

Fattigdom og sult i Obamas Wall Street-regerede USA

26. oktober 2015 – American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) (Det amerikanske akademi for børnesygdomme) har tilføjet to spørgsmål til deres patienters familier i akademiets retningslinjer til sine læger:

»Inden for det seneste år, har De været bekymret for, om Deres mad ville slippe op, før De får penge til at købe mere?«

»Inden for det seneste år, slap den mad, De købte, op, og havde De ikke penge til at købe mere?«

Denne anbefaling til sine læger skrev AAP efter udgivelsen af rapporten fra Rådet for Lokalsamfundets Børnelægers Fødevarekomite, med titlen »Fremme af Sikkerhed for Fødevareforsyning for Alle Børn«. Baseret på komiteens undersøgelse af data fra 2007-2014 konkluderede rapporten, at »16 millioner børn (21 %) lever i husstande, hvor der ikke er permanent adgang til tilstrækkelig mad«, og opsummerede de indlysende konsekvenser af denne mangel på mad:

»Efter at tage multiple risikofaktorer i betragtning har børn, der lever i husstande, hvor madforsyningen er usikker, selv på laveste niveau, større sandsynlighed for at blive syge, være længere tid om at komme sig efter sygdom, og være hyppigere indlagt på hospital. Mangel på tilstrækkelige og passende fødeemner kan nedsætte et barns evne til at koncentrere sig og klare sig godt i skolen og er forbundet med højere niveauer af adfærdsmæssige og følelsesmæssige problemer fra børnehaveklassetrinet og frem til ungdomsklassetrinet. Fødevareusikkerhed kan ramme børn i et hvilket som helst lokalsamfund, ikke kun i traditionelt underforsynede lokalsamfund ... «

Efter syv år med Barack Obama som præsident, efter otte år med

George W. Bush, er enhver statistik, man vælger for at undersøge amerikanernes levevilkår, rædselsvækkende.

San Francisco Chronicle rapporterede f.eks., at en fjerdedel, 25 %, af amerikanske mænd lever i eller nær fattigdom. Det er 26,5 millioner mænd. Men blandt unge amerikanske mænd i aldersgruppen 18-34, der drives ud i denne tilstand, stiger andelen imidlertid til en tredjedel. Som forfatteren Andrew Yarrow skrev, »i en økonomi, hvor lønninger er stagneret eller faldet, og middelhusstandsindkomsten ikke er højere i dag, end den var for 25 år siden, er det vigtigt at huske, at fattigdoms- og nær-fattigdomsindkomster går på tværs af alle race-, køns- og aldersskel.«

Lawrence Davidson, historieprofessor ved West Chester Universitetet i West Chester, Pennsylvania, skrev den 11. oktober, at 6,8 % af det amerikanske folk, henved 22 mio. mænd, kvinder og børn, forsøger at overleve på en indkomstkategori, der identificeres som »dyb fattigdom«, en tilstand, der måles som 50 % eller mindre af fattigdomsgrænsen. »På dette niveau hersker der håbløshed, og menneskers daglige mål er blot at holde sig i live ... Dette er et temmelig chokerende tal i et land, der af de fleste regnes for at være det rigeste land på Jorden«, skrev han.

Den nyligt udkomne bog, '2 dollars om dagen: At leve af næsten ingenting i Amerika', tager sagen op om de næsten 1,5 mio. amerikanske husstande, der næsten ikke har nogen pengeindkomst overhovedet. Dette tal er stigende og er næsten fordoblet siden 1996, da loven om velfærds-»reformen« blev vedtaget.

Senator i Den amerikanske Kongres Mike Gravel fordømmer Obamas dronekrige

20. oktober 2015 – Senator til Den amerikanske Kongres, Mike Gravel fra delstaten Alaska (1969-1981), har fordømt Obamaregeringens politik med at dræbe civile og tilfældige tilskuere gennem »Dronekrige, der er planlagt under møder, der har en meget præcis og omhyggeligt detaljeret kommandostruktur«, som involverer CIA-chef John Brennan og andre, men som sluttelig falder tilbage på præsident Obama personligt.



I juni 1971 var senator Gravel den eneste, der var modig nok til at oplæse »Pentagon-papirerne«, Daniel Ellsbergs afsløring af de løgne, som man fortalte den amerikanske offentlighed for at skjule Vietnamkrigens fiasko, i Kongressen, hvorved papirerne indgik i Kongressens protokol. På det tidspunkt, hvor senator Gravel afslørede løgnene om Vietnamkrigen, var både **New York Times** og **Washington Post** gennem en retskendelse blevet forbudt at offentliggøre dokumenterne, og Ellsberg var blevet truet med retsforfølgelse og fængsling. I dag eksisterer der intet retsligt forbud mod offentliggørelse af »Drone-papirerne«, men de store aviser har nægtet at dække historien.

Følgende pressemeddelelse blev overgivet til LaRouchePAC af senator til USA's Kongres Mike Gravel (1969-1981):

Websiden *The Intercepts* »[The Drone Papers](#)« giver detaljerede oplysninger om, hvordan det amerikanske, militære mordprogram

fungerer i Afghanistan, Yemen og Somalia, i morderiske detaljer. »Dronepapirerne«, der er afsløret af endnu en 'Edward Snowden', vinder nu opmærksomhed internt i USA, på trods af de store mediers mørklægning, med dækning, der fremkommer i *Mother Jones*, *WIRED* magazine, *Small Wars Journal* og *Lawfare*, samt med britisk dækning i *The Guardian* og med dækning i irske aviser.

Dækningen i *Mother Jones* havde overskriften »A Massive National Security Leak Just Blew the Lid off Obamas Drone War« (Et massivt sikkerhedslæk har netop blæst låget af Obamas Dronekrige). Den citerer *The Intercepts* unavngivne whistleblower, »Denne oprørende eksplosion af overvågningslister – af at overvåge personer og inddele dem på hylder og i bunker på lister, at tildele dem numre, tildele dem 'baseball cards' ('røde kort'?), tildele dem dødsdomme uden varsel, på en verdensomspændende slagmark – dette var, fra allerførste færd, forkert.«

Historien bemærker, at Amnesty International har krævet en omgående Kongresundersøgelse af hele droneprogrammet med det argument, at de netop lakkede papirer »rejser alvorlige bekymringer om, hvorvidt USA systematisk har krænket International Lov, inklusive gennem at klassificere ikke-identificerede personer som 'soldater' for at retfærdiggøre deres drab«. Der eksisterer nu officielle, amerikanske, militære dokumenter, siger artiklen, der i detaljer beskriver omfanget af massedrabsprogrammet (mellem januar 2012 og februar 2013 blev f.eks. 200 mennesker dræbt under droneangreb i det nordøstlige Afghanistan, alt imens der kun var opført 35 navne på drabslisten). *Mother Jones*-historien satte også fokus på den kendsgerning, at, i nogle tilfælde, har præsident Obama underskrevet drabsordre, der ikke engang identificerede specifikke mål, men som bemyndigede droneangreb baseret på iagttagede adfærdsmønstre hos grupper af personer.

The Guardian satte fokus på den kendsgerning, at præsident Obama har løjet med sine påstande om, at hans droneprogram

kræver »nær-vished« for, at der ikke vil forekomme civile ofre. Ifølge Bureau of Investigative Journalism er næsten 1.000 civile blevet dræbt under 421 droneangreb i Pakistan siden 2004, herunder skønsmæssigt 200 børn. Og dog opregner droneprogrammets lister alle uidentificerede civile, der er dræbt i kamp, som terrorister for at mørklægge den kendsgerning, at, i mange områder, hvor droneprogrammet opererer, er 90 % af de dræbte personer ikke de godkendte mål.

Under mit første møde med Barack Obama, under den første debat mellem demokratiske kandidater til præsidentnomineringen i 2008 i South Carolina i 2007, satte jeg spørgsmålstegn ved Obamas helligelse til anvendelsen af dødbringende magt for at eliminere terrorister, efter at Barack Obama havde erklæret, at »Der er ingen modsætning mellem, at vi anvender vores militær, og i visse tilfælde i dødbringende form, for at eliminere terrorister, og opbygning af alliancer i hele verden ... ', hvormed han refererede til Iran og den mulige støtte til Israel, hvis landet blev truet. Obama var noget forlegen over at have skabt denne forbindelse. Idet han passerede forbi mig efter debattens afslutning, talte han vredt til mig, 'Hvem er du, Gravel, at du stiller spørgsmålstegn ved min moralitet i brugen af atommissiler i et Førsteangreb?' Så satte jeg virkelig spørgsmålstegn ved hans moralitet. I dag peger jeg på Obamas åbenlyse immoralitet i anvendelsen af Droneangreb mod uskyldige tilskuere til angreb med dronemissiler.

Leder, 27. oktober 2015:

Ruslands og Kinas verdenslederskab er afgørende nu, hvor Det britiske Imperium står for fald

En nyligt deklassificeret rapport fra 1990, der blev udfærdiget af Præsidentens Efterretnings-Råd (eng.: PFIAB) viste, at truslen om en atomkrig i 1983, ud fra et sovjetisk perspektiv, var blevet drastisk undervurderet af den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste, hvilket skabte en meget reel fare for atomkrig på daværende tidspunkt. Lyndon LaRouche henviste til denne rapport som værende en afgørende markør for det amerikanske lederskabs forfald efter dette tidspunkt, baseret på LaRouches eget kendskab til den situation, som rapporten omhandler – selv om der ikke blev henvist til disse kendsgerninger i selve PFIAB-rapporten.

Kendsgerningen er, at daværende præsident Ronald Reagan den 23. marts 1983 havde vedtaget det forslag, som LaRouche havde udarbejdet, om et fælles udviklingsprojekt mellem USA og Sovjetunionen om at bygge et rumbaseret, anti-missilsystem, baseret på nye, videnskabelige principper (partikelstråle- og laserstrålesystemer), som ville have gjort en ende på den ekstreme fare, der hidrørte fra politikken med »Gensidigt Garanteret Ødelæggelse« (Mutually Assured Destruction, MAD), en politik, der er baseret på at fastholde verden opdelt i Øst og Vest, og hvor begge sider retter massive arsenaler af atomvåben, der kan udløses ved mindste varsel, mod hinanden.

Mordforsøget på Ronald Reagan, der blev udført af en bekendt af Bush-familien kort tid efter Reagans indsættelse, havde nær afsluttet dette historiske samarbejde mellem Reagan og

LaRouche, men Reagan overlevede og annoncerede programmet under navnet Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) (Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ). Men britiske interesser i både USSR og USA saboterede indsatsen – en proces, der reflekteres i PFIAB's indrømmelse af efterretningsfiaskoen fra 1983 vedr. truslen om atomkrig.

Siden denne sabotage af SDI og Reagans erstatning med den forræderiske Bush-familie i tre embedsperioder og Obama i to perioder, har der i USA været et udtalt forfald ned i økonomisk og strategisk vanvid, der har muliggjort Wall Streets og City of Londons bankinteressers dominans over regeringen, og som har lanceret den ene krig efter den anden i kolonialistisk stil over hele planeten og drevet den vestlige verden ud i kaos, som det nu reflekteres i flygtningekatastrofen i Sydvestasien og Europa.

SE »den fulde historie om SDI«

Med skabelsen af BRIKS og dettes nye finansinstitutioner, der er helliget international infrastrukturudvikling, samt præsident Putins fremragende flankoperation i Syrien, er verden nu i en position, hvor Det britiske Imperium langt om længe kan blive stedt til hvile. Obama, og Hillary Clinton (der underkastede sig Obamas ondskab), er blevet afsløret som støtter af terrorisme med det formål at opnå »regimeskift« over for nationer, der nægter at underkaste sig, og som beskyttere af de morderiske finansfyrster på Wall Street ved at afvise den nødvendige genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der skal underkaste Wall Street en konkursbehandling.

De interventioner, som talsfolk fra LaRouchePAC i løbet af de seneste uger på Manhattan og andre steder i hele USA har gennemført, har fået repræsentanter fra Imperiet til at søge dækning med den voksende bevidsthed om sandheden af deres forbrydelser, der er blevet offentligt udtalt og har ødelagt deres evne til at hjernevaske og tvinge godtroende amerikanere. Tiden er inde til at lukke Wall Street ned,

fjerne Obama og til, at solen endeligt må gå ned over Det britiske Imperium.

Se: En kort gennemgang af historien om LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ, fra LPAC (Jeff Steinberg)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r0pVhtVdS7A>

Putin i Valdai-klubben om krig og fred

22. oktober 2015 – Emnet for dette års konference i Valdai Debatklubben i Sotji, Rusland, hvis hovedtale blev holdt af Putin, er »Samfund mellem krig og fred: At overvinde konfliktens logik i morgendagens verden«.

På podiet sammen med Putin var Reagans ambassadør til Moskva, Jack Matlock, fhv. tjekkisk præsident Vaclav Klaus og formand for det iranske Majlis, Ali Larijani. De talte hver især til forsamlingen, men deres bemærkninger er endnu ikke tilgængelige.

Deres tilstedeværelse forbinder Valdai-begivenheden med mødet i Wien i dag mellem udenrigsministrene fra USA, Rusland,

Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien. EIR's kilder siger, at Kerry og Lavrov havde været tilbøjelige til at invitere Iran til mødet, men besluttede ikke at gøre det, indtil visse interne uenigheder med Iran er løst. De drøftede også at invitere Jordan og Egypten, der er ledende sunni-magter – som også Tyrkiet er det – men som støtter den russiske mission imod terrorisme i Syrien. Egyptens støtte til missionen har været åben og udtrykkelig lige fra første færd. Jordans støtte er stiltiende, men velkendt.

Putins åbningstale er kun delvist blevet offentliggjort på engelsk. I de indledende afsnit advarede han imod »konceptet om det såkaldte afvæbnende førsteangreb« og sagde, at der sikkert var nogen, der led under

»den illusion, at den ene parts sejr i en global konflikt igen var mulig – uden uafvendelige, uacceptable, som eksperterne siger det, konsekvenser for vinderen, hvis der da er én ... Tærsklen for anvendelse af magt er blevet mærkbart lavere.«

Senere spurgte han,

»Hvorfor er det, at indsatsen fra lad os sige vore amerikanske partnere og deres allierede i deres kamp mod Islamisk Stat ikke har produceret nogen mærkbare resultater? Dette er tydeligvis ikke et spørgsmål om mangel på militærudstyr eller potentiale. USA har tydeligvis et enormt potentiale, det største, militære potentiale i verden, men at snyde er aldrig let. Man erklærer krig mod terrorister og prøver samtidigt at bruge nogle af dem til at arrangere brikkerne på det mellemøstlige bræt i sin egen interesse, som man har lyst til.«

COP21: Udviklingslande og Kina siger til klimakonference: »Det er ligesom apartheid«

20. oktober 2015 – Nozipho Joyce Mxakato-Diseko, Sydafrikas delegerede til et møde i Tyskland for at forberede det endelige udkast til COP21-Folkemordskonferencen i Paris i december, sagde til konferencen: »Det er ligesom apartheid. Vi befinder os i en position, hvor vi essentielt set er holdt udenfor«, og sagde, at de fattiges synspunkter var blevet ignoreret, rapporterer de sydafrikanske aviser *Mail* og *Guardian*. Mxakato-Diseko talte på vegne af det tidligere G77 og Kina, der nu refereres til som »hovedgruppen af 130 udviklingsnationer og Kina« (Reuters), og som Sydafrika i øjeblikket er formand for.

Reuters tilføjer, at »den sidste uges forhandlinger om udkastets ordlyd, der begyndte i Tyskland i mandags, fik en stormfuld begyndelse med udviklingsnationer, der sagde, at deres krav var blevet udeladt fra det nedskalerede 20-siders udkast«. Det drejer sig om krav, der omfatter bestemmelser, som man tidligere har indgået aftale om, om finansiel støtte til omkostningerne for programmet til fattige nationer, økonomier og også om at fastholde de udviklede nationers ansvarlighed – bestemmelser, der i praksis kunne sabotere gennemførelsen af enhver aftale.

Lederen af USA's delegation Trigg Talley sagde, at den næste tekst kunne fungere som grundlag for forhandlinger, rapporterer Reuters. »Dette dokument indeholder mange ting, som de fleste parter ikke er enige i«, sagde han. Rige nationer ønsker at sikre, at fremvoksende økonomier vil forpligte sig til handling.

Ifølge Reuters: »Udviklingsnationerne vandt et krav i mandags om, at de kunne genindsætte nationale krav i teksten, hvilken skabte frygt hos nogle for, at den igen kunne blive uhåndterlig. Den forrige version kom op på 80 sider.« Med andre ord, så ønsker folkemordstilhængerne ikke, at de farvede skal svare igen.

