

Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler ved BüSo-kongres i Berlin: Vi behøver en offentlig debat om alle nationers virkelige interesser

Hvad kan Tyskland gøre? Meget, i modstrid med dem, der hævder, at vi er for små til at gøre noget som helst. For det første må vi starte en debat om, hvad Tysklands virkelige interesser er. Vi bør hæve sanktioneerne mod Rusland. Helmut Schmidt havde ret, da han sagde, at krisen i Ukraine var begyndt med Maastrichttraktaten. Vi bør også afslutte enhver mission og alle missioner, som Bundeswehr deltager i til støtte for USA's/Storbritanniens politik. Vi bør promovere en offentlig debat om alle nationers sikkerhedsinteresser. Vi må have en ny, inkluderende sikkerhedsarkitektur. Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble bør træde tilbage, fordi hans »sorte nul«-politik giver næring til optrapningen af højrefløjen.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING **den 16. november 2015:**

Efter terrorangrebet i Paris: Hvad der skal gøres

Amerikansk admiral: Aktiver NATO imod ISIS og inviter Rusland til at være med

15. november 2015 – Det er nu et åbent spørgsmål, hvorvidt Frankrig vil anmode om aktiveringen af NATO, under bestemmelserne om kollektivt forsvar i NATO's artikel 5, i kølvandet på terrorangrebene i Paris den 13. november. Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, en tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende og et nuværende seniorstabsmedlem af Fletcherskolen for Jura og Diplomati ved Tufts Universitet, skriver i en artikel 14. nov. på avisen *Foreign Journals* webside, at Frankrig bør anråbe artikel 5, og at NATO nu må gå ind i kampen mod ISIS.

»Paris ville være i sin gode ret til at forvente, at NATO spiller en betydningsfuld rolle i at organisere en afgørende, militær respons på angrebene«, skriver admiral Staviridis. »Det fundamentale formål med NATO's mission bør være at besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, som de dér har skabt.« Dernæst forklarer Stavridis de skridt, som NATO bør tage, inklusive at gå til FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Stavridis går imidlertid et skridt videre og kræver, at man inviterer Rusland til at deltage i denne NATO-mission. »NATO bør lægge vægt på, at det opbygger en »åben koalition«, en

koalition, der ikke kun kan omfatte de traditionelle allieredes styrker, men også styrker fra NATO's traditionelle modstander, Rusland«, skriver Stavridis. »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

Foto: Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, 15. nov. 2015.

Leder, 16. november 2015: Paris ændrer alt – NATO må gå sammen med Rusland for at knuse ISIS

USA og Europa har fået et alarmsignal til at vågne op gennem det barbariske terroristangreb i Paris. Mange ledende personer kræver nu, at Obamas vanvittige politik for regimeskift i Syrien – som, ligesom tidligere i Irak og Libyen, er i færd med at udløse kaos i hele verden – omgående må afsluttes, så verden kan gå sammen imod ISIS-svøben.

Lørdag sagde præsident Putin:

»Det er klart, at, for effektivt at bekæmpe dette onde, har vi brug for en reel, fælles indsats fra hele det internationale samfund.«

Tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende admiral James Stavridis sagde til *Foreign Policy*, at Frankrig kunne forvente, at NATO anråbte artikel 5, der bemyndiger en NATO-respons på angrebet, med det »fundamentale formål« fra NATO-missionens side at

»besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, den dér har skabt«. Hvad der er vigtigere, så tilføjede admiralen: »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

I Wien lørdag anførte den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov en bred koalition af nationer med et krav om en våbenhvile i Syrien, med en tidsramme på 18 måneder til almene valg. Præsident Assad er ikke ekskluderet fra denne proces.

Søndag talte præsidenterne Obama og Putin på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Tyrkiet, hvor en regeringsperson fra Det Hvide Hus til Reuters sagde, at

»Præsident Obama og præsident Putin enedes om behovet for en syrisk ledet og syrisk ejet politisk overgang, forud for hvilken ville være FN-formidlede forhandlinger mellem den syriske opposition og det syriske regime, så vel som en våbenhvile.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde søndag fra Tyskland, at amerikanerne må forstå, at »intet vil være det samme i Europa efter dette«. Det overlagte angreb mod hverdagslivet – koncerter, sportsbegivenheder, restauranter – viser, at alle er sårbare, ikke blot i Frankrig, men i hele Europa. Hun rapporterede, at højtplacerede europæiske kilder ved, at amerikanske og britiske efterretningskræfter åbenlyst har støttet terroristerne, både gennem saudierne og direkte, som tidligere chef for den amerikanske Forsvarsintelligenstjeneste (DIA), general Michael Flynn, allerede har afsløret.

Hun påpegede den kendsgerning, at i januar, den dag, da angrebet mod Charlie Hebdo fandt sted i Paris, sagde den tidligere amerikanske senator Bob Graham ved en pressekonference, at, hvis de hemmeligstemplede 28 sider af Kongressens undersøgelsesrapport om angrebet mod USA den 11. september var blevet frigivet, ville angrebet i Paris ikke

have fundet sted. Vi må nu, sagde fr. LaRouche, atter fokusere på vores indsats for at få dette ødelæggende bevis frigivet, der viser, at Obama er i en åben alliance med terroristerne med det formål at opnå sin kriminelle politik med regimeskifte.

Lyndon LaRouches ven, den amerikanske, tidl. senator Mike Gravel, har udstedt et følgebrev til et juridisk dokument, der viser, at hans sejr i Højesteret i 1971 – da retten dømte, at hans offentliggørelse af de hemmeligstemplede Pentagon-papirer i Kongressens arbejdsprocedure, var legal under Forfatningen – også gjaldt for de 28 sider, og at ethvert medlem af Kongressen kunne indlæse dem i Kongressens journal. Lyndon LaRouche har pålagt en fuld mobilisering af sin organisation over de næste par dage for at frigive dette dokument til alle kongresmedlemmer, pressen og alle borgere.

LaRouche understregede, at Obama nu er den mest hadede person i verden, og at der ikke er, og ikke vil være, nogen tillid til USA, så længe han forbliver i præsidentembedet.

Supplerende dokumentation:

Amerikansk admiral: Aktiver NATO imod ISIS og inviter Rusland til at være med

15. november 2015 – Det er nu et åbent spørgsmål, hvorvidt Frankrig vil anmode om aktiveringen af NATO, under bestemmelserne om kollektivt forsvar i NATO's artikel 5, i kølvandet på terrorangrebene i Paris den 13. november. Pensionerede admiral James Stavridis, en tidligere NATO-øverstbefalende og et nuværende seniorstabsmedlem af Fletcherskolen for Jura og Diplomati ved Tufts Universitet, skriver i en artikel 14. nov. på avisen *Foreign Journals* webside, at Frankrig bør anråbe artikel 5, og at NATO nu må gå

ind i kampen mod ISIS.

»Paris ville være i sin gode ret til at forvente, at NATO spiller en betydningsfuld rolle i at organisere en afgørende, militær respons på angrebene«, skriver admiral Staviridis. »Det fundamentale formål med NATO's mission bør være at besejre Islamisk Stat i Syrien og ødelægge den infrastruktur, som de dér har skabt.« Dernæst forklarer Staviridis de skridt, som NATO bør tage, inklusive at gå til FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Staviridis går imidlertid et skridt videre og kræver, at man inviterer Rusland til at deltage i denne NATO-mission. »NATO bør lægge vægt på, at det opbygger en »åben koalition«, en koalition, der ikke kun kan omfatte de traditionelle allieredes styrker, men også styrker fra NATO's traditionelle modstander, Rusland«, skriver Staviridis. »Rusland bør inviteres til at deltage sammen med NATO og andre koalitionsmedlemmer imod Islamisk Stat.«

Rædsel har slået Paris: »At overvinde frygten« af Jacques Cheminade, leder af Solidarité et Progrès (LaRouche-bevægelsen i Frankrig)

Paris, 14. november 2015 – Rædsel har slået Paris. Massakrer er blevet begået i blinde for at sætte vores land i en tilstand af chok. Med det samme barbari og de samme metoder

som i Mellemøsten, Libanon, Irak og Israel, eller i Syrien. Seks samtidige angreb i hjertet af vores hovedstad og ved Stade de France-sportsstadion, med det formål at mangfoldiggøre ofrene, bunkerne af lig i gaderne, restauranter, der er forvandlet til lighthouse, udrykningskøretøjer for hylende sirener: en strategi af frygt, omhyggeligt planlagt, for at levere det budskab, at det værste kan ske overalt og for alle mennesker.

Vores reaktion må modsvare udfordringen. Vi må kun frygte selve frygten, for frygten inspirerer til vanvittige reaktioner, der kommer oven i det første vanvid. At beherske den kan ikke lade sig gøre i passivitet eller fornægtelse, men ved at se tingene i øjnene, i sandhedens navn. Kun kampen for sandheden gør det muligt at undfly angstens kvælertag.

Erklæringen af undtagelsestilstand og lukningen af grænserne, som Republikkens præsident har annonceret, så vel som også deployeringen af politi- og militærstyrker, er de umiddelbart nødvendige forholdsregler, for vi er i krig. At forblive forenet og gøre fælles front i de værdiers navn, der er indskrevet i Republikkens Forfatning, er umiddelbart uundværligt.

Man må imidlertid gå til de første årsager, uden hvilket rædslen vil gentage sig og endda optrappes. Hvilket vil sige skabe en verden, i hvilken de nationale og internationale omgivelser ikke længere skaber kriminalitet, som de gør i dag. For man kan ikke undfly det onde ved simpelt hen at undertrykke det, men ved at virkeliggøre vilkår, under hvilke det gode overlader det onde mindre og mindre plads.

