

# **General Gerasimov: Det russiske militær udvikler sig fortsat som reaktion på truslerne, som Rusland står overfor**

*14. december, 2015* – Den russiske generalstabschef, general Valeriy Gerasimov, afgav en længere rapport om det russiske militær til forsvars-attachéer i Moskva i morges. "Tilspidsning af globale og regionale sikkerhedsproblemer karakteriserer situationen i verden nu til dags. Det hænger først og fremmest sammen med udvidelsen af den internationale terrorisme og radikale ekstremisme", lagde han ud med at sige. "For det første giver NATO's uvenskabelige militærpolitik over for Rusland anledning til bekymring. Alliancen udvider sin militære tilstedeværelse og forstærker sine væbnede styrkers aktivitet langs den Russiske Føderations grænser." Med deployering af et ballistisk missilforsvar og udvikling af nye krigsvåben", sagde han, "forværres problemet med ubalancen i de strategiske styrker."

Andre trusler inkluderer farvede revolutioner (han brugte ikke dette udtryk, men det fremgik klart af hans beskrivelse, at det var det, han talte om) til at omvælte regeringer, spredning af masseødelæggelsesvåben; forbrydelser og narkotikahandel hen over grænser; separatisme; og ukontrolleret folkevandring samt fremmedhad. "Kombinationen af disse årsager og tilstedeværelsen af en dybt rodfæstet, mellemstatslig spænding skaber en trussel om optrapning af nye og aktuelle konflikter. Desværre bare stiger og stiger antallet af sådanne konflikter", sagde han. "En forening af hele verdenssamfundets bestræbelser imod de fælles udfordringer og trusler, først og fremmest international

terrorisme, er en tiltagende oplagt nødvendighed.”

Med hensyn til Syrien er Rusland i færd med at smede relationer til mange lande over denne konflikt. ”Så meget desto mere, som den moderne historie udviser eksempler på succesfuldt samarbejde mellem de vestlige lande og den Russiske Føderation. Heriblandt fælles aktiviteter under den Internationale Styrkes Sikkerhedsassistances operation i Afghanistan, løsning af problemet med kemiske våben i Syrien, styrkelse af drøftelser om ”Irans atomprogram”, undertegning og implementering af ”Minskaftalerne” og kampen mod pirater i området ud for Afrikas Horn”, sagde Gerasimov. ”Under disse omstændigheder udgør de russiske væbnede styrker statens hovedinstrument i tilvejebringelse af sikkerhed i enhver situation, såvel som i løsningen af opgaver under militærkonflikter af forskellig intensitet.”

Meget af den resterende del af rapporten var helliget det russiske militærs moderniseringsbestræbelser, som er ganske store inden for områderne bemanning samt uddannelse og udstyr. Af største betydning var Gerasimovs understregning af moderniseringen af Ruslands atom-afskrækkelsesvåben, der, sagde han, vil blive udviklet ”til at opretholde de offensive og strategisk defensive styrker på et niveau, der vil levere den garanterede afskrækkelse af aggression rettet mod den Russiske Føderation og dens allierede.” Andre områder, som Gerasimov rapporterede om, var fremskridt mht. fornyelse af udstyret i de militære tjenester hen imod målsætningen om 70 % ’s moderne udrustning ved år 2020, og professionaliseringen af tjenesternes mandskab.

---

# Russisk forsvarsminister: NATO kommer stadig tættere på Rusland

14. december 2015 – Den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu satte, i bemærkninger i Forsvarsministeriet den 11. dec., kød på NATO's militære opbygning rundt om Ruslands periferi. »Alene i løbet af det seneste år har NATO deployeret tretten gange så mange tropper, otte gange så mange militære fly og op til 300 tanks og infanteri-kampkøretøjer til de Baltiske Stater, Polen og Rumænien«, sagde han. Han bemærkede, at NATO aktivt er i færd med at muliggøre de tidligere jugoslaviske republikkers, Georgiens og Ukraines indtræden i 'forsvars'-alliancen og trække Finland, Sverige og Moldova ind i sin sfære. NATO har ligeledes etableret et cybersikkerhedscenter i Estland og et strategisk propagandacentret i Letland. NATO har 200 atombomber i Europa, og disse bomber er i færd med at blive moderniseret, og NATO har 310 fly, der befinder sig i forskellige stadier af beredskab til at kaste disse bomber, bemærkede Shoigu.

Moskvas bekymringer blev leveret direkte til Washingtons nationale sikkerhedsetablisement i løbet af weekenden i form af en kronik i *Defense News*, forfattet af Ruslan Pukhov, direktør for Centret for Analyse af Strategier og Teknologier i Moskva. Pukhov skriver om de fremskridt, som det russiske militær har gjort inden for modernisering af sig selv, konfronteret med sanktioner og andre handlinger fra NATO's side, og de udfordringer, det stadig står overfor, såsom mht. mandskab. »Samtidig har NATO's anti-russiske, aggressive militære aktivitet i Østeuropa, som NATO-landene ikke engang gør sig den ulejlighed at lægge skjul på, hidtil ikke ført til nogen håndgribelige ændringer i Ruslands militære planlægning«, skriver han. »Dette får os til at mene, at Moskva ikke anser en militær storkonfrontation med Vesten for

at være en reel mulighed.« I stedet forlader Rusland sig på sine strategiske atomstyrker for at modgå Vestens militære trussel, en strategi, som han sammenligner med Eisenhowers »New Look« i 1950-erne.

I Syrien, fortsætter Pukhov, er det fortsat uklart, om den russiske militære intervention vil frembringe det ønskede resultat, alt imens den komplicerer Ruslands relationer med USA, Tyrkiet og andre magter. Ud over alt dette søger regimet i Kijev at sabotere Minsk-aftalerne med det formål at tiltrække mere international opmærksomhed og sympati. »I 2016 vil Moskva blive konfronteret med udsigterne til voksende krise på to fronter samtidigt. I begge tilfælde vil opgaven for præsident Putin være at gennemføre en hårfin balancegang mellem at beskytte russiske interesser og forhindre en endnu større konfrontation med Vesten, konkluderer Pukhov.

*Foto: 11. december 2015: Præsident Vladimir Putin taler ved Forsvarsministeriets styrelses udvidede møde i Nationalforsvarets Styrelsescenter i Moskva.*

---

**Flyveblad, 15. december 2015:  
Finanskrakket er i gang –  
Kun en revolution i den  
transatlantiske  
politik kan afvende**

# **katastrofen**

*Hele det transatlantiske, London/Wall Street finanssystem befinder sig på randen af det totale kollaps. Det kunne ske hver time, hver dag, det skal være. De kritiske tegn er allerede synlige for enhver, der ikke med overlæg gør sig blind. Fire italienske banker er gået fallit i den forgangne uge, med den Europæiske Unions påtvungne bail-in plyndring af indskydernes midler til følge. Puerto Rico har allerede meddelt, at landet sandsynligvis vil gå i betalingsstandsning den 1. januar over en forfalden gæld på 1 milliard dollar, toppen af en gældsboble til i alt 72 mia. dollar; og gribbefondene er helt eksponeret. Flere hedgefonde, der er eksponeret over for Puerto Ricos gæld og den bankerot, der har fundet sted i sektoren for skiferolie og -gas, er allerede bukket under. Dette er blot et forvarsel om det transatlantiske systems umiddelbart forestående, totale sammenbrud.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Irak angriber voldsomt  
tyrkisk invasion  
og amerikansk respons i brev**

# til FN's ambassadør Samantha Power – kræver handling fra FN

12. december 2015 – På trods af, at det Amerikanske Udenrigsministeriums talsmand, John Kirby, verbalt langede ud efter RT-reporteren i denne uge og hævdede, at Irak vil håndtere Tyrkiets invasion af Irak som et bilateralt anliggende, så er kendsgerningen, at Irak går til FN's Sikkerhedsråd. Kirby fik et hysterisk anfald over RT-reporteren og kaldte hende »latterlig« og »gal« for at rejse spørgsmålet om Iraks vrede mod NATO-medlemmet Tyrkiet.

RT's reporterer have ret, og i går indgav den irakiske regering en officiel klage over Tyrkiet til FN og sendte et brev fra den irakiske regering til Samantha Power, Obamas 'ansvar-for-at-beskytte (R2P), regimeskift'-galning i FN.

Reuters rapporterer, at den irakiske ambassadør til FN, Mohamed Ali Alhakim, i brevet til Power skrev: »Vi anmoder Sikkerhedsrådet om at kræve, at Tyrkiet omgående trækker sine styrker tilbage ... og ikke igen at krænke irakisk suverænitet. ... Dette anses for at være en åbenlys overtrædelse af principperne i FN's Charter, og en krænkelse af Iraks territoriale integritet og staten Iraks suverænitet.«

I sproglige vendinger, der er en kindhest mod Tyrkiet og en advarsel til USA og andre NATO-medlemmer, sagde Alhakim, at den tyrkiske invasion er en »aggressiv handling« og tilføjede, »Assistance med militær uddannelse og avanceret teknologi og avancerede våben for at bekæmpe terrorenheden Islamisk Stat må være baseret på bilaterale og multilaterale aftaler og ske i fuld respekt for national suverænitet og den irakiske forfatning, og må være koordineret med de irakiske bevæbnede styrker.«

Irak har også klaget over Obamas meddelelse om, at dræberteams fra Specialstyrkerne vil ankomme til Irak.

*Foto: Tanks fra den tyrkiske hær på den tyrkisk-irakiske grænse.*

---

## **USA: Kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard udtaler sig imod Bush/Obama-politik for regimeskift**

*12. december 2015* – I løbet af det seneste døgn har kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard optrådt på TV og i radio og talt imod Bush/Obama-politikken for regimeskift, der netop nu er i gang imod Syriens præsident Assad. På National Public Radio (NPR) her til morgen konkluderede Gabbard: »Hvis Assads syriske regering bliver væltet, vil ISIS og al-Qaeda og disse andre grupper tage magten i hele Syrien og skabe en endnu større humanitær krise, så de mennesker, der er flygtet fra Syrien, fortsat ikke vil have noget hjem der. De vil fortsat ikke se nogen fred og stabilitet, og truslen mod resten af verden vil være endnu større.«

Gabbard tilbageviste værten Steve Simons linje om, at syrere skulle være flygtet ud af deres land for at undfly Assad, hvilket er den linje, som forfølges af London/Team Obama. Hun sagde: »Hvis vi ser på tidslinjen, så begyndte folk at forlade – folk begyndte at forlade landet, da borgerkrigen gik i gang. Og meget af dette er blevet drevet af den finansiering, udstyring og bevæbning, som er udført af lande som USA, Saudi Arabien, Qatar og Tyrkiet. Og det har været, og er fortsat, en

meget grim borgerkrig, hvilket er en af grundene til, at jeg er fortalende for at standse og afslutte denne borgerkrig, så vi kan fokusere vore ressourcer omkring overvindelsen af ISIS.«

I går aftes, på Fox TV News' program med Greta van Susteren, afviste Gabbard spørgsmålet om, at Assad-regeringen skulle købe ISIS-olie på det sorte marked, som en afledningsmanøvre. »Det er vigtigt at huske på, hvem, der er vores fjende.« Hun sagde, man skulle se tilbage på San Bernadino, på hvem det var, der fløj flyene ind i tvillingetårnene, samt andre terrorhandlinger. Disse mennesker var ikke kæmpere på mission fra den syriske præsident Assad! Gabbard, der er veteran fra Irakkrigen og har rank af major i Hawaiis Nationalgarde, gentog, at vi præcist ved, hvem disse mennesker er – al-Qaeda, al-Nusra og ISIS. Med hensyn til påstandene om, at Syrien skulle købe olie fra ISIS, sagde hun, at »de rapporter, der kommer frem, er et gennemskueligt forsøg på at aflede kritik bort fra Tyrkiet«, som er et hovedtransitsted for salg af ISIS-olien. Erdogans søn og svigersøn profiterer af det. Faktum er, at, hvad enten Syrien køber noget olie eller ej, så har det minimal virkning i sammenligning med Tyrkiets åbne grænse med Syrien, som giver mulighed for, at udenlandske kæmpere, våben, ammunition, penge og olie kommer ind i terroristgrupper.

---

## **Den russiske forsvarsminister forklarer NATO's provokerende udvidelse mod Rusland**

*11. december 2015* – I en tale i dag ved det Russiske Forsvarsministeriums Bestyrelses udvidede møde gav



forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu en detaljeret rapport om NATO's udvidelse i Vest- og Østeuropa, der tydeligvis er rettet imod Rusland – og intet andet.