FN's generalsekretær Ban Ki-moon var på folkemordssiden: »Der er ingen tid at spille«, sagde han til en nyhedskonference i Slovakiet. »Det har været ganske frustrerende at se forhandlere kun forhandle ud fra deres meget snævre nationale perspektiver. Dette er ikke et nationalt spørgsmål, men et globalt spørgsmål.«

Tyskland kan skabe historie: Afgørelsen om krig og fred. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

25. oktober 2015 – I den nuværende, historiske fase, i hvilken så godt som alle antagelser om samfundet, der regnes for at være sikre, bliver forældede, og hvor alle fornemmer, at det handler om de helt store spørgsmål om krig og fred, om at være eller ikke være og om en nedstyrtning i kaos eller en ny, klassisk renæssance, hører Tyskland til de få aktører på verdenspolitikens store scene, der kan være med til at afgøre, hvilken af de to alternativer, der bliver virkelighed. Således tænker foreløbig kun ganske få mennesker i Tyskland, hvad der imidlertid ikke forklejner sandhedsindholdet i denne erklæring. Naturligvis er Kinas verdenshistoriske rolle mere selvfølgelig; med Xi Jinpings »win-win«-perspektiv om den

globale opbygning af Den nye Silkevej har det sat en fuldstændig ny model for udenrigspolitiske relationer på dagsordenen, der, for første gang i historien, viser en måde, hvorpå den katastrofale geopolitik, som allerede har ført til to verdenskrige i det 20. århundrede, kan overvindes gennem gensidigt samarbejde til gensidig fordel. Og ligeså selvfølgelig er Ruslands rolle, der, med sit strategiske partnerskab med Kina og ligeledes med sin militære flanke i Syrien, har skabt en ny magtkonstellation i verden, der tydeliggør, hvor hult Obamaregeringens unipolære krav i mellemtiden er blevet. Præsident Putin har netop, i sin tale ved årets møde i Valdai-klubben, med temaet »krig og fred« understreget den fare, der eksisterer, hvis USA forsøger at bruge det amerikanske antiballistiske missilforsvarssystem i Østeuropa til et førsteangreb, der angiveligt skulle sætte en modstanders våben ud af spillet med moderne, nukleare højpræcisionsvåben, for således at kunne ændre den strategiske balance til egen fordel og påtvinge hele verden sin vilje, alt imens en sådan handling kun kan føre til en garanteret, gensidig udslettelse. Efter den succesrige atomaftale med Iran kan påskuddet om en angivelig trussel, der skulle komme fra iranske raketter, ikke mere opretholdes, alt imens denne trussel i virkeligheden aldrig har eksisteret. Til hvilket formål opretholdes da missilforsvarssystemet fortsat?

Putin, hvis egne militæroperationer i Syrien imod ISIS og andre diverse oprørere skrider succesrigt fremad, påpegede samtidigt årsagen til den til sammenligning fejlslagne, amerikanske militæroperation i regionen. Det skyldes netop en uopløselig modsigelse mellem på den ene side at ville skride ind over for terrorister, og så samtidigt bevæbne dem for, ved hjælp af disse, at styrte legitime regeringer. Man bør under ingen omstændigheder gå glip af den kosteligt ironiske behandling af samme tema om den forvirrende amerikanske politik over for terrorismen i Mellemøsten, i den seneste udgave af satireprogrammet »Die Anstalt« med henvisning til den rørstrømske udsendelse »Herzblatt«

(<http://www.zdf.de/ZDFmediathek#/beitrag/video/2583744/Herzblatt>).

Og naturligvis påhviler det selve den amerikanske befolkning – den måske vigtigste aktør på den nævnte verdensscene – at sætte en stopper for og straffe de permanente overtrædelser af den internationale folkeret, der desværre er blevet reglen gennem fortsættelsen af den neokonservative politik fra Bush/Cheney-tiden og frem til den nuværende Obamaregering. Det handler om krigene i Sydvestasien, der byggede på løgne, og frem til droneangreb imod formentlige terrorister, uden nogen som helst korrekt retsproces, eller de berømte »kollaterale skader«, der, iflg. afsløringer fra den seneste whistleblower på websiden *The Intercept*, for op til 90 %'s vedkommende har ramt uskyldige civilister.

Den undersøgelse i den amerikanske kongres, som flere organisationer kræver som en bydende nødvendighed, kunne meget hurtigt føre til, at præsident Obama stilles for en rigsret; Obama, der iflg. de offentliggjorte dokumenter hver tirsdag personligt sammensatte dødslisten. Det stormløb af flygtninge mod Europa, og frem for alt til Tyskland, er resultatet af disse krige og droneangrebene, der snarere har fremmet end inddæmnet ISIS' fremmarch.

Historien har imidlertid på en særlig måde, netop på grund af flygtningekrisen, spillet den afgørende bold hen til Tyskland. Beredvilligheden til at hjælpe i betragtning af de mange fortvivlede menneskers nødsituation er fortsat stor hos et stort flertal af befolkningen. Men allersenest siden guillotinen, der demonstrativt blev medbragt til en demonstration, de, iflg. Forbundskriminalpolitiets oplysninger, omkring 500 overfald på flygtningehjem i år og mordforsøget på overborgmesterkandidaten fra Köln, Henriette Reker, er det også tydeligt, at grænselinjen mellem de »bekymrede borgere« og den rene ekstremisme, der ikke står tilbage for selv voldshandlinger, er overskredet. Det truer med at gøre det til sandhed, som Putin for mange måneder siden

advarede om, da han profeterede, at Vestens støtte til nazistiske organisationer i Ukraine ville føre til en udbredelse af sådanne organisationer i mange europæiske stater. Den ulykkelige situation for flygtninge i Slovenien, i hvilken mennesker i disse dage uden tøj, der passer til klimaet, gennes sammen som storforbrydere af fuldstændigt overdrevne sikkerhedsstyrker, uden at dette i mindste måde ville føre til, at trængslen stilnede af, er blot den øjeblikkelige registrering af en tragedie, der – hvis der ikke findes en løsning på et andet plan – inden for kort tid vil føre til en eskalering af situationen i hele Europa, for enden af hvilken kunne findes kaos og borgerkrig.

Der er en løsning på denne krise, men den kræver, at en hel række af fejlagtige aksiomatiske antagelser i de forgangne årtier i Vestens politik, og i Tysklands politik i særdeleshed, må korrigeres.

Den første, selvfølgelige konsekvens må være den omgående afslutning af krige under falske påskud. Tyskland har gjort sig til medskyldig i ikke alene den totale udspionering af egne borgere i samarbejde mellem BND og NSA, i den bevidste handling at stille militærbasen Ramstein til rådighed for droneangreb i Sydvestasien og en stiltiende og delvist eksplicitte støtte til Washingtons og Londons unipolære politik. Kun Tysklands ikke-deltagelse i krigene imod Irak under regeringen Schröder og imod Libyen under Merkel/Westerwelle har i det mindste reddet en lille del af landets ære.

Tyskland har på samme måde gjort sig til medskyldig, idet det i årtier har bidraget til IMF's og Verdensbankens betingelsespolitik over for udviklingslandene, som har forhindret enhver form for virkelig udvikling til fordel for et gældsregime, der udelukkende kom det Britiske Imperiums finanssektors profitinteresser til gode, og for hvilket begrebet »globalisering« blot er et andet udtryk. Når millioner af flygtninge i dag ikke alene flygter fra krige på

basis af løgne, men også fra fattigdom og sygdom – de såkaldte »økonomiske flygtninge« (»bekvemmelighedsflygtninge«) fra Balkan, fra Sydeuropa og fra Afrika – så er dette konsekvensen af denne politik.

Så længe Tyskland holder fast ved den samme monetarisme, der også er rettet mod Europa, med Schäubles »Sorte Nul«, dvs., at, for at tilgodese det hjernesvind, der hedder et balancerende husholdningsbudget, må der skæres ned på daginstitutioner for børn, gymnastiksale, uddannelsesprogrammer, pensioner osv., for at forsørge flygtningene, og som går hånd i hånd med den brutale »nøjsomhedspolitik« over for Grækenland og hele Sydeuropa, så længe vil de sociale spændinger i Tyskland og i hele Europa vokse, til de eksploderer.

Og der findes en yderligere, dårlig, populær vane, som Tyskland må skille sig af med, hvis vi ønsker at finde en løsning på denne krise: Vi må smide den grønne ideologi over bord. Den forestilling, at vi kan spise de såkaldte udviklingslande af med »vedvarende, passende« udvikling – altså slutteligt slet ingen udvikling – og samtidigt kan bygge nye »Limes«-mure op omkring »Bastionen Europa«, må opgives. Vi må have reelle udviklings- og opbygningsprogrammer for Afrika, Sydvestasien og den sydlige hemisfære, som overvinder fattigdommen og underudviklingen. De gennem videnskab og kunst opdagede, universelt gyldige principper kaldes universelle, fordi de også gælder i udviklingslandene.

Om menneskeheden kan mestre de nuværende udfordringer vil afhænge af, om vi virkeliggør et nyt paradigme, som i kulturenes og civilisationernes mangfoldighed aktualiserer de højeste udformninger af det, som menneskehedens universalhistorie hidtil har frembragt. Og kun, hvis det lykkes os at bringe en dialog i stand mellem repræsentanterne for disse forskellige kulturers højeste perioder, vil vi i rette tid kunne imødegå den indskrænkede bogholdermentalitet og tåbernes enfoldighed med den storslåede idé om

folkeforståelse og en forenet menneskehed.

Hvis Tyskland ville sige, at vi forlanger, at disse krige ophører, at en reel udviklingspolitik i fællesskab med BRIKS-staterne om opbygning af Verdenslandbroen kommer på dagsordenen, vi integrerer på kort sigt flygtningene, men vi udvikler deres hjemlande gennem opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej, vi husker vor egen klassiske højkultur og indleder en dialog mellem kulturer med de andre kulturers storhedstid – så kan vi tyskere skabe historie.

Jeg er optimistisk, hvad det angår.

RADIO SCHILLER den 26. oktober 2015: Ønskes: et nyt lederskab for USA

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

Leder, 19. oktober 2015: USA: Obama kan og skal afsættes i denne uge

LPAC Fredags-webcast, 16. oktober 2015: De lækede 'Dronepapirer': Brug chancen til at katalysere et presserende nødvendigt oprør, hvis vi skal redde USA. v/Jeffrey Steinberg

LPAC Fredags-webcast 23. oktober 2015

[Link til the Drone Papers\(på engelsk\)](#)

Leder: USA: En revolution finder sted i dette land

22. oktober 2015 – En revolution finder sted i dette land. Det kan læses ud af de markante ændringer under de successive ugentlige lørdagsdialoger på Manhattan med Lyndon LaRouche, der i realiteten er spydhovedet for det hele, og som LaRouche indledte for kun et år siden, da han begyndte Manhattan-processen. Mødet sidste lørdag 17. oktober fremviste en hidtil uset intellektuel dynamik hos stort set alle talerne på Manhattan-mødet. De første, indledende rapporter fra onsdagens Aktionsdag i Washington D.C. viser, at vælgere og aktivister fra hele Østkysten tilslutter sig LaRouchePAC-delegationer til Kongressen i stadig større antal, og at vælgere, der bliver hjemme, udøver større pres end nogen sinde – pr. telefon – for at kræve Obamas fjernelse fra embedet og for at kræve, at den amerikanske regering lukker Wall Street ned.

Hvad vigtigere er: de fleste af de aktivister, der kom til Washington, deltog aktivt i uddannelsen af deres kongresmedlemmer – OG gjorde det effektivt.

En faktor, der har givet denne revolution et vigtigt skub fremad, har været den svindelagtige, såkaldte demokratiske »debat« den 13. okt., sammen med LaRouches omgående fordømmelse af samme – hvilket faktisk gik forud for selve debatten. Som LaRouche, i en erklæring den 20. okt., bemærkede, så blev han nærmest helt på en nat, da han omgående fordømte denne såkaldte debat som en stinkende farce og en svindel. Hele denne proces – den såkaldte debat og LaRouches omgående og dødeligt præcise svar – udløste en form for selvrealisation blandt mange amerikanere, der pludselig forstod, at det stadigt dalende niveau af intellekt og moralitet, der

demonstreres af den »praktiske« manden-på-gaden og hans nyheds- og underholdningsmedier, ikke førte nogen vegne hen, undtagen til døden. Og at den radikalt modsatte standard, der længe er blevet forfægtet af LaRouche, i virkeligheden er deres eneste redning – hvilket det også er.

Under forløbet af Hillary Clintons høring i dag for Husets Benghazi-komite var flere af spørgsmålene en nøjagtig gentagelse af det, LaRouche har sagt. Hun blev afsløret i, at hun udmærket forstod og skrev, at angrebet på den diplomatiske mission i Benghazi var en terrormission af al-Qaeda, alt imens hun samtidig fastholdt den løgn, at missionen var udtryk for en protest mod en video. »Jeg tror, De kendte sandheden«, sagde kongresmedlem Jordan fra Ohio.

Hun blev konfronteret med den kendsgerning, at en amerikansk embedsmand mødtes med en lokal al-Qaeda-leder (fra Ansar el-Sharia, der angiveligt skulle yde sikkerhed til den amerikanske mission) kort tid før angrebet.

Det nærmeste, nogen kom til at konfrontere Hillary direkte med den kendsgerning, at hun gik med på Obamas ordre om at lyve, som det dokumenteres af Ed Klein i bogen *Blood Feud* og bekræftes og uddybes af LaRouche, var et kvindeligt kongresmedlem, der spurgte Hillary, om hun havde talt med Obama aftenen for angrebet. Hillary bekræftede, at det havde hun, men nægtede at besvare det følgende spørgsmål: »Hvad sagde han til Dem?«

Dette bekræfter, hvad LaRouche har sagt – dette ville fremme den revolution, der er i gang i USA.

I mellemtiden, som LaRouche også har sagt, så arbejder de medlemmer af Barack Obamas regering, der i realiteten er de ledende regeringsmedlemmer, uden om ham og ignorerer ham faktisk, for at forhindre den krig, som Obama har forsøgt at lancere. Udenrigsminister Kerry skal mødes fredag med den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov, samt den tyrkiske og

saudiske udenrigsminister. I dag talte præsident Putin til Valdai Debatgruppen i Sotji, Rusland, hvor han sad på podiet sammen med fhv. amerikansk ambassadør til Moskva, Jack Matlock, formanden for det iranske Majlis, Ali Larijani, samt fhv. tjekkisk præsident Vaclav Klaus. Der er grund til at forbinde disse to udviklinger.

Obama kan fjernes nu, og han må fjernes.

I sin erklæring fra 20. okt. sagde LaRouche:

»Den enkle sandhed er, at en ærlig vurdering af det katastrofale kollaps af reel produktivitet i den amerikanske økonomi er, at et stort og stadigt voksende flertal af vore medborgere står over for at miste deres arbejde, sult, sammenbrud af den almene sundhedssektor, ødelæggelsen af uddannelsessystemet og en generel opløsning af basal infrastruktur.«

Nylige statistikker, som det rapporteres af Administrationen for Social Sikkerhed (i USA, folkepensioner, invalidepensioner m.m., -red.), viser, at, alt imens det statslige fattigdomsniveau for en familie på fem ligger på 28.410 dollars om året, så har næsten 40 % af alle amerikanske arbejdere ikke engang en indtægt på 20.000 dollars om året. Der er 7,9 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der er »officielt arbejdsløse«, og yderligere 94,7 mio., der anses for ikke at være en del af arbejdsstyrken, som vi har rapporteret – kombiner de to tal, og man får et tal på 102,6 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der ikke har noget arbejde. »Som nation er vi ruinerede, og de fleste af os lever fra løncheck til løncheck«, skrev en bidragyder til Zero Hedge-websiden. Det skønnes at koste 50.000 dollars om året at forsørge en middelklassefamilie på fire, og dog har 71 % af alle arbejdere mindre end det, hvilket gør det umuligt for en familie at overleve med kun en forsørger.

LaRouche kræver en nedlukning af Wall Street under Glass-

Steagall og udstedelse af

»statskredit til genoplivelse af den produktive økonomi gennem anlægsinvesteringer i infrastruktur og andre vitale programmer«.

Samtidig refererede Putin i dag, i sin Valdai-tale – i en passende sammenhæng med Obamas krigspolitik, som han fordømte – til flygtningekrisen i Europa og sagde:

»Desværre hører vi ordene krig og konflikt stadig hyppigere, når vi taler om relationer mellem folk fra forskellige kulturer, religioner og etnicitet. I dag forsøger hundrede tusinder af migranter at integrere sig i et andet samfund, uden en profession og uden noget som helst kendskab til sprog, tradition og kultur i de lande, de flytter til.«

Det eneste svar kommer fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som hun udtrykker det i sin artikel fra 20. september, **»Flygtningekrisen kan kun løses gennem et fundamentalt skift i den økonomiske politik«.**

Hun indleder med de inciterende ord:

»I disse, verdenspolitikens stormfulde dage, ser vi to, grundlæggende forskellige typer af politiske og finanspolitiske beslutningstagere: de, der ud fra et optimistisk menneskesyn fremlægger en klar vision for menneskehedens fremtid, og de, hvis kræmmersjæl slet ikke lader nogen plads tilbage til noget som helst menneskesyn, men kun med tilbagevirkende kraft søger at opretholde deres magt og gæld fra fortiden, selv om disse for længst er ophørt med at være erholdelige. I de dramatiske ændringer, der vil finde sted i de kommende uger, vil vi kun kunne løse de problemer, vi står overfor, hvis det lykkes at vinde de europæiske nationer og USA for det nye paradigme, som BRIKS-nationernes økonomiske politik og Kinas »win-win«-politik med den Nye Silkevej repræsenterer.«

LPAC Fredags-webcast 23. oktober 2015: Benghazi-høring med Hillary Clinton. Implikationerne af 'Dronepapirerne'. v/ Jeffrey Steinberg m.fl.