Det er NATO's krige, de økonomiske uretfærdigheder og ødelæggelsen af værdige livsvilkår, der har skabt betingelserne for terrorisme. Det samme gælder for den kyniske og forbryderiske politik med del og hersk i traditionen efter Det britiske Imperium, og imod hvilket intet i realiteten har modsat sig i vores transatlantiske univers.

At sætte en stopper for rædslen indebærer således en absolut politisk kursændring. Med lanceringen af gensidig udvikling, »win-win«, der sikrer, at vores børn og børnebørn lever bedre end vi selv, er denne lancering, der er annonceret af de kinesiske og indiske ledere, den eneste, virkelige kilde til fred. Samtidig med, at vi i Mellemøsten bekæmper alle terroristgrupper, Islamisk Stat såvel som al-Nusra-Front og Erobringshæren.

Denne lørdag, den 14. november, i Wien, bør Frankrig spille en aktiv rolle i forhandlingerne, der tilsigter at lancere en fredsproces i Syrien, idet vi koordinerer vores indsats med det russiske diplomati, og ikke spiller i hænderne på dem, der tager friheden som gidsel.

I Mellemøsten må Islamisk Stat slås i hjertet af sine økonomiske ressourcer, med bombardementer af deres olieledninger og ved at slå de banker, der hvidvasker deres ressourcer, hvilket hidtil ikke er sket.

Der må sættes en stopper for medskyldigheden i terrorismen hos Qatar, Saudi-Arabien og Emiraterne, uden at vise dette klientel nogen forekommenhed. Og sluttelig må man samtidig genskabe økonomiske udviklingsbetingelser i alle regionens lande, for at migranterne dér kan genfinde værdige livsbetingelser, hvilket Kina tilbyder os ved at udstrække sit koncept med Den nye Silkevej. I mellemtiden må man, i alle regionens flygtningelejre, og i samarbejde med de internationale, humanitære organisationer, skabe disse værdige vilkår ved at sikre tilstrækkelige fødevarer, lægebehandling, anstændige, midlertidige beboelser og uddannelse til børnene.

Dette koncept er ikke russisk, kinesisk, amerikansk eller fransk, det er det koncept, der retfærdiggør nationalstatens eksistens: at tjene menneskehedens sag. Frankrig bør indtage en prominent plads i dette afgørende engagement, og ikke underkaste sig barbarer i djellaba, kameez eller jakkesæt.

Jacques Cheminade, leder af Solidarité et Progrès.

**Ovenstående leder af Jacques Cheminade er oversat fra fransk. Vore fransktalende læsere kan følge med i situationen i Frankrig på Solidarité & Progrès' hjemmeside:
<http://www.solidariteetprogres.org/>**

LPAC Fredags-webcast 13. nov. 2015:

Terrorhandlingerne den 13. nov. i Paris. Hvorfor vil New York

Times ikke offentliggøre de lækkede »Drone-papirer«?

Vi mødes naturligvis i aften under meget alvorlige og forfærdelige omstændigheder, mens rapporter løber ind om, at over 100 mennesker er blevet dræbt i noget, der synes at være terrorangreb i hele Paris. Hele den franske nation er nu i undtagelsestilstand. Jeff Steinberg vil kommentere hele denne situation senere i aftenens udsendelse.

Engelsk udskrift.

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 13, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're watching our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review.}

Now, obviously, we are meeting here tonight under very solemn and horrifying conditions, as we are hearing reports that

over 100 people have died in what seem to be terrorist attacks across Paris. The entire nation of France is currently under a state of emergency, and obviously details of these attacks are still coming in, as this is an ongoing situation. I know Jeff will have something to say later on this subject, later on this

evening, during this broadcast, as pertains to these horrific events.

But this evening we're going to be beginning our broadcast with an on-the-ground video report from New York City, where the

LaRouche Political Action Committee held a rally earlier today in

front of the headquarters of the {New York Times}. I'm sure many

of our viewers have had a chance to see on the front page of the

LaRouche PAC website a press release which was published on this

website yesterday, which is titled, "Why won't the {New York Times} publish Obama's Drone Papers?", which makes the point that, despite the fact that the Times played a central role back

in 1971 in publishing the so-called "Pentagon Papers", which were

revealed by Daniel Ellsberg, and were released to the American

people by the courageous actions which Senator Mike Gravel took
by reading them into the {Congressional Record} – despite the fact that the Times was instrumental in this action, which was instrumental in laying the foundation for the downfall of Richard Nixon, and the ultimate end of the Vietnam War – today the {New York Times} has made the willful choice {not} to publish any serious coverage of the so-called “Drone Papers”, which were likewise leaked by a courageous whistleblower from within the drone program itself, a so-called second Edward Snowden, and published by Glenn Greenwald’s internet-based publication, {The Intercept.}

Despite thoroughly damning new details that have emerged and are contained within these documents, the Drone Papers, which pull back the curtain on the murderous and completely out of control targetted assassination program that’s being run, top-down by President Barack Obama, in his weekly kill sessions, without any due oversight, and from behind closed doors, despite this, the editors of the {New York Times} have publicly stated that in their opinion, these new revelations do not “warrant their own story.”

The truth is – and you can be assured that the {New York Times} editorial staff well knows this – any widespread and serious coverage of the “Drone Papers” today. by a major national newspaper of record, such as the New York Times, in the fashion of the Times’ own coverage of the Pentagon Papers in 1971, would have an utterly devastating effect on revealing to the American people the true reality of how this secret drone program is

actually run, and the character of the President who runs it. And just as the Pentagon Papers did back then, major publication of the “Drone Papers” today would likewise lay the foundation for the indictment and political downfall of this President – as his murderous proclivities are put on full display for the entire country to see.

The question is: Knowing all of this, as the press release puts it, “Is the {New York Times} more afraid of Barack Obama than it was of Richard Nixon? And will that fear of taking on the true characteristic of what this President stands for, cause the {New York Times} to fail to address that awful reality at the very time that Obama is leading the United States into unprecedented war-provocations against both Russia and China, and by failing to do so, thus finding themselves – the {New York Times} – complicit in actions which threaten the outbreak of a Third World War, and endanger the continued existence of all mankind.

With that said as an opening statement, we bring the on-the-ground report from New York City, delivered by LaRouche PAC’s Daniel Burke:

“Hi, I’m Daniel Burke, and this is a LaRouche Political Action Committee rally that you’re witness to at the moment, in front of the {New York Times} headquarters on 41st Street and 8th Avenue. And we stand here today in the midst of certainly the gravest crisis that our species has ever faced, which is well expressed in this banner that we have before us “Obama Leads America to Hell.” But our mission is to unify the United States, to have the courage to stand up against the insanity that is dominating our government today.

“At the moment, we are on the brink of a thermonuclear war,

because of the fact that this man has been tolerated, and his provocations against Russia, and against China, are unprecedented

in the history of humanity, in terms of the danger that they pose. But as we've laid out in webcasts over the recent weeks, there is a clear train of abuses; the evidence is before you, and

now it's a matter of having the courage to stand up against it.

So that's what we're doing today, because the fact of the matter

is that the {New York Times} has been covering up for Obama's Satanic drone murders. It's been released through {The Intercept}, from a new whistleblower, as we've documented in our

webcasts so far: that Obama is at the top of a chain that is mass-murdering civilians. And the {New York Times} buried the release of these documents at the bottom of a column a couple of

weeks ago, and then they justified this, by claiming that it did

not warrant its own story.

"So, we stand here to specifically indicate the editors, the writers, who were involved in this cover-up; demand that this be

brought to justice; and in the meanwhile to consider that what we

need today is for one Senator to stand up, and to move against Obama. This is what happened with Richard Nixon, and it was in that case that the {New York Times} had the courage in 1971 to publish the 'Pentagon Papers'. Why will they remain silent on these Satanic murders from Barack Obama?"

OGDEN: Now, Mr. LaRouche wanted to feature this video report from New York City for the reason that he has placed Manhattan at

the center of his strategy to restore the United States to its original founding principle as embodied in Alexander Hamilton,

the very opposite of everything that Obama has come to represent today. Further coverage of this rally will be available on the LaRouche PAC website, including a longer version of this on-the-ground report, as well as the text of the press release, which I mentioned at the outset of tonight's proceedings. But, when you place Obama's drone program in the context of his open and blatant war provocations against both Russia and now increasingly against China, in the recent days and weeks, which will lead to a global thermonuclear war if not stopped. In that context, I would like to ask Jeff to elaborate a little bit on what Mr. LaRouche's assessment was of the importance of using this campaign, as you just saw, centered in Manhattan around the revelations that are now contained and released in the "Drone Papers" in order to drive Obama from office before he has the chance to lead the world into World War III.

STEINBERG: I learned earlier today that there is a joke circulating very widely in Israel, and I'm sure in other places around the world. And the joke goes something like this: What's the difference between God and Barack Obama? The answer? God doesn't think he's Barack Obama. What we're dealing with here is truly a Satanic personality, and yet, he's been permitted to carry out atrocity after atrocity; all on behalf of the British, whose policy, at the level of the British Empire, at the level of the British monarchy, has been always one of massive population reduction through policies of genocide. I think that's the way you've got to understand the events that are unfolding right now in

Paris.

In a very real sense, the slaughter that's taken place over the

last few hours – and of course French authorities are not sure that it's over; there were seven attacks against seven different

random targetted popular nightspots all around the city of Paris,

highly coordinated. Kind of what we saw in 2008 in Mumbai, but

on a much more elaborate scale. And you've got to ask yourself,

where does this kind of Satanic behavior come from? What are the

roots of this Islamic State jihadist apparatus?