»Tendensen mod en forværring af den militære og politiske, internationale situation er fortsat, især i Europa, Centralasien og Mellemøsten«, advarede Shoigu i sin brevspektrede tale, der dækkede alle aspekter af Ruslands forsvarsevner og beredskab.

NATO's udvidelse er foregået hurtigt, sagde han, og har inkorporeret 12 nye medlemmer på relativt kort tid. »I dag forbereder Montenegro, Makedonien, Bosnien og Herzegovina, Georgien og Ukraine sig på at tilslutte sig NATO«, sagde han. Finland, Sverige, Serbien og Moldova er i færd at blive trukket ind i NATO's interesseområder.

Antallet af NATO-fly er steget med otte gange, rapporterede Shoigu, alt imens antallet af tjenestegørende mænd steg med tretten gange på De baltiske Staters, Polens og Rumæniens territorier. Der er også planlagt op til 300 tanks og infanteri-kampkøretøjer til disse nationer, ligesom Aegis Ashore missilforsvarssystemet også deployeres til Rumænien og Polen.

Hertil kommer omkring 200 amerikanske luftatombomber, i Italien, Belgien, Nederlandene, Tyskland og Tyrkiet; desuden er 310 bombefly i forskellige stadier af beredskab. Den russiske forsvarsminister bemærkede også, at et cybersikkerhedscenter er blevet etableret i Talinn, i Estland, samt et strategisk propagandacenter i Riga, Letlands hovedstad. Sidstnævntes formål, sagde han, er at give NATO-medlemslande mulighed for at opnå »informationsoverlegenhed« over Rusland.

---

# USA og Rusland må samarbejde

—

## Kun et nyt paradigme kan forhindre fascisme!

### Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Men hverken menneskehedens udslettelse i et termonukleært Armageddon eller ofringen af menneskeliv til fordel for finansoligarkiet er uundgåelig. At forhindre dette kræver først og fremmest, at man overvinder partianskuelser eller geopolitiske anskuelser og i stedet erstatter dem med et upartisk samarbejde på alle niveauer, for menneskehedens fælles interesser. Ikke overraskende viser EU, der siden Maastrichttraktaten har udviklet sig til et monstrum, i lyset af flygtningekrisen og det forestående finanskarak, sig ikke alene at være en mislykket model, men EU er yderligere nu ved at gennemføre en åbenlyst fascistisk politik. Det seneste fremstød i denne retning er Bruxelles meddelelse om, at den under alle omstændigheder allerede afskyelige EU-grænsekontrol-organisation Frontex skal erstattes af en ny organisation, der kontrolleres fra Bruxelles, og som deporterer flygtninge med egne grænsevagter, opererer i ikke-EU-medlemsstater og kan sætte sig ud over indvendinger fra medlemsstater. Dermed ville det i flygtningespørgsmålet komme til den største overførsel af suveræniteten til Bruxelles, siden euroens indførelse.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Medvedev: Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske fly var en casus belli, men vi valgte ikke at respondere symmetrisk

*10. december 2015* – Den russiske premierminister Dmitry Medvedev sagde i et Tv-interview i går, at Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske Su-24 bombefly i Syrien den 24. nov. var tilstrækkelig »casus belli« til at begynde en krig, men Rusland valgte ikke at gøre det.

»Det var et direkte angreb på en fremmed stat. I den nuværende situation er en krig det værste, der kunne ske. Derfor blev der taget en beslutning om ikke at levere et symmetrisk svar til det, tyrkerne havde gjort«, forklarede han. »Vi var dog nødt til at gøre dem begribeligt, at de vil stå til ansvar for deres handlinger. Af præcis denne årsag, og for at beskytte vore borgeres sikkerhed, blev de relevante beslutninger truffet.«

Man bør indse, at Ruslands handlinger faktisk ikke er sanktioner, men snarere den russiske stats »beskyttende reaktion«, sagde Medvedev.

---

# Leder, 11. december 2015: USA: Tro ikke på de offentlige løgne!

Den fordærvede offentlige mening og de ditto offentlige medier påstår, at Obamas fjernelse er umulig. Ja, de går endda så vidt som til at påstå, at det ikke engang bliver diskuteret. Men takket være først og fremmest, og mest af alt, den hovedrolle som katalysator, der spilles af Lyndon LaRouches »Manhattan-projekt« – er ingen af disse påstande sande. Ja, faktisk finder der en aktiv diskussion sted om behovet for at fjerne Obama på højeste regeringsplan. Ikke flere løgne; det kan gøres, og det må gøres, og vi må sørge for, at det bliver gjort, og gjort hurtigt.

Undertiden har en aktion, der angiveligt synes at være lokaliseret til et enkelt sted, såsom »Manhattan-projektet«, en universel virkning; tænk f.eks. på Brunelleschis kuppel i Firenze (katedralen Santa Maria della Fiore).

En del af det, som disse fordærvede medier og den offentlige mening forholder dig, er, at der nu foreligger et aktuelt lovforslag i Kongressen, der opregner 11 overtrædelser, der kunne udløse en rigsretssagsprocedure imod enhver præsident, der begik en hvilken som helst af disse overtrædelser. Den mest prominente af disse overtrædelser er lige netop disse »store forbrydelser og forseelser«, for hvilke Lyndon LaRouche har rejst tiltale mod Barack Obama i sine ugentlige dialoger med Manhattan-projektet.

Kongresmedlem Ted Yoho (R-Fla.) introducerede »H. Res. 198« den 13. april i år. Den er behagligt kortfattet. Efter nogle indledende »alt imens'er«, siger dens operative afsnit ganske enkelt det følgende:

»Repræsentanternes Hus erklærer, at de følgende præsidentielle

handlinger skal udgøre 'store forbrydelser og forseelser' inden for rammerne af artikel II, sektion 4, der skal udløse Husets vedtagelse af en artikel eller artikler for en rigsretssag ('impeachment'), der skal sendes til Senatet til efterprøvelse –

»(1) at indlede krig uden udtrykkelig bemyndigelse fra Kongressen

»(2) at, i USA eller i udlandet, dræbe amerikanske borgere, der ikke er engageret i aktive fjendtligheder imod USA, uden korrekt retssag (med mindre drabet var nødvendigt for at forhindre umiddelbar, alvorlig fysisk skade mod tredjeparter);

»(3) at forsømme udøvelsen af tilsyn med underordnede, der har gjort sig skyldig i kroniske forfatningsmæssige overgreb;

»(4) at bruge anviste midler i modstrid med betingelser fastsat for deres anvendelse;

»(5) med overlæg at lyve for Kongressen for at opnå bemyndigelse til krig;

»(6) at forsømme omsorgen for, at love samvittighedsfuldt udøves, derigennem, at erklæringer eller en systematisk politik for ikke-håndhævelse underskrives;

»(7) at indsætte eksekutive aftaler i stedet for traktater

»(8) med overlæg at lyve under ed for en føderal dommer eller undersøgelsesjury (grand jury)

»(9) at misbruge føderale (statslige) organisationer til fremme af en partisk politisk dagsorden;

»(10) at nægte at overholde en Kongresstævning om (udlevering af) dokumenter eller vidneafklæggelser, der er udstedt til et legitimt juridisk formål; og

«(11) at udstede eksekutive ordrer eller præsidentielle

memoranda, der krænker eller omgår Kongressens forfatningsmæssige magtbeføjelser.«

Bemærk, at kongresmedlem Yohos lovforslag vil træde i kraft, så snart det er vedtaget af et flertal i Repræsentanternes Hus. Der behøves ingen handling fra Senatets side. Kongresmedlem Yoho har to medsponsorer: republikanerne Jeff Duncan fra South Carolina og Tom McClintock fra Californien. Republikaneren Justin Amash fra Michigan var en medsponsor, men trak sig tilbage den 9. juni. Vi kender endnu ikke hans begrundelser for tilbagetrækningen, men de involverer sandsynligvis intensiteten i kampen – i en kamp, som nogle ønsker, vi skal tro, slet ikke finder sted.

Hele den aktuelle fokusering på det umiddelbare behov for at fjerne Obama har ført til, at nogle personer igen undersøger bestemmelserne i Sektion 4 i det 25. tillæg til Den amerikanske Forfatning, der foreskriver, hvordan man fjerner en præsident, »der ikke er i stand til at udøve sit embedes magtbeføjelser og pligter«, men som forsømmer at gå af på eget initiativ – og således har brug for et lille skub, kunne man sige.

Den sædvanlige fremlæggelse af Sektion 4 – det, der rent faktisk har været vores sædvanlig fremlæggelse af Sektion 4 – siger, at vicepræsidenten og et flertal af regeringsmedlemmer skal vedtage at erklære præsidentens mentale defekt (i det aktuelle tilfælde). Men det er rent faktisk ikke, hvad den siger. Dette er blot et af alternativerne. Det andet alternativ er, at Kongreshusene (dvs. Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet) ved lov etablerer en anden »institution«, der ville få virkning af en særlig kommission til at undersøge og vedtage præsidentens evne til at fortsætte i embedet.

Det er potentielt set en temmelig stor forskel.

Lyndon LaRouche tilføjede her til aften, at der må være et tværpartisk initiativ for at dumpe (Donald) Trump. Netop nu

har demokrater og republikanere mulighed for at sænke Trump på en regulær, upartisk basis. Hvis de kommer frem og siger det sammen, så omdefinierer det arten af præsidentkampagnen for 2016. Selv januar måned vil være for sent. Det bør ske nu, en upartisk organisering imod Trump, og denne samme kombination må også tage initiativ til handling for at dumpe Obama.

---

## **POLITISK ORIENTERING**

### **den 10. december 2015:**

# **Er NATO allerede i krig med Rusland?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **Frankrigs politik i**

### **Mellemøsten efter angrebene**

# **13. november**

*Paris, 9. december 2015 (Nouvelle Solidarité)* – Det tyrkiske luftvåbens nedskydning af Ruslands Su-24 bombefly over Syrien har blot fortsat udviklingen af den franske situation, siden Hollandes møde med Putin i kølvandet på angrebene i Paris 13.

november. En indikation for tendensen er de erklæringer, som den franske ambassadør til Rusland, Jean Maurice Ripert, kom med den 7. dec. på en videnskabskonference i Moskva. Ambassadør Ripert talte om samarbejde mellem Rusland og Frankrig, især omkring spørgsmål om terrorisme, rapporterer Sputnik. »Inden for terrorisme har samarbejde mellem de russiske og franske tjenester aldrig været afbrudt ... Vi har samme interesser.« »Inden for disse områder«, understregede han, »sparer Putin og Hollande ingen midler for at få håndgribelige resultater. Præsident Hollande og præsident Putin har talt med hinanden 22 gange siden årets begyndelse. Tror I, der er nogen anden statschef, der har talt så tit med præsident Putin?«, spurgte han.

»Det er i nøden, at man kender sine venner. Angrebene den 13. november ramte Frankrig og hensatte landet i sorg ... Og jeg behøver ikke understrege, hvor meget, de russiske myndigheders, og også befolkningen i Moskvas, tilkendegivelser af solidaritet har rørt os.« Han nævnte de lange køer af moskovitter, der kom for at lægge blomster og tænde lys foran den franske ambassade i kølvandet på angrebene i Paris.

Ord er en ting, men kendsgerningerne er undertiden noget barskere. Den franske deployering i Mellemøsten har, alt imens den er en del af den amerikanske koalition, en vis grad af autonomi. Franskmændene deployerer fra deres egne baser – hangarskibet Charles de Gaulle og militærbasen i Abu Dhabi, De forenede arabiske Emirater – og ikke fra Incirlik i Tyrkiet. Siden begyndelsen af deres engagement der, har franskmændene sagt, at, alt imens de er en del af koalition, så ville de forlade sig på deres egne efterretninger og selv afgøre, hvad deres mål skal være. Militære kilder her siger, at, på trods af, at de aktuelle efterretninger på jorden i Syrien lider under, at franskmændene totalt har brudt med præsident Assad og Syrien, så har de deres egne efterretninger via satellitter og andre midler.