Jeffrey Steinberg og Matthew Ogden gennemgår intrigerne bag torsdagens Benghazi-høring med Hillary Clinton og den fortsatte uenighed og implikationerne af offentliggørelsen af Intercepts »Dronepapirer«. ... American Civil Liberty Union har krævet officielle Kongresundersøgelser, især af de utallige civile, der er blevet dræbt som en del af dette program – dette målrettede dræberprogram – der alle er klassificeret under fjendtlig kæmperstatus til trods for det faktum, at der ikke engang er nogen, der kender identiteten af det store flertal af disse mennesker, der blev dræbt.

Jeffrey Steinberg and Matthew Ogden reviewed the machinations behind Thursday's Benghazi hearing with Hillary Clinton and the continued fall out and implications of the publication of the Intercept's "The Drone Papers."

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's October 23, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to welcome you to our weekly broadcast here of the LaRouche PAC Friday night webcast. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg

from *Executive Intelligence Review*, and we're here to deliver the message that Mr. LaRouche had to deliver when we met with him earlier this morning; only a matter of hours ago. Now, last week, for those of you who watched this broadcast, we discussed in depth the content of the so-called "Drone Papers," which were published by Glenn Greenwald's publication, *The Intercept*, along with Jeremy Scahill last week. And based on documents that were leaked or were provided to *The Intercept* by a whistleblower, a second Edward Snowden, from within the drone program itself. The content of those papers is horrifying, to say the least; but the implications of the release of the Drone Papers are continuing to resonate. And the effect is continuing to grow; especially as pertains to Barack Obama, who has presided over this policy during the extent of his entire Presidency. The ACLU has called for official Congressional investigations, especially into the innumerable number of civilians that have been killed as a part of this program – this targeted killing program – who are all classified under enemy combatant status, despite the fact nobody even knows the identities of the vast majority of these people who were killed. And there's also a press release that has been published and released by former Senator Mike Gravel and also former Democratic Presidential candidate from the 2008 Presidential primaries. This press release was published on the LaRouche PAC website, as well as *Executive Intelligence Review*, and is available. And again, Senator Gravel takes this directly to the point; that this is the murderous policy of the current President, President Barack Obama.

Now, this is what the subject of our institutional question is for this week; and we're going to begin by reading the text of that question, and then I'm going to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response, plus a little bit more additional background. So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, some officials within the Obama administration believe that the drone program is key to fighting the war against global terrorism. Others believe that the program is a clear

violation of the US Constitution, and of international law. Please give us your assessment of the legal issues involved in the drone issue.”

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. As Matt said, we had a very extensive discussion with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier today; and I’ll get into some of the more legal issues that are on the table here, but I first want to just read you some things that are not quite verbatim quotes, but very clearly reflect the major thrust of Mr. LaRouche’s response to this question.

First, he said, were it not for the recent actions of Russian President Vladimir Putin, humanity as a whole may already have been lost. And this is clearly reflected in the British and Obama policies that came very close to triggering global conflagration, whether over the Ukraine situation or Syria. On the specific issues of the drone policy, what Mr. LaRouche said is if Obama is allowed to run loose, even on a reduced basis, it poses a grave danger to mankind. He gets by with murder; he’s a satanic figure, and he’s already been allowed to complete two terms in office. And furthermore, he is still killing people. The United States, under first Bush and now Obama, has become an unsafe nation with no competent leadership. Obama must be kicked out of office quickly, and Wall Street has to be shut down. If Wall Street is shut down, we can save the USA; but so long as Wall Street maintains its grip over the US economy, we’re doomed.

And Mr. LaRouche made direct reference to the personal aspects of President Obama, which he’s been identifying and actively discussing since the very early months of the Obama Presidency; precisely since April 11, 2009, when he delivered an international webcast and warned that the President had the personality of Emperor Nero. Someone, who had a severe narcissist disorder, and that this would pose a grave danger to the country and the world, if it went unchecked. Now, I think we briefly discussed last week, the fact that we know

that one of the defining influences on President Obama during his early formative years when he was a preteen, was his stepfather in Indonesia; who himself was a real killer. He was brought back from graduate studies in Hawaii to participate in the Suharto coup and the mass bloodletting that followed. And there was household brutality, both directed against Obama's mother and against young Barack Obama personally. These things have deep and enduring, scarring impact; and so much of the personality of the stepfather rubbed off on Obama. And we're seeing the consequences of that in this drone policy.

I call all of your attention to the fact that in 2012, two reporters – I believe from *Time* magazine – published a book-length account of the 2012 Presidential elections. The book was published in 2013. And what they recounted was a conversation that President Obama had with some senior White House aides; it was after one particular incident in his long line of drone killings, where Anwar al-Awlaki – a US citizen – was killed in Yemen in a drone strike. Now, one could debate al-Awlaki's role as a figure within al-Qaeda, and there are many things that could be said, but are not relevant to the topic here. The point is that an American citizen, by order of President Obama, was murdered in cold blood by a drone attack signed off on by the President; but as an American citizen, al-Awlaki was deprived of any due process. Now, mass murderers are subject to due process, to fair trials; but in this case, because he was on Obama's kill list, despite the fact that he was an American citizen, he was murdered. Several weeks later, his 16-year old son was murdered, along with yet another American citizen, in drone attacks in Yemen. And, while the administration claimed that the murder of the son was not intended, but was a consequence of targeting others, it remains the fact that at least three now – I'm sure many more – American citizens have been murdered overseas by President Obama.

So, in this incident that's recounted in the book by these

two *Time* magazine reporters, Obama is quoted telling one of his close aides – boasting in fact – that it “Turns out I’m really a quite good, effective, killer. I never thought that I was going to emerge as a great killer, but here I am.” In the ensuing two years since the book was published, to my knowledge there have been no attempts by the White House to deny the accuracy of those quotes. They’ve attempted to explain it away, and complain instead about the fact that there are too many leaks coming out of the inner circle, but nobody has outright said that that was not Obama’s statement, those were not his words. So, you’re dealing with somebody, who clearly has the pathology of a killer.

Now, a week and a half ago, the German Bundestag, soon after the release of the “Drone Papers,” held hearings in which they brought two American former drone pilots to testify, and those hearings were serious and substantial. And, yet, here we are, two weeks after the release of the “Drone Papers,” and there’s not been a public hearing; there has not been a word to speak of, from any members of Congress. We know that there’s pressure from ourselves, from groups like the ACLU, for some kind of congressional hearings, but the fact of the matter is, that the dis-functionality of the two political parties, and the dis-functionality of Congress as the result of that, has meant that President Obama has literally been able to get away with murder, and continues to do so, right up to this moment.

So, the fact of the matter is, that the drone program, as we’ve now been given a very in-depth window into it, through the House Intelligence Committee’s review of the Executive Branch procedures – of the various Obama guidelines on how to manage the drone program – we know that none of these things have actually worked; that this is a reckless, “Murder, Inc.” operation, that violates a 1975 ban, signed by President Gerald Ford, against assassination. And the fact that these assassinations are simply referred to as “targeted killings,” does nothing to mitigate the fact that President Obama has

been guilty of mass-murder. And there's an entire structure of government that is complicit in that process. And the guilt spreads beyond the U.S. borders, and becomes clearly another clear bit of evidence that President Obama has been, from the very outset and remains to this moment, a British agent. Mr. LaRouche pointed to the specific role of Valerie Jarrett as one of the key British agents within the Obama inner circle. But let's look a bit further at the testimony that was delivered before the German Bundestag. What one of the two drone pilots testified, was that there's an entire international network that has all been involved in working up the targeting information, and feeding in key data to facilitate the mass-murder operations that are carried out under this drone program. In particular, there is a working intelligence-sharing alliance, known as "Five Eyes." These are the national intelligence services, the technical intelligence services, of the United States – in this case, the National Security Agency – the services of Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. In other words, four countries: Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, which are not just simply members of the British Commonwealth, but are countries where Queen Elizabeth II *is the Sovereign*; where in each case, those countries are run by a privy council that is appointed by, and reports directly back to the British Monarchy, in this case Queen Elizabeth.

So, you have the United States and the British Monarchy participating as a single, seamless entity, in gathering the targeting data that has been used in this mass drone killing program which began right at the very outset of the Obama Presidency.

And, again, what we heard in the Bundestag testimony, and we're yet to see a moment of congressional hearings on this, up to this moment, is that those five agencies, with other assistance – the German Federal Intelligence Service (BND) was involved in this program as well. They've developed the

technique to use the GPS functions on cell phones to track down the exact locations of where a particular cell phone is, at any given moment, and in fact, the drone kill program targets *cell phones*, which have been “associated” with people on the kill list. But the ability to verify that the person holding that cell phone, at the moment, that the drone strike takes place, is the actual target, is something that doesn’t function. There’s very little evidence that there has been much consideration about whether or not they’re even going after the right targets.

So, in effect, we’re dealing with an even more out-of-control drone program, where all of the guidelines that were established by President Obama and the administration, at the very beginning, for how to conduct the drone warfare, fully implemented, it would not make any difference, from the standpoint that these are war crimes, and crimes against humanity, and represent instances of mass murder. The fact of the matter is, that even those limited guidelines – for example, if an individual can be captured and interrogated, rather than killed, that’s preferable – well, throw that out the window right away. There’s never been any effort, once you’re on the kill list, you are a target, and, within a 60-day period, if feasible, you will be gone after, and you will be dead, or perhaps someone else at that moment carrying your cell phone, will be dead.

So, the program is absolutely unconstitutional, is a clear violation of the UN Charter, and is not only illegal and should be the basis for President Obama’s immediate removal from office, but let’s go one step further. There should be no presidential immunity from criminal prosecution, whether in U.S. Federal Court, or in The Hague, for these heinous crimes. Now, the bankruptcy of the U.S. governing institutions, the failure of Congress to instantly take up this issue, the failure of the federal courts to act against this drone program in a decisive way, has meant that the prospect of

justice under this situation right now in the United States, is gravely impeded.

So, what do we find out? In Germany, Somali family members and Yemeni family members of individuals killed in the drone warfare have filed lawsuits against both the German and American governments. There's no attempt to get at justice in the U.S. court system, because of how badly the whole structure's been corrupted since George W. Bush, and even more so under Obama. So, the situation is that families seeking justice are going to the federal courts in Germany, in Cologne, and are filing against the German and U.S. governments. The German government is clearly complicit in this. The Ramstein Air Force base is one of the major hubs of the U.S. drone operations, and it's being done with the complicity and cooperation of the German government.

How far does it go? When we looked at the Bush administration's illegal renditions and torture program, it took a long time to get to the bottom of it, and find out how many countries were complicit and were cooperating in this crime against humanity and war crime. So we're dealing here with a matter of a bankruptcy and a failure of institutions to live up to their Constitutional responsibilities. And that's where you, the American people, have an enormous amount of responsibility. The evidence against President Obama and the chain of command that he sits on top of in this drone mass-murder program is cut and dry. It's been known for a long time, but now with the release of this hundred-plus page House Intelligence Committee review of the program, which contains previously-unpublicized details, the book of evidence is there. This President should be immediately removed from office. The crimes that are evidenced in this documentation alone go vastly beyond the crimes of Richard Nixon, that resulted in his forced resignation. Nixon was facing impeachment, was facing the activation of the 25th Amendment at the time that he wisely decided to resign. We're in a

situation, that is far more advanced and far more grave now, than we faced under Nixon back in the early 1970s. So it's up to you to make sure that our institutions of government begin to function, and if we can achieve *that*, then this President will be removed from office, and the dangers associated with his continuing on the job, including the danger of thermonuclear war, will at last be removed.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Let me just follow up what we've begun to discuss here. As I'm sure most of you are aware of, the hearing of the Benghazi Select Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives took place yesterday, at which Hillary Clinton was called as a witness. This has certainly been a central focus of attention for a number of months now, leading up into this hearing. However, after literally hours upon hours of questioning of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, hardly any of the Congressmen, in *either* party, managed to get at the true issues. There were significant questions that were raised, certainly. However, even those who *did* raise those questions, for the most part failed to pursue their lines of questioning to the necessary and actually relevant conclusions.

First of all, why does Hillary Clinton continue to insist on covering up for Obama's role in directly ordering her, on the night of the Benghazi attacks, to lie about the events that occurred that night – even though it's been proven multiple times that she knew exactly what was really going on, that there was clearly, this was clearly a pre-meditated attack against a U.S. Government compound on the anniversary of September 11th, carried out by jihadist militants, as opposed to the made-up story that was then echoed several days later by Susan Rice, of a spontaneous demonstration in response to a video denigrating the Prophet Mohammed. Why does Hillary continue to cover up for the fact that Obama directly ordered her to lie?

And secondly and maybe even more significantly in a broad

sense, where did the policy that led to the events that night in Benghazi even come from? As former Chairman of the House Permanent – or the House Select Committee on Intelligence, Congressman Peter Hoekstra, identifies correctly, in a book which he just released earlier this month, titled *Architects of Disaster – The Destruction of Libya*, the entire thing ultimately is Obama's fault, in the continuing takeover of Libya, Iraq, and now parts of Syria, by these terrorist groups – ISIS and related – including those who attacked the compound that night in Benghazi, September 11, 2012, this is all a direct consequence of the decision that was made by Obama to invade Libya, to overthrow a sitting sovereign government, and to kill former President Muammar Qaddafi in cold blood. And, as Congressman Hoekstra makes the point, Qaddafi was *our ally* in the war on radical jihadist terrorism – very reminiscent of the policy now being carried out by Obama against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, today, exactly the same scenario. Makes you wonder where Obama's true allegiances lie.

Now, as I said, the majority of the members of Congress who had the opportunity to question Hillary Clinton during the Benghazi hearing yesterday completely failed to address these two crucial points. But, virtually simultaneously with the hearing taking place on Capitol Hill yesterday, in Russia, in Sochi, Russian President Vladimir Putin was addressing a gathering of the Valdai international discussion club in Sochi, and he *did* address precisely these issues, in very direct terms, denouncing Obama's policy in Libya and in Syria, of supporting and arming the very terrorists that we're supposed to be fighting against in the interest of using them to overthrow yet another sitting president, the government of Assad. And in addition, President Putin addressed the even broader question of the generally imperialistic outlook now being typified by Barack Obama, which is leading mankind right now to the very real danger of total self-destruction through global nuclear war.

What Putin started his speech by focusing on, was the question of the history of the fundamental notions of war and peace themselves. He said it's a proper subject for a Russian president to address, since Leo Tolstoy wrote a book called *War and Peace*. But he said that for centuries, the concept of peace had been based on the notion of the balance of power, for better or for worse. But *now*, in a world of nuclear arms, and thermonuclear arms, he said, the traditional ideas of peace from this standpoint can no longer function. We need a new concept, a new paradigm, a post-war, at least, vision. He said any major war today would not bring victory to either party, but would only end in the guarantee of mutual total destruction. The only thing that's protected humanity from this terrible fate, he said, over the last 70 years, are the principles of international law that were established under the framework of the United Nations following the Second World War, as well as the general sobriety and self-control of those leaders who have found themselves operating on a global stage, such as during the Cuban Missile Crisis with President John F. Kennedy. However, he said, now we've reached a point where some powers are pursuing a model of unilateral domination of the planet, and the danger that a military situation may get out of control, and just such a mutually-destructive nuclear war be unleashed, has now become all too real. And the emergence of the doctrine of what he called the disarming first strike – be it nuclear or even non-nuclear – has further skewed this postwar balance of power and the system of international law, which has protected mankind since the end of World War II, and has further increased the possibility of the outbreak of a devastating global conflict. And he said, there are those who possess the illusion that there exists the possibility of victory in such a world conflict, without the irreversible, unacceptable consequences that would follow such a nuclear war. So for this reason, he said, you've seen a general weakening of the underlying psychological aversion to the idea of war itself, which has gripped previous generations; and the very perception of war

has been changed, turned into an almost media entertainment. As if, he said, nobody actually dies in a conflict; as if people do not suffer and cities and entire states are not destroyed. But this is the reality of war.

It's very significant, as I think Mr. LaRouche has pointed out previously, for President Putin, whose family died and suffered in the siege of Leningrad, the realities of what war means are much more real than what are generally held by those such as the American generation of an Obama or some sort. But I just want to read one quote from what President Putin had to say, just to bring this to the point of what necessarily needs to be addressed when we look at the background of what has brought us to this point. This is a quote; he said, "Why is it that the efforts of say our American partners and their allies in their struggle against the so-called 'Islamic State', has not produced any tangible results? Obviously, it's not for lack of military equipment or capability. It goes without saying that the United States has a huge potential; the biggest military potential in the world. However, it is impossible to play a double game; to declare war on terrorists, and simultaneously try to use some of those same terrorists to arrange the pieces on the chessboard in the Middle East according to what you perceive as your own interests. It is impossible," he said, "to combat terrorism in general, if some terrorists are used as a battering ram to overthrow the regimes, that are not to one's liking. You cannot get rid of those terrorists. It is only an illusion that you can come in and get rid of them later; clean up the mess. To take the power away from them, or reach some sort of negotiated agreement with them. And the situation in Libya," he said, "is the best example of this."

So, as I said, this really goes directly to the point here. If you're serious about fighting to eliminate the danger of global terrorism, then perhaps you should stop arming and supporting the very same terrorists who you claim to be

fighting against in the interest of using them to overthrow sovereign governments that are not to your liking. And to me this seems to be a somewhat more reasonable approach than running a drone program that ends up just killing a majority of innocent civilians; or perhaps releasing the 28 pages, documenting the role of the Saudis in supporting the 9/11 hijackers would be a good place to start as well.