Well, remember that the former head of the Defense

Intelligence Agency, General Michael Flynn, warned earlier this

year in a now widely circulated interview with Al-Jazeera

America, that he had gone to President Obama in the summer of

2012 and warned that the policies that the US was pursuing –

particularly the policies of facilitating the running of heavy weapons from the Libyan port city of Benghazi into various Syrian

rebel groups – was going to result in the creation of a jihadist

caliphate on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and in that

general Middle Eastern region. Now, this was two years prior to

the formal surfacing of the Islamic State, which really launched

its operations in Iraq with the dramatic takeover of Mosul; and

that was in June of 2014. So you've got high-level US Defense Intelligence officials telling the President of the United States, "Drop your fixation with the overthrow of the Assad

government in Syria. Halt the flow of weapons that were unleashed on the world as the result of the overthrow of Qaddafi

and his instant execution back in the fall of 2011; which unleashed floods of weapons throughout Africa. And through this

Benghazi operation of British Intelligence and John Brennan as the Counterintelligence Director of the Obama administration, the

weapons began to flow into Syria; and these weapons went into the

hands of the very jihadist networks that we've now seen operating

on the streets of Paris.

So, is there a causal relationship between the British Satanic policies of mass population reduction, often stated by Prince Philip – the royal consort who insists that the world's population must be reduced by 80%. The fact that General Flynn

openly said that President Obama did not ignore the warnings, but

pursued a willful policy of continuing with the arming of the Syrian rebels after he was repeatedly told what the consequences

of that would be. And now we've seen those consequences, with the establishment of the Islamic State; we've seen those events

now spilling over into the streets of Paris. The situation in France is still unfolding; there's no definitive answers in terms

of who particularly carried out these heinous attacks. But we know that the circumstances under which those kinds of events could happen, were the product of a persistent line of policy that has come out of the Presidency of the United States for at

least the last 15 years; the 8 years of Bush and Cheney, and now

the 7-plus years of Barack Obama. So you're dealing with somebody who is by his character, pursuing outright policies that are evil, that are Satanic, and that at their core are British; that directly go to the demands of the Prince Philips of the world, who call for mass population reduction. Now we know that in two weeks, the COP21 climate change conference is scheduled to happen in Paris; we may very well find that there was a relationship between these attacks that we're now just seeing unfolding on the streets of Paris right now, and that upcoming conference. Earlier this week, Secretary of State John Kerry bluntly stated what has now become obvious; namely that that COP21 conference – despite the efforts of the papal encyclical and John Schellnhüber and other outright proponents of genocide – that conference is likely to fail. There's too much resistance from developing sector countries that realize that what they're looking at is a recipe for genocide. So, what we have before us then, are other means by which the world is careening towards the kind of events that can lead to the mass population reduction policies that are being demanded principally out of the British monarchy; and are being carried out principally through agents of that monarchy such as Barack Obama. So, what have we seen just in the recent days? The administration has continued with the drone kill policy; and as we saw in the rally out in front of the {New York Times}, it's quite clear that the White House has put enormous pressure on the major US media outlets to suppress the story. Because if the

story were to get national media attention through the {New York Times}, through the {Washington Post}, through CNN or one of the major cable news outlets, there would be a groundswell of demand for President Obama's removal from office. These policies are policies of outright genocide. And we've been continuing our own investigation into the drone kill policy of Obama; looking beyond the "Drone Papers" that were released by {The Intercept} about three or four weeks ago. And when you dig deeper into this policy, what you find is that there have been repeated and consistent studies carried out by the military, carried out by major thinktanks whose job it is to do analysis of the actions of the military. You have the Stimson Center producing a series of two reports in 2012 and in 2014; the Naval Post-Graduate School out in Monterrey, California, produced a major study; the Rand Corporation produced a major study. In every instance, they can to the identical conclusion: the drone policy is a failed policy; it can never work; it will never work. The idea of targetting priority terrorist agents for elimination, does nothing to reduce the spread of these kinds of jihadists. If anything, it becomes a major means of further recruitment, of expansion of operations. These are not things that are unknown at the levels of the National Security Council, the Obama White House, and similar locations. It is {willfully known} that these polices do not curb

terrorism, do not defeat insurgent movements. They feed them, they fuel them, they expand them.

And so, you really do have a principle here, in which the objective is not to defeat terrorism, but the objective is to spread the kind of murderous chaos that we've seen engulf Syria for the last four and a half years; that we've seen in Iraq and Afghanistan, going back to the beginning of the Bush/Cheney administration in 2001, with the aftermath of the 9/11 events that have been systematically covered up, first by President Bush, now by President Obama.

The real issue, here, is not exposing the role of the Saudis in this kind of sponsorship of terrorism, including the 9/11 attacks. The real issue here, is that there is a {conscious policy} of creating conditions of global instability and chaos,

that ensure that the targeted population- reduction goals are being met, and war is still one of the major means for that to be

carried out. So, we have a period that we've been living through,

that constitutes more than a Thirty Years War, a period of perpetual war, and these last two Presidencies have been major instrumentalities to make sure that that policy happens.

Now, in the past days, in addition to the continuing cover-up of the Obama drone kill programs which go directly and

personally to Obamas desk in the Oval Office, every single one of

these kill orders has Barack Obamas personal signature on it.

Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, when he was asked to comment about the drone program, simply said, Its the only game

in town. So, this has been the {signature policy} – an indiscriminate mass murder policy, of this President and of this

administration. The idea of toleration for that, for one moment

more, is something that now clearly threatens us all. If these kinds of actions can happen in the streets of Paris, France, then

they can happen anywhere, including here in the United States. Now, not only is Obama continuing to pursue and defend this policy of drone kill, but, in the past week, we've seen an escalation on the strategic scale, as well. Defense Secretary Ash

Carter spent last week in Asia, attending the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting. He tried to turn that event, unsuccessfully,

fortunately, into a gang-up against China. The host government,

Malaysia, refused to include a reference to the South China Sea

situation in the draft communiqué for that conference. Carter showed up – and by the way, the United States is not a member of

ASEAN. Carter was there as an invited guest of the ASEAN countries, the ten nations of Southeast Asia. But, he basically

intervened to try to hijack the entire direction of that conference. Fortunately, many of those countries of the region simply refused to do it. As the result, the conference ended in a

shambles; there was no final communiqué.

From Kuala Lumpur, Carter returned to the United States via Simi Valley, California, where he gave a major speech at the Reagan Library, and assailed both Russia and China, and accused

them of sabre-rattling around the threat of nuclear war. What he

was referring to, in the specific case of Russia, is that Russia,

in response to the United States deployment of ABM systems right

along the southern borders of Russia, the expansion of NATO

throughout eastern Europe, in violation of the agreements that were reached at the time of German reunification. In response to all of those provocations, the Russians have moved to establish new levels of defense against what President Putin this week described as a clear attempt by the U.S. and its allies, to break up the strategic balance that had existed throughout the period of the Cold War and the post-Cold War period, up until this time, and that the United States, by refusing to collaborate with Russia on some kind of global missile defense program, as President Reagan had proposed back in 1983, when he was in close collaboration with Lyndon LaRouche on that project. The United States policy, is to create a thermonuclear war-winning option. That poses not just an existential threat to Russia, but a grave threat to all of mankind. Now, middle of this past week, President Putin convened the annual meeting with top Russian defense officials and leaders of the defense-industrial sector of Russia, at Sochi, on the Black Sea. In opening remarks to that event, which were widely televised throughout Russia, Putin made very clear: the United States has been targeting Russia with the ABM deployment. The fact is clearly demonstrated, because even after the P5+1 deal was reached with Iran, the United States announced it was continuing to move full steam ahead with the ABM deployment, not in partnership with Russia, but unilaterally, with U.S. allies. Since the original argument had been made that this ABM system

was strictly directed against Iran, now that Iran has come into compliance with the nuclear deal, with the P5+1, it just shows the lie to everything that Obama has been saying on this. Putin made very clear, that Russia is moving forward to develop new weapon systems that can defeat any kind of ABM program that the U.S. puts in place, which {will} be directed against Russia. At the same time, as reported this week in the {Guardian} – we've mentioned it here on these Friday night webcasts for some time – the United States is going ahead with the deployment of what is, in effect, a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons that will be forward-based in central and eastern and western Europe, which will be a new generation. They're called the B61-12, with highly accurate tail-guidance systems, that will penetrate deeper into Russian territory, with much more precision accuracy, and therefore these nuclear weapons will have greatly-reduced thermonuclear payloads, which means that the gap between strategic nuclear war and tactical-theater conventional nuclear war, is greatly reduced. In other words, we're moving towards a policy of having a deployable force of thermonuclear weapons, directed at close range, against targets in Russia. Now, we learned this past week, through excerpts from a forthcoming authorized biography of George Herbert Walter Bush [{Destiny and Power}, by Jon Meacham], that at the time of the 1991 Operation Desert Storm, and again during 2003, during the period of the invasion and overthrow of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, [Vice President] Dick Cheney was persistently pushing for the use of nuclear weapons. In the case of the first war in the Gulf,

Cheney was promoting the idea that the U.S. should use 17 tactical nuclear weapons against targets in Iraq. So now we've got a continuation of that policy under President Obama. So, here we are, more than 25 years after the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the collapse of the Warsaw Pact – we're facing the gravest threat of thermonuclear war not because of any actions on the part of Russia, but because of the character of the President of the United States, a Satanic character who has no sense whatsoever of the consequences of pursuing this kind of policy of genocide. So, whether it's preparing the groundwork for thermonuclear confrontation with Russia, and similarly with China – we've had B-52 bombers, which are bombers that are capable of carrying thermonuclear warheads, flying over territory that China claims in the South China Sea, as China's sovereign territory, as part of the Spratly Islands. That happened just in the last several days, and it's only now been first acknowledged by the Pentagon. There was an earlier incident involving naval ships, incursions, into those same waters. So we've got the targetting of Russia, the beginnings of a similar outright targetting of China. We have the drone policy, and the cover-up of that policy. So here we are, literally looking at somebody whose track record, documented proven track record, is that of mass murder. And yet there is toleration for his remaining in office. Now in our discussion this afternoon with Mr. LaRouche, he

very much placed the emphasis on the situation in Manhattan. You've got a unique characteristic of the population of Manhattan, the population of New York City and the great metropolitan area – but particularly the population of Manhattan. They still have a greater sense of reality, at least large segments of the population do. They have a greater sense of the morality that goes with recognizing the great danger that we're facing in the world today. And so, if you look back historically, Manhattan was the place where the core concepts around which our Constitutional republic was organized were formulated. They were formulated in Manhattan in particular by our First Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. There is a Hamiltonian tradition that prevails, and that tradition is the organizing principle for our nation, for our republic. So Manhattan holds a special place for the nation as a whole. Mr. LaRouche pointed out that if you do a survey, region by region around the United States, you will find that region by region the economy has been destroyed. The social fabric has been gutted. We have drug addiction, suicide, all kinds of social dislocation because region by region, the economies of these areas of the United States have been gutted, particularly during the period first of the Bush-Cheney administration, and at a greater and greater accelerating rate, under President Obama. Never mind that since 9/11, \$44 {billion} in your taxpayers' money has gone into the establishment of this drone kill program that is one of the critical factors that keeps expanding the size and brutality of the terrorist apparatus that we've now seen playing out on the streets of Paris just in the last few hours.