For at gå yderligere frem med alliancen med Rusland, må



Frankrig imidlertid bryde med den amerikanske koalition. Problemet er, at, pga. Frankrigs tab af industri og landets genintegrering i NATO, så er det afhængigt af amerikansk udstyr til hovedoperationer derovre. Og alt imens udenrigsminister Laurent Fabius sagde til *Le Progrès de Lyon* den 5. dec., at han ikke stillede krav om, at Assad skulle gå, før en politisk overgang finder sted – et skridt fremad vis-à-vis hans tidligere holdninger – så har Frankrig endnu ikke besluttet at genoprette samarbejde med Assad, hvilket er, hvad landet burde gøre.

Alt imens det er vigtigt for Frankrig at begynde at bevæge sig væk fra den angloamerikansk dominerede koalition og hen imod Rusland, så kan løsningen tydeligvis kun komme fra afsættelsen af Obama i USA.

*Foto: Moskovitter udtrykker deres solidaritet med Frankrig foran den franske ambassade.*

---

## **Rusland siger, USA og Rusland snart vil præsentere FN-Resolution for at forkrøble ISIS' indkomster**

Rusland siger, USA og Rusland snart vil præsentere FN-Resolution for at forkrøble ISIS' indkomster, sagde Ruslands ambassadør til FN Vitaly Churkin til reportere den 9. dec. »Vi arbejder sammen med USA's delegation om et fællesprojekt. Dette er en storstilet resolution til bekæmpelse af

terrorisme. Vi har tiltro til, at vi vil opnå dette, at denne resolution vil være klar til 18. december.« RT rapporterer, at denne »nye resolution vil indeholde en klausul, der vil håndhæve en strengere implementering af Resolution 2199 [en russisksponsoreret resolution fra februar 2015], der forbyder illegal oliehandel med terroristgrupper.«

*Foto: Vitaly Churkin i FN.*

---

## **USA bekræfter officielt: Amerikanske F-15-fly er i Tyrkiet som Ruslands modstandere**

*9. december 2015* – De amerikanske F-15C luft-til-luft-kampfly, der blev deployeret til Syrien i begyndelsen af november, blev sendt dertil for at være modstandere mod Ruslands tilstedeværelse i Syrien. En unavngiven højtplaceret embedsmand i det amerikanske Luftvåben kom med kommentarer, der faktisk sagde dette, i går, som det rapporteres af *The National Interest*. Embedsmanden sagde, at kampflyene blev sendt til Tyrkiet, fordi »vi mente, at Rusland var i færd med at optrappe deres krænkelser af grænsen.«

Embedsmanden bekræftede således den erklæring, som kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-Hi.) kom med den 1. dec. i Husets Komite for de Væbnede Styrker, da hun udspurgte forsvarsminister Ash Carter om truslen om atomkrig mod Rusland: »Så, den kendsgerning, at vi nu har vores F-15-fly, der afpatruljerer den tyrkisk-syriske grænse, med en primær luft-til-luft-operation – der er ingen luftkamp imod ISIS; de

har ingen aktiver i form af luftvåben; så jeg kan kun gå ud fra, at disse flys mål er russiske fly«, sagde hun. Carter svarede aldrig på hendes erklæring om F-15C-flyene, men det er nu demonstreret, at hun har ret.

Den unavngivne embedsmand klagede i øvrigt over, at tyrkerne ødelagde deployeringen af det amerikanske luftvåben med deres nedskydning af det russiske Su-24 fly den 24. november, som det amerikanske luftvåben ikke havde forventet, og det forventede heller ikke den russiske reaktion, dvs. russernes deployering af S-400 luftforsvarssystemet, tættere på den syriske kyst.

*Foto: Det russiske krigsskib Moskva krydser nu ud for den syriske havneby Latakia.*

---

## **Leder, 10. december 2015: USA: Et spørgsmål om overlevelse – for hele verden. Fjern Obama!**

Spørgsmålet om Frankrigs overlevelse efter det andet terrormassemord i Paris på et år blev udtrykt, da den franske præsident Hollande omgående og tvingende nødvendigt gik i aktion for at fremtvinge en alliance mellem Rusland, Frankrig og USA for at knuse ISIS og al-Qaeda.

Spørgsmålet om Ruslands overlevelse efter Tyrkiets bombing af det russiske fly over Syrien blev udtrykt, da præsident Putin holdt sin magtfulde tale til parlamentet i militærets hal, og påkaldte Ruslands 15 år lange kamp for at bekæmpe terror i

Rusland, og nu, international terror, og indkaldte hver eneste russiske borger til at se sig selv som en »soldat« i denne krig.

Spørgsmålet om Amerikas overlevelse nu har intet at gøre med valggøgllet efter terrorangrebet i San Bernardino. Spørgsmålet handler om den præsident Obama, der insisterer på at angribe og konfrontere Rusland og Kina som fjender, og som skjuler og benægter beviser for, at Saudi Arabien, Tyrkiet, Qatar og London støtter radikal jihadisme. Den præsident, der beordrede den amerikanske »åbning« til det Muslimske Broderskab siden 2011; som, siden afsættelsen og mordet på Gaddafi, har ført en bevidst kurs mod et endeligt opgør med Rusland og Kina, og i hvilket selvmorderisk opgør han tror, at de vil kapitulere til regimeskift, hvor som helst, han måtte ønske det.

Stiftende redaktør for Executive Intelligence Review Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, at Obama fjernes fra embedet, siden 2009, hvor han, med det samme, Obama indtog Det Hvide Hus, identificerede hans fatale »Nero-kompleks«.

LaRouche fremlagde det i dag: »Putin udøver en kvalitet af lederskab, der er de fleste amerikanske præsidenter i vores historie overlegent – men Obama! Obama begik et bevidst bedrageri, to gange på nationalt TV, hvor han dækkede over terroroperationen i Californien. Han støttede denne operation ved at forsøge at skjule dens karakter, og dernæst skjule dens sponsorer. Obama er en faktor for terrorisme og krig, en potentiel atomkrig.«

Obama driver nu nationen og planeten hen mod en atomar konfrontation, som den menneskelige civilisation ikke kan overleve. Atomvåbeneksperter kan se det og kommer med offentlige advarsler. Mindst ét kongresmedlem kan se det; kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard fra Hawaii udfordrede forsvarsminister Carter med denne Obamas trussel om atomkrig i Husets Komite for de Bevæbnede Styrker. Præsident Putin og det kinesiske lederskab ser det helt bestemt og træffer enhver

foranstaltning til at forberede sig, så vel som til at undgå krig.

Onsdag ringede en af LaRouchePAC's samarbejdspartnere i Midtvesten til sit kongresmedlem, briefede ham og sagde til ham, at Obama måtte fjernes ved hjælp af det 25. forfatningstillæg, omgående. Kongresmedlemmet sagde, at han ikke havde hørt nogen diskussion om dette. Vælgeren svarede magtfuldt, »Så kan du begynde diskussionen!« Det gjorde kongresmedlemmet, usandsynligt nok, og ringede tilbage til sin vælger to gange til for at rapportere, hvordan de andre i Kongressen havde reageret.

Det er blot én borger. Gang det op. Ændr hvad du tænker mht. din mulighed for at være med til at gøre, hvad der i virkeligheden er ret og nødvendigt.

---

## **Er nedtællingen til Tredje Verdenskrig allerede begyndt?**

*7. december 2015* – Veterandiplomat Paul Craig Roberts rejser netop denne frygtindgydende kendsgerning i en artikel i dag med overskriften: »Der er krig i horisonten: Er det for sent at standse det?« På trods af al Ruslands tilbageholdenhed og fornuft – først i Ukraine og nu i Syrien – bemærker Roberts, så er deres tilbageholdenhed blevet behandlet som svaghed, og ved hver begivenhed, især efter Tyrkiets angreb på russernes Su-24 bombefly, har Washington blot øget provokationsniveauet. Dette kan skyldes, som han ildevarslenende bemærker i begyndelsen, at, »når mobilisering for krig først begynder, følger det sin egen dynamik og er ukontrollerbart.«

Alt imens han aldrig bruger termen »atomar«, fremlægger

Roberts tydeligt kendsgerningen om den globale trussel. »Det er ikke klart, i hvilken udstrækning de russiske og kinesiske regeringer forstår, at deres uafhængige politik, som blev bekræftet af den russiske og den kinesiske præsident den 28. september [på FN's Generalforsamling], af Washington anses for at være 'eksistentielle trusler' mod USA's eneherredømme. Grundlaget for USA's udenrigspolitik er det forpligtende engagement over for at forhindre andre magter i at rejse sig til en status, hvor de vil være i stand til at begrænse Washingtons ensidige handling. Ruslands og Kinas evne til at gøre dette gør dem begge til mål.«

»Den russiske regering har forladt sig på ansvarlig, ikke-provokerende respons«, siger han. »Rusland har antaget en diplomatisk fremgangsmåde og forladt sig på, at europæiske regeringer kommer til fornuft og erkender, at deres nationale interesser afviger fra Washingtons, og ophører med at gøre Washingtons politik for eneherredømme mulig. Denne russiske politik er slået fejl. Gentagne gange er Ruslands ansvarlige responser med lav profil blevet brugt af Washington til at afbilde Rusland som en papirtiger, som ingen behøver være ræd for. Vi står tilbage med det paradoks, at Ruslands faste beslutning om at undgå krig, er i færd med at føre direkte til krig.«

»Hvad enten de russiske medier, det russiske folk og hele den russiske regering forstår dette eller ej«, siger Roberts som afslutning, »så må det være indlysende for det russiske militær. Det eneste, de russiske militærledere behøver gøre, er at se på sammensætningen af de styrker, der er sendt af NATO for at 'bekæmpe ISIS'. Som George Abert bemærker, så er de amerikanske, franske og britiske fly, der er blevet deployeret, kampfly, hvis formål er luft-til-luft-kampe, ikke angreb på jorden. Kampflyene er ikke deployeret for at angribe ISIS på jorden, men for at true de russiske bombefly, der angriber ISIS-mål på jorden.«

»Der er ingen tvivl om, at Washington driver verden hen imod

et Armageddon, og Europa er den, der gør det muligt. Washingtons købte og betalte marionetter i Tyskland, Frankrig og Storbritannien (Det forenede Kongerige) er enten dumme, ligeglade eller magtesløse over for at undfly Washingtons greb. Med mindre Rusland kan vække Europa, er krig uundgåelig.«

---

## **Rusland sender budskab med ubådslancerede krydsermissiler**

*8. december 2015* – For første gang har Rusland affyret krydsermissiler fra en ubåd imod ISIS-mål i Syrien. Ubåden Rostov-ved-Don affyrede et uspecificeret antal Kalibr krydsermissiler, mens den var neddykket. Den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu sagde til præsident Putin, at både Israel og USA blev adviseret på forhånd om affyringen, hvilket er blevet bekræftet af Pentagons pressesekretær Peter Cook under en pressebriefing her til eftermiddag. Putin bemærkede, at Kalibr krydsermissilet kan armeres med både konventionelle og atomare sprænghoveder og tilføjede, at han håber, atomsprænghoveder »aldrig vil blive nødvendige«.

I øvrigt rapporterede Shoigu, at russiske krigsfly med base i Latakia og Tu-22M Backfire bombefly med base i det sydlige Rusland har fløjet 300 sortier og ramt 600 mål i løbet af de seneste tre dage, og alle sortierne har været ledsaget af Su-30SM kampfly.

---

# Leder, 9. december 2015: NATO har bevæget sig over i en krigstilstand mod Rusland

Efter fuldstændigt at være blevet taget på sengen af den russiske præsident Putins strategiske flankoperation i Syrien, som annonceredes den 30. september, har Det britiske Imperium og præsident Obama lanceret en igangværende række direkte militære angreb og provokationer imod Rusland, som eskaleres for hver dag, der går. Dette har de gjort gennem helejede datterselskaber såsom ISIS (der mere ligner en gren af Londons Dope, Inc.), den tyrkiske regering, Saudi Arabien osv. Tag denne korte kronologiske oversigt i betragtning:

\* 31. okt.: Ruslands Metrojet sprænges i luften over Sinai af ISIS.

\* 24. nov.: Tyrkiet nedskyder et russisk SU-24 over Syrien, med klar godkendelse og forudgående ondsksfuld hensigt fra Obamas side. Tirsdag modtog præsident Putin flyets sorte boks, som det lykkedes russiske og syriske styrker at bjærge, og meddelte, at den kun vil blive åbnet under internationale eksperters tilstedeværelse, og at den ville vise, at flyet var blevet ramt i syrisk luftrum.

\* 1. dec.: Den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ash Carter annoncerede deployeringen af yderligere amerikanske specialstyrker i Irak, under den irakiske regerings højlydte protester.