But while Putin has made it clear that Obama's policies in Libya were not exactly what they expected when they supported the UN resolution, this disastrous consequence that has taken place as a result of that invasion and that regime-change operation, is definitely not a mistake that Putin is going to let happen again in the case of Syria. And thus, we see the crucial and decisive actions that have been taken in the recent weeks in what's being characterized by some as President Putin's third Chechen war; because of the extent of the overlap and the interconnection between those whom Putin successfully fought against in Chechnya in 1999, and those who he is now fighting in Syria today, among the Islamic State and otherwise.

So, Jeff, I know that Mr. LaRouche has put significant emphasis on the importance of this historical view of the current situation during our discussion with him earlier today. And this is the type of background which he – Mr. LaRouche – has a very unique view of, due to his experience and his personal role that he played as a central figure that he played throughout much of this history. So, while many people have a tendency, including in the US Congress itself, to exhibit a very short-sighted and shallow insight into these types of questions – including even the questions concerning the current Benghazi investigation – maybe you could give a little bit of a deeper background and insight into what the true questions are that are at hand; along the lines of what President Putin was indicating in his speech.

STEINBERG: You've got to start from the standpoint of

understanding the British factor, the British problem, and how that has impacted on the sweep of recent history. And it requires getting away from the idea that history is a string of successive events; these are processes, these are dynamics, and there are certain cardinal events that fundamentally alter the direction of history. And these are the things that people really have to grapple with to be able to really sort out and made sense of the deep, profound crisis that we're going through right now. I think you've got to start from the fact – and this was a major subject of our discussion with Lyn and Helga LaRouche earlier today. You've got to start with at least a modicum of a sweep of recent history.

The fact is, that the last time that we had a viable and effective Presidency was with Ronald Reagan. And there were many caveats that have to be identified in terms of the Reagan Presidency. There was intention on the part of Reagan and on the part of an inner circle of close advisors and collaborators going into the 1980 Presidency – the elections and then Reagan's inauguration in January 1981 – to fundamentally change the direction of US policy. We had been through a turbulent period of the 1970s; the watergating of Nixon, the end of Vietnam, the emergence of a Trilateral Commission government that brought us to the brink of nuclear war in the 1970s. The policy of that government and of the Council on Foreign Relations to being a process of controlled disintegration of the U.S. and world economy.

All of these had already taken place; and this was the backdrop to the beginning of a critical collaboration between Mr. LaRouche and President Reagan. There was a convergence of thinking and commitment to restore the American tradition; and to do it by presenting Presidential leadership. And it was in that context that on a number of leading issues, the leading one in particular being the LaRouche-Reagan collaboration on what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative [sdi]. That was a shaping directionality for a sweeping change

in the US Presidency and particularly in the major US global relations. There was a very real prospect with the LaRouche-Reagan-Edward Teller and other collaboration around the idea of a joint Strategic Defense Initiative between the United States and the Soviet Union, with allied countries from both blocs involved, to bring an end to the threat of thermonuclear war. Reagan doggedly pursued that, even in spite of the fact that within his first 100 days in office, there was a serious assassination attempt against him. And of course, many of you may recall that that assassin, John Hinckley, came from a family that was intimately associated with the Bush family. So, right from the outset, within that first 100 days, Ronald Reagan was gravely wounded; he survived and, in fact, did continue in the Presidency. And the high water mark of that was the SDI policy. Reagan had also intended to make a dramatic break with Wall Street that was symbolized by the fact that he and some of his Kitchen Cabinet advisors were in depth involved in discussion with Mr. LaRouche over firing Paul Volcker and fundamentally changing the whole nature of the Federal Reserve System. And this became an issue that was a matter of outright warfare between Wall Street and London on the one side, and the Reagan inner circle on the other. The Reagan assassination attempt greatly weakened the Reagan Presidency and paved the way for George HW Bush to emerge as more and more of a dominant figure in the Reagan Presidency. They were never able to dissuade Reagan from pursuing the Strategic Defense Initiative that he had worked out with LaRouche; but nevertheless, Reagan was weakened, and many things that were promised at the outset of the Reagan Presidency were never able to materialize because of British interference. And that included the fact that British agent Yuri Andropov came into power in the Soviet Union and put the kibosh on the SDI collaboration. The entire effort against Wall Street and against the policies of the Fed, were basically shut down at the point that Reagan was shot, and had to go through a prolonged period of recuperation. So, you had a real Presidency with Reagan, despite the Bush factor, and

despite the consequences of the assassination attempt. And there was a period of four years or so where on a number of policy issues, there was a Reagan-LaRouche cooperation; many of the details of which are frankly yet to come out in public.

We had the Bush 41 Presidency that was a disaster. LaRouche was railroaded into Federal prison; and for all practical purposes was expected to die in Federal prison. And that would have very likely happened had Bush been elected to a second term in office. What happened, however, was that Bush was defeated for re-election; and Bill Clinton came in. And there was a level of collaboration once again with the Presidency; there was potential with the Clinton Presidency to revive some of the core ideas that had been running through the Reagan Presidency, and reflected back earlier on the successful Presidencies of John Kennedy and before that, obviously, Franklin Roosevelt. But, Clinton ran up against a buzz saw. The British launched literally warfare against the Clinton Presidency; they manipulated the First Lady to be a factor that further disrupted. You had the factor of Al Gore as Vice President; which was as bad a choice as George Herbert Walker Bush was for Ronald Reagan. So, in effect, the Clinton Presidency never lived fully up to its potential; and towards its concluding year, at the point that Clinton was about to make a significant move against the preponderant system of London offshore global finance, he was gone after. He was set up; his Presidency was destroyed. He went through House impeachment, and at the end of the day, Clinton made the gravest mistake of his political career, by signing the bill that repealed Glass-Steagall.

Now, what's happened since that point, with the George W Bush Presidency for eight years, and then now with the Obama Presidency already for seven years, is that the British have been in the driver's seat in the White House throughout that 15-year period. And so, what President Putin identified correctly in his Valdai speech, needs to be fleshed out much

further. It's got to be understood that there has been effectively a British-Wall Street takeover of the Executive branch of the US government. It's come to be completely dominant over the Republican Party and over the Obama wing of the Democratic Party.

So, if you step back and realize that the entire history of the United States has been a struggle against the British Empire, then you get an idea from a much deeper historical appreciation of how this process, how this dynamic has played out and brought us to the point that we've reached right now. Now, there are other examples that come up throughout history; even the history of the shaping events that established the American republic, its character, and the war against the British. At the very beginning of the 18th Century, you had a giant of a figure; one of the key figures who revived the entire Renaissance tradition in Europe, namely Gottfried von Leibniz. Leibniz was a key player in European political affairs. His interests extended to an extensive understanding and appreciation of China and of the commonalities between Confucianism and Western Christianity. He was moving to establish control over Britain to dismantle the empire system that was beginning to come into existence at that time. And it was with the death of Leibniz – and there were people waiting breathlessly to confirm that indeed he was dead. But with his confirmed death about 20 years into the 18th Century, that's when the British Empire took off. Leibniz had been instrumental as an adviser in the British court, to establishing some of the key players who shaped and framed the United States; some of the leading governors who were sent over as Royal Governors from England during the period of Leibniz's influence in London. You had Spotswood in Virginia; you had Hunter in New York. These were leading international republican figures, who were part of the Leibniz networks. Franklin was a student of Leibniz's writings, and traveled to Europe in the 1750s to obtain access to some otherwise difficult to obtain writings of Leibniz. But Leibniz's death

was one of those cardinal moments in history that framed events that moved forward from there; just as there was a concerted move coming from the worst elements of the European oligarchy to crush the influence of the Golden Renaissance.

So, these kinds of critical historical events, which are really reflective of long-term processes, are the big challenge to be understood. If you're going to shape history and define a viable future for mankind, then it's very helpful to know from an historical standpoint, who are your friends and who are your enemies. In January of 1981, in fact on the day of Ronald Reagan's inauguration, *Executive Intelligence Review*, Mr. LaRouche's flagship publication, issued a warning forecasting that there would be an attempt to assassinate President Reagan within his first 100 days in office. This was not based on some kind of footprints of would-be assassins; but it was based on an understanding that the Reagan election represented a potential break from British control over the US Presidency that had been a dominant factor since the assassination of John F Kennedy.

We knew that at critical moments, the British have assassinated American Presidents in order to prevent break-out of the United States as a proper republican leader of the world. You had it take place early on, not with a President, but with a giant of the American Constitutional republic, Alexander Hamilton; who was assassinated by an undisputed British agent, Aaron Burr. You had the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, which doesn't even need any further elaboration; it was a British assassination carried out by Confederate networks, but operating out of British intelligence centers, including Montreal, Canada. You had the assassination of President McKinley, who was reviving the Lincoln-Hamilton tradition at a critical moment; and was pushing back against British imperial operations. His assassination brought Teddy Roosevelt, the favorite nephew of one of the heads of the Confederate Secret Service –

headquartered in London – into the Presidency. You had the assassination of Kennedy; a British assassination, for again, reasons that are too obvious to have to deal with in any detailed explanation here.

So, it was on the basis of that knowledge and understanding of the sweep of the US fight against the British Empire forces in the world, that drove us to issue a warning that there would be an attempt to assassinate President Reagan because of what he represented as a best hope for a return of the United States to its historic mission and its historic tradition and policy. We were, unfortunately, correct. It was about the 90th day of the Reagan Presidency that John Hinckley carried out the assassination attempt; and while Reagan survived it, it weakened the potentiality of the Reagan Presidency.

So, you've got to look at those kinds of historical processes and dynamics, and think through how these events play out. If you want to understand Benghazi, you can't start on September 11th of 2012; you've got to go back to the fact that a British policy that was coordinated with rotten elements in France – the same elements that were directly involved in the attempts to assassinate President Charles de Gaulle a decade or two earlier – those elements, along with Obama. British directly, Anglo-French forces and Obama, decided to bring down Qaddafi and to unleash absolute Hell throughout North Africa and into the Middle East. Where were the weapons that fueled the Islamic State and the Nusra and other insurgencies in Syria coming from? They were coming from Benghazi; they were coming from the Libya that became an absolute Hell on Earth. An absolutely ungovernable area, because the British – with their French and Obama underlings – got rid of Qaddafi to unleash this process. To unleash a state of permanent warfare across the entire North African and Middle East and really the entire Islamic world.

So, if you don't understand that British factor, it's very difficult to understand why we are in the crisis that we're

in. If you understand that dynamic, and you understand that Obama – like Bush before him – was effectively a British agent; then you understand why it is an imperative that Obama is removed from office, and that the other major center of British influence in the United States – namely Wall Street, which is completely, irreversibly, unrepentantly bankrupt, has to be shut down. And that this is an urgent matter of life and death for the survival of our nation and for the world as a whole.

Putin understands the broad dynamics; he's got to even further understand the real nature of the enemy. The enemy resides principally in London; and it's the London controls and strings that are pulled in Washington, that are the major problem here in the United States. As LaRouche said in our discussion earlier, get rid of Wall Street; remove Obama from office. And that eliminates much of the British influence, the destructive influence, over the United States. Then we've got a shot at rebuilding the world and forging the kinds of alliances that are waiting for us: the BRICS alliance; the collaboration with Russia on bringing an end to this bloodshed and horror show throughout the Middle East and North Africa. The opportunities are all there, but step one is Obama must be removed. And now the book of evidence is there; it's irrefutable, and Congress has to act. And secondly, Wall Street has to be shut down, cold; no compensation. Wall Street goes down; we put back Glass-Steagall, and learn the playbook of Franklin Roosevelt on how to rebuild an economy. If we can do those things, we're in fine shape; the world is in fine shape. But if those actions aren't taken right now, then we're all in grave danger.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. And what I want to do to conclude tonight's broadcast with, is to read something which I think sums up in very cogent terms what Jeff just concluded with. And this is the Presidential policy statement from Lyndon LaRouche that was issued on this website earlier this

week. And what Mr. LaRouche says in this, which he issued following the Democratic debate, what he calls "A Brief Statement on the Nature of Our Current National Crisis; and the Proper Framework for Approaching This Vital Presidential Election" is the following; and I'm just going to read it verbatim, from the beginning of where he makes the points about what actions must be taken. He says:

"First, the defining issue for today is the fact that Wall Street is hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt, and there can be no serious improvement in the conditions of life for the vast majority of Americans until Wall Street is shut down altogether. The first and most immediate remedy for the bankruptcy of Wall Street is the reinstating of Glass-Steagall.

"The simple truth is that an honest appraisal of the disastrous collapse of real productivity in the US economy is that a large and growing majority of our fellow citizens are facing job loss, starvation, collapse of genuine health care services, the destruction of the educational system and an overall disintegration of basic infrastructure. This has accelerated under the Barack Obama Presidency, but it began before that, particularly during the George W. Bush terms in office.

"Any attempt to dodge this fundamental truth during the now ongoing presidential campaigns, by appealing to 'issues' or populist slogans, dooms the United States to total destruction in the very short term period ahead.

"Wall Street must be shut down totally. The entire Wall Street system is bankrupt. It must be ended. Then, we must do what Franklin Roosevelt did to overcome the Great Depression. Today, we face an even greater challenge, due, in part, to the decades of collapse of the productive powers of labor in this nation. Shut down Wall Street now, reinstate Glass-Steagall as a means of reconstituting viable commercial banking, and then

begin a program of Federal credit to revive the productive economy, through capital investment in infrastructure and other vital programs. We must begin to reverse the collapse of our industrial economy, and we must train a new generation of young people to develop the skills to function in a modern, technology-intensive growing economy.

“This is what the 2016 presidential candidates must address. Any attempt to divert from this essential agenda is tantamount to surrendering to Wall Street and those who would see the United States disintegrate altogether.

“A segment of the American people, horrified by the clown show of last week, is demanding nothing less. Any candidate who fails to meet this standard does not belong in the race. This is not a popularity contest or a test of who can best pander to the worst pragmatic impulses of a beaten-down and terrified public. This is an election that will determine whether or not the United States still has the moral fitness to survive.

“I hear the American people crying out for a future minus the scourge of Wall Street. They deserve nothing less.”

And with that, I would like to thank everybody for watching our broadcast here tonight, and bring a conclusion to this webcast. Thank you very much. Thank you, Jeff, for joining me in the studio. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Xi Jinping i Storbritannien

19. oktober 2015 – Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping ankom til Det forenede Kongerige i dag, hvor han skal bo på

Buckingham Palace og indlede sin mødekalender tirsdag, den 20. oktober med de kongelige, premierministeren, oppositionslederen Jeremy Corbyn, en tale i Parlamentet og et besøg til byen Manchester for at drøfte Kinas deltagelse i indsatsen for at opbygge Englands industrielle nord.

Reuters bemærker, at, alt imens briterne forventer at underskrive aftaler om kernekraft, højhastighedstog og andre større projekter under besøget og taler om en »gylden æra« for relationer mellem U.K. og Kina, så vil der være nogle anti-kinesiske demonstrationer fra Amnesty International, uighurer og andre NGO'er.

I et nedskrevet interview med Reuters (forberedt af hans stab, men godkendt af præsident Xi), understregede Xi økonomisk samarbejde og bemærkede, at, »alt imens den globale vækst er langsommere, så vokser investerings- og forretningssamarbejdet mellem Kina og U.K. fortsat«.

Xi sagde: »U.K. har erklæret, at det vil være det vestlige land, der er mest åben over for Kina. Dette er et visionært og strategisk valg, der fuldt ud imødekommer Storbritanniens egne, langsigtede interesser.« Om U.K.'s ambition om at blive Kinas finansielle nav sagde Xi: »Som et af de globale finanscentre er London en vigtig pumpestation i den verdensøkonomiske livline, så at sige. Et styrket, finansielt samarbejde med London er afgjort et win-win-valg for begge lande.«

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at der er britiske topinteresser, der står med et virkeligt problem og som ønsker at ændre det overfladiske udseende mht. det, de foretager sig, men ikke substansen i deres politik.

Xi kom med stærke indvendinger imod klagerne over den kinesiske stats rolle i forretningslivet: »Selv under markedsbetingelser støtter lande deres selskabers vækst på forskellige måder, og sådanne forholdsregler bør ikke have

etiketten statslig støtte. Kinas system er anderledes end de vestlige landes. Af historiske grunde udfører kinesiske selskaber mange sociale funktioner, der er vanskelige at måle ud fra en simpel regneformel.«

Han angreb også den virkelige årsag til den megen ståhej over den langsommere vækst i Kina (en »afmatning« ned til en vækstrate i det seneste kvartal på kun 6,9 %!): »Som en økonomi, der er tæt knyttet til internationale markeder, kan Kina ikke forblive immun over for den globale økonomis glansløse præstation. Vi er bekymrede over den kinesiske økonomi, og vi arbejder hårdt på at løse det. Vi er også bekymrede over den træge verdensøkonomi, der indvirker på alle lande, især udviklingslandene.«

Leder, 20. oktober 2015: Lyndon LaRouche: »Lad os vinde«

Lyndon LaRouche fremlagde mandag et strategisk overblik over kampen for omgående at fjerne Obama fra Det Hvide Hus og »vende tidevandet til fordel for menneskeheden« i sine indledende bemærkninger til den ugentlige **webcast med LaRouche PAC Policy Committee**.

Han begyndte med at gøre op, hvor vi står ca. en uge efter debatten mellem det Demokratiske Partis præsidentkandidater tirsdag, den 13. oktober, og den åbenlyse britiske indsats for at forme denne debat i løbet af weekenden.