So we're dealing with an assault against the American people, an assault that has weakened the social fabrics of many parts of our country. So again, Manhattan represents a certain kind of glue, a potential critical point of inspiration for saving this nation, and this event that you've just seen a brief excerpt of in front of the {New York Times} headquarters today, is indicative of the kind of thing that we will be doing at an accelerating and continuing rate of expansion in Manhattan. And we've got a situation in Washington, where there are a precious handful of elected officials, people in other positions within the Federal government, within the military, within the diplomatic corps, within the intelligence services – a handful of people – who remain truly committed to the survival of this nation and the planet, and we call on you, the American people, to put maximum pressure on them to step outside the bounds of what's required to "go along to get along" and for a handful of these people to step forward and speak the absolute truth about what has gone on in this country, particularly during the seven years of this Obama presidency. One or two leading members of the U.S. Senate, in particular, taking their oath of office seriously, can bring this President down and start the process of reversal of this destructive, literally Satanic takedown of the United States and everything it has historically stood for. We need that step,

but

we need the voice of the American people, led by Manhattan, to make sure that that actually happens, and that it happens in time.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Jeff's comments just now regarding the events which occurred in Paris this evening prompted me to recall the remarks that former Senator Bob Graham made at a press

conference on Capitol Hill on Jan. 6 of this year, which was nearly hours after the Charlie Hebdo attacks, also in Paris.

And

in that press conference, former Senator Bob Graham laid the responsibility right at the doorstep of President Obama, and put

the fault right on Obama's doorstep, because of his refusal to end the cover-up of the 28 pages of the 9/11 Joint Inquiry report. And as Jeff just said, this indictment of Obama's fault

on this matter, obviously still applies, and Bob Graham at that

press conference, called for a Lincolnesque standard of full disclosure of the contents of the 28 pages in that count, but also this obviously applies to the "Drone Papers", and all the other crimes that remain in the shadows.

Bob Graham was referring to Abraham Lincoln's full disclosure of the role of the British in supporting the Confederacy during the Civil War. And what Senator Graham said at

that time, was that the national security threat lies {not} in the disclosure of these documents, but in the non-disclosure, as

could be seen then in the case of the attacks on {Charlie Hebdo},

and I believe as can be seen again today in the continuing attacks in Paris. Also, I would say the 28 pages warrant the Pentagon Papers treatment by some courageous member of the United

States Senate, or U.S. House.

Now, with that said, we have a question which has come in from our institutional source, and I'm going to read it. It's very brief, and I'm going to ask Jeff to respond: "Mr. LaRouche.

What are your thoughts on the immigration crises in Europe, and

what is our advice to European leaders?"

STEINBERG: Mr. LaRouche's answer to this question was very brief and very blunt. He said the first step toward solving this

problem is that Wolfgang Schäuble, the Finance Minister of Germany, has got to be dumped. Schäuble, in Mr. LaRouche's words,

belongs to be put in a pig pen, because his ideas and his opinions stink. He's terrible, he's disgusting, and he personifies those in Europe who are trying to stir up this refugee crisis into a showdown, a kind of a confrontation that could ultimately lead to the eruption of an outright civil war in

Europe. In fact, I greatly fear that in the wake of these Paris

attacks, that you're going to see an enormous backlash.

German

Chancellor Angela Merkel, who is increasingly becoming a captive

of the revolt by people like Schäuble in her own party, actually

took the surprising, but courageous stance, of saying that these

refugees must be assisted; they must be protected, and they must

be given an opportunity to be integrated into European society.

And so, there's a deep split over this issue.

The Russians, through President Putin, have intervened forcefully into the Syria situation to bring the Syria war to

an
end. The Russian military intervention on behalf of the Assad
government, is beginning to show significant success.
Remember,
the Russian involvement only began directly on September 30;
so
we're talking about a period of six weeks. And in that six
week
period, there have been a number of significant setbacks
delivered to the Islamic State and some of the other jihadist
elements of the Syrian rebel opposition. The area around the
city of Aleppo, which is the industrial capital of Syria, is
now
in the process of being retaken by the government forces. 60%
to
80% of the population of Syria has now moved, or has already
been
located in areas under government protection. So, the idea
that
the Syrian people are fleeing to Europe through Turkey and
other
routes to get away from Assad is not the reality of the
situation. They're fleeing to get away from the Islamic
State,
the Nusra front, and the jihadists who've been the instruments
for the war to overthrow the Assad government.
Remember, in August of 2009, President Obama simply
declared, "Assad must go"; and with that declaration, the US
began facilitating the efforts of the Saudis, the Turks and
others to provide weapons to an army of jihadists who have
come
in from around the world. So, defeat the Islamic State; push
back against the tyranny of the Anglo-Saudi apparatus; dump
the
likes of Wolfgang Schäuble and others of his ilk, who are
trying
to stir up literally a Hitlerian backlash in Europe against

these

refugees, who are caught in a trap between the brutality of ISIS

back in the Middle East and Iraq and Syria, and the emergence of

a nativist right wing, literally a Hitlerian backlash inside western Europe. If Europe is to survive, if Syria is to be rebuilt, then you've got to take certain decisive actions; and the United States should be collaborating with Russia in a coordinated effort to defeat ISIS. Because every effort that the

US and this so-called coalition of 60 nations has taken against

ISIS has been a completely transparent fraud.

So, who's responsible for the flood of refugees streaming into Europe? Start with President Obama, British Prime Minister

Cameron, former French President Sarkozy, current French President Hollande. These are the criminals who, along with the

Saudis, the Turks, the Qataris and the others, have been providing all of the logistical and other support to the spread

of jihadism. Because ultimately what they're out to accomplish

is a population war. We've said this previously. The British policy towards the entire Islamic world, is to foment a new religious Hundred Years War between Sunni and Shi'a on a global

scale; because ultimately their objective is population reduction. If they can launch such a Hundred Years War, then how

many of the 1.8 or so billion Muslims on this planet will survive

at the end of the day? And again, we have a President of the United States who, by personality and by ownership by the British, is a fully witting instrument in this process.

So, on the one hand, as Mr. LaRouche said, Schäuble and people of his ilk have got to be dumped. They're the menace; they're the danger. Schäuble wants to go ahead with murderous austerity against the population of Europe; and has even less interest in doing anything for these refugees. And Obama, in his own right, has carried out the same kinds of policies. The destruction of the United States on his watch and on the watch of the previous President, is a crime beyond imagination. And so, it's time for the American people and even a handful of leading elected officials in Washington to wake up to exactly where the clock stands and to act before midnight.

OGDEN: Well, with that said, I think is the point where we are going to bring a conclusion to our broadcast tonight. Again, I would recommend people go on the website and watch the full coverage of the rally in front of the {New York Times} headquarters today in New York City; as well as reading the full text of the press release that was circulated en masse there today. Thank you for joining us, and please stay tuned. And please, if you are in the New York City area, participate in the weekly discussion which Mr. LaRouche holds every Saturday afternoon with the citizens of Manhattan. If you're not, you have the opportunity to do the same on Thursday nights with the weekly Fireside Chats. Thank you very much for joining us tonight; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Rusland tilbød USA samarbejde om missilforsvar, men USA sagde "Nej"

3. november 2015 – Rusland har i mindst 2 tilfælde i de seneste år tilbudt USA samarbejde om en politik for et virkeligt internationalt, ballistisk missilforsvar, men er i begge tilfælde blevet afvist af Bush/Obama-regeringerne. Alexander Grushko, Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, sagde i et interview til Rossiya-24 TV, at Washington i stedet er i færd med at udvikle sit globale missilforsvarssystem med det formål at opnå militær overlegenhed over Rusland.

"Desværre blev chancen for at udvikle et virkeligt globalt missilforsvarssystem spildt. Dette system ville ikke have været baseret på en specifik alliance, men ville i stedet effektivt beskytte mod virkelige, ikke fiktive, missiltrusler. NATO afviste at forfølge dette, hovedsageligt af ideologiske grunde", sagde han.

Den nyligt afholdte missilforsvarsøvelse ud for Skotlands kyst viser, at "det system, der er ved at blive udviklet, ikke tilsigter at forsvare mod den såkaldte "atomtrussel fra Iran", bemærkede han. "Desværre udvikler USA i øjeblikket sit missilforsvarssystem i et forsøg på at opnå militær overlegenhed over Rusland." Selvom Grushko tilsyneladende ikke direkte henviste til nogen eksempler på tilbud om samarbejde, så kom den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin med et sådant tilbud til præsident George Bush ved et topmøde i Kennebunkport, Maine, i 2007, og nogle år senere tilbød Rusland NATO at anvende deres antimissil-radarstation i Aserbajdsjan. Begge disse tilbud var et ekko af Reagan-

LaRouches forslag om samarbejde om SDI (Strategisk Defense Initiative; det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ) fra 1983, som på det tidspunkt blev afslået af Yuri Andropov, der fungerede som en agent under britisk indflydelse.