\* 3. dec.: Tyrkiske tropper invaderede det nordlige Irak under den irakiske regerings skingre protester, igen med klar opbakning fra Obama. Dette eskalerede den 7. dec., da der



rapporteredes om yderligere tyrkiske tropper, der gik ind i området, hvilket bragte tallet op på 900 iflg. guvernøren for provinsen Ninive, rapporterer Sputnik. Tyrkiet har nægtet at trække sine tropper tilbage; deres eneste »indrømmelse« har været endnu ikke at sende yderligere 350 tropper, der er opstillet på grænsen, ind.

\* 6. dec.: USA bombede en syrisk militærbase i Syrien og dræbte tre soldater; et yderligere amerikansk bombeangreb dræbte 32 civile. Forsvarsministeriet har afvist ansvaret for angrebet på militærbasen og har modargumenteret med, at russerne gjorde det.

Finnian Cunningham, den anti-britiske, irske, politiske analytiker, hvis artikler jævnligt udgives i de russiske medier, opsummerede situationen i en artikel den 7. dec. i *RT*: »På trods af de absurde benægtelser, så er den barske konklusion den, at NATO er i krig med Syrien ... gennem forlængelse betyder dette, at NATO også har bevæget sig over i en krigstilstand imod Rusland, som den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assads regerings allierede.« Cunningham konkluderede: »Det ser ud, som om Washington er parat til at starte en verdenskrig.«

Og den russiske militærekspert Vladimir Bogatyrev gav et interview til Radio Sputnik den 7. dec., hvor han sagde, at Tyrkiets indrykning i det nordlige Irak er en provokation, der er koordineret med den amerikanske regering. »Vi er gået ind i en helt ny fase i kampen mod Daesh [ISIS] ... Det er afgjort en tyrkisk provokation. Og den var selvfølgelig koordineret med USA.«

Men alle disse provokationer på vegne af briterne og Obama går op imod Putins stålsatte beslutning og hans igangværende flankering af provokationerne. Tirsdag meddelte Putin og hans forsvarsminister Shoigu, at Rusland havde lanceret krydsermissiler imod ISIS fra en russisk ubåd i Middelhavet. Putin tilføjede, at missilerne kan armeres med enten et

konventionelt sprænghoved eller et atomsprænghoved, men at han håbede, atomsprænghoveder »aldrig vil blive nødvendige«.

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 7. december 2015: Vil Obama og Tyrkiet have krig med Rusland?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **Assad siger, russiske aktioner i Syrien beskytter hele Europa**

6. december 2015 – Den syriske præsident Bashar Assad advarede igen i dag, i et interview udgivet af Londons *Sunday Times*, de europæiske nationer om disses aktuelle, katastrofale kurs og pegede som en modsætning på det, Rusland gør:

»De [Rusland] ønsker at beskytte Syrien, Irak, regionen – og endda Europa. Jeg overdriver ikke, når jeg siger, at de beskytter Europa i dag.« Men det, de europæiske nationer gør sammen med USA, hvor de bomber i Syrien uden hans regerings

tilladelse, er ulovligt, sagde Assad, og er kun med til at få ISIS-canceren til at vokse.

»Vi ved lige fra begyndelsen, at Storbritannien og Frankrig var spydhoveder i støtten til terroristerne i Syrien, lige fra konfliktens begyndelse«, sagde han. »Vi ved, at de ikke har denne vilje, selv hvis vi vil gå tilbage til kapitlet om militær deltagelse i koalitionen, må den være omfattende, det må være fra luften, fra jorden, for at have samarbejde med tropperne på jorden, de nationale styrker, for at denne indgriben eller deltagelse skal være lovlig. Det er kun lovligt, hvis deltagelsen er i samarbejde med den legitime regering i Syrien. Så jeg ville sige, at de ikke har viljen og de har ikke visionen om, hvordan de skal nedkæmpe terrorismen ...

Så jeg ville sige, for det første, så vil de ikke skabe nogen resultater. For det andet vil det blive skadeligt og ulovligt, og det vil støtte terrorisme, som det, der skete efter at koalitionen begyndte sin operation for et år eller så siden, for dette er ligesom en cancer. Man kan ikke skære i canceren. Man må fjerne den. Denne form for operation er ligesom at skære i canceren, som vil få den til at spredes hurtigere i kroppen.«

Assad gentog ikke desto mindre sit tidligere tilbud om at samarbejde med enhver, der er seriøs omkring at ødelægge ISIS: »Hvis de er parat – seriøst og oprigtigt – til at bekæmpe terrorisme, byder vi ethvert land eller enhver regering, enhver politisk indsats, velkommen; i den henseende er vi ikke radikale, vi er pragmatiske.«

---

# Obama og briterne deployerer Tyrkiet til at provokere Putin

6. december 2015 – Den ISIS-allierede Recep Erdogans tyrkiske regering deployeres af Obamaregeringen og briterne for at forsøge at provokere den russiske præsident Putin ind i deres fælde med en konflikt, der eskaleres til atomkrig.

De 150 tyrkiske tropper og 25 tanks, der i denne weekend uindbudt gik ind i det nordlige Irak, er »lige ved siden af Mosul og lige imellem kurderne og ISIS«, direkte på smuglerruten for illegal ISIS-råolie ind i Tyrkiet fra Irak, skrev Tyler Durden i ZeroHedge.com den 5. dec. Den tyrkiske avis *Hurriyet* tilføjede, at det er planen, at »Tyrkiet får en permanent militærbase i Bashiqa-regionen i Mosul«.

Den irakiske regering protesterede i går over, at den tyrkiske handling var en »invasion« og krævede deres omgående tilbagetrækning og optrappede i dag med en erklæring fra premierministerens kontor, der lød: »Hvis en tilbagetrækning af disse styrker ikke finder sted inden for 48 timer, har Irak ret til at tage alle tilgængelige muligheder i anvendelse, inklusive at ty til FN's Sikkerhedsråd.« Foreløbig har Tyrkiet kun svaret lakonisk, at det har suspenderet alle yderligere troppeoverførsler.

I betragtning af disse udviklinger spørger Durden: »Dette er sluttelig endnu en optrapning fra Erdogan, og timing, sted og vage forklaringer rejser alle mulige spørgsmål om, hvad disse 150 tropper og 25 tanks foretager sig, men man kan være sikker på, at, hvis Bagdad irettesætter Washington og giver grønt lys til russisk rekognoscering og luftangreb i Irak, vil vi snart finde ud af det.«

Med et par nye hændelser mellem Tyrkiet og Rusland

tilbageholdt Tyrkiet tidligere på ugen fire russiske handelsskibe i den tyrkiske havn Samsun pga. angivelige »manglende dokumenter« og overtrædelse af sikkerheden. Tre af de fire skibe blev frigivet den 4. dec., men et skib er fortsat tilbageholdt. Den tyrkiske handling kom iflg. rapporterne efter russerne tilbageholdt fem tyrkiske skibe i Novorossiysk, der siden alle er blevet frigivet. Og det Tyrkiske Udenrigsministerium har protesteret over, at en russisk soldat i går svingede med en raket-affyrer på sin skulder på dækket af et russisk skib under dets passage gennem Bosporus, der deler Istanbul i to.

*Foto: Tyrkiets statsminister Recep Tayyip Erdogan.*

---

## **Leder, 7. december 2015: USA: En sand præsidentiel erklæring om terrorisme fra Lyndon LaRouche**

»Det, vi har her, er et problem, der umiddelbart kan spores til det terrorregime, der ramte Paris og andre dele af Frankrig for nylig. Vi har nu i USA, i mindre skala, den samme type operation med en arabisk gruppe for panik, og som begår masse mord. De masse mord, der styres af Tyrkiet og andre netop nu, er en del af den samme ting, som nu dræber amerikanere i USA på samme basis. Og grunden til, at dette finder sted, er Barack Obama, der har magt til at håndtere dette problem, men ikke gør det. Man kan derfor ikke klage over disse ting, hvis man ikke handler med de midler, der er til rådighed, for at korrigere problemet.«

»Der sker det, at politiets styrker har nogen indsigt i dette her, men den form for indsigt, der behøves, bliver ikke leveret! USA's præsident er ansvarlig for at håndtere dette, for denne bølge af terror, der smittede fra Frankrig, som kom fra Saudi Arabien oprindeligt, derfra, rammer nu USA, og enten ved USA's præsidentskab det, eller også er det så dumt, at det ikke ved det.«

»Nogen bør gøre noget ved det. Det her vil blive værre. Men hvis man ikke sørger for at blive dette særlige tilfælde af terror kvit – for dette er kun en del af en plan for at skabe massiv uro, på denne måde, internt i USA, så vel som andre steder.«

»Så derfor gør Obama ikke sit job! Obama handler ikke for at redde amerikanske borgeres liv. Og det er den eneste måde at få ram på det her. Lad være med at kommentere det: Korriger det.«

»Vi er kommet til et tidspunkt, hvor vi ikke simpelthen kan løse et problem ad gangen. Vi må erkende, at hele planeten, under Det britiske Imperiums indflydelse, som sådan; det var Det britiske Imperium, der organiserede de generelle krige i forrige århundrede; [den amerikanske] borgerkrigen var et produkt af dette samme problem.«

»Problemet er således, at vi simpelthen må rense op i dette rod.«

Senere i diskussionen gentog LaRouche:

»Denne præsident må fjernes fra embedet, fordi han terroriserer hele USA's befolkning, og han er derfor ikke skikket til at være USA's præsident.«

LaRouches lederskab overlapper den voksende afsky i landet mod Obamas løgne, og hans afsindige fremstød mod en atomar konfrontation med Rusland og Kina – som på det seneste bruger Erdogans regering i Tyrkiet til at lancere den ene provokation

efter den anden imod Rusland. Den 4. dec. var Melon-Scaifes *Pittsburgh Tribune Review* den seneste avis, der tog spalteskriver Charles Hurts artikel i *Washington Times* op, hvor denne rejser spørgsmålet om det nødvendige i at aktivere det 25. forfatningstillæg imod en præsident Obama, de er ansvarlig for, at ISIS nu »kommer til Amerika«. Andre medier, såsom *Boston Herald*, er oprørte over Obamas håndtering af San Bernadino-skyderiet og skriver: »Vold på arbejdspladsen? Virkelig?«

Men det er kun få mennesker i USA, der endnu forstår dybden af de forandringer, der kræves for at løse disse problemer – såsom den presserende forlængelse af Verdenslandbroen ud i hvert eneste hjørne af planeten, inklusive i det krigshærgede Mellemøsten. De har heller ikke overvejet den menneskelige kreativitets enestående egenskaber, der ligger uden for de dagligdags vaner med »praktisk tankegang«, og som er nødvendige for at få denne revolutionerende transformation til at ske.

Her kommer LaRouches Manhattan-projekt ind, som netop tager dette afgørende spørgsmål op. Som LaRouche erklærede i sin **'Samtale omkring Pejser'**:

»Sådan noget som en evolutionær proces inden for udvikling af menneskelig kultur eksisterer ikke. Der er virkninger, der finder sted på bestemte tider. Men så kollapser hele kulturen pludselig, den forsvinder, den bliver slagtet. Senere kommer der så en anden person og stimulerer til noget nyt, og giver således menneskeheden en ny chance for at gøre fremskridt.«

»Det er vores opgave at forstå dette spørgsmål om fremskridt, og fremskridt er ikke en evolutionær proces. Det er altid en revolutionær proces, det er aldrig evolutionært! Og alle, der bare sidder og venter på en revolutionær proces, narrer sig selv. En sådan form for revolution må være en genial handling, der ligesom kommer ud af intetheden. Og jeg leder efter folk, der vil gøre den slags arbejde og blive til de genier, der vil

forårsage, at fremtiden bliver genfødt.«

---

# Advarsel: "Hvorfor det ikke løser problemet at bombe ISIS"

Den 1. december, 2015 – Flere personer har i de seneste dage udtalt og afsløret den svindel, der er forbundet med Obamas og briternes aktuelle handlinger i Syrien, samt udstillet truslen om en altomfattende krig; man er tæt ved ligeud at sige 'få galningen ud' (af det Hvide Hus, -red.), før det er for sent. Tidligere præsidentkandidat Pat Buchanan, en pensioneret amerikansk oberst, og en professor ved Bath Universitetet i Storbritannien er tre eksempler på sådanne kommentatorer.