»Vi har nu nået et vendepunkt, der følger efter det, der skete den 13. ds. [Tv-debatten mellem præsidentkandidaterne fra det Demokratiske Parti], og det var en parodi. Det var et orgie, en vederstyggelighed. Men desværre for fjenden er det ikke en populær trend, og det vil gå i den anden retning – og det har det gjort. I det mellemliggende interval på en uge siden debatten har vi set den største stigning i folkelig støtte blandt mennesker, der stemmer eller har tænkt sig at stemme, end vi har set i lang tid.

Vores job nu er ikke at være abstrakt omkring disse spørgsmål. Vi ved, at vi har hakket sporerne i Obama, at Obama nu er færdig. Alt rent globalt siger, at Obama er færdig. Det er, hvad der nu vil ske.«

LaRouche uddybede videre, at LaRouche-bevægelsens mobiliseringsaktivitet under anførsel af Manhattan-projektet finder »en total forandring bort fra pessimisme« i en stor del af befolkningen. Han tilføjede, at denne forandrede situation også har alt at gøre med det globale lederskab, som Rusland og Kina frembyder.

»Det er storartet! Dette er, hvad der er sket med Rusland. Ruslands aktivitet, hvad Rusland succesrigt har opnået, og det, som de stadig gør, har været den udløsermekanisme, der har været gnisten til en global evne til at vende tidevandet til fordel for menneskeheden. Og det er, hvad vi gør!«

Alt imens LaRouche advarede om, at de nødvendige, dramatiske ændringer ikke vil komme let, tilføjede han:

»Men det, jeg har fået ind i løbet af de seneste 48 timer, er en slående eksplosion: nationen og dele af verden er i bevægelse. Og naturligtvis, det, som Kina og Rusland har gjort yderligere, har været absolut afgørende i denne forandring i omstændighederne over hele planeten.

Vi befinder os i en periode med ansvar, ikke for at gøre krav på store præstationer, men for at erkende, at vi har

mulighed for resultater, der ikke har været tilgængelige for os længe. Vi må derfor bruge og støtte disse talenter og erkende, at man har et ansvar for at sikre, at man yder sit bidrag til den proces, som vi nu kæmper for at gøre til virkelighed.»

George Osborne håber at bringe Silkevejen til Storbritannien

17. oktober 2015 – Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings umiddelbart forestående besøg i Storbritannien fortsætter med at skabe kontrovers. Avisen *Guardian* skrev 16. oktober, at George Osborne, finansminister og øjensynligt hovedfortaler for tættere relationer med Kina, er fast besluttet på at bringe den Nye Silkevej frem til sin endestation i London. Xi Jinping med frue ventes til Storbritannien 20. oktober.

»Antikkens Silkevej, langs med hvilken karavaner af handelsfolk bragte fine kinesiske stoffer og udsøgt porcelæn til markederne i hele Asien, nåede aldrig så langt som til det kølige Britannien. Men George Osborne er fast besluttet på, at den antikke Silkevejs efterfølger i det 21. århundrede vil få terminus i London«, skrev *Guardian*.

Et afgørende element i Storbritanniens tilslutning til Kinas »Et bælte, en vej« er at udvide handel i renminbi i City of London og indvarsle en »gylden æra« med økonomisk og finansielt samarbejde med Kina.

Guardian citerer Mark Boleat, formand for politisk strategi i City of London Corporation, og som sagde: »I de senere år har

samarbejdet mellem Det forenede Kongerige og Kina inden for den finansielle servicesektor været særlig stærk og har haft stor gavn af regeringsstøtte fra begge sider.«

De skriver, at, alt imens Tyskland tilbyder Kina kapitalgoder, inklusive maskinværktøj, så kan Storbritannien tilbyde finansielle serviceydelser og forretningsmæssige serviceydelser inklusive regnskabsførelse, rådgivning og jura.

Alt imens Osborne er meget forpligtet på denne politik, så er Washington »rasende« over den, og især over, at Storbritannien gik med i Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB).

Osborne fik støtte fra Kristin Forbes, et medlem af Bank of Englands komite for monetær politik, og som i en tale i Brighton og Hove Handelskammeret den 16. okt. sagde: »Blot et enkelt land – Kina – har været ansvarligt for over en tredjedel af væksten af det globale BNP siden 2011, og selv, når man medregner landets nylige langsommere vækst, forventes landet stadig at være drivkraft bag henved 35 % af den globale vækst i år ... ethvert foretagende, der er ude efter muligheder for vækst, burde overveje disse regioner, der – så langt – er ansvarlige for de største bidrag til global vækst.«

Jonathan Ashworth fra Morgan Stanley citeres for at have sagt: »Hvis man medregner Hongkong, så er Kina nu Storbritanniens sjette største eksportmarked og den tredjestørste importkilde. Desuden er Kina nu topeksportmarked for flere sektorer, såsom automobilproduktion og højere uddannelse, og vokser hastigt inden for turisme.«

Præsident Xi forventes at afslutte en handel om kinesisk deltagelse i konstruktion af Storbritanniens atomreaktor i Hinkley, det første, nye atomkraftværk, der bygges i Storbritannien i flere årtier.

Indstilling til lovforslag om bankopdeling i Svenske Rigsdag for femte år i træk – hvornår kommer der lovforslag om bankopdeling i Danmark?

Fra vores søsterorganisation, LaRouche-rörelsen i Sverige, har vi modtaget følgende rapport:

Stockholm, 6. oktober 2015 – For femte år i træk er en indstilling til et lovforslag, der kræver en bankopdeling, fremstillet i den Svenske Rigsdag. I år har en gruppe, bestående af medlemmer af Venstrepartiet under anførsel af deres økonomiske talskvinde Ulla Andersson, fremstillet lovforslaget. Forslaget kræver, at Rigsdagen pålægger »regeringen omgående at indlede en undersøgelse af opgaven at forberede en lov, der adskiller traditionel bankaktivitet fra såkaldt investeringsbankaktivitet«.

Begrundelsen for loven er udvidet i sammenligning med de lovforslag, de har fremstillet i de foregående år, idet den først og fremmest påpeger »statens implicitte garanti for, at man ikke vil tillade store, finansielle institutioner at gå bankerot. Dette er årsagen til, at banker er blevet 'for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned', og udgør kernen i det strukturelle incitament for de store, finansielle institutioner, der var hovedårsagen til den finansielle krise«.

Dette lovforslag påpeger værdien af den statslige garanti, der beløber sig til 26 mia. SEK om året i perioden 1998-2014 [hvilket tegner sig for omkring en tredjedel til en fjerdedel

af bankernes årlige profit]. Der refereres til de forskellige forslag om bankopdeling i U.K., USA og EU for at vise, at der også i Sverige er behov for en undersøgelse. Med hensyn til USA nævner de også »debatten om en total bankopdeling. Total bankopdeling vil sige, at investerings- og handelsaktiviteter ikke er tilladt i det samme forretningsforetagende eller den samme forretningsgruppe, der er aktiv inden for traditionel, kommerciel bankvirksomhed.«

»De tekniske løsninger ser forskellige ud, men formålet er det samme. Tab, der opstår i investeringsbankaktiviteter, må ikke spille over i den mere traditionelle bankaktivitet og i værste tilfælde true en banks eksistens eller udsætte skatteborgerne for den risiko, at de er tvunget til at betale for aktiviteter, der ikke kan betragtes som samfundsnyttige ('Too big to fail'-problemet).« Med en antydning af risikoen peger lovforslaget på den britiske bankundersøgelses skøn, der siger, at så meget som fire til fem sjettedele af britiske bankers overskud kommer fra investeringsbankaktiviteter. »Taget i betragtning, hvor stor den svenske banksektor er sammenlignet med landets BNP, er det sandsynligt, at de svenske bankers investeringsbankaktiviteter er betydelige.« [Pr. person overgås de svenske banker kun af Schweiz] Lovforslaget siger, at bankgarantien i sin nuværende form er fuldstændig absurd, eftersom bankerne kan bruge den som statstilskud til spekulation i intern handel mellem bankerne med diverse finansielle instrumenter. Det er ikke let at forstå, hvorfor staten skulle yde tilskud til finansspekulation i den private forretningsverden. For slet ikke at tale om at gå ind og redde disse forretninger, hvis de risikerer bankerot. Udelukkende kun traditionel bankvirksomhed bør være omfattet af den implicitte statsgaranti.«

Sluttelig peger lovforslaget på interessekonflikter, når bankerne både varetager investering for kunder og samtidig handler på egne vegne.

Medlemmerne af Rigsdagen, der står bag lovforslag 2015/16:370

er: Ulla Andersson, Ali Esbati, Christina Høj Larsen, Wiwi-Anne Johansson, Daniel Riazat, Daniel Sestrajcic (Alle fra Venstrepartiet).

I tidligere år har også Miljøpartiets rigsdagsmedlemmer fremstillet lovforslag, men der fremstilles sædvanligvis ikke lovforslag i Rigsdagen fra et parti, der er i regering. Miljøpartiet er i regering sammen med Socialdemokraterne, og minister med ansvar for finansmarkederne, Per Bolund, fra Miljøpartiet, har i Rigsdagen været en stærk fortaler for bankopdeling, før han blev minister i 2014. Han vil være den ansvarlige minister, der skal håndtere bankopdeling i regeringen, hvis Rigsdagen foreslår en undersøgelse.

Lovforslaget kan ses her:
<http://data.riksdagen.se/fil/5DB165B6-3C25-4273-901E-D7C701F34C73>

DOKUMENTATION

Motion 2015/16:370

Bankdelningslag

- Motion 2015/16:370 (pdf, 76 kbyte, nytt fönster)

av *Ulla Andersson, Ali Esbati, Christina Høj Larsen, Wiwi-Anne Johansson, Daniel Riazat, Daniel Sestrajcic (alla V)*

Förslag till riksdagsbeslut

1. Riksdagen ställer sig bakom det som anförs i motionen om att regeringen skyndsamt bör tillsätta en utredning i syfte att utarbeta ett lagförslag som separerar traditionell bankverksamhet från s.k. investmentverksamhet och tillkännager detta för regeringen.

Motivering

I de flesta länder finns en implicit garanti från statens sida att man inte kommer att låta stora finansiella institut att gå i konkurs. Denna försäkran är en förklaring till varför vissa bolag kunnat växa sig så stora att de blivit "too big to fail", samt utgör den bärande bjälken i en incitamentsstruktur bland de stora finansiella företagen som var en av huvudorsakerna till finanskrisen.

Implicita eller uttalade statliga garantier innebär en kraftig subvention av storbankernas upplåningskostnader. Garantierna innebär också att det inte finns någon större anledning för storbankernas kreditgivare att ta reda på bankernas finansiella situation. Finansinspektionen har försökt uppskatta värdet på den svenska implicita garantin. Deras bedömning är att den i genomsnitt har uppgått till 26 miljarder kronor per år för de fyra storbankerna under tidsperioden 1998-2014.^[1] Motsvarande studier i andra länder har kommit fram till liknande resultat.^[2]

I finanskrisens kölvatten har en rad olika utredningar tillsatts. En brittisk bankutredning visade bl.a. att när den brittiska staten gav olika former av stöd till bankerna under finanskrisen visade det sig vara svårt att separera traditionell samhällsviktig verksamhet från investmentverksamhet. Detta innebar att hela banker fick räddas, även de delar som inte ansågs samhällsviktiga, vilket blev mycket kostsamt. Bland annat mot denna bakgrund föreslog utredningen en slags separation (ringfencing) av bankernas verksamhet i dels traditionell bankverksamhet (affärsverksamhet), dels investmentverksamhet. Storbritannien har ännu inte infört bestämmelser om att banker måste separera investmentverksamhet från affärsverksamhet. Men arbetet pågår och enligt Bank of England börjar banker redan nu förbereda sig för en dylik separation, eller mer korrekt "ringfencing". Planen är att "bankseparationen" ska vara på plats den 1 januari 2019.^[3]

Även inom EU och i USA pågår arbete med strukturella

bankreformer. Under januari 2014 föreslog Europeiska kommissionen nytt regelverk för att hindra de största bankerna från att använda bankens egna kapital för riskfyllda aktiviteter (s.k. proprietary trading). Kommissionens förslag baseras mycket på Liikanenrapporten (en rapport framtagen av "High-level Expert Group on reforming the structure of the EU banking sector"). Även kommissionen förespråkar ett slags "ringfencing" av investmentverksamhet från traditionell affärsverksamhet.

I USA diskuterar man total bankseparation. Med total separation skulle inte investment/tradingverksamhet få förekomma inom samma företagsgrupp som sysslar med mer traditionell affärsverksamhet. Konkret har USA i övrigt hunnit ungefär till arbetet med utkast för preliminära regler som till stora delar förbjuder affärsbanker att ägna sig åt tradingverksamhet (spekulativ handel med bankens egna kapital) och ålägger banker restriktioner för handel med hedgefonder mm. [4]

Sammanfattningsvis pågår alltså arbete i Storbritannien, USA och inom EU med olika typer av bankdelningslagar. De tekniska lösningarna ser olika ut, men syftet är detsamma; att resultat från bankernas investmentverksamheter inte ska spilla över på resultatet för den mer traditionella affärsverksamheten, och i värsta fall hota bankens hela existens eller riskera att skattebetalarna får betala för verksamhet som inte anses samhällsnyttig (det s.k. To-Big-To-Fail- problemet).

Den ovan nämnda brittiska utredningen uppskattar att så mycket som fyra till fem sjättedelar av de brittiska bankernas sammanlagda balansomslutning härrör från det som definieras som "investmentverksamhet", vilket motsvarar 40-50 biljoner kronor. Det finns i dagsläget inga beräkningar över storlekarna på investmentdelarna i de svenska bankerna. Dessa är förmodligen lägre jämfört med vad som är fallet i Storbritannien. Men med tanke på hur stor den svenska banksektorn är i förhållande till BNP så är det troligt att

även de svenska bankernas investmentverksamhet är betydande.

Ett annat skäl till att en bankdelningslag borde införas har sin grund i den ovan nämnda implicita bankgarantin. Den implicita bankgarantin innebär en kraftig subvention av storbankernas verksamhet. Garantin i sin nuvarande utformning blir helt absurd i och med att bankerna kan använda subventionen till att spekulera med egna pengar i olika finansiella instrument. Det är inte helt enkelt att förstå varför staten ska subventionera privata företags finansiella spekulation. Och sedan dessutom gå in och rädda företagen om de riskerar att gå i konkurs som ett resultat av denna spekulation. Endast bankernas traditionella verksamhet ska omfattas av den implicita garantin.

En lag om bankdelning bör också införas för att minska risken för intressekonflikter. Bankernas nuvarande affärsmodeller där de dels placerar pengar för kundernas räkning, dels handlar för egen räkning kan leda till betydande intressekonflikter. Bankerna kan dra nytta av privatpersoners insättningar, som delvis är försäkrade genom den statliga insättningsgarantin, för att ägna sig åt mycket stora och riskabla finansiella spekulationer. Detta leder till betydande intressekonflikter och bidrar till att öka instabiliteten i det finansiella systemet.

Mot bakgrund av vad som anförts ovan bör regeringen skyndsamt tillsätta en utredning i syfte att utarbeta ett lagförslag som separerar traditionell bankverksamhet från s.k. investmentverksamhet. Detta bör riksdagen ställa sig bakom och tillkännage för regeringen.

[1] Finansinspektionen (2015), "Den implicita statliga garantin till systemviktiga banker".

[2] Sveriges Riksbank (2011), "Lämplig kapitalnivå i svenska storbanker – en samhällsekonomisk analys".

[3] RUT, Dnr 2015:1026

[4] Ibid.

Amerikanske anti-tankvåben bruges imod den russiske/syriske offensiv i "stedfortræderkrig" mod Rusland

12. oktober 2015 – Amerikanske BGM-71 TOW missiler, hemmeligt leveret til terrorister i Syrien af CIA via Saudi Arabien, bruges mod den syriske hær og det russiske luftvåbens offensiv i det nordvestlige Syrien, skriver Washington Post. Offensiven har gjort hurtige fremskridt de seneste dage, med russiske luftangreb, der betegnes som "vedholdende og meget præcise" af selv den syriske, anti-Assad menneskerettighedsgruppe 'Syrian Human Rights Observatory', og med den syriske hær's intense kamp på landjorden med overvindelse af kraftig modstand for at generobre betydelige områder.

Liz Sly (Washington Post) afslørede i morges, at et stort antal TOW missiler var blevet brugt, hvilket forsinker, men ikke stopper offensiven. "Amerikanske anti-tank-missiler, der

er leveret til oprørerne i Syrien, spiller en uventet stor rolle på slagmarken i Syrien og får konflikten til at ligne en stedfortræder-krig mellem USA og Rusland, på trods af præsident Obamas udtrykte ønske om at undgå en sådan”, skrev Sly. Dusinvis af videoer er lagt ud på You Tube, der viser oprørere, der affyrer amerikanske missiler mod russisk producerede tanks og pansrede køretøjer tilhørende den syriske hær, siger hun.

Kaptajn Mustafa Moarati fra Tajamu al-Issa militsen rapporteres at have sagt, at der kom nye våbenforsyninger, efter at de russiske deployeringer begyndte, og at de er blevet lovet yderligere våben. Sly sammenligner forsyningerne med de amerikansk-leverede Stinger anti-luftskyts missiler i Afghanistan, som blev brugt mod russerne, men (undlader hun at sige) som også skabte al-Qaeda rædsels-showet, som siden har plaget verden.