I slutningen af sidste uge afholdt det russiske Forsvarsministerium det, som de kaldte en kommando-og-kontrol-øvelse, der involverede ægte lanceringer af missiler fra hver af deres strategiske atomtriades tre ben, såvel som fra kortdistancesystemer. Forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu meddelte i går, at øvelsen var vellykket. "Som helhed viste øvelsen de strategiske atomstyrkers og langdistance-præcisionsvåbenkompleksernes høje kampberedskab", sagde han.

Ruslands forhøjede niveau af militær aktivitet repræsenterer noget af en gåde for USA, især på det maritime område. Bør Obamas doktrin med 'Omdrejningspunkt Asien' (Asia Pivot) fortsætte efter planen, eller bør USA sætte flere skibe ind i Europa?

"Deres ubådsstyrke og flåde er aktive i en grad, de ikke har været i lang tid, i omkring 20 år", sagde chefen for marineoperationer, admiral John Richardson, til *Financial Times* i et interview. "Hvordan skal vi fordele vore styrker for at sikre, at vi bevarer en passende balance og er passende engageret?" Richardson sagde, at flåden var i færd med at vurdere, om de skulle forøge deres tilstedeværelse i Europa og Stillehavsområdet. "Det er, hvad vi i øjeblikket drøfter."

Vladimir Putin advarer igen USA mod at bryde den strategiske atomvåbenbalance

12. november 2015: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med skarpe åbningsbemærkninger inden mødet med topforsvarsfolk fra regeringen og repræsentanter for det russiske militære/industrielle kompleks under det årlige revisionsmøde. Mødet, der fandt sted tirsdag i Sotji, faldt sammen med meddelelsen om, at det russiske forsvarsbudget for næste år vil være 49 mia. dollar, hvor de 35 mia. er direkte øremærkede til de russiske bevæbnede styrker. Til sammenligning er det amerikanske forsvarsbudget 10-15 gange STØRRE: og to nye, amerikanske våbenprogrammer – det nye F-35 stealth kampfly og udskiftningen af ubåde, der medfører ballistiske missiler – er hver for sig mere kostbare end hele det russiske forsvarsbudget.

Putin fokuserede sine indledende bemærkninger omkring den trussel mod Rusland, som udgøres af USA's og dets allieredes globale missilforsvarsprogram. Putin sagde i begyndelsen af sine bemærkninger:

»Som vi alle ved opbygger USA og dets allierede uophørligt deres globale missileforsvarssystem. Desværre tager man hverken vore bekymringer eller vore samarbejdsforslag i betragtning. Vi har ved flere lejligheder indikeret, at vi anser sådanne handlinger for at være et forsøg på at underminere den eksisterende atomvåbenbalance, og på faktisk at destabilisere hele systemet med regional og global stabilitet.«

Putin bemærkede, at Washington vedvarende har hævdet, at ABM-deployeringerne relaterede til faren fra Iran, men deployeringerne fortsætter, selv efter P5+1-aftalen. Han

sluttede:

»Derfor«, konkluderede han, »er henvisninger til de iranske og nordkoreanske atommissiltrusler et dække for de sande intentioner, der i realiteten drejer sig om at neutralisere andre atomstaters strategiske atompotentiale, ud over USA og deres allierede; primært vedr. Rusland, selvfølgelig, og om at opnå en afgørende militær overlegenhed med alle de heraf følgende konsekvenser.«

Det faktum, at Putin ikke uddybede *»de heraf følgende konsekvenser«*, udvandede på ingen måde hans direkte budskab: Obama, lige som Bush og Cheney før ham, er hastigt i færd med at drive verden mod en atomar konfrontation. Putin gjorde det klart, at Rusland allerede forbereder sig til en sådan konfrontation gennem netop det arbejde, der var emnet for dette særlige, årlige møde, som han talte til.

Putin forklarede:

»Vi har gentagne gange sagt, at Rusland vil tage de nødvendige, tilsvarende forholdsregler for at styrke sit atompotentiale. Vi vil ligeledes også arbejde på anti-missilforsvarssystemer, men i det første stadium, som vi gentagent har sagt, vil vi fokusere også på offensive systemer, der kan overvinde ethvert anti-missilforsvarssystem.«

Putin bemærkede i sine slutbemærkninger, at Rusland i de seneste tre år har arbejdet på at udvikle

»flere lovende våbensystemer, der kan udføre kampmissioner i dybden under betingelser med et anti-missilforsvarssystem«,

og bemærkede, at kampenhederne er begyndt at modtage sådanne nye våbensystemer allerede i år.

Det er ikke alle, der i USA og Vesten ikke har opfattet pointen. Stephen Blank, senior-stabsmedlem ved USA's

Udenrigspolitiske Råd, skrev for nylig en artikel med overskriften, »The West Underestimates Putin at its Peril« ('Vesten undervurderer Putin, til sit eget fordærv'). Han begynder,

“For den store, britiske militæranalytiker Basil Liddell-Hart var det aksiomatisk, at formålet med krige var en bedre fred. Med andre ord, så, for at være succesfulde, må de sættes i forbindelse med politiske resultater og strategiske landvindinger.» Efter en bemærkning om, at Obamaregeringen har vist sig at være ude af stand til strategisk tænkning, skrev Blank, »Hvilke fejl, Rusland og dets bevæbnede styrker så end måtte have, så er foragt for strategi ikke en af dem. Washingtons eliter, med få undtagelser, kan ikke acceptere, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tænker og handler strategisk.» Dernæst demonstrerer Blank, at, i det aktuelle tilfælde med Syrien, er det præcis, hvad Putin gør. Han konkluderer, at »Putin kunne måske sluttelig tabe spillet i Syrien, for intet er så uforudsigeligt som krig. Men denne mulighed kan ikke retfærdiggøre den selvbehagelighed, arrogance og intellektuelle dovenskab, der truer USA's interesser og dets allierede.»

I *Guardian* den 10. nov. bragte Julian Borger spørgsmålet direkte tilbage til USA's atomvåbenprovokationer mod Moskva. Borger rapporterede om nylige advarsler fra tidl. viceformand for Generalstabscheferne, gen. James Cartwright, der udtalte, at moderniseringen af USA's taktiske atomvåben i Europa, B-61 12, gør dem »brugbare«, og dette udgør en alvorlig fare for at glide ind i en atomkrig. Cartwright sagde til PBS, »Hvis jeg, med bevarelse af samme sprængkraft, kan nedbringe sprængstofmængden, og derfor det sandsynlige atomnedfald, osv., gør dette det så mere anvendeligt i en præsidents eller national sikkerhedsbeslutningstagers øjne? Og svaret er, at det sandsynligvis kunne være mere anvendeligt.« Borger bemærkede, »Det store ved atomvåben var, at deres anvendelse angiveligt var utænkelig, og de var derfor et

afskrækkelsesmiddel mod overvejelser om en ny verdenskrig. Når de først bliver 'tænkelige', befinder vi os i et andet, og langt farligere, univers.

Leder, 12. november 2015: Putin har ret: Obama gør fremstød for et termonukleart Armageddon

Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin talte ved åbningen af en konference med ledere fra Forsvarsministeriet og militærindustrien i Sotji, Rusland, tirsdag, hvor han i skarpe vendinger advarede om, at præsident Barack Obamas politik er i færd med at drive verden mod en termonuklear udslettelse i en meget nær fremtid. I realiteten fremkom Putin med det mest vandtætte argument for, hvorfor USA's præsident må fjernes fra embedet nu.

Putin gjorde det klart, at USA har løjet om grundene til, at det bygger et globalt missilforsvarssystem, eftersom Iran nu har underskrevet P5+1-aftalen og afstået fra atomvåben. Målet for USA's og dets allieredes globale ABM har hele tiden været at ændre den globale, militære balance til fordel for USA's Prompt Global Strike-doktrin, dvs. evnen til at kunne lancere et atomart førsteangreb imod Rusland (og som angiveligt skulle ødelægge modpartens evne til et gengældelsesangreb, *-red.*). Rusland for sin del vil ikke finde sig i dette; og Rusland bygger nye våbensystemer, af hvilke nogle allerede er i felten, og som kan modgå enhver ABM-fordel, som USA måtte opnå.

Dette er den samme Barack Obama, hvis mærke for udenrigspolitisk »succes« har været massedrabs-droneprogrammet, under hvilket et ukendt antal uskyldige civile er blevet dræbt for blot posthumt at blive klassificeret som »fjender dræbt under kamp«, eller, mere enkelt, »offer for krigen«. Under diskussion med sine medarbejdere fra LaRouches Politiske Komite onsdag trak Lyndon LaRouche en klar linje mellem menneskelige væsener og uhyrer, som Obama, der ikke har nogen evne til agape, næstekærlighed, og således mangler de menneskelige, følelsesmæssige egenskaber, der adskiller mennesket fra dyret.

LaRouche bemærkede, at Californiens guvernør Jerry Brown har samme karakter som Obama, totalt distanceret fra ethvert begreb om agape.

Selv, hvis et termonukleært Armageddon kan undgås i den umiddelbare fremtid, så har Obamas syv år i embedet, der fulgte efter otte år med Bush-Cheney, haft en total disintegration af livsvilkårene for det store flertal af amerikanere til følge. Den seneste grusomhed er den massive stigning af kokainproduktionen i Colombia, der uundgåeligt meget snart vil antage form af en strøm af billig kokain, der kommer ind i USA. Dette kommer oveni det allerede epidemiske spring i heroinafhængighed og afhængighed af smertestillende medicin. Det amerikanske folk er udset som målskive for en ny og ondsindet, britisk Opiumskrig. Tilfældet med Colombia eksemplificerer dette; med præsident Santos, en protege af Tony Blair og Obama-allieret, der åbenlyst har promoveret legalisering af narkotika, har nedlukket coca-udryddelsesprogrammerne og nu er i den endelige fase for forhandlinger om en narko-fred med den berygtede narko-terrorist FARC.