Buchanan konkluderer i sin artikel med titlen: "Er vi ved at snuble ind i en krig med Rusland?", således: "Som tingene står i dag, støtter Putin de amerikansk-franske angreb på ISIS. Men hvis vi følger tyrkerne, og begynder at hjælpe de oprørere, der angriber den syriske hær, kunne vi befinde os ansigt til ansigt i en konfrontation med Rusland, hvor vore NATO allierede ikke er med os. Er der nogen, der har gennemtænkt dette?"

Professor David Miller havde følgende overskrift på sin artikel: "Hvordan stopper vi terrorisme? Ved at stoppe med at begå terrorisme." I det skotske dagblad *National*, skriver



Miller, at "det første, de vestlige nationer skal gøre, hvis de ønsker at stoppe terrorisme, er at stoppe med at begå den. Hemmelige bortførelser, tortur, snigmord på udvalgte personer med drone eller special-kommando, samt massedrab på civile, forårsager terror og skaber terrorister." Vi ved, at Daesh (ISIS) er et afkom af Blair-regeringens katastrofale invasion af Irak. Ideen om, at Daesh og andre drives af islamisk ekstremistisk ideologi, støttes ikke af dokumentation fra frontlinjen. Lydia Wilson fra 'Center for the Resolution of Intractable Conflict' ved Oxford Universitet, rapporterer om oplevelsen med at interviewe Daesh-krigsfanger i Irak. Hun citerer en fange, der formulerer sine grunde til at kæmpe således: "Amerikanerne kom," sagde han. "De fjernede Saddam, men de fratog os også vores sikkerhed. Jeg brød mig ikke om Saddam, vi sultede dengang, men i det mindste havde vi ikke krig. Borgerkrigen startede, da I kom hertil."

I *Spectator* skriver pensioneret oberst Andrew J. Bacevich, nu ansat ved Boston Universitetet, i en artikel med overskriften "Vi foregiver at være i krig: Hvorfor det ikke løser problemet at bombe ISIS":

"Selv suppleret med kommandoraids, træningsmissioner og generøs uddeling af våben til lokale styrker, beløber de opnåede resultater for de mange fløjne bombetogter, mængden af brugt ammunition og de ramte mål, sig tilsammen ikke til meget mere end militært småstikkeri. I USA har luftangrebene indlysende mangel på effektivitet udløst opfordringer til en decideret invasion. Ekspert i den krigeriske kategori, af hvilke de fleste gik forkert af Irakkrigen i 2003, insisterer på, at blot 10.000 eller 20.000 landtropper – maksimalt 50.000! – hurtigt vil kunne gøre det af med Islamisk Stat som en kampstyrke. Garanteret sejr. Intet problem ..."

"Knus ISIS, hvad enten det sker med bombing eller landtropper, og problemerne vil stadig være der. Et nyt ISIS, under et andet navn, men sandsynligvis under samme flag, vil dukke op i stedet, meget lig den måde, hvorpå ISIS selv

dukkede op af asken fra al-Qaeda i Irak ...

"Intervention tjener typisk til at skærpe situationen og fremprovokere yderligere modstand. Fremfor at slukke radikalismens flammer, ender vi med at nære dem ...

"At de vestlige regeringer pr. refleks vil hjemsøge regionen med yderligere vold, repræsenterer ikke en politik, men derimod en opgivelse af politik. Det er på høje tid at tænke anderledes", konkluderede han.

---

# **LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast 4. december 2015: Brug jeres enestående, menneskelige potentiale til at bidrage til skabelsen af en højere tilstand af eksistens for menneskeheden!**

I løbet af de 10 dage, siden Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske bombefly ... , har de barske kendsgerninger, som hr. LaRouche har advaret om i årevis, hævdet sig meget levende, og på uigendrivelig måde: at, under denne præsidents fortsatte

politik befinder verden sig kun en hårs bredde fra en fuldt optrappet atomkrig, en krig, der kunne bryde ud, hvornår det skal være, og en krig, der ville blive absolut uden fortilfælde mht. det omfang af død og ødelæggelse, som en sådan krig ville udløse. Engelsk udskrift.

## **Utilize Your Unique Human Potential To Contribute**

### **To the Creation of a Higher State of Existence for Mankind! International Webcast for December 4, 2015**

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's December 4, 2015. You're watching our regular Friday evening webcast here from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). My name is Mathew Ogden, and I will be your host

here this evening. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and by Benjamin

Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team. And the three of us

did have an opportunity to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier today, and what we present here tonight will be

informed as a reflection of the outcome of that discussion.

We meet here tonight under very urgent circumstances. In the 10 days since the shooting-down of the Russian fighter jet by Turkey over Syrian territory, the stark reality of what Mr. LaRouche has been warning about for years has asserted itself very vividly, and in an indisputable way: that under the continued policies of this President, the world is currently only

a hair's breadth away from all-out thermonuclear war, a war which

could occur any hour of any day, and one whose consequences would

be absolutely unprecedented in the magnitude of death and devastation which such a war would unleash.

As Mr. LaRouche was very forthright in the hours following

that incident on Nov. 24, and was echoed and confirmed later by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Turkey was by no means acting alone in the decision to take this incredibly provocative action, but must have possessed some sort of prior agreement directly from the United States to shoot this Russian plane down-the very first such direct military action against a Russian military aircraft by a NATO member country in over 60 years, and one taken with the obvious foreknowledge of everything that such an attack implies in terms of the rapid chain of escalation of response, and counter-response, which can very quickly, under these circumstances, lead to the issuance of a command for the launch of a nuclear strike.

Thus, as Mr. LaRouche has not ceased to warn in very clear terms, every day that Obama has his finger on the red button of the United States strategic nuclear arsenal, is a day of existential danger to the entirety of the human race. Now in the aftermath of this incident, the dire urgency of this grim reality has begun to sink in. We saw the article that we mentioned last week in {Politico} magazine on Nov. 27, by Bruce Blair, a nuclear security expert at Princeton University, and one of the cofounders of the Global Zero movement for the elimination of nuclear arms. The article was titled "Could U.S.-Russian Tensions Go Nuclear?", and described in detail the so-called launch-on-warning status which have the nuclear weapons of both Russia and the United States on hair-trigger alert in which the decision to launch a full-scale nuclear barrage by either side, must be made within a matter of mere minutes, if

not

mere seconds. The author, Bruce Blair, says the following:

“The public doesn’t realize just how little time exists for our leaders to make a decision to use nuclear weapons, even today. And if anything, the atmosphere has become even more hair-trigger. A launch order is the length of a tweet. Missile crews in turn transmit a short stream of computer signals that immediately ignite the rocket engines of many hundreds of land-based missiles. For the United States, this takes one minute. Given the 1 to 30 minute flight times of attacking missiles, 11 for submarines lurking off the other side’s coasts,

and 30 minutes for rockets flying over the poles to the other side of the planet, nuclear decision-making under launch-on-warning, the process from warning to decision to action, is extremely rushed, emotionally charged, and pro forma,

driven by check lists. I describe it as the rote enactment of a

prepared script. In some scenarios after only a 3 minute assessment of early warning data, the U.S. President receives a

30 second briefing on his nuclear response options, and their consequences. He then has a few minutes – 12 at most – more likely 3 to 6, to choose one option.”

The author also quotes President Reagan, who in his memoirs complained of having “only 6 minutes to decide how to respond to

a blip on a radar scope, and decide whether or not to release Armageddon.” – which, parenthetically, is why President Reagan decided to take up Mr. LaRouche’s proposal for a joint U.S.-Russian space-based missile defense system, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, to render nuclear missiles impotent

and obsolete. But as we well know, Barack Obama is definitely no

Ronald Reagan.

Now in addition to this article by Bruce Blair, yesterday former Defense Secretary William Perry, said in a very significant presentation which he made in Washington, D.C., the following: "The U.S. is on the brink of kicking off a new nuclear arms race that will elevate the risk of nuclear apocalypse to Cold War levels. " He said, "We're now at the precipice, maybe I should say the brink, of a new arms race," and called for the dismantling of the ICBM component of the so-called nuclear triad. And he went on to say, "the risk of nuclear war is exacerbated by the dismantling of the relationship between Russia and the U.S. that had been formed after the fall of the Soviet Union. Without clear military to military communication between those two nations, the risk of conflict increases. I probably would not have said this 10 years ago," he said. But today we now face the kind of dangers of a nuclear event like we had during the Cold War, an accidental war. I see an imperative, therefore, to stop this damn nuclear arms race from accelerating again." And finally, we have the confrontation by Congresswoman , Democratic Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard, during a hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, of Obama's Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, which we're going to play a video clip for you in just one minute. Representative Gabbard's remarks were covered quite extensively in the press, under headlines such as "Tulsi Gabbard says, Obama Policies could trigger war with Russia," which was in the Huffington Post, and "Democratic Congresswoman

Warns, Obama Could Drag the U.S. into a devastating nuclear war with Russia," Daily Mail. What you're about to hear Congresswoman Gabbard say, also echoes statements that she made a few days earlier in a CNN interview, after having returned from Paris, in which she warned that Obama's policies in Syria " put the United States and Russia into a head-to-head conflict, with the possibility that one side will shoot down the other's planes, kicking off what is much larger, potentially world war, and a nuclear war between the United States and Russia, and she said, "We've got to ask ourselves: what will the costs of this be? The devastation to the American people and to the world, and for what? What's the benefit? Why are we trying to do this in Syria? Why are we trying to go to war with Russia over this disagreement concerning the overthrowing of the Syrian government of Bashar al-Assad. It's crazy." So let's see this short video clip of Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard and Ash Carter:

GABBARD: The policy to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad has thrown us into a potential direct head to head military conflict with Russia. I have some important questions along this line. How many nuclear warheads does Russia have aimed at the U.S., and how many does the U.S. have aimed at Russia?

CARTER: Congresswoman, I will get you those precise numbers as best we know them. Let me just summarize it by the fact that

we have a, I'm confident, a strong, safe, secure, reliable deterrent. But it's also true that Russia, like the Soviet Union that precedes it, has a massive nuclear arsenal.

GABBARD: Right. And it would be accurate to say that both of our countries have the capacity to launch these nuclear weapons within minutes?

CARTER: We do.

GABBARD: I've seen pictures, films, and images from Nagasaki and Hiroshima; I know you have as well. And I presume you would agree with me that nuclear war would be devastating to the American people; the amount of suffering that it would cause and the devastation to our families, our children, our communities, our planet, our future generations is difficult to imagine. So, I'm wondering if there's been an assessment done on how many lives would be lost and the damage that would be done if this nuclear war between our two countries were to occur?

CARTER: Congresswoman, I've been doing this for a long time, including during the Cold War, and working on nuclear weapons since the beginning of my career. And to answer your question, there have been estimates made right along. When there was a Soviet Union, then a Russia, and it's a very simple story; it is as you say. Nuclear war would be an absolutely unprecedented, and result in a catastrophic destruction; that is why deterrence is so important, that's why prudence in the field of nuclear matters



by leaders all over the world is so essential.

GABBARD: So the fact that we now have our F-15s patrolling the Turkey-Syria border with a primary air-to-air combat operation; there's no air-to-air combat against ISIS. They don't have any air assets. So, I can only presume that the purpose of these planes would be to target Russian planes; is that accurate?

CARTER: Congresswoman, let me answer the point you began with, which is we have a different view, a very different view from Russia about what would be constructive for them to do in Syria. We have that disagreement; we can't align ourselves with what they're doing. We're opposing and want them to change what they're doing in Syria. That's not the same as the United States and Russia clashing; I think that the Chairman and his counterpart in Russia just talked yesterday about making sure that we didn't by accident have any incident involving US and Russian forces. So, we have a sharp disagreement there, but that's not the same as blundering into an armed situation with one another.

GABBARD: But that sharp disagreement – sorry, sir, I only have a minute here – that sharp disagreement with two diametrically opposed objectives. One, the US seeking to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad, Russia seeking to uphold the Syrian government of Assad, creates that potential; that strong potential and that strong likelihood for that head-to-head combat, or that head-to-head military conflict. And Russia's installation of their anti-aircraft missile defense system increases that possibility of whether it's intentional or

even an accidental event, where one side may shoot down the other side's plane. And that's really where the potential is for this devastating nuclear war, for something that could blow up into something much larger.