I mellemtiden har en embedsmand fra Forsvarsministeriet fortalt Fox News, at USA har kastet 50 tons ammunition til mindre våben og granater ned i det kurdiske område i det nordlige Syrien i søndags, men ikke til kurderne (da vores “allierede” Tyrkiet ikke ville synes om det). Dette er det nye “udstyr”-program, der erstatter programmet for “uddan-og-udstyr”, der totalt mislykkedes.

Foto: TOW-antitankmissil, arkivbillede, amerikansk soldat i Afghanistan.

Xi Jinping kaster handsken og udfordrer til reformer af det internationale system

16. oktober 2015 – Under en særlig samling af Kommunistpartiets Politbureau den 12. oktober, der var indkaldt for at drøfte spørgsmålet om den globale styrelse, krævede præsident Xi Jinping en omfattende reform af det globale styrelsessystem, rapporterede *Xinhua* tirsdag. Reform er nødvendige for at Kina kan spille en større rolle i den globale styrelse, sagde Xi, og internationale organisationer må reformeres for at reflektere betydningen af fremvoksende markeder og udviklingslande. Reform er en »uimodståelig tendens«, sagde Xi, og reformer på globalt plan handler om at »fastlægge regler for den internationale orden og for internationale mekanismer« så vel som for »at træffe bestemmelse om, i hvilken retning verden skal gå«.

Xi sagde, at opkomsten af udviklingslande som Kina har fremkaldt »revolutionerende ændringer« i verdensordenen, og det er nu nødvendigt, at Verdensbanken og Den Internationale Valutafond, f.eks., gennemfører reformer for fuldt ud at reflektere de fremvoksende markeders behov og interesser. »Det er ikke simpelt hen et spørgsmål om at konkurrere om den mest fordelagtige position i den økonomiske udvikling, men om, hvilke roller og funktioner, nationer vil indtage i den internationale ordens langsigtede, systemiske arrangement.«

»I dag må lande, i langt højere grad end på noget andet tidspunkt, forhandle«, sagde Xi. »Problemer er ikke begrænset af de interne grænser, og udfordringer kan ikke håndteres af noget land alene.« Han nævnte Kinas koordinering af den regionale handel og infrastrukturnetværket under politikken med **Et bælte, en vej** og dens forslag om en ny, mere samarbejdende model for relationer mellem store lande, som

eksempler på en fokusering på fælles interesser.

Xi understregede »en resolut bevarelse« af den internationale orden og et system, der er centreret omkring principperne i FN's Charter, såvel som »en bevarelse og konsolidering« af de nyttige resultater af sejren i Anden Verdenskrig. »hensigterne og principperne i FN's Charter har ingen dato«, sagde Xi og tilføjede, at den kendsgerning, at de ikke er blevet virkningsfuldt gennemført bærer skylden for rivaliseringer og uretfærdigheder i dag.[1]

Xi krævede også bevarelse af et åbent verdensøkonomisk regime og »et klart standpunkt imod« handels- og investeringsprotektionisme, en ikke ligefrem subtil kritik af det nyligt gennemforhandlede TPP, som af *Global Times* blev karakteriseret som et regime med »imperial præference« i britisk stil.

Xi sagde, at Kina bør forsvare sine egne interesser såvel som udviklingslandenes fælles interesser, og ikke alene fokusere på sine behov, efterhånden, som det udvikles, men også på de forventninger, som det internationale samfund har til Kina. Han opfordrede indtrængende til opbygningen af et »samfund af skæbnefællesskab« og til promoveringen af en global styrelse med gensidig rådslagning, indsats og gensidigt fællesskab.

[1] Se: Præsident Xi Jinpings tale til FN's Generalforsamling, komplet dansk tekst

Leder, 19. oktober 2015: USA: Obama kan og skal afsættes i denne uge

I løbet af weekenden blev præsident Obama stukket af fire ødelæggende angreb på hans forbrydelser i embedet. Det absolut mest dramatiske er, at der stadig fremkommer nye detaljer fra Dronepapirerne, de lækkede dokumenter, der viser, at præsident Obama lige fra sine første dage i embedet stod i spidsen for et globalt mordprogram, der blev styret fra Det Hvide Hus' Situationsrum, og i hvilket program tusinder af mennesker blev mål som ofre for mord i Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen og Somalia under Obamas dronedrabs-program.

Situationen er pludselig meget moden til, at præsident Obama omgående kan blive fjernet fra embedet. I samme forbindelse, med sin vidneforklaring om Benghazi planlagt til torsdag, den 22. okt., for den Særlige Komite i Repræsentanternes Hus, må man forvente, at Hillary Clinton også snart bliver dumpet.

I løbet af weekenden blev præsident Obama stukket af fire ødelæggende angreb på hans forbrydelser i embedet. Det absolut mest dramatiske er, at der stadig fremkommer nye detaljer fra **Dronepapirerne**, de lækkede dokumenter, der viser, at præsident Obama lige fra sine første dage i embedet stod i spidsen for et globalt mordprogram, der blev styret fra Det Hvide Hus' Situationsrum, og i hvilket program tusinder af mennesker blev mål som ofre for mord i Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen og Somalia under Obamas dronedrabs-program. Skønsmæssigt 90 % af ofrene for dette masse-mordsprogram var ikke engang opført som mål på listerne, som blev personligt underskrevet af Obama. De blev imidlertid omgående klassificeret som terrorister og fjendtlige kæmpere for at dække over størrelsesordenen af Obamas forbrydelser.

Dronepapirerne blev ikke gjort tilgængelige for offentligheden før sidste torsdag, men Amnesty International har allerede krævet en tilbundsgående undersøgelse under Kongressen. Hvad der er mere relevant, så krævede Lyndon LaRouche i løbet af weekenden, at Obama omgående blev fjernet fra embedet, enten gennem en rigsretssag eller ved at påkalde bestemmelserne i det 25. forfatningstillæg – og dernæst blive stillet for en kriminalret for masse mord.

Søndag udgav *New York Times Magazine* en udstrakt gentagelse af **Seymour Hersh's afsløring fra maj 2015** af det bedrageri, der lå bag Obamas Hvide Hus' redegørelse for mordet på Osama bin Laden i 2011. Obama, daværende rådgiver til det Hvide Hus i kontraterrorisme John Brennan og andre i Obamas inderkreds løj åbenlyst om omstændighederne omkring drabet på bin Laden, alt sammen for at styrke Obamas udsigter til genvalg, på bekostning af sandheden. Obama og hans team fabrikerede en udførlig fabel i Hollywood-stil om angrebet i Abbottabad, Pakistan, og reklamerede for CIA's detektivarbejde, når sandheden var, at de væsentlige informationer kom fra en pakistansk officer, der kom med oplysninger om nøjagtigt, hvor al-Qaeda-lederen befandt sig – til gengæld for en belønning på 25 mio. dollars. Det Hvide Hus dækkede på typisk vis over saudiernes rolle, der i årevis betalte for at holde bin Laden i sikkerhed under Pakistans ISI's overopsyn. Alt imens *New York Times Magazine* ikke til fulde bekræftede Hersh' redegørelse, så var de først til at give en fremtrædende amerikansk mediedækning af den virkelige historie.

Den højt respekterede, internationale organisation, Læger uden Grænser, optrappede sin kampagne imod Obama ved at udstede nye anklager og udgive nyt bevismateriale i løbet af weekenden om, at USA med fuldt overlæg bombede LUG-hospitalet i Kunduz, Afghanistan, og dernæst satte tunge køretøjer ind for at pløje hen over beviserne. En unavngiven kilde i Pentagon bekræftede, at LUG havde »gjort alt det rigtige« i deres dokumentering af hospitalets koordinater, således, at dette var placeret på en

liste over beskyttede lokaliteter, en liste, der består af hospitaler, skoler og moskeer, der aldrig måtte angribes, selv, hvis der var beviser for, at kæmpere fra al-Qaeda eller Taliban befandt sig i umiddelbar nærhed. Dette var endnu en operation for masse mord fra Obamas side, og det kan have relevans, at bombningen af Kunduz kom på et tidspunkt, hvor LUG havde svoret at kæmpe for at bekæmpe Obamas underskrivelse af aftalen om Trans-Pacific Partnership, fordi denne aftale ville nægte almen medicin (dvs. som ikke fremstilles af de store medicinproducenter; billigere kopimedicin) til en halv milliard fattige mennesker i hele verden.

Med Hillary Clintons forestående vidneforklaring sendte ABC News søndag morgen en dokumentar, der afslører, at Obama, Clinton, Victoria Nuland og Ben Rhodes løj for det amerikanske folk og mørklagde al-Qaeda-angrebet på det amerikanske diplomatiske kompleks i Benghazi, Libyen, den 11. sept. 2012, hvor USA's ambassadør Christoffer Stevens og tre andre amerikanske embedsmænd blev dræbt. ABC-udsendelsen afspejlede Lyndon LaRouche og Jeffrey Steinbergs briefing i National Press Club i december 2012, hvor de beviste, at Obama og Clinton, mens angrebene fandt sted, vidste, at det var et overlagt, tungt bevæbnet al-Qaeda-angreb, der blev udført af en Ansar al-Sharia-gruppe, affilieret med al-Qaeda i det Islamiske Magreb (AQIM). ABC-historien omfattede Nuland, Obama, Clinton og Rhodes, sammen med Susan Rice, der udtænkte løgnene om Benghazi-angrebet, idet de var udmærket klar over, at angrebet intet havde at gøre med »spontane demonstrationer« mod bagvaskelse af profeten Mohammed.

Anden del af samme ABC-udsendelse handlede om et interview med tidligere kongresmedlem Peter Hoekstra, der var formand for Efterretningskomiteen i Repræsentanternes Hus, og som nu fremkom med anklager om, at Obama havde forrådt den libyske leder Gaddafi, der var en førende allieret i krigen mod islamiske terrorister, og at Obamaregeringen havde uddannet og bevæbnet de selv samme terrorister, der udførte slagteriet i

Benghazi den 11. sept. 2012.

Alene disse Dronepapirer udgør et klart anklageskrift for kriminel virksomhed imod Obama, der går langt ud over »store forbrydelser og ugerninger« som standard for en rigsretssag. Obamas omgående fjernelse fra embedet er nu en mental sundhedstest for USA's Kongres.

Der er en mulighed i denne uge for at dumpe Obama og påbegynde processen med at genindføre korrekt, forfatningsmæssig regering af USA, noget, der stødt og roligt er blevet eroderet i løbet af de seneste 15 års Bush- og Obamaregering. Dette er ubetinget den vigtigste handling, der skal udføres, med omgående begyndelse.

**LPAC Fredags-webcast, 16.
oktober 2015:
De lækkede 'Dronepapirer':
Brug chancen til at
katalysere et presserende
nødvendigt oprør,
hvis vi skal redde USA.**

v/Jeffrey Steinberg

Som hr. LaRouche understregede, har vi nu en chance for at katalysere et presserende nødvendigt oprør, der kommer internt fra det Demokratiske Parti og de amerikanske borgere generelt imod alt, hvad Obama og hans team står for. Det er den presserende nødvendige handling, der må udføres, hvis vi skal redde USA; og hvis vi skal opbygge et virkeligt kvalificeret præsidentskab til at erstatte Barack Obama i det Hvide Hus, som De forenede Staters præsidentskab. Engelsk udskrift.

LaRouche PAC Webcast, October 16, 2015:

Take the Opportunity of Catalyzing an Urgently Needed Revolt

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's October 16, 2015. You're watching our weekly Friday night live webcast from larouchepac.com. And we are broadcasting live tonight, at our usual time; 8pm Eastern, 5pm Pacific. And we thank you for tuning in. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence Review magazine. And the two of us had the opportunity to meet with Mr. LaRouche earlier today; and had a very important and necessary conversation that we intend to convey the essence of to you. He had a very concise message; and our aim tonight is to get that across to our viewership.

So, we're looking at the opportunity right now, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized, of catalyzing an urgently needed revolt from within the Democratic Party and the American citizenry generally, against everything that Obama and his team stand for. And this is the urgent, necessary action that must be taken, if we are going to save the United States; and if we're going to build a truly qualified Presidency to take the place of Barack Obama in the White House as the Presidency of this

United States. Over the course of this week, the evidence against Obama has only continued to pile up. This is very clear evidence; and we intend to present this evidence in summary form to you tonight. This will include, but will be exclusively, significantly number one: The release by Glen Greenwald and by Jeremy Scahill in their publication, {The Intercept}, of what they're calling "The Drone Papers"; a reference obviously to the famous "Pentagon Papers" of the 1970s, which incidentally were read into the Congressional Record by former Senator Mike Gravel, who has appeared on several forums with representatives of the LaRouche Movement nationally, recently. Number two, you have the continued fall-out from the savage, deadly, murderous bombing of the Doctors Without Borders (MSF) hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan, under the orders and the command of Barack Obama; which the MSF organization is referring to explicitly as a war crime. And number three, in this context, we have the announcement by Obama just yesterday that he is extending the US perpetual-war military deployment in Afghanistan even further. And I know that Jeff will get into all three of these points more in depth tonight.

But first, what Mr. LaRouche wanted to begin tonight's broadcast with, is the significance of what's being referred to as the "insurrection" that has erupted from within a certain layer of the Democratic Party leadership – the Democratic National Committee – which came to a head around this CNN debate that was held in Sin City; Las Vegas, earlier this week on Tuesday. This insurrection is being led by none other than Tulsi Gabbard, a Congresswoman from Hawaii, who is one of the five vice chairs of the Democratic National Committee [DNC]. Our viewers might recall that Tulsi Gabbard made herself an outright, outspoken enemy of the Obama White House about two weeks ago, by very prominently denouncing Obama's World War III policy in Syria on national television; stating that 1) the overthrow of President Assad would be a grave mistake, akin to the overthrow of both Saddam Hussein

and Muammar Qaddafi. This is significant from Tulsi Gabbard, who is herself an Iraq War combat veteran. She called for the direct cooperation with President Putin of Russia in military operations in defeating ISIS and al-Qaeda. This was in the image of Franklin Roosevelt's cooperation with Russia during World War II to defeat Hitler and the Nazis; which is by the way an echo of exactly what President Putin himself called for in his speech at the United Nations General Assembly.

And this isn't the only policy which Tulsi Gabbard has openly disagreed with Obama on; she's also a major and outspoken supporter of the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. And this is a point that Mr. LaRouche stressed was very significant and must be emphasized.

So, it just so happens that Congresswoman Gabbard is at the center of the rebellion within the leadership of the DNC against the chairwoman of the DNC, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, who is an ally of Obama. So, according to an article in Bloomberg today, which is titled "Insurrection Erupts at the Democratic National Committee", this has, in fact, been brewing for quite some time; but it boiled over this week when Gabbard was dis-invited by Debbie Wasserman Schultz from attending the Democratic Party debate in Las Vegas, because she had openly criticized the policy of limiting the number of these Democratic debates to only six.

Only four of them are before the significant primaries at the beginning of next year. And Gabbard also criticized the policy of punishing any of the candidates if they participated in any forums that were not sanctioned by the DNC. Now, what this is being called, and the adjectives that are being used in this Bloomberg article are "autocratic", "dictatorial", this policy by Debbie Wasserman Schultz. And there's an open coup that's brewing against her leadership of the Democratic National Committee. And I'm going to ask Jeff to get into is the implications of this.

I'd advise that people read some of the coverage that's in

this Bloomberg article. One very significant quote is by another one of the vice chairs, a man named RT Ryback; a former mayor of Minneapolis, who is allied with Tulsi Gabbard on this issue. He is outspoken, saying Wasserman Schultz is operating with dictatorial, autocratic power over the Democratic National Committee; her leadership must be questioned. And he's almost at the point of saying she should be kicked out as the leader of the Party. Ironically, this is coming on the heels of the exact same treatment that was dished out to John Boehner on the Republican side.

So, what I'm going to introduce Jeff with, is just a quote from this article. And I think this sort of summarizes exactly what we have the responsibility to address here tonight. "Says one Democrat with close ties to the Democratic National Committee, 'The next Chair is going to have to burn the place down and rebuild it.'" So Jeff, how do we do that?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I think the critical thing to bear in mind here is that Debbie Wasserman-Shultz is nothing other than a total clone and voice at the DNC for President Obama. Go back to the beginning of the Obama presidency. Initially, former Congressman and former Ohio Governor Ted Strickland had been called by the White House, and had been asked to be the Chairman of the DNC, and had been told, "Wait by your phone, because you're going to get a call from the President very soon." He waited, and waited, and waited, and then several days later, read in the newspaper that Debbie Wasserman-Shultz had been named instead as the party chairman.

As we understand this, this was the direct result of an intervention by Valerie Jarrett, by Michelle Obama, and it was a foretaste of many things that would follow from them. So, what she is doing to the Democratic Party is all being done on the basis of orders coming directly from the White House. Tuesday's debate in Las Vegas was a demeaning insult to the institution of the Presidency. That's not to say that

everything that the participants in the debate said was demeaning, but the whole way that the debate was organized by CNN, which has no qualifications whatsoever to actually be hosting a debate like this, was turned into some version of the Barnum and Bailey circus mixed with the Gong show. Every candidate brought swarms of people, probably right off the floors of the casinos half drunk, and they were being encouraged to scream and razz and make all kinds of noise whenever their candidate had something to say. It was shameful, it was demeaning, and what Mr. LaRouche said is that this was organized by the British. This wasn't even done directly by President Obama. This was the kind of stunt that's meant to demean the office of the Presidency, and people who participated in this process were by and large victims of a set-up that should have never ever been allowed to happen.