Præsidenten for Boston Federal Reserve Bank er også kommet ud i denne uge med svare advarsler om en nedsmeltning af den kommercielle ejendomsboble og bemærkede, at situationen er mere alvorlig end i september 2007, hvor bolig- og

erhvervsejendomsmarkedet først nedsmeltede; dette førte til nedsmeltningen i 2008 og den efterfølgende kvantitative lempelse ('pengetrykning').

Hvis vi ser bort fra faren for atomkrig, så er de reelle livsbetingelser for det store flertal af amerikanere blevet ødelagt i løbet af de seneste 15 år med Bush og Obama. Europa er i en endnu værre tilstand med førende nationer som Tyskland og Frankrig, der er håbløst kollapsede, og med Storbritannien allerede i et totalt økonomisk sammenbrud. Alt imens det transatlantiske område går fra ondt til værre, og førende britiske kredse pønser på krig som en vej ud af deres dilemma, så er situationen i Asien og Eurasien en kvalitativt anden, med Kina, Rusland og Indien, der fører an i indsatsen for at afstikke en ny kurs for virkeligt, globalt samarbejde og en videnskabelig revolution, der vil blive til gavn for hele menneskeheden.

Muligheden for at lancere et sådant »nyt paradigme for menneskeheden«[1] er forhånden, og det første, altafgørende skridt er afsættelsen af Obama og nedlukning af Wall Street, så processen med økonomisk genrejsning og heling i USA kan påbegyndes.

[1] Se video med Helga Zepp-LaRouche m.fl., »Et nyt paradigme for civilisationen«, engelsk, med dansk udskrift.

Supplerende dokumentation:

Vladimir Putin advarer igen USA mod at bryde den strategiske atomvåbenbalance

12. november 2015: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kom med skarpe åbningsbemærkninger inden mødet med topforsvarsfolk

fra regeringen og repræsentanter for det russiske militære/industrielle kompleks under det årlige revisionsmøde. Mødet, der fandt sted tirsdag i Sotji, faldt sammen med meddelelsen om, at det russiske forsvarsbudget for næste år vil være 49 mia. dollar, hvor de 35 mia. er direkte øremærkede til de russiske bevæbnede styrker. Til sammenligning er det amerikanske forsvarsbudget 10-15 gange STØRRE: og to nye, amerikanske våbenprogrammer – det nye F-35 stealth kampfly og udskiftningen af ubåde, der medfører ballistiske missiler – er hver for sig mere kostbare end hele det russiske forsvarsbudget.

Putin fokuserede sine indledende bemærkninger omkring den trussel mod Rusland, som udgøres af USA's og dets allieredes globale missilforsvarsprogram. Putin sagde i begyndelsen af sine bemærkninger:

»Som vi alle ved opbygger USA og dets allierede uophørligt deres globale missileforsvarssystem. Desværre tager man hverken vore bekymringer eller vore samarbejdsforslag i betragtning. Vi har ved flere lejligheder indikeret, at vi anser sådanne handlinger for at være et forsøg på at underminere den eksisterende atomvåbenbalance, og på faktisk at destabilisere hele systemet med regional og global stabilitet.«

Putin bemærkede, at Washington vedvarende har hævdet, at ABM-deployeringerne relaterede til faren fra Iran, men deployeringerne fortsætter, selv efter P5+1-aftalen. Han sluttede:

»Derfor«, konkluderede han, »er henvisninger til de iranske og nordkoreanske atommissiltrusler et dække for de sande intentioner, der i realiteten drejer sig om at neutralisere andre atomstaters strategiske atompotentiale, ud over USA og deres allierede; primært vedr. Rusland, selvfølgelig, og om at opnå en afgørende militær overlegenhed med alle de heraf følgende konsekvenser.«

Det faktum, at Putin ikke uddybede »de heraf følgende konsekvenser«, udvandede på ingen måde hans direkte budskab: Obama, lige som Bush og Cheney før ham, er hastigt i færd med at drive verden mod en atomar konfrontation. Putin gjorde det klart, at Rusland allerede forbereder sig til en sådan konfrontation gennem netop det arbejde, der var emnet for dette særlige, årlige møde, som han talte til.

Putin forklarede:

»Vi har gentagne gange sagt, at Rusland vil tage de nødvendige, tilsvarende forholdsregler for at styrke sit atompotentiale. Vi vil ligeledes også arbejde på anti-missilforsvarssystemer, men i det første stadium, som vi gentagent har sagt, vil vi fokusere også på offensive systemer, der kan overvinde ethvert anti-missilforsvarssystem.«

Putin bemærkede i sine slutbemærkninger, at Rusland i de seneste tre år har arbejdet på at udvikle

»flere lovende våbensystemer, der kan udføre kampmissioner i dybden under betingelser med et anti-missilforsvarssystem«,

og bemærkede, at kampenhederne er begyndt at modtage sådanne nye våbensystemer allerede i år.

Det er ikke alle, der i USA og Vesten ikke har opfattet pointen. Stephen Blank, senior-stabsmedlem ved USA's Udenrigspolitiske Råd, skrev for nylig en artikel med overskriften, »The West Underestimates Putin at its Peril« ('Vesten undervurderer Putin, til sit eget fordærv'). Han begynder,

"For den store, britiske militæranalytiker Basil Liddell-Hart var det aksiomatisk, at formålet med krige var en bedre fred. Med andre ord, så, for at være succesfulde, må de sættes i forbindelse med politiske resultater og strategiske landvindinger.« Efter en bemærkning om, at Obamaregeringen

har vist sig at være ude af stand til strategisk tænkning, skrev Blank, »Hvilke fejl, Rusland og dets bevæbnede styrker så end måtte have, så er foragt for strategi ikke en af dem. Washingtons eliter, med få undtagelser, kan ikke acceptere, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tænker og handler strategisk.« Dernæst demonstrerer Blank, at, i det aktuelle tilfælde med Syrien, er det præcis, hvad Putin gør. Han konkluderer, at »Putin kunne måske sluttelig tabe spillet i Syrien, for intet er så uforudsigeligt som krig. Men denne mulighed kan ikke retfærdiggøre den selvbehagelighed, arrogance og intellektuelle dovenskab, der truer USA's interesser og dets allierede.«

I *Guardian* den 10. nov. bragte Julian Borger spørgsmålet direkte tilbage til USA's atomvåbenprovokationer mod Moskva. Borger rapporterede om nylige advarsler fra tidl. viceformand for Generalstabscheferne, gen. James Cartwright, der udtalte, at moderniseringen af USA's taktiske atomvåben i Europa, B-61 12, gør dem »brugbare«, og dette udgør en alvorlig fare for at glide ind i en atomkrig. Cartwright sagde til PBS, »Hvis jeg, med bevarelse af samme sprængkraft, kan nedbringe sprængstofmængden, og derfor det sandsynlige atomnedfald, osv., gør dette det så mere anvendeligt i en præsidents eller national sikkerhedsbeslutningstagers øjne? Og svaret er, at det sandsynligvis kunne være mere anvendeligt.« Borger bemærkede, »Det store ved atomvåben var, at deres anvendelse angiveligt var utænkkelig, og de var derfor et afskrækkelsesmiddel mod overvejelser om en ny verdenskrig. Når de først bliver 'tænkkelige', befinder vi os i et andet, og langt farligere, univers.

NYHEDSORIENTERING NOVEMBER: Samarbejde eller krig?

Flygtningekrisen i Europa er skriften på væggen. Kun ved at erstatte Obamas konfrontationspolitik med et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina kan der gives en vej ud. IS må besejres militært, men samtidig må der også økonomisk opbygning til. Høring i USA's kongres om faren for atomkrig. Obama afsløret som morder i nye, lækkede dronepapirer. Stem nej 3. december. Skift COP21 i Paris fra konferencen for folkemord til konference for udvikling for hele menneskeheden. Dette er en redigeret udgave af Tom Gillesbergs nyhedsopdatering fra den 9. november. Lyt med på www.schillerinstituttet.dk/

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 11. november 2015: Dræber-politik er ikke »til debat« – Obama er ren ondskab

10. november 2015 – Fra de dræbende livsbetingelser i USA til bombing af hospitaler, og til droneangreb med masse mord til følge i adskillige lande; spørgsmålet er ikke »til debat«: Obama er ren ondskab. Han er gået for vidt. Han må fjernes fra embedet.

Denne kendsgerning blev understreget af Lyndon LaRouche ved et medarbejdermøde i denne uge, hvor han uddybede det faktum, at Obama fungerer som en britisk agent – han er sin stedfaders søn – i et præsidentskab, der styres af den britiske agent Valerie Jarrett, og som er i færd med at skubbe os ud på randen af atomkrig. Vi har brug for en senator, der vil sige sandheden. Vi befinder os i en 'Nixon-situation', og nogen må presses til at træde frem, tage et ansvar og handle.

Obamas morderiske drone-politik, f.eks., tiltrækker stadig større opmærksomhed og fordømmelse, på trods af de kontrollerede, større mediers næsten totale mørklægning af de dokumenterede »Drone-papirer«. På Capitol Hill vil der i næste uge være et arrangement, sponsoreret af amerikanske, kirkelige netværk, med titlen »Tværreligiøs Briefing om Dronekrig«, hvor en pensioneret officer fra hæren vil tale.