CARTER: I have to correct something, Congresswoman, that you said; which is that I would characterize Russia's prospective differently. And by the way, what they say and what they do are

two different things. What they said they were going to do was fight ISIL and pursue a political transition; and not support Assad endlessly, but instead, try to pursue a political solution.

What they've done militarily has had the effect of supporting Assad, no question about it. And they haven't gone after ISIL, they've gone after moderate – that's our source of disagreement.

We're having that disagreement and trying to get them to come around; that is what Secretary Kerry is doing, to a more reasonable and constructive position. But at the same time, as the Chairman's efforts indicate – and the Russians agree with this intent on avoiding an accidental situation in the air over Syria.

OGDEN: Having seen that, the question that you must ask is, what is the necessary action that must be taken to defuse this very real and immediate threat of thermonuclear war which threatens us as a direct consequence of Obama's policies, both in

Syria and elsewhere. And I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium to address this question; but as Mr. LaRouche has repeatedly said, the only guarantee is for responsible parties in

this country to take the Constitutional action necessary to

remove Barack Obama from the Presidency of the United States, specifically through the activation of the 25th Amendment to the US Constitution. Which stipulates that if the President is deemed mentally incapable of serving in the role of Commander in Chief, he can be removed and replaced through the predetermined line of succession. Mr. LaRouche has been calling for this measure to be taken for a number of years; but just this week, discussion of this measure has exploded into the mainstream press, including very significantly in an editorial that was published in the {Washington Times} by staff writer Charles Hurt, which was titled, "Has the President Lost His Ability to Discharge the Powers and Duties of Office?" The editorial begins by asking, "Has our President officially lost his ability to discharge the powers and duties of his office? Anyone who listened to President Obama speak to reporters in Paris on Tuesday, would reasonably conclude that it is high time to start drawing up the papers to transmit to Congress for his removal." And after describing in detail the rambling and largely incoherent performance by Obama during his press conference in Paris earlier this week, the author concludes by stating the following: "Someone alert the Senate Pro Tem; somebody call the Speaker of the House, and let's all dust off the 25th Amendment." So Jeff, with all this evidence of a growing acknowledgement in public discussion of the danger which Mr. LaRouche has been warning about for years, of world war resulting from the continuation of Obama's policies, what can you tell us about what

the discussion is among responsible persons behind the scenes, and what must be done now to remove this imminent threat of a global thermonuclear war?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I think it's important to take note of the fact that the {Washington Times} did publish that Charles Hurt piece, but that there were other commentaries

along exactly the same lines. There was a similar editorial comment, picking up on the {Washington Times} story in the {Washington Enquirer}; and in both cases, there were references

to a series of commentaries that appeared recently in the {Washington Post}, which is generally thought of – along with the {New York Times} as one of the mainstays of the liberal establishment media apparatus. You had Richard Cohen and Dana Milbank, two of the senior regular {Washington Post} editorial columnists taking note of the fact that President Obama was completely disoriented and when his teleprompter broke down during the course of his presentations in Paris, he stammered and

staggered 336 times in a speech that ran a total of 13 minutes.

Never mind that the gathered world leaders were told that they had a firm 5-minute limitation on their speeches. It may have taken the President 13 minutes to deliver a 5-minute address;

I haven't reviewed the text, or timed it or anything. But clearly,

he is suffering from severe mental exhaustion, a breakdown; someone who – as Lyndon LaRouche identified as early as April of

2009 – suffers from a form of extreme narcissism, can't avoid the reality that the world is going in a very different direction

than his narcissistic delusions would have him believe.

Just prior to the attacks in Paris, on the 13th of November,

the President issued a statement saying that ISIS was contained and on the way to being defeated, and didn't pose a threat. Earlier he had called them "the junior varsity of terrorism." I think reality tells us something quite different. Earlier this week, he said that there is no measurable security threat, here, inside the United States. And what we saw happen in San Bernardino, California several days ago, clearly demonstrates that that was not an accurate reflection of reality. The response of the White House has been to put pressure on FBI Director, [James] Comey, and on the media, to hold back from drawing the obvious conclusion, that virtually anybody in their right mind has drawn, from even the media coverage of that San Bernardino incident, namely, that it was a pre-meditated terrorist attack. It's very much reminiscent of what happened on September 11th, 2001, when President Obama ordered a false statement, a patently absurd false statement, about the attack in Benghazi [Libya] that led to the murder of U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other American officials. And that, of course, is still an issue that's pending before the House [Select Committee on Benghazi]. So, we're clearly dealing with a situation where the President's grip on reality is slipping precipitously. Under similar circumstances, back in the early 1970s, members of President Richard Nixon's own political party, were grounded enough in reality that they were willing to recognize that Nixon was "losing it" mentally, and represented a grave danger to the survival of the United States, and they were

seriously contemplating invoking the recently-ratified 25th Amendment, that provides for the immediate removal of the President of the United States. These recent articles, published this week, have openly said that Vice-President Joe Biden should reach out to Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, and similarly consult with the Cabinet, and consider invoking the 25th Amendment. That process can remove Obama from office within a matter of {hours}. And so, we're here in a situation. We've seen the developments. We've saw the Tulsi Gabbard exchange with Ashton Carter. And, I think it's noteworthy, that the statements that Matt just quoted from, from former Defense Secretary Bill Perry, have very much bearing on the situation, because Perry and Ash Carter have jointly written a number of articles in military journals. They're very very close. One could almost say that Perry is Ashton Carter's mentor. So, if you've got someone like Perry alarmed enough to come out publicly – and really, in a sense, reverse his own statements of the recent years – and say we've got to get in synch with the Russians, and you hold that up against what Carter is saying as an official spokesman for the Administration, putting the onus on Russia, and really refusing to directly address the issues that were raised by Congresswoman Gabbard, you get an idea that there is a disconnect from reality, with respect to the most pressing and dangerous issue facing mankind today, which is the question, "Are we close to the kind of incident that could get out of control and lead to nuclear war?"

Nobody in the Administration is talking about what the consequences and implications are, of the fact that President Obama {publicly, after the fact}, endorsed the actions of the Turkish government in shooting down that Russian Su-24 over the

border area between Turkey and Syria. I'm told by leading U.S. military and intelligence contacts that there's unanimous agreement among the leading countries of NATO, including the U.S.

military, and all of the major European militaries, that, basically, the Turks had no business shooting down that Russian

plane; it was an act of {absolute provocation}. If Turkey was not

a member of NATO, with that Article 5 mandate for collective security backing them up, without the idea that [President] Erdogan had, that he had the full backing of President Obama, it's very unlikely that he would have even remotely considered ordering the bombing of that Russian plane.

Now, what is the aftermath of that action by Turkey? From a strictly military standpoint, as we talked about this last week,

leading figures within the U.S. military and intelligence command, immediately got on the horn with their Russian counterparts. And there was an agreement reached that this would

not be, in and of itself, a trigger for an all-out war in the region, a war between Russia and Turkey. President Putin refrained from any direct military retaliation against Turkey. And that's a good thing.

What Russia {did} however do, as Representative Gabbard referenced, Russia has deployed their S-400 Air Defense Systems

to the airbase in Latakia Province inside Syria. That airbase is

32 miles from the Turkish border. The S-400 Air Defense Systems

have a range of 250 miles. In other words, Russia has the ability to knock out Turkish aircraft 200 miles {inside} Turkish territory. That's an area in which U.S. fighter planes and drones are also operating.

The Russians have now equipped all of their entire range of Su fighter planes with air-to-air missile capabilities, so that

you've got both American and Russian, and now you've got the added complexities of British and French, perhaps soon German, planes, all flying within that same general airspace.

So, to say that we are not in a situation where the conflict, even if it's a disagreement over policy toward Syria,

that this doesn't represent a hair-trigger situation for a war that could directly involve U.S. and Russian forces, not surrogates, but direct U.S. and Russian military forces, would be

an absolute denial of reality.

Now, a number of military thinkers have come out with measures that could be taken to mitigate the risk. There are those, including [ret.] German General [Harald] Kujat, who've called for the re-convening of the NATO-Russia Council, to create

a mechanism for coordination between NATO and Russia, in which the Syria-Turkey issue would be one element of it. Former top DIA

official and retired U.S. Army Colonel, [W.] Patrick Lang, in his

widely-read website, has said that Turkey should be suspended from NATO, because their irresponsible behavior could, by itself,

be a trigger for general war. There are proposals, reflected by

[U.S. and Russian nuclear security expert] Bruce Blair; reflected



by Gen. [James] Cartwright, who was the former vice-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [and] former head of the U.S. Strategic

Command, our nuclear triad; along with Russian [Maj.] Gen. [Vladimir] Dvorkin, who was the chief intelligence analyst for Russia's strategic rocket force – who've all said, "Let's immediately abandon launch-on-warning. We've got to, basically, create an alternative to this hair-trigger situation, where a decision about global nuclear annihilation, has to be made in a matter of seconds."

The reality is, that there is another option. It's the option that was referenced in the {Washington Times} and the {Washington Examiner}, and even implicitly in the {Washington Post}. And it's the option that Lyndon LaRouche has been discussing {for a very long time}. You've got to {remove} one of

the most crucial factors that continues this threat, which is the continuation of President Barack Obama in office. The 25th Amendment is there. His behavior in Paris, his erratic behavior,

has caused alarm bells to go off all over the place, and the question that's got to be posed, is: "Are {you}, Member of Congress; are {you}, American Citizen, willing to run the risk of

maintaining a President in office, who may very well be "losing it" mentally, and who certainly has exhibited a policy of hatred towards Russia

and particularly towards President Putin, that under the present circumstances poses a grave danger of general war, a war that

could be a nuclear war.

So, that's the question on the table. And now that Mr. LaRouche is no longer the only leading American political voice openly talking about immediately invoking the 25th Amendment, maybe it's time for a serious national debate and dialogue on that issue to put the kind of pressure on Vice-President Biden, Secretary Kerry, Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, to not run the risk, to not play, to use a bad analogy, Russian roulette, with nuclear warheads, and the barrel of a gun, when the survival of humanity is at stake.

We are really now in a very different place than we even were a few weeks ago. The actions taken by Erdogan have brought us to that moment of hair-trigger, and while there are many things that could be done to ameliorate that danger, the fact is that none of them are possible so long as President Obama is in office. So the tools are right there. The 25th Amendment can be activated on a moment's notice. We could have a regime change, purely constitutional, here in the United States, as a measure of caution against someone in a state of mental breakdown, being in a position of having his finger on the nuclear trigger. And I see no justification whatsoever for running the risk of mankind's survival, of waiting another day to activate that potential.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, I'm just going to pose the institutional question for this evening, and Jeff

will

deliver what Mr. LaRouche's response was to this, as well as Helga LaRouche's insights. The question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the German Bundestag has voted to support the U.S. coalition military operations in Syria against the Islamic State,

and the British Parliament has also taken similar action. What is

your view of German and British involvement in the fight against

the Islamic state in Syria?"

STEINBERG: Well, I think that one thing that's obvious, the first comment from Mr. LaRouche on this was, yes, we've got to defeat the Islamic State. It's got to be done, and there's got to

be an alliance of countries involved in doing that, and with that, he said, of course always be cautious. You can never trust

the British.

Now, the fact of the matter is that there are measures that could be taken, that would lead to the crushing of the Islamic State, to the taking back of Raqqa, their nominal capital, to the

ouster of the Islamic State from Mosul—the military options are

all quite clear and are being openly discussed, and are being proposed around the tables all over the place. Seal the border with Turkey. The Erdogan government in Turkey through the son Balal Erdogan, son of the president, has been the major source of

black market revenue for the Islamic State, since the very beginning. We know that there are massive black market oil deals

going on between ISIS and the Turkish black market, which is really the mafia underbelly of Erdogan's AKP Party, and the MIT,

which is the Turkish equivalent of the CIA, run by one of Erdogan's very close associates.

So, you can seal the borders. You can start the economic squeeze against the Islamic State. You could create a single joint military command operation fully integrating Russia, into

whatever other military operations are going to be run. President

Hollande of France, when he was in Washington, and then in Moscow

last week, specifically proposed that there be a consolidated unified air campaign against ISIS, and that on the ground the Syrian army be integrated with some of the rebel groups that are

strictly made up of former Syrian military personnel-some element

of the Free Syrian Army, in particular. That kind of ground force, maybe with some other assistance from the Iraqi military,

along with a massive air campaign, through a single unified command, could wipe out the Islamic State, at least in so far as

it's operating out of a major safe haven territory in Syria and

Iraq.