Of course, this is the same CNN that bailed out Obama four years ago, when Mitt Romney was about to nail him on what had actually happened in the Sept. 11, 2012 attacks in Benghazi, but instead, you may recall Candy Crowley jumping in on behalf of Obama, and shutting down Mitt Romney mid-sentence. So what you have here is an assault against the appropriate decorum and respect for the Office of the Presidency, and even though there were a few comments by Martin O'Malley, on two occasions, openly calling for Glass-Steagall, the reality is that the entire event was a shameless circus, and the best thing to do is to make sure that this is forgotten as soon as possible, and that there is never again this kind of insult to the Office of the Presidency by allowing this kind of clown show to occur.

And Mr. LaRouche, during his Thursday night Fireside Chat with supporters from around the country, emphasized that we've got to return the Presidency to a constitutional framework. We've got to have qualified candidates, and we've got to assemble not an individual, not some personality or popularity contest, but we've got to assemble a qualified team of people, a

President, a Vice President, qualified people to fill out the cabinet, so that we can get away from the horror show of the last 15 years, where 8 years of Bush and Cheney, and now 7 years of Obama, have all but effectively destroyed the institution of the Presidency.

Now the reality is that we can't wait. The reality is that Obama must be removed from office in the immediate days ahead, and this is not a matter of trying to scramble around to find some pretext in which to do that, because Matt just mentioned at the outset, that the Glen Greenwald, Jeremy Scahill new publication, the Intercept, has published an extraordinary 8-part series, based on newly-leaked government documents. These documents were prepared after Edward Snowden had already dumped his material, and had already left government, and probably already taking refuge in Russia. But what these documents show is that President Obama is guilty of mass murder. The entire drone program that has been the hallmark, the entirety, of the Obama administration's counter-terrorism program, has been conducted outside the framework of the U.S. Constitution, outside of international law, and represents perhaps the single greatest incident of mass murder in the modern history of this planet.

Now, that may sound extreme, but I would urge all of you to not just read the 8-part series of articles, but to go to the links to the actual documents that reveal the true nature of this Obama administration, completely lawless mass murder campaign. One of the points that's made right at the outset, in the opening article of this series, is that since 1975 – and you can go back to the history of the revelations about CIA crimes, the Church and Pike Committee investigations – during that period President Gerald Ford issued an Executive Order and laws were passed, making it explicitly illegal for the U.S. President to order assassinations. And of course, President Obama, since the very beginning of his term in office, has been regularly convening Tuesday meetings at the

White House, where they've been specifically developing kill lists of targets to be gone after. And so, rather than use the appropriate and accurate term of assassinations, President Obama and his team choose the word "targetted killings," but the concept is identical.

Now, we've talked on a number of occasions in recent weeks, on these webcasts on Friday night, about the fact that General Michael Flynn, who was the head of the Defense Intelligence Agency and was fired by President Obama in the summer of 2014 for being a major obstacle to the kinds of illegal programs the Administration has been running since the beginning – General Flynn was interviewed by The Intercept to comment on the documents and to comment on his own first-hand knowledge of this assassination program. General Flynn had been the Director of Intelligence for the Joint Special Operations Command, for Central Command, and then became the head of the entire Defense Intelligence Agency. Here's what he had to say about the Obama Administration's program:

"The drone campaign right now really is only about killing. When you hear the phrase 'capture or kill', capture is actually a misnomer. In the drone strategy that we have, 'capture' is a lower case c. We don't capture people any more. Our entire Middle East policy seems to be based on firing drones. That's what this Administration decided to do in its counter-terrorism campaign. They are enamored by the ability of Special Operations and the CIA to find a guy in the middle of the desert, in some shitty little village (pardon my French), and drop a bomb on his head and kill him."

Now to hear President Obama, you would think that the White House program has been surrounded by Constitutional lawyers who've been studying every step along the way, to make sure that everything involved in this program is legal. In a speech at the National Defense University several years ago, President Obama discussed the program, and again, quote: "The United States has taken lethal, targetted action against al-

Qaeda and its associated forces, including with remotely piloted aircraft, commonly referred-to as drones. As was true in previous armed conflicts, this new technology raises profound questions about who is targetted, and why. About civilian casualties and the risk of creating new enemies. About the legality of such strikes under U.S. and international law. About accountability and morality. Drone strikes, he concluded, are effective and legal. Now, it happens that under pressure, particularly after news reports about his Tuesday kill-meetings at the White House, caused quite a stir, the White House issued a policy document. It's in the public record, it didn't have to be leaked out. It's called "U.S. Policy Standards and Procedures for the Use of Force in Counter-Terrorism Operations Outside the United States and Areas of Active Hostilities." I won't bore you with the precise language of this document, but among the highlights, they say, "In every instance we prefer to capture rather than kill. We have precise standards for the use of lethal force, and these criteria include, but are not restricted to, near-certainty that the terrorist target is present, near-certainty that non-combatants will not be injured or killed, an assessment that capture is not feasible at any time of the operation, an assessment that the relevant government authorities in the country where action is contemplated cannot or will not address the threat to U.S. persons, and an assessment that no other reasonable alternatives exist to effectively address the threat to U.S. persons." And they say, "There must be a legal basis for using lethal force, and secondly, that lethal force will only be used against a target that poses a continuing imminent threat to U.S. persons."

Now, the fact of the matter is that these were strict rules for targetted killing that were promulgated by the Obama Administration, signed by the President himself, and as documented in The Intercept series, by commentaries by people like General Flynn, this policy has been violated in virtually every instance. So even by the criteria that his own

Administration set forth, President Obama has been guilty of carrying out what can only be described as mass murder. Now, there are procedures for dealing with crimes of mass murder. Number one, to the extent that the President is directly implicated in these actions, this is cause for immediate and obvious impeachment, and perhaps, because of the urgency and timeliness of this, it would be more appropriate to simply invoke the 25th Amendment. If you have somebody who has been living under the cloak of apparent civility and respectable position, but who turns out to be a mass murderer, then you'd have to conclude that that person was suffering from a form of socio-pathological insanity. That invokes the 25th Amendment immediately. And so, that's the situation that we're dealing with. What Mr. LaRouche said, is in this case, you would want to remove that person, President Obama, from office immediately, and then immediately commence with criminal proceedings for the mass-murders that he's committed.

Now, among the documents that were leaked to the authors of this series of articles, is a document that was prepared by the House Select Committee on Intelligence, in April of 2012. It was called the Performance Audit of the Department of Defense Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR). And what this audit by the House Intelligence Committee concluded, is that the entire targetted-kill program was rife with violations, with failures to live up to any of the standards that would be appropriate under the Constitution, or even under the Obama Administration's own guidelines, and that basically there was a mad rush to try to line up as much money as possible for these drone-kill programs, and therefore there were shortcuts, there was misrepresentation of the program, and in fact since the September 11 attacks, the Defense Department has spent \$67 billion on putting together the ISR infrastructure that the Obama Administration has exclusively used for the drone killing-program.

Now, other comments on this. Again, from General Flynn. He

said that the White House, for expedient reasons, abandoned its own guidelines. There were no attempts to capture. There were no attempts to work with local governments on setting up the circumstances to capture. There was no attempt to live up to the standard that to be a legitimate target for these assassinations, the individual had to oppose an immediate and imminent threat of terrorist attack against the United States. And what General Flynn said, quote, "We've tended to say, drop another bomb via a drone, and put out a headline that 'We killed Abu Bag of Donuts' and it makes us all feel good for 24 hours. And you know what? It doesn't matter. It just made them a martyr. It just created a new reason to fight us ever harder." Flynn went on to say that there was "way too much reliance on technical aspects of intelligence, like signals intelligence, or even just looking at somebody with unmanned aerial vehicles. He gave an example. "I could get on the telephone from somewhere in Somalia, and I know I know I'm a high-value target. And I say in some coded language, 'The wedding is about to occur in the next 24 hours.'" Flynn said, "That could put all of Europe and the United States on a high-level alert, and it may just be total bullshit. SIGINT is an easy system to fool, and that is why it has to be validated by other INTs, namely like human intelligence. You have to ensure that the person is actually there, at that location, because what you really intercepted was the phone."

And in fact, one of the things that was concluded in this in-depth House Intelligence Committee review of this drone-kill program was that in most instances, there was almost exclusively reliance on the tracking of cell phones, and so, very often, it was the cell phone that was the determinant of the location where the drone attack occurred. And in many instances, almost a majority of the instances, many innocent people who just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time were killed, and immediately afterwards, even though these people were not known, they didn't even know what their identities were when the drone-firing took place, they would

immediately be classified as unknown enemy combatants. In other words, if you were there, you were de facto a terrorist, and it was de facto justified that you were a legitimate target for Obama's assassinations.

Now, the documents also included a number of structural flow-charts. The point that the Pentagon and the CIA wanted to make, was that these programs did not involve a few people sitting around in a room, going through piles of what they themselves called "baseball cards" – photographs and biographical information on the people who were on the potential-target list. It was based on the data in these "baseball cards" that the President of the United States would sign the kill-order. And once the kill-order was signed – and by the way, it usually took on average 58 days from when an individual was identified by name to when he went through the process of investigation, surveillance, and his name landed on the President's desk for a finding that this person should be killed. And then from that moment on, there was a 60-day time deadline for accomplishing the killing. I'm sure part of the reason for that is that every week there were more and more names being added, and the priorities were continuously shifting. But the fact of the matter is, that there was an elaborate chain of command through which this vetting process took place; chains of command within the military and the CIA. Then there was a chain of command which led up to what was called the Principals Committee, which are the leading members of the President's Cabinet and heads of other agencies that have critical roles to play in this process. And then in every single instance, the ultimate decision was made and was signed off on by the President of the United States. So, in other words, every single person killed in this drone warfare program was authorized for assassination by President Obama.

Now, we know that there were a number of leading advisors, particularly John Brennan; who for the first four years of the

Obama Presidency was the President's Counter-terrorism Advisor right there at the White House – then he was made Director of the CIA. We know that David Petraeus, who was formerly a high-ranking military commander, brought over to the CIA, and who was found not only to have been engaging in an extramarital affair, but was caught passing massive amounts of classified documents to his mistress and biographer; and yet he only received a slap-on-the-wrist misdemeanor, and to this day is still a key advisor to President Obama. Petraeus propagated a series of orders, establishing the chain of command and the operational profile of at least the Joint Special Operations Command [JSOC] part of this kill program. But ultimately, everything landed on the desk of President Obama; and when he signed the kill order, the 60-day clock began to tick down, and that was when the operations in the field went into action.

We know, of course, that Anwar al-Awlaki – an American citizen – clearly someone who had an association with al-Qaeda, was put on the assassination list; and yet, as an American citizen, he was denied any of the Constitutional due process that all American citizens are entitled to. And so, al-Awlaki was killed in an American drone attack in Yemen; several weeks later, his 16-year old son and another American citizen were killed in another drone attack. The administration had to scramble to cover that up. And now there are at least some indications that Anwar al-Awlaki may have been targeted for cold-blooded murder; because he was an FBI informant, and in that capacity, knew certain secrets about how this whole process and program of targeting was working, and perhaps knew of certain government ties to al-Qaeda. We don't know that, but there are court actions underway right now that may provide an even further light on the specific case of al-Awlaki. In Afghanistan, in Yemen, in Somalia, in Pakistan – those were the four major areas where this mass assassination was taking place; there were extensive drone bases, massive amounts of military equipment. But yet, in all of the

instances, it would appear that more often than not, the criteria that the administration itself put forward were never in a single instance adhered to; and the collateral damage, the number of innocent people later, after the fact, posthumously declared enemy combatants was massive. We don't even begin to have a total death toll, but for every individual on the Presidential-approved kill list, there were multiple numbers of people who were killed simply because they were in the immediate vicinity. And one aspect of the program evolved to the point that targeted assassination operations were conducted on the basis of activity profile, not even identification of specific individuals. In the case of Afghanistan, there were instances where drone-targetted operations were directed against weddings, simply because the drones detected a large number of young males holding up guns in the air and firing them into the air. Now that happens to be part of a fairly typical tribal wedding ceremony in Afghanistan; so we don't know how many of these targeted assassinations were conducted on the basis of those kinds of activities.

Now, there was a report that was issued in 2014, that was done by General John Abizaid, who was the former head of the Central Command, and a lawyer from Georgetown named Rosa Brooks, who was a former attorney at the Department of Defense. And that report noted that there are "enormous uncertainties" in drone warfare, and that these uncertainties "are multiplied further when the United States relies on intelligence and other targeting information provided by a host nation government. How can we be sure we are not being drawn into a civil war; or being used to target the domestic political enemies of the host state leadership?" So, in other words, this program was completely out of control, off the charts; but was thoroughly embraced by President Obama from his first days in office – probably initially courtesy of people like John Brennan. But the fact of the matter is that a massive number of crimes have been committed. The official

documents, including those classified documents leaked out to {The Intercept}, make it clear that there was an absolute, unambiguous chain of command. In other words, the way that law enforcement would map out the structures of a mafia organization that they were going to break up; and unambiguously, the godfather of this entire mass kill program was President Obama. And if that doesn't constitute sufficient criteria for immediately launching impeachment proceedings or invoking of the 25th Amendment, then we've pretty much lost any sense of what our Constitutional republic is all about.

OGDEN: OK, I would like to just present the institutional question which we got in this week, which is very brief. It reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the United States is to extend its military presence in Afghanistan beyond 2016. What is your opinion about the extension of our military presence in Afghanistan?"

STEINBERG: Well, I think first of all, you've got to consider the timing of this announcement. Regardless of whatever process there was, however long the deliberations were about making this decision, I find it extremely distasteful that the President chose to make this announcement just days after the United States had bombed the hospital of Doctors Without Borders in Kunduz. There are new developments just in the last 24 hours, indicating that some American or NATO either tanks or APCs – armed personnel carriers – had arrived on the site soon after the bombing had ended, and had basically plowed through the rubble. And at least in the eyes of Doctors Without Borders, this was an attempt to bury and conceal evidence of a major crime that was committed. We spoke last week about the fact that Doctors without Borders had issued a call under the Geneva Convention for a top-down investigation, and they basically say that the actions that were undertaken under the auspices of President Obama, constituted war crimes.

So I think if you step back, and think about the thrust of what we've presented here in the last half hour or so, about

the nature of the drone program, and then situate the bombing of this Doctors Without Borders hospital within that overall framework, I think you'll see that this situation is completely out of control, and lawless. In fact, one of the commentators who have been noting the horrors of this incident has pointed out that it may come down to the fact that President Obama's only legacy is that he will have been the only Nobel Peace Prize award recipient to bomb another Nobel Peace Prize recipient – because Doctors Without Borders has also been far more legitimately granted that award.

Now, the fact of the matter is that the United States has been engaged in Afghanistan since 2001, since soon after the 9/11 attacks, and here we are, 14 years later, still debating the question of whether or not we're on the verge of the Taliban taking the place over again. I think that that 14 year process, at an estimated cost to U.S. taxpayers of well over \$2 trillion, ought to raise some serious questions about whether this policy is advisable to continue indefinitely into the future, even past the Obama Presidency. And one of the ways that the argument is being framed, for why the U.S. should remain and why NATO should remain, in Afghanistan, is the argument that there's more training, there's more assistance needed, but the implication is that there's only a binary choice: either we stay, or we go, as if there were no other options on the table, which is emphatically not true.

There are some senior retired U.S. military officials, and others, who have recently proposed that there is a viable alternative, and that you have the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which is a regional security arrangement which involves Russia, China, all of the countries of Central Asia, and as of their last meeting earlier this year, it also includes India and Pakistan. And it's virtually a certainty, now that the P5+1 agreement has been ratified both here in the U.S. and by the Majlis in Iran, so that the sanctions will be lifted in the months ahead, that Iran will be the next member

country given full membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

Just look at that on a map. Every country surrounding Afghanistan is a member of the SCO, and again, within a very short period of time Iran, which borders on Afghanistan, will be included in that membership. Right now, they're associate members, so in effect they're already part of the deliberations.

What about having the SCO, which has a strong vested interest in the security and stability of the area, working out a coordination with the US and NATO for a hand-off of security responsibility, as well as economic development responsibility, to the SCO? China, which was one of the initial sponsors of the SCO, has a critical vested interest, because the entire One Belt, One Road policy that is the cornerstone of Xi Jinping's international outreach, requires stability in exactly that area around Afghanistan. You have countries that are of the same ethnic background. You've got Tajiks and Uzbeks, and Iranians, Persians, who form a major part of the population of Afghanistan. You've got Pushtuns, who are also across the border in Pakistan. India has historically played an extraordinarily important and close role with the government in Kabul, and of course, Russia is gravely concerned about the security of Central Asia, as well as the Caucasus region of Russia.

So, it would be a sane and natural policy for the U.S., for NATO, to enter into discussions with the SCO, and propose an orderly transition, and develop a coherent strategy for bringing this whole 15 year crisis to an end. If you in fact go back to the original Brzezinski plans for conducting covert operations against the Soviets in Afghanistan, which preceded by six months the Soviets coming into Afghanistan, you see that this area has been affected by an even more than 30 years of war uninterrupted process. So there is an alternative. There's a thoughtful, diplomatic, economic, security

alternative, and one must wonder, if this option is not being considered, whether the real concern here is to keep Afghanistan safe for the opium trade, because 95 % of the world's opium supply, at enormous profits, is coming out of Afghanistan.