Menneskehedens fremtidsperspektiver er storslåede, når vi først har krydset vores nuværende farezone. I den umiddelbare fremtid fortsætter præsident Putin med sin dynamik for at skabe en ramme, inden for hvilken katastrofen i Syrien/Sydvestasien og med London/Obama kan finde en løsning. En udvidet gruppe på 20+ nationer og organisationer vil den 14. november træde sammen i Wien til forhandlinger. Et russisk forhåndsforslag med otte punkter, der omfatter betingelser for

en våbenhvile, skabelse af en liste over terroristorganisationer og andre væsentlige tiltag, skal efter sigende allerede være under diskussion.

USA: Obamas forsvarsminister Ash Carter på krigsstien mod Rusland ... og Kina

8. november 2015 – Den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ashton Carter talte i Ronald Reagans Præsidentielle Bibliotek i Simi Valley, Californien, i går, på vej hjem fra sin rundrejse i Asien, der var spækket med provokationer imod både Rusland og Kina. Hans bemærkninger var en direkte trussel om, at USA forbereder sig til krig med Rusland, primært, og Kina sekundært, fordi, som AP opsummerede Carters pointe, »disse trends tilsammen afprøver amerikansk forrang og USA's stilling som forvalter af verdensordenen«.

Carter reserverede sine »stærkeste ord« til Rusland. »Det er yderst foruroligende, at Moskvas raslen med atomsablerne rejser spørgsmål om Ruslands lederes forpligtende engagement mht. den strategiske stabilitet, deres respekt for normerne for anvendelse af atomvåben, og hvorvidt de respekterer den dybe forsigtighed, som ledere i atomalderen viser mht. at svinge vildt med atomvåben.«

Han sagde, at terroristgrupper som ISIS bestemt udgør en trussel, »men andre udfordringer er mere komplicerede og, i betragtning af deres omfang og kapacitet, potentielt set farligere« – en temmelig åbenlys henvisning til Rusland og Kina. Dernæst advarede han: »Vi søger ikke at gøre Rusland til en fjende. Men tag ikke fejl: USA vil forsvare sine

interesser, vore allierede, den på principper hvilende internationale orden og den positive fremtid, som denne har at tilbyde os alle ...

Vi udforsker de teknologier, der er mest relevante over for Ruslands provokationer, såsom nye, ubemandede systemer, et nyt, langtrækkende bombefly og innovationer inden for teknologi som den elektromagnetiske railgun, lasers og nye systemer til elektronisk krigsførelse, i rummet og i cyberspace, inklusive et par stykker, der er overraskelser, og som jeg faktisk ikke kan beskrive her.«

USA: Usædvanlig begivenhed på Capitol Hill advarer om Obamas atomkrigsprovokationer mod Rusland

4. november 2015 – Et usædvanligt, offentligt møde fandt sted her til eftermiddag på Capitol Hill, Washington, USA, som advarede om farerne ved, at Obamas provokationer imod Rusland fører til atomkrig. Begivenheden var arrangeret af kongresmedlem John Conyers (D-Mich.), som er alderspræsident, dvs. det længst siddende medlem, i Repræsentanternes Hus. Flere andre kongresmedlemmer deltog i mødet, og mødepanelet inkluderede en række eksperter, herunder Stephen Cohen, Jack Matlock og Joseph Pepper.

Antallet af mødedeltagere var imponerende, og der var kun ståpladser. Kongresmedlem Alan Grayson åbnede arrangementet med at påminde tilhørerne om den Kolde Krigs dage, hvor skolebørn måtte gå i beskyttelsesrum og afholde øvelser om,

hvad de skulle gøre i tilfælde af atomkrig. Grayson advarede om, at amerikanerne, som følge af Obamas provokationer imod Rusland, var på vej tilbage til samme slags fare.

I sine åbningsbemærkninger advarede kongresmedlem Conyers om, at dæmoniseringen af præsident Putin og Rusland førte tilbage til den Kolde Krigs mørkeste stunder og kunne føre til atomkrig.

Tidligere amerikansk ambassadør til Sovjetunionen Jack Matlock, der for blot to uger siden sad på podiet, da den russiske præsident Putin talte ved Valdai-klubbens årlige begivenhed i Sotji, Rusland, gennemgik den beskidte historie med USA's krænkelser af aftaler med Rusland, NATO's provokationer med udvidelsen mod øst, osv. Cohen støttede op om Matlock ved at advare om, at hvis NATO etablerer flere baser op ad den russiske grænse, eller endnu et land, der grænser op til Rusland, indlemmes i NATO, så vil det betyde krig. Cohen citerede tidligere ambassadør til Moskva Michael McFaul som en af de fanatiske provocateurs imod Rusland. Alle talerne advarede om, at den største fare vil være, hvis der ikke er nogen, der går til modstand imod dette sindssyge fremstød for krig.

Joseph Pepper, en tidligere direktør for store, amerikanske selskaber, sagde, at også han var et barn af den Kolde Krig og beskyttelsesrummene, og han krævede, at der kom en nedtoning af hade-retorikken imod præsident Putin, med referencer til denne som værende en Hitler eller en Satan. Obama trækker røde linjer for Tredje Verdenskrig overalt, advarede han.

Både Matlock og Cohen bemærkede, at Obamas provokationer imod Rusland allerede har ført til brud mellem Tyskland og USA og til, at Tyskland allierer sig mere med Rusland. Cohen advarede om, at, med mindre, der kommer en modstand mod Obamas galskab, der kan trække ham tilbage, så kunne der hurtigt ske en udvikling, hvor der vil være en alliance mellem Tyskland, Rusland og Kina, og hvor USA står fuldstændig isoleret

tilbage.

På et tidspunkt under forløbet kom kongresmedlem Walter Jones gående ind i salen, hvor høringen fandt sted, og Conyers bad ham omgående om at tilslutte sig ham på podiet. Jones fik en stående ovation fra tilhørerne.

Denne begivenhed har intet fortilfælde på Capitol Hill og afspejler et voksende oprør imod Obamas krigsgalskab, som man må udnytte til sidste hvid. Livlige debatter med LPAC-aktivister fandt sted, så snart arrangementet sluttede, med mange af deltagerne som mangeårige kontakter, inklusive folk som Ray McGovern, der har talt ved Schiller Institut-konferencer i både New York og Tyskland. Denne begivenhed repræsenterer et enormt potentiale for et udbrud.

RADIO SCHILLER den 9. november 2015: Havner vi i himmel eller helvede? Faren for atomkrig, samt muligheden for samarbejde

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Leder, 9. november 2015: En fortælling om Én By

»Sagen er den, at, hvis man ønsker at redde USA; hvis man ønsker at redde vor nation og det, den står for, må man fokusere på missionen på Manhattan, missionen på Manhattan, som den defineres af Alexander Hamilton. Den er der stadigvæk.«

Med dette udsagn åbnede den amerikanske statsmand, Lyndon LaRouche, den 7. nov. det ugentlige møde med sit Manhattan-Projekt i New York City, og han fortsatte med at forklare slagplanen, der skal redde De forenede Stater, og planeten, fra randen af en katastrofe.

»Det første, vi må gøre i denne henseende, er at smide Obama ud af embedet«, erklærede LaRouche. »For, hvis Obama ikke fjernes fra embedet, vil han få verden ind i en atomkrig, som meget få mennesker vil have en chance for at overleve. Så jobbet består i at fjerne Obama, på den korrekte måde, ved at fremlægge et anklageskrift for de forbrydelser, han har begået, og fjerne ham fra embedet på dette grundlag. Dette er den eneste, mulige løsning, vi har, for at redde USA's eksistens, og desuden meget af den øvrige verden.

I løbet af de sidste 48 timer fortsætter listen over forbrydelser, begået af Barack Obama, med at vokse. Et eksempel herpå er truslerne, i ånden efter Dick Cheney, udtalt af forsvarsminister Ash Carter, om, at USA er i færd med at forberede krig mod både Rusland og Kina. I en tale ved afslutningen af sin ugelange rundrejse i Asien, der var spækket af provokationer, udtalte Carter: »Moskvas raslen med atomsablerne rejser spørgsmål om russiske lederes forpligtende engagement over for strategisk stabilitet ... Tag ikke fejl, USA vil forsvare sine interesser.«

Samtidig har Det britiske Imperium telegraferet sine identiske intentioner med et voldsomt angreb mod Labour Party-leder Jeremy Corbyn for at være »modstander af anvendelse af atomvåben«.

I betragtning af den trussel, som Barack Obama og Det britiske Imperium repræsenterer for menneskehedens fortsatte eksistens, sagde LaRouche: »Vi må samle folk på Manhattan, og ligeledes andre steder i USA, til at udgøre en enkelt enhed omkring et formål. Med mindre vi kan gøre dette og få Obama fjernet, f.eks., og andre onder, der er blevet tvunget ned over USA, har vi ikke en chance for at redde denne nation.«

«Dette er én nation«, bekræftede LaRouche. »Det er ikke en samling af, opdeling af stater, der har sæde i en nation. Det er én nation«, som det eksemplificeredes af Alexander Hamilton og hans politik.

Og denne ene nation har en unik rolle at spille i fællesskabet af nationer med at orkestrere tilblivelsen af et globalt system med udvikling, i Hamiltons ånd, efter de retningslinjer, der indikeres i Lyndon og Helga Zepp-LaRouches mangeårige program for udvikling af en Verdenslandbro – der udtrykkeligt strækker sig ind i det ellers dødsdømte USA. Som en forestående EIR-publikation om USA's rolle i Verdenslandbroen udtrykker det: »USA kan ophøre med at dræbe og dø og begynde at opbygge igen« – med begyndelse i den forfatningsmæssige fjernelse af Barack Obama fra Det Hvide Hus.