The problem, however, as has been demonstrated by Paris, by San Bernardino now this week here in the United States-on a much

lower scale, of course- by the bombing of the Metro jet, Russian

metro jet over the Sinai, by the suicide bombings in Southern Beirut, all of these things indicate that you're dealing with a

much larger problem that's not going to be solved overnight. You

can crush the nominal Islamic State militarily, but you've got to

address a much more fundamental issue, which is that the policies, the geo-political policies coming out of the leading Western powers—the United States, particularly Great Britain, France to a degree, certainly Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Turkey—there's been a long-standing policy of promoting the Saudi-Wahhabi neo-Salafist agenda, and spreading this disease, this Dark Age ideology, all over the globe. You have large swaths of territory in the Middle East, in North Africa, in other parts of Asia, that are ungovernable, and have been turned into no-man's lands as the result of the prolonged policies— I would say that it's the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries' Thirty Years War, except it began operationally in 1979, when Jimmy Carter and Brzezinski were still in office, when there was a presidential finding authorizing the assembling of the Islamist mujahideen to drive the Soviet Red Army out of Afghanistan, except, of course, that operation began 6 months before the Soviets even went into Afghanistan. So, we're in the throes of a multi-generational process of creating Dark Age conditions in many parts of the planet. If you were born 35 years ago in Afghanistan, you've never lived under anything other than 30 Years' War conditions of violence and chaos. And don't say that Afghanistan was always like that, there's nothing you can do about it. That's emphatically not true. Throughout the postwar period, the 50s, 60s, and 70s, the United States' presence in Afghanistan was largely through the Army Corps of Engineers, the Peace Corps, and other organizations like that, and the place was relatively peaceful and stable. It

was not the world's opium production capital. So, the point is that there are alternative policies that must be enacted to really defeat this Dark Age phenomenon.

The Chinese have adopted the One Belt/One Road policy of developing vast corridors of infrastructure, of industrial and agricultural expansion, of water management, throughout much of

Eurasia. For that program to work, it's going to be urgent that

we achieve stability in places like Syria and Iraq, and in many

parts of North Africa. So, the real question here is, if you're

prepared to commit to defeating the phenomenon that ISIS right now is the most visible representation of, you've got to be prepared to fundamentally change your thinking. You've got to be

willing to abandon geo-politics, altogether. Abandon the British

Empire, because this policy of permanent warfare across this great big crescent running from North Africa through the Middle

East and Central Asia, all along the southern borders of the former Soviet Union into Western China,—that's a British geo-political policy. It was called the Bernard Lewis plan back

in the 1970s, of spreading fundamentalist chaos along that entire

what they called crescent (arc) of crisis.

That program hasn't changed. It's British geo-politics at its worst. It's population warfare at its worst. And those policies must be abandoned all together. There was even a commentary this week in the {Wall Street Journal} of all places,

asking the question of whether or not China's New Silk Road policy might not be the key to saving the situation in Syria and

Iraq, and throughout that region. You've got to give people hope that there is a viable prospect for a future, if you're going to get those leading strata within Syrian society back from Europe, where they were driven out by ISIS; back into Syria to rebuild their country. They've got to know that there is a commitment to a kind of a global Marshall Plan, which the Chinese have proposed as part of their One Belt/One Road policy. I had the privilege, earlier this week, of being in Tokyo, attending two conferences. One where Helga Zepp-LaRouche spoke about the urgent need to avoid the war dangers by the United States and other western countries, by becoming fully involved and committed to working in conjunction with China and the other BRICS countries on this One Belt/One Road policy. We've got to build development corridors from areas that are now strictly war zones. I spoke at a second conference earlier this week with Mrs. LaRouche in Tokyo; and we both took up this question very strongly. You need a new paradigm of thinking; you need to think at the level of real human beings who uniquely are capable of thinking about the future. Of creating a new future; not one that's defined by the geopolitics of population war, but one that's defined by scientific advancement, by the betterment of all mankind. So, the issue on the table is, you can defeat ISIS militarily with some readily

available tool; especially if you drop the war confrontation with Russia, and get into an alliance with Russia, which means getting Obama out of office under the 25th Amendment. It's doable, but you're not going to solve the deeper underlying problem of the consequences of the last 35 years or more of this hideous geopolitics of pitting one nation, one people against another, promoting irrationalism and fundamentalism. You've got to basically roll up your shirt sleeves and begin real development of the kind that China has correctly defined as the win-win policy of the future.

At this conference, there was a leading representative from Russia, Dr. Yakunin, who said that the Russians have concluded that their Eurasian development plan for major infrastructure projects, is completely compatible with China's One Belt/One Road policy. India, as a leading BRICS country, is fully on board with that prospect. We're about to develop a plan and publish it in the coming days, for the United States to become fully integrated into this global World Land-Bridge policy. But this requires an overhaul of thinking; and that overhaul of thinking is now long overdue, because the very survival of mankind is literally on the table if we don't make that change. So, we've got a much bigger challenge and a much bigger agenda. Even if we're serious about defeating the Islamic State and other manifestations of this Dark Age policy. It's going to have to be done through a vast change in thinking, and a



return

to real human thinking about what kinds of projects can insure not just the survival, but the betterment of mankind going into the future.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Just by way of quick introduction of Ben Deniston, who's going to conclude our broadcast here tonight,

I want to pick up here directly off of what Jeff just ended with.

As those who have been following the website this week know; and

who had the chance to participate last night in the Fireside Chat

with Mr. LaRouche, Mr. LaRouche's emphasis has been one of saying

that this entire Dark Age situation which we now find ourselves

in today – both internationally as Jeff just elaborated, and

also here domestically with the Dark Age of rising death rates,

addictions, violence, and so forth, that is plaguing the American

people as the result of 16 years of a Bush and Obama

Presidencies, Mr. LaRouche said, "The future cannot be created by

a continuation of the failed policies of the past. This Dark Age,

which we now find ourselves in the midst of, cannot be overcome

without the conscious elimination and overturning of the failed

axioms of the present system. A New Paradigm today, as Jeff was

just discussing, just as with the Golden Renaissance of Filippo

Brunelleschi and Nicholas of Cusa, is never something which can come about through an evolutionary change," as Mr. LaRouche said

last night, "but only as a consciously revolutionary effect of the intervention of a great genius. The effect that a great genius has on history; a genius such as Brunelleschi or Cusa. Or

more recently, you can use the example of Albert Einstein. Geniuses who reject the failed ideas of the past, and instead introduce something completely new; a valid, newly discovered principle upon which a valid and viable future can be built. So

this is something which obviously Mr. LaRouche has done consistently throughout his life; and has based his entire career

on. But for those of you who had the chance to participate in the

Fireside Chat with Mr. LaRouche last night will know, you heard

him call on all of you; on all of the American citizenry to adopt

that perspective of genius as your personal commitment going forward. And this is obviously something which all of us have to

think about very profoundly.

So Ben, I guess I would ask you to elaborate for us a little bit, what is the equivalent of the great Brunelleschi's dome, you

could say, of today; which can be the herald of this new Renaissance for all mankind today?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: It's quite a task, I think, Matthew. But as Matthew said, I'm just going to pick up off of – we've been working on, the LaRouche PAC Science Team – this program of putting together a picture for the American people, what it would

mean for the United States to join this New Silk Road orientation. What it would mean for us as a country to really return to our roots, as founded by people like Alexander Hamilton, as Mr. LaRouche has put a great deal of emphasis in his

most recently developing flank in Manhattan being real soul of the nation where we could pivot the United States back to an orientation like Matt just referenced in terms of a real pursuit

of mankind as a creative force. What will it actually mean for the United States to once again participate in that process? And

this is something that, as was referenced, at least a thesis perspective on what that would look like for the United States.

But I wanted to open by just referencing something that was mentioned earlier, just to get a sense to get at the real principle of what we were talking about. There was a rather unprecedented study that came out, a study that's rather shocking

that pointed to an unprecedented reality which has been uncovered

in just the last couple of months, which is the realization of the increase in death rates among white, American, working age people. And we have a graphic illustrating the comparison of the

death rates for this particular demographic, in comparison with a

number of other developed nations. [Figure 1] And we can see in

red there, from 1990 up to past 2010, the change in the death rate for, again, white Americans from age 45 to 54. And I just want to put this on the screen for a minute, because there's a lot of stats we can go through in terms of what's happening, and

a lot can be done to give a sense that I think most Americans have their own clear sense of, living in this nation, of the

real

process of death of the U.S. economy, under the Bush-Obama reign.

But I think this one is rather shocking, because these are people that are supposed to be in their prime. We're talking about people who are supposed to be reaching their, towards the

peak of their productive contribution to society, people who are

supposed to be approaching the pinnacle of their ability to contribute to the advancement of the society of which they're a

part. And what are we seeing in that layer of the population?

This dramatic acceleration, continual year to year increase, in

the death rate of this section of the population. As the authors

of the study stated, "We have half a million Americans who are now dead, who frankly should not be dead," according to what we

would expect from a healthy economic process.

And what's the cause of this? What are the major factors contributing to this increase in the death rate? You have drug addiction, alcoholism, substance abuse, prescription drug abuse,

heroin abuse, suicides. These are diseases of despair as has been

said. These are diseases of a dying society, where people who should be at their prime contribution to the economic process, are instead ending their own lives. They're killing themselves.

What's supposed to be our leading productive sector of the economy is instead destroying and ending their own lives, through

their own willful choice of these substance abuse, drug addiction, suicide, what have you.

So I think this should be taken as a very clear signal of

what's happened to the United states, what's happened to the American economy. And what we have to reverse. And what I want to talk about just briefly is trying to get at the essence of the issue, to the degree possible. Because we can talk about putting people back to work, we could talk about creating jobs, we could talk about rebuilding things-but that's not going to get to the real essence of what we confront right now as a nation. We have to really re-find the purpose of the existence of our nation, as Matthew referenced as Mr. LaRouche said last night, in an understanding of what is mankind's purpose as a creative force in the Universe.

Why do people work? Why do people have jobs? Why do people work to contribute to society? What's the purpose of existence? That's been eliminated really over two generations, increasingly though in a rapid acceleration, under the Bush-Cheney regime. The very idea that mankind is inherently creative species; I mean, that mankind creates its own existence meaning that {you}, as an individual part of that species, part of that process, can participate in the actual physical creation of the future state of society. That if society moves forward, ... And what do we mean by "move forward"? LaRouche has spent decades developing a science of physical economy. What is economics for mankind? We can support a greater population, higher population density, with

better living standards for everybody; that unlike the animals, unlike the Greenies' ideology, there's no zero sum game for mankind. There's no finite, fixed amount of wealth for the human species. That mankind can uniquely create a fundamentally higher state of existence for his species as a whole.

That doesn't come from merely finding some new resource, or exploiting some new resource, but from the unique creative powers of the human mind. Something {unique} about the human mind that we don't see existing anywhere in animal life per se. That that unique capability is the substance, the principle, underlying what makes mankind a unique force on this planet. We have to again find our existence in exercising and implementing that principle—the idea that based on that principle, we can create wealth for our nation. We can grow our population. We can have a large population with higher living standards, better infrastructure, better conditions of life, better health care. We can provide all that. Mankind has the ability to do that. But the way that mankind does that is by the creative contributions of individuals acting in coordination with society. We've lost the connection to that. We have to re-establish the connection to that. Really in a scientific sense. That mankind has a real physical immortality that he can create for himself. He can be the creation of the future existence, not just the extension of the past, not just the extension of the present, but the creation of a state of existence for society which

would

not ever exist if not for the actions, the contributions, of the

earlier generation of the earlier state.

That's what we have to return to. Creation of new states for mankind, not just perpetuating or rebuilding what we had in the

past, but rising to a new level. And we need that now more than

ever. That has been at the root of our existence as a republic,

again going back to Hamilton, people like Lincoln, people like Franklin Roosevelt-that's been understood to varying degrees, that this is what makes mankind unique, and we have to focus our

efforts of government, of society, in exercising and facilitating

that creative process.

So what do we need to do now, today? Just to go through some of the obvious things that we should be focused on, and doing as

a nation. One leading element is going to be rebuilding our nation, rebuilding our infrastructure, and in a sense not really

rebuilding, but building anew, building a higher level of existence for our nation. And one of the things we're going to be

featuring in our prospective program for the United States is actually building a modern, high-speed rail system. This is just

obvious. That transportation in the United States would be a joke

if we didn't have to deal with it every single day. The idea of

people just wasting their lives on these highways. Hours upon hours upon hours daily, just wasted.