OGDEN: Well, thank you very much, Jeff.

What we've now presented in the summary course of this webcast tonight, was what Mr. LaRouche asked for. It is high time for the Obama policy to go. The evidence has just been presented by Jeff and myself here on this broadcast tonight, and that evidence speaks for itself. However, the task still remains, as Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, that LaRouche PAC and responsible citizens across the United States, must also build a New Presidency, to lead the United States out of what is arguably the worst disaster that we've ever faced as a nation, after eight years of Bush and Cheney, and then eight more years of Obama.

It's very clear, what Mr. LaRouche's thoughts were about the Tuesday Democratic debate, and what Jeff said earlier about the CNN kind of clown show atmosphere that was created around that. But as people who listened to Mr. LaRouche's fireside chat last night might have heard, he was also emphatic on keeping our vision clear as to what our responsibility as citizens is, not to just pick and choose among candidates, but to create what he calls a Presidency, and to conclude tonight's webcast, I actually want to read what I found to be a very compelling section of Mr. LaRouche's discussion on this question of the Presidency last night.

He said: "The point is that people usually think that we want a President. Now, according to our national law, we do get a President, one President. We also get a Vice President. But on the other hand, what we need is a team of citizens who are qualified to lead the formation and institution of a system of government under a Presidential system. In other words, you

can't just say, this is the President; now everyone's going to listen to him. That's not right. You have to have a President who is acceptable, who's qualified to lead the nation, but no one person can control the United States as a nation efficiently. There has to be a team based on the kind of team that we had when we composed a Presidential system. It also means we depend in the way that we can deal with certain members of Congress, in the House of Representatives in general, and so forth.

"You have people who don't always agree with each other, but we need that kind of office as a deliberation process, in order to have the kind of people of the United States find they have a core of agreement on goals and purposes which suit the requirements of the Presidency.

"Now the other part of that has a feature to it. When we create a Presidential system, we don't create a President per se. We try, in the best features of our existence, in our history, our intention is always to introduce new concepts, more appropriate concepts, more brilliant, more fruitful than ever before. Maybe some people can come together as a team around that idea. They might be rivals, but our goal is to go to the higher level, the highest level of achievement, of the improvement of our system of government: to create a team of people who are qualified, and actively qualified, to conduct the business of our government as a whole. And that's the way we have to look at it."

So, lest we get too distracted by the personality contests, and all of the media hype that's created by CNN and related organizations, I think it's important to keep that idea in mind.

And that's what Mr. LaRouche has devoted his entire career to, over the last 40 to 50 years of his public life. So we have the responsibility as leaders of the LaRouche PAC, and you have the responsibility as viewers of this broadcast here

tonight, to cooperate with us in trying to bring that lofty and noble goal about.

I appreciate your attention to our broadcast tonight. I advise that you take the evidence that we've presented here, and let it speak for itself. Please share this as widely as you can. Get it around to your friends and neighbors, and continue to participate in all of the events that LaRouche PAC is hosting – from these Friday night broadcasts, to the Fireside chats with Mr. LaRouche, and the continuing activities in Manhattan, including the discussion that I know we will be engaged in again tomorrow, with Mr. LaRouche himself.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Den russiske krigsindsats i Syrien – Opdatering

16. oktober 2015 – Russiske kampfly har ødelagt i alt 456 ISIS-mål i Syrien, siden de påbegyndte deres bombninger den 30. september, sagde oberst-general Andrei Kartaplov, chef for den Russiske Generalstabs Direktorat for Hovedoperationer til reportere ved det Russiske Forsvarsministerium her til morgen under en konfronterende briefing, der understregede, hvordan Rusland har ændret situationen i Syrien. Ifølge Sputnik News rapporterede Kartalov, at russiske kampfly, med base i lufthavnen uden for Latakia, i løbet af den seneste weekend har fløjet 394 sortier og ødelagt 46 kommando- og kommunikationsposter, 6 fabrikker for sprængstoffer, 22 varehuse og brændstofdepoter, samt 272 militante stillinger, bastioner og feltlejre.

»De fleste bevåbnede formationer er demoraliseret. Der er voksende utilfredshed med feltkommandørerne, og der er bevis for ulydighed. Desertering er blevet udbredt«, sagde Kartalov. Han rapporterede ligeledes, at, iflg. efterretningskilder, krydser omkring 100 ISIS-kæmpere grænsen til Tyrkiet hver dag, idet de flygter fra kampzonen.

»Jeg vil gerne endnu engang påpege, at vore fly udfører luftangreb imod de militantes infrastruktur baseret på data, der kommer fra flere efterretningskilder, såvel som efterretninger, vi får fra informationscentret i Bagdad«, sagde Kartapolov som svar på påstande om, at Rusland skulle bombe andre mål end ISIS. »Vi bomber kun mål, der er besat af internationalt anerkendte terrorgrupper. Vore krigsfly opererer ikke i de sydlige dele af Syrien, hvor, iflg. vore efterretninger, enheder fra den Frie Syriske Hær opererer«, sagde Kartalov.

Kartalov understregede også, at Rusland gentagne gange har bedt om efterretninger om ISIS-stillinger fra den amerikansk ledede koalition, men ikke har modtaget noget svar.

»Da vi ikke modtog koordinater for ISIL-styrkerne, bad vi vore partnere om at give os data om regioner, der er besat af den moderate opposition. Desværre gav vore partnere os ikke et svar på nogle af vore forespørgsler«, sagde Kartalov. »Så vi skabte et omfattende kort over områder, der er kontrolleret af ISIL, baseret på vore efterretninger og på information fra centret i Bagdad«, fortsatte han.

Ifølge det Russiske Forsvarsministerium har russiske fly fløjet 669 sortier siden 30. sept. I den samme tidsramme har den amerikansk ledede koalition fløjet i alt 77 luftangreb, hvilket ekstrapoleres til 285 sortier, en beregning, der er baseret på den amerikanske centralkommandos egen rapport om, at kun 27 procent af angrebssortier i krigen mod ISIS resulterer i faktisk frigivelse af våben.

På jorden lyder rapporterne, at den syriske hær, med russisk luftstøtte, bevæger sig fremad. Russiske sortier er stilnet af i løbet af de seneste dage, fordi »frontlinjen med ISIL's terrorgrupper (grupper fra Islamisk Stat) er under forandring som følge af aktive offensiver fra de syriske bevæbnede styrker«, sagde Forsvarsministeriet i en erklæring her til morgen. »Militanterne er på tilbagetog og forsøger at etablere nye stillinger og ændre det logistiske system, der leverer ammunition, våben og materialer til dem«, sagde ministeriet. Syrisk fjernsyn, der citerede en militær kilde, sagde, at hæren havde indledt en operation i den nordlige og nordvestlige del af provinsen Homs »med det formål at genoprette tryghed og stabilitet i landsbyerne og byerne i området«. Kampene, rapporterer AFP, synes at have til hensigt at sikre hovedvejen, der fører fra Homs til den tilstødende provins Hamas hovedby, Hama city.

»Regimet er i realiteten i færd med at gøre sine styrker parat i hele Homs' nordlige landdistrikt ... Det, vi frygter, er, at de vil følge samme strategi, som de havde i Hama-landdistriktet. De angreb faktisk kæmperne på alle fronter samtidig«, sagde lokal medieaktivist Hassan Abou Nouh til Reuters.

Rusland er »kategorisk uenig« i den hollandske havarirapport om MH17

14. oktober 2015 – Moskva er »kategorisk uenig« i den hollandske havarirapport om MH17, sagde Oleg Storchevoy,

vicechef for Rosaviatsiya, Ruslands nationale tilsyn for civil lufttrafik, i går, og karakteriserede kommissionens konklusioner som »fundamentalt forkerte«. DSB, den officielle hollandske organisation, der fik ordre til at undersøge flyulykken den 17. juli 2014, udsendte sin slutrapport i går.

For det første sagde Rosaviatsiya, at det »støtter den hollandske havarikommissions konklusion om, at den ukrainske side har det fulde ansvar for ikke at lukke luftrummet midt i militæraktiviteterne, der kunne udgøre en potentiel fare for den civile flytrafik«. DSB, den hollandske organisation, der fik opgaven at undersøge ulykken, rapporterede, at flyet syntes at være blevet ramt af et jord-til-luft-missil og erklærede, at mindst 16 militærfly og -helikoptere var blevet skudt ned i det østlige Ukraine i månederne forud for MH17-ulykken.

For det andet rapporterede Rosaviatsiya-tilsynsmyndigheden, at »ukrainske myndigheder ikke sikrede koordinering mellem militære myndigheder og myndigheden for flytrafik for at sikre sikker flyvning.

For det tredje anklagede Rosaviatsiya, at, ved det første møde hævdedes det, uden beviser, at MH17 var blevet ramt af en BUK-1 missiltype, der var affyret fra byen Snizhne. Beviset var angiveligt et bueformet element, der skulle være blevet fundet. Dette var en forud aftalt version af begivenhederne, sagde Storchevoy. Det pågældende element var sandsynligvis plantet, anklagede Rosaviatsiya og bemærkede, at de virkelige kemiske stoffer, som en eksplosion af et BUK-missil efterlader, slet ikke stemmer overens med de data, som den hollandske rapport fremlægger.

Iflg. den hollandske havarikommissions rapport styrtede MH17 ned som følge af et 9N314M-model sprænghoved, båret af et missil i serien 9M38, der blev affyret et sted inden for et areal på 320 km² i Østukraine; rapporten specificerede ikke, hvem, der var ansvarlig for affyringen.

Den russiske producent af forsvarssystemer Almaz-Antey fremlagde også sine egne undersøgelsesresultater, der fandt, at det missil, der nedskød MH17, kun kunne have været en model af missilerne i 9M38-serien, der blev taget ud af tjeneste i den russiske hær i 2011; de konkluderede også, at missilet blev lanceret fra regionen Zaroshchenske, der dengang var under Kijevs kontrol.

Rusland vil bruge sin ret til at indlede en fornyet undersøgelse af MH17-ulykken, sagde Storchevoy i dag til reportere. Rusland inviterede alle andre lande, 'der ikke finder det ligegyldigt at finde den sande årsag til tragedien', til at vurdere Ruslands undersøgelsesresultater.

USA: Nedskæring i pensioner og tilskud til lægehjælp vil ramme millioner

Nedskæringer i sociale pensioner og ydelser til lægehjælp vil ramme millioner af sårbare amerikanere, når de månedlige præmier for 30 %'s vedkommende af modtagere af Medicare vil stige med 50 %, og egenbetaling for hospitalsindlæggelse vil stige. Kongresmedlemmerne Boehners og Pelosis forsøg på at undgå nedskæringer har nået et dødvande.

Xi Jinping vil fjerne fattigdom inden 2020

16. oktober 2015 – I en tale til Forum for Global Reduktion af Fattigdom og Udvikling i Beijing i dag, afgav Xi Jinping et højtideligt løfte om, at Kina totalt ville fjerne fattigdom i Kina inden 2020 og hæve landets 70 mio. fattige op over fattigdomsgrænsen, der er fastsat til en årlig indkomst på 376 dollars. I løbet af de seneste 15 år har Kina løftet 600 mio. mennesker ud af fattigdom.

FN's generalsekretær Ban Ki-moon sendte et videobudskab til forummet og roste Kinas præstation og landets forpligtende engagement til at fortsætte deres bemærkelsesværdige kurs. Processen med Den nye Silkevej bringer denne politik ud i international skala.

Kina vil masseproducere Ebola vaccine

15. oktober 2015 – Et kinesisk selskab har planer om at masseproducere den Ebolavaccine, som Kinas Akademi for Militærmedicinsk Forskning har udviklet. Tianjin CanSino Biotechnology, Inc., i den nordøstlige by Tianjin, er i færd med at bygge en produktionsfacilitet til 315 mio. dollars til formålet. Faciliteten vil stå færdig i 2017 eller 2018. Det findes endnu to vacciner – Merck and NewLink Genetics', og Johnson & Johnsons – hvoraf den første betragtes som færdigtestet (men der forlyder intet om produktionsplaner); det andet selskab har netop indledt kliniske tests.

Tyskland kan klare det – Men Tyskland må forandre sig

Stakkels Tyskland! Du er sunket dybt, hvis alt det, som de meningsdannende massemedier publicerer i disse dage, er sandt! Man må da spørge, hvordan tyskerne i både Øst og Vest klarede at genhuse og integrere henved 14 millioner flygtninge (!) for 70 år siden, umiddelbart før afslutningen af Anden Verdenskrig og i tiden umiddelbart derefter, flygtninge fra det tabte Øst og Sudeterlandet? Hvordan kunne tyskerne blive i stand til at genopbygge deres udbombede byer så hurtigt?

Se også: “Løs flygtningekrisen ved at realisere en ny, epokeskabende vision for fremtiden”, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Download (PDF, Unknown)

USA: Obama vil ikke modtage en russisk militærdelegation om koordinering

Washington har nægtet at modtage en russisk militærdelegation i USA om militær koordinering, eller at sende en delegation

til Rusland, siger russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov til Duma

13. oktober 2015 – Washington har nægtet at modtage en foreslået, russisk militærdelegation, ledet af premierminister Dmitri Medvedev, for at drøfte koordineret handling i kampen mod terrorisme i Syrien, rapporterede RT i går.

Udenrigsminister Lavrov sagde til den russiske Duma i går: »Vi har foreslået amerikanerne det, som præsident Vladimir Putin informerede offentligheden om i går, nemlig, at sende en delegation af militære eksperter til Moskva for at aftale en serie af fælles skridt, [og] bagefter vil vi være rede til at sende en delegation på højt niveau, ledet af premierminister Medvedev, til Washington.«

RT rapporterede: »I dag har vi fået at vide, at de [amerikanerne] ikke vil være i stand til at sende en delegation til Moskva. Samtidig kan de ikke modtage vores delegation i Washington«, tilføjede han.

Lavrov rapporterede, at Moskva »inviterede vore andre partnere til at deltage i Bagdad-informationscentrets aktiviteter, så alle kan se det fulde billede; så alle kigger på det samme blad, og for at undgå misforståelser; besvarelsen var ikke konstruktiv. De sagde, 'Hvorfor i Irak? Det er ikke sikkert der.' Vi forklarede, at, iflg. vores vurdering kan Bagdad Center operere under meget favorable betingelser. Men hvis der foreligger et ønske om at koordinere handlinger et andet sted, så er vi parat til dette«, sagde Lavrov.

»Aftalen om de militær-tekniske forholdsregler for at undgå hændelser i luften, som i praksis er udført, vil være operative fra i dag, håber jeg. I dag vil de sidste detaljer blive udført for at koordinere alle aftalens punkter«, sagde Lavrov til statsdumaen.

»Og så er vi parat til at sætte os og drøfte tingene, med alle kortene på hånden: hvor DE mener, terroristerne er, hvor VI mener, de kunne være ... Jeg er sikker på, at hvis vi arbejder

ærligt, så vil disse evalueringer være sammenfaldende. [fremhævelse original] Vi bør alle begynde med at lægge vore kort frem, både i direkte og indirekte betydning«, understregede ministeren ... »Jeg kan ikke se nogen grund til, at vi ikke skulle sætte os og drøfte [disse] ting. Måske mener Vesten, at Islamisk Stat og Assad simpelt hen skal reducere hinanden«, sagde han. »Men jeg vil helst ikke tro, at vore vestlige kolleger ledes af en sådan 'forenklet' logik.«

Tyskland, kansler Merkel: Kun politisk dialog med deltagelse af Rusland og andre regionale stater kan løse krisen i Syrien

15. oktober 2015 – I en erklæring her til morgen i Bundestag (det tyske parlaments underhus) sagde kansler Merkel mht. Syrien: »Der er intet, der opmuntrer os til at forvente, at noget vil ændre den ulykkelige situation i den nærmeste fremtid. Men skal vi opgive af denne grund? Nej! ... Det vil kræve en dyb indånding at stabilisere denne iturevne stat igen. Hertil haster det med en dialog med Rusland ... Vi må selvfølgelig lancere en politisk dialog, der bør involvere Rusland og andre internationale parter, inklusive regionale stater.«

(En antydning fra Merkels side om, at hun ville støtte i det mindste en lempelse af sanktionerne mod Rusland, ville

naturligvis være nyttig.) De flygtninge, der er ankommet, med stadig flere, der forventes at ankomme til Tyskland, vil blive der i nogen tid fremover med denne udsigt til 'en dyb indånding' for Syrien. I alt forventes omkring 600.000 syriske flygtninge at være ankommet til Tyskland ved årets slutning.

Den tyske kansler gentog, at hendes politik for flygtningekrisen vil være et pragmatisk mix af at acceptere og integrere især de syriske flygtninge på den ene side, og forholdsregler til at reducere flygtningestrømmen på den anden side. Sidstnævnte involverer mere finansiel og anden støtte til Tyrkiet, som Merkel skal besøge den 18. oktober, og til Libanon og Jordan, tre lande, der har de fleste flygtningelejre; men en stærkere grænsekontrol, oprettelsen af særlige transitzoner for flygtninge for at forsegle de øvrige grænser, samt øget grænsepatruljering langs EU's sydlige grænser (FRONTEX-programmet), er også involveret.