oktober 2015: Gør nedlukning af Wall Street til en integreret del af alt, hvad vi gør!**

*Torsdag den 1. oktober, 2015* – Lavrov og Kerry, der holdt deres fjerde møde torsdag på sidelinjen af FN, må holde momentet ved lige gennem uophørlig kontakt, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. Der er nu en udvikling i gang, og det må tilskyndes gennem deres fortsatte dialog og arbejde.

Meningsdannere må fastholde et uophørligt fokus på amerikansk-russisk samarbejde, mens Obama må holdes ude af billedet så meget som muligt. Hold det russisk-amerikanske samarbejde i gang, og bloker Obamas muligheder for at indlede indirekte handlinger imod det. Obama gør stadig sit beskidte arbejde, selv om han nu er tvunget til at gøre det fra bag scenen; se nøje på, hvad Obama indirekte gør. Han er gået i skjul, men han fortsætter med at operere, som under forklædning. Obama er blevet slået tilbage, men han er ikke helt færdig endnu. Presset på Obama må ikke lempes et eneste øjeblik. Forøg presset på Obama.

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

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

er død og må begravnes, for stanken er overvældende.

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

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

Lyd:

---

## **Leder 30. september 2015: Obama – udmanøvreret, skubbet af scenen, kørt ud på et**

# sidespor, men ...

## Stadig i embedet

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

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

Med hensyn til Syrien, så var den ene, umiddelbare og konkrete ting, der kom ud af det 90 minutter lange møde mandag aften mellem Putin og Obama, en bekræftelse på, at det amerikanske og russiske militær ville kommunikere med hinanden med det formål at fremme »de-konfliktion« i deres militære operationer. Det er ironisk, eftersom netop denne proces blev indledt den 18. sept. i en telefonsamtale mellem den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigu og den amerikanske forsvarsminister Carter, men kort tid efter blev afvist af Obamaregeringen. Dette er typisk, og farligt. Kerry og Lavrov skal også mødes onsdag for yderligere at gå i dybden med de russiske, diplomatiske initiativer. Ifølge en amerikansk kilde, så dominerede Putin diskussionen med Obama med konkrete forslag til en reel krig, med FN-mandat, for at udslette Islamisk



Stat, og han fik for første gang fornemmelsen af, at Obama var blevet tvunget til at høre efter.

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

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

Men Obama forlod mødet uden et ord.

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

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

Midt i alle disse vigtige handlinger kommer et særligt, strategisk initiativ imod de grønne fascister. Under præsident Putins tale den 28. sept. til FN's Generalforsamling fremkom han med det tilbud, at Rusland, sammen med FN, ville ko-sponsorere en global konference om »biosfæren og tekno-sfæren« for at behandle nye, avancerede teknologier, der kan løse problemet med ressource-udtømmning og forbedre planetens miljø. Hertil kommer, at den indiske premierminister Modi har

genoptaget sit angreb på den udviklede sektors intriger, der blev lanceret i København (COP15), og advarede om, at Indien ikke vil acceptere nogen såkaldte aftaler om klimaforandring, der udelukker nationerne i udviklingssektoren fra reel, videnskabsdrevet, økonomisk vækst. Under et møde på tomandshånd med Modi fik præsident Obama efter sigende et stilfærdigt vredesanfald over Modis modstand og vil sende amerikanske regeringsembudsmand til New Delhi for at klemme Indien, forud for klimatopmødet i december i Paris (COP21).

---

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

*29. september 2015* – Det 90 minutter lange møde mellem præsidenterne Obama og Putin, der endelig blev afholdt i går (mandag), var ikke et møde på tomandshånd, men en formel affære med fem eller seks regeringsfolk fra hver nation – her iblandt udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry – der flankerede deres præsident, som sad i hver sin ende af et langt bord.

Obama sagde intet om mødet bagefter og overlod det til en unavngiven »højtplaceret regeringsperson« at give en kort rapport senere samme aften om, at mødet havde været »produktivt« og »fokuseret« og mest omhandlede Ukraine og Syrien. Den unavngivne regeringsperson rapporterede imidlertid, at den amerikansk-russiske koordinering vedr.

operationer i Syrien, som Obamas Hvide Hus tidligere havde skudt ned, vil blive etableret. Som nationale, statslige radiokanaler opsummerede regeringspersonens rapport, så »aftalte de to præsidenter, at deres militær skulle bevare kommunikation med henblik på 'de-konfliktion'« af operationer i Syrien.

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

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

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

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

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

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