If you go to the third graphic here, we have a comparison,

just to give people a sense of—in the green, we see existing high speed rail systems in the United States and China. Now, in the United States this has been debatable whether we could actually include the green corridor we've included as technically high-speed rail. Relative to what we have, we could consider it high-speed rail, but that's not saying much. It's stretching the definition, but it's the closest we have. and throughout the rest of the United States, you see one proposal, among a number of proposals, for what kind of obvious, sane high-speed rail system we should have: travelling 150 miles per hour, to get people to different locations in a quick efficient manner. You see China is doing this. You see China's program now, what they've built, and what they're committed to building I believe out to 2020, for their high-speed rail program. So this could be done. This needs to be done. We have the water issue. We have, to put it lightly, insane governor in California, who, despite living on the coast of the largest body of water on the face of this planet, seems to think that we've run out of water. Well, we have plenty of means available to us to provide all the water we need. Some of this is illustrated in the next graphic, the fourth graphic. This is something we've covered in more detail on the LaRouche PAC website and other locations. But mankind fully has the capability of managing the water cycle in completely new ways. We have desalination. LaRouche has been talking about



desalination for decades. Nuclear-powered desalination, you can provide the water you need in the coastal areas. You can do water transfer. There's rivers that exist that have abundant excesses of water that just flow into the ocean unused. And we can really go to the frontiers. We can look at mankind managing the water in the atmosphere. This is actually happening right now as we speak in various places around the world. We have technologies now to actually manage precipitation in the atmosphere; increase precipitation where we want it. Some of this is drawn directly from insights into how our Earth's climate system actually responds to different galactic environments – the galactic conditions affecting our climate. Understanding this gives us an insight into how we can manage those conditions; how we can increase the rainfall where we need it. How we can actually direct flows of atmospheric water vapor to where they're needed. We could be drawing the atmosphere of water vapor from over the Pacific Ocean into California and increasing the rainfall in California. We can do that. Power, energy, nuclear power; we've been sitting on nuclear power for decades. It's been suppressed; fusion has been suppressed. There's been a conscious policy to not put the resources into fusion that are needed to develop fusion power. We've had in effect a policy of not developing fusion power for decades. You just look at the budget compared to what was known to be required to develop it; it's obvious. And various

experts

have made clear, we can have a demonstration functioning fusion

power plant in 10-15 years, if we decided to do it.

Obviously, all this would require a high-speed rail system, solving our water crises, mass production of nuclear power, a crash program to develop fusion power. This would force us to confront the fact that we need to rebuild our manufacturing base;

rebuild our industrial base. We'd be forced to confront a certain

reality that now we look at an unemployment problem; with this program, we're going to be confronted with a little more

frightening reality. We actually have an unemployable problem; we

have people who have no skills. We're going to need to look back

to things like Franklin Roosevelt's CCC program, and figure out

how to upgrade that and advance that for an entire new challenge

of taking not just a labor force, a society that's had no productive work for a decade or more. And look, we've had two generations of zero-growth policy; two generations of de-industrialization, a shift towards this insane, so-called "services economy". Wall Street bubbles. We've had fewer and fewer people who have any idea of how to contribute a productive

contribution to the economic process.

So, we're going to need to actually tackle all these issues.

And, again, this is not just rebuilding stuff we had before; it's

not just rebuilding our infrastructure. It's not just recreating

the state of the economy as it was 20, 30 years ago. This is looking at how do we increase the potential productivity of the

economy as a whole to a completely new level? Modern transportation, water, power. We can open up entire new regions of the continent; entire new territories of the nation can now be developed. New agriculture; new production; new industries; new cities. We could actually be developing new Renaissance cities, organized around a conception of man as a creative process. The city itself can be an expression of the principle of this new Renaissance; this New Paradigm that we want to create. The construction of sane, organized city population areas, centered around cultural development; educational development. Centered around universities and cultural systems as the core of the development of your population, of your society. That organizes this city. Around it, you have the various agriculture, industry, etc. that's an expression of mankind's creative capabilities. But actually coherently designing the city in which the population around this new principle, this new conception of mankind. So, this is what we can do; this is what we need to fight for. But I think to attempt to address what Matthew said in terms of Mr. LaRouche's remarks in terms of actually creating a new future; that has to be the number one guiding principle. And Mr. LaRouche in recent years has again come back to the pedagogy of the difference between mankind and the animals. And I think that's something that most people still don't understand the way he understands it. What is it that mankind has that makes our

species separate; that makes us distinct? What is that actual principle which mankind has the ability to tap into and employ if he chooses to; if he chooses to organize his society in a truly human way? And what would that mean for us today? Well, again, it wouldn't mean just doing what we've done in the past. It would mean that right now, what we have to do is bring society to a level that we've never had before. And we have to fight to engage the American population again into recognizing that their meaning to history, their meaning, period, depends upon that. That the meaning of their very existence depends upon recognizing that they have a potential to contribute to the creation of a higher state of existence for society. And for mankind, if we're not doing that, if we're not organizing society to do that and exercise that, and implement those creative leaps of mankind, then you're not being human; and your population is being denied an actual efficient access to their true scientific immortality as a human species.

There's obviously a lot that could be said, but I think that's the principle that we have to focus on; that it's not just about creating jobs. It's not just about employing people who are various economic statistics; it's about coming to a new, higher understanding of economics really as an expression of this unique spark of human creative potential. And we have to, again, focus on that as the number one issue; the cause, the substance of

what

will allow us to progress and move forward. And that really is the whole purpose of all of this.

So, we're going to have more coming out; a lot more can be said, but I think that's the challenge that we have right now. And I think it's going to be a huge challenge, given what's happened to the population; especially in the last two Presidencies. But the fight is to awaken that in the American people; they have to realize that this is the only thing that's worth fighting for. Fighting for creating the future in a way that is truly, uniquely human.

OGDEN: Thank you, Ben. And what Ben referred to, is a forthcoming programmatic feature which is intended to be a supplement to the EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge". This is going to be titled, "Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road". I also know this will be the bulk of the subject of the presentation which Helga delivered in Tokyo, which Jeff was referring to; and will be available in transcript form in the next edition of {Executive Intelligence Review}. So, I'm going to bring a conclusion to our broadcast here tonight. I would encourage all of you to continue participating in both the Thursday night Fireside Chats, which Mr. LaRouche hosts every week, as well as if you are present in the New York City area, the Manhattan Project meetings, which occur every Saturday afternoon. Another one will occur tomorrow.

So, thank you very much for joining us. Thank you to both Jeff and Ben, and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com)

---

# Ikke alle baltiske nationer er ivrige efter Tredje Verdenskrig

3. december 2015 – I en tale på London School of Economics torsdag benægtede Letlands udenrigsminister Edgars Rinkevics, alt imens han ikke gav udtryk for varme følelser for Rusland og protesterede over, at Krim havde sluttet sig til Rusland igen, osv., en rapport, der sagde, at Letland ikke ville indgå i nogen koalition, der involverer Rusland, rapporterede *Baltic Times* i går.

»Jeg vil ikke udelukke, og vi kan finde en måde at koordinere med Rusland på, i det mindste til et niveau, hvor vi ikke nedskyder hinandens fly eller starter Tredje Verdenskrig ... Hvis vi ikke koordinerer med Rusland, vil vi ikke være i stand til at nedkæmpe ISIS på den mest effektive måde«, sagde Rinkevics.

Han sagde også, at de erklæringer, som den lettiske, litauiske og estiske præsident havde udstedt den 20. nov., var blevet rapporteret på en upræcis og oversimplificeret måde af den internationale presse, da denne sagde, at De baltiske Stater ikke ville indgå i nogen koalition, der involverede Rusland, iflg. *Baltic Times*. Virkeligheden er langt mere nuanceret, i det mindste i Letlands tilfælde, sagde han.

For sit vedkommende sagde Estlands premierminister Taavi Roivas i et interview til Reuters i går, at han ikke tror på, at Rusland vil angribe Letland, på trods af »bekymrende« indtrængen og militærøvelser nær ved dets grænser i år. Reuters sagde, at han også »distancerede sig fra et krav fra

Letlands og Litauens side om en permanent NATO-troppetilstedeværelse i Baltikum.« Roivas sagde: »Scenariet med grønne mænd [dvs. russiske tropper] er ikke mere sandsynligt her end i Storbritannien. Estland er et NATO-land, og jeg anser det for usandsynligt, at Rusland tænker på at angribe NATO ... NATO-lande bør ikke være bekymrede over direkte intervention.«

*Foto: Edgars Rinkevics*

---

## **Obama og NATO beskytter Tyrkiet mod Rusland**

*Den 1. december 2015* – Efter præsident Obamas optrapning mod den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin i går, mødtes NATO-landenes udenrigsministre i Bruxelles i dag (mødet løber indtil 2. december), hvor de lovede, at NATO står bag Tyrkiet uanset, hvad der måtte ske.

"NATO's mangeårige planer for Tyrkiets forsvar er på plads og vurderes løbende", sagde ministrene i en fælles udtalelse i dag. "I lyset af den generelle omskiftelighed i regionen, styrkes disse planer yderligere" med en forøgelse af Tyrkiets luftforsvar. "I ånden af 'alle for én', forbliver vi fast besluttet på fortsat at udvikle yderligere NATO-sikkerhedsforanstaltninger, og alliancepartnere arbejder med forberedelse af andre mulige bidrag."

Den amerikanske NATO-ambassadør Douglas Lute gav i sine bemærkninger i går Tyrkiet fuld opbakning i forbindelse med den tyrkiske nedskydning af det russiske SU-24 fly den 24.

november.

"De amerikanske data, jeg har set, bekræfter Tyrkiets version af begivenhederne. Flyet befandt sig i tyrkisk luftrum; kamphandlingen blev udført i Tyrkiet; flyet blev advaret gentagne gange", sagde han. "Der var ikke blevet udsendt nogen flyveplan, der omfattede en krænkelse af NATO's luftrum."

Til trods for, at de kastede skylden for episoden på Rusland, opfordrede embedsfolk i både Bruxelles og Washington til en mindskelse af spændingerne. NATO-generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg foreslog en modernisering af koldkrigs-traktaten kendt som Wiener-dokumentet, der udstikker reglerne for storstilede militærøvelser og anden militær aktivitet, tillige med 'varme' telefonlinjer og andre militære kommunikationskanaler. "Den må nødvendigvis moderniseres, fordi der er adskillige smuthuller", sagde Stoltenberg. I går ringede formanden for USA's Generalstabschef, general Joseph Dunford, for første gang til general Valeriy Gerasimov, den russiske generalstabschef, og ifølge Dunfords talsmand var dette et af de emner, de diskuterede. Talskvinde for USA's Udenrigsministerium Elizabeth Trudeau sagde til journalister, at bevismateriale fra Tyrkiet og amerikanske kilder "indikerer, at det russiske fly krænkede tyrkisk luftrum" til trods for, at det blev advaret flere gange af tyrkiske styrker. "Vi bør nu tilskynde til en dialog, og vi har behov for en nedtrapning af situationen," sagde hun og tilføjede, at en "fortsat diskussion imellem de to parter nu er det vigtigste".

Alexander Grushko, Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, reagerede på alt dette ved at beskyldte NATO for at give Tyrkiet politisk rygdækning for aggressionen mod Rusland. Ifølge Sputnik rapporterede Grushko, at han har haft en samtale med NATO's vicegeneralsekretær Alexander Vershbow om nedskydningen.

"Jeg informerede ham om Ruslands holdning til hændelsen, og henviste til de militære og politiske faktorer, der bevidner



den kendsgerning, at det var et overlagt angreb på det russiske fly i syrisk luftrum", sagde Grushko. "Jeg understregede, at NATO, der ikke er kommet med nogen principmæssig evaluering af denne ulovlige handling, faktisk har dækket politisk over Ankara som sit medlem og derfor har et medansvar for episoden", sagde han. Grushko anklagede Tyrkiet for ikke at følge etablerede NATO-procedurer til at forhindre luftfartøjer; dvs., at det kampfly, der vil forhindre indtrængning, skal flyve op langs siden af det indtrængende fly for at identificere det, og derefter eskortere det ud af luftrummet. Ved hændelsen den 24. november "blev disse NATO-procedurer ikke fulgt, eftersom piloterne, ifølge Ankara, ikke engang kendte identiteten af det indtrængende fly", sagde Grushko.