Udvikling i den amerikanske

Kongres imod Obamas ikke-erklærede krig i Syrien

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

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

Her følger den fulde ordlyd af McGovern's brev:

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

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

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

I overensstemmelse med Deres løfte om at vende tilbage til sædvanlig orden, tilskynder vi Dem til at instruere de

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

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

**LPAC Fredags-Webcast 6.
november 2015:
Obama beordrer medieicensur af
Drone-papirer –
Læger uden Grænser udgiver**

egen rapport om Kunduz – Obamas krigsprovokationer mod Rusland og Kina tilsigter 3. Verdenskrig. O.m.a.

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

TRANSCRIPT:

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

Now, the three of us did have a chance to meet with Helga and Lyndon LaRouche just a few hours ago; so that has definitely informed the content of the broadcast that you'll hear tonight. What you will hear tonight is a thorough exposition of the continually building case for immediate legal action to be taken against the murderous policies of the Barack Obama Presidency. The case against him continues to snowball. You'll hear about the media censorship that was ordered directly from the Obama White House to eliminate any coverage in the leading newspapers of record of the United States, including the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, of the damning

story that was broken by Glenn Greenwald and Jeremy Scahill in The Intercept of the so-called "Drone Papers"; which exposes the lurid details of Obama's weekly kill sessions, which have routinely resulted in innumerable innocent civilian deaths. You'll hear about the most recent revelations in the case of the bombardment of the Doctors Without Borders hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan; in which it is now being revealed that doctors and other medical personnel who were fleeing the hospital, fleeing the bombardment of this medical facility, were systematically gunned down by US military gunships. [This is] further building the case that this is indeed an intentional targetting of a medical facility, and amounts to nothing less than a war crime. You'll hear about the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been fleeing the illegal wars that have been perpetrated by the Obama administration in the Middle East and northern Africa, resulting in the massive social displacement of entire portions of these populations as well as widespread death and destruction, as Obama continues to lend his support to the overthrow, by radical jihadists, of sitting sovereign governments in this region. You'll hear about the shocking statistics of the rise in the death rates, rising dramatically throughout the United States; particularly among the former skilled, industrial and manufacturing labor force, who were sacrificed at the altar of the bail-out of the bankrupt Wall Street banks by first the Bush and now the Obama administrations. One of the leading causes of this increase in death rates across the United States, and especially in this formerly productive sector of the American labor force, is an unbelievable surge in deaths from heroin and related drug overdoses; not only among the inner city minority populations, but also now among suburban middle and upper class white populations, surpassing automobile and firearms rates of mortality and now reaching an epidemic level as characterized by the Centers of Disease Control.

And finally, you'll hear about the continuing mounting danger of global extinction warfare as the Obama administration

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

The invitation to this event, which was published by the Committee on East-West Accord and was circulated by the office of Congressman John Conyers, read in part as follows: “The Ukrainian crisis represents a low in US-Russia relations not seen since the fall of the Soviet Union. And the recent Russian involvement in the Syrian situation is now making the danger even worse. American and Russian jets flying bombing missions in close proximity to one another, raises the possibility of a military accident between two nuclear-armed powers. As the *New York Times* warned, the complicated and shifting landscape of alliances leaves us ‘edging closer to an

all-out proxy war between the United States and Russia.' The majority of Americans never lived through the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 or the darkest days of the Cold War. They have led lives without the looming specter of nuclear war, but the areas of conflict between our nations are growing. The conflict in Ukraine, the expansion of NATO, Russia's involvement in Syria, and other lesser issues are driving a new wedge between the US and Russia. While most would agree that conflict between the United States and Russia benefits no one, the likelihood of such a conflict, as well as the serious consequences that it would bring, is not being discussed on Capitol Hill."

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

Now each member of this panel, and a number of the Congressmen, each in their own way referred to the darkest days of the Cold War, which they all remembered as members of the senior statesmen of this country. John Conyers being the dean of the House of Representatives, Jack Matlock being a former ambassador and a close collaborator of President Ronald Reagan – they referred to the Cuban Missile Crisis. They recalled the experience of duck and cover, hiding under one's desk, nuclear air raid drills, underground bomb shelters, nuclear bunkers, and stated that although the situation at that time seemed bad, the situation today is as bad, or worse; and that unless the direct provocations against Russia are halted, there is very real possibility which exists of open nuclear warfare breaking out, and exterminating the human race.

Ambassador Matlock echoed much of what he had stated previously during previous appearances in Washington, D.C.,

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

Steven Cohen underscored Matlock's remarks and warned point-blank, in no uncertain terms, that the placement of one more base on Russia's borders, or the incorporation of one more country in Eastern Europe into the NATO security alliance, military alliance, would mean war between the U.S. and Russia, and everything that entails. He pointed out that Michael McFaul's blog has shifted from what he called "Mickey Mouse democracy promotion" to now, all-out strident calls for outright warfare and regime change provocations. Cohen emphasized that the danger of war today is far worse than at any time during the Cold War, mostly because of this cross-partisan 100% close-to-consensus when it comes to the demonization of Putin, and Russia, and the lack of any substantial pushback from among the corridors of power in Washington, against this narrative, especially from within Congress – although this was something which, he noted, was changing with this historic event, changing in front of the eyes of all those who attended this event, over a packed audience, standing room only, with this hearing that was sponsored by John Conyers and other members of Congress: the first open discussion of this kind in a forum such as this by *anyone* on Capitol Hill.

And finally, John Pepper made a very impassioned call for a completely new paradigm in U.S.-Russia relations, one which is

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

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

So, with that said, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to come to the podium for the next segment of tonight's broadcast, to elaborate a little bit more on what I've just covered.

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

immediate resignation.

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

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

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

Now the problem of not directly addressing the clear and obvious solution to the this crisis, namely the constitutional removal of President Obama from office, is in fact indicative of a much deeper problem, a problem that very few people other than people like Mr. LaRouche think about constantly. The bottom line is that since the very beginning of the 20th Century, since the intervention by Lord Bertrand Russell and others around him to destroy Classical science, and to replace it with mathematics and with the disease of pragmatism, since

that process began at the beginning of the 20th Century, we've been on a steady downward trajectory – culturally, economically, philosophically, morally. We've been, throughout the trans-Atlantic region, in a slow but now intensifying complete collapse of society, and when you broach the issue of a President who has committed atrocities, such as his drone kill policy. All you need to do, is go back on the LaRouche PAC website, and review the last three Friday evening webcasts. You'll have all of the details you need to know about that.

The fact that there has not been a move to remove this president from office, is because the disease of pragmatism has infected our political institutions to such a great degree, and has infected our general population to an even greater degree, that the only measure that can prevent the possible annihilation of mankind, is considered to be “unpractical, it's not pragmatic, there's no guarantee that this process will succeed.” So, we've been on this long trajectory downward. It's very much like the principle of how you boil a frog. If you put a pot of water on the stove, and get that water boiling to a full boil, and try to throw the frog in the boiling water, the frog's going to jump right out. He'll run away and you'll never find him. If you put the frog in a pot of warm water, comfortably warm water, and have a low flame, then, gradually, that water will reach a boiling point, and the frog won't notice it, because the incremental changes are gradual. That's why you've got to look back and consider where we are as a trans-Atlantic civilization today, and ask yourself, from that standpoint: can we survive by continuing to cling to pragmatism and avoid taking the necessary urgent measures that can save us from otherwise certain doom?

The drone policy, as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion today: it's emblematic of Obama. He's a mass killer. He *boasted* to White House staff, back in 2011, that he was really good at killing. Coming into the office of the

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

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

But there's many, many more things to consider. You have the conditions of life of the American people, which have been destroyed, systematically, boiling-frog style, over a period of, really, the last 40 years, or you could say even the period going back to the death of [president] Franklin Roosevelt in April of 1945. It's been a largely downward trajectory ever since then, and that is merely a slice of the process that began right at the turn of the 20th Century, with Bertrand Russell's invasion and assault against science. If you look back at the sweep of the 19th Century, you had some of the greatest accomplishments in culture and in science – in real, physical science. You had [bernhard] Riemann, you had the great classical composers – Beethoven, Brahms. You had the work of Friedrich Schiller, branching over from the 1700s into the 1800s. You had a renaissance underway, particularly in

Europe, particularly in Germany, during the end of the 19th Century, covering the whole sweep of that Century. And suddenly, it came it came to a screeching halt, with the British top-down intervention, personified by Bertrand Russell. And we've been on a cultural downslide ever since. If you destroy the culture, you destroy the moral fabric of a society.

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

Well, those figures are an absolute lie, and I think if any of you think about it, any of you watching this broadcast now, think about whether your conditions of life are better or worse than they were at the start of the Obama presidency, or, even more so, at the end of the Clinton presidency, when Bush and Cheney came in. If you say, "My conditions are better, my prospects for my children and grandchildren are better," then you are in an extremely small minority. The simple reality is that half of the 271,000 jobs claimed to have been created, are *purely fictitious*. They're the result of a mathematical slight-of-hand trick, projecting, on average, death and life rates and starts of new businesses and bankruptcies. But there's nothing normal about the current economy. So, forget that number! If you take the fact that 94 million working-age Americans, qualified to be in the labor force, are *not* counted as part of the labor force, because they are either chronically unemployed or have never been able to find a job, then if you add those 94 million people, working-age people, in, you find that the actual unemployment rate in the United States, is 23%! That number is on a par with the worst, darkest, days of the Great Depression in the 1930s, before

Roosevelt put people back to work.

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

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

So, this has occurred during the period of the Bush-Cheney administration and during the period of Obama. There's nothing that we can do right now, in particular, about Bush and Cheney, from the standpoint they're out of office. They should have been impeached for a whole range of reasons, and they were not impeached. Yet President Obama is the current President. And he stands guilty of crimes that even go beyond the scope of what Bush and Cheney did. The drone killing policy is a policy of mass murder. In effect, you should be thinking about President Obama from the standpoint of somebody who is a bigger mass murderer than Charles Manson. How would you feel about having Charles Manson in the White House? Well, guess what? Maybe you do. So, the question is, and this is addressed to the outstanding individual who did appear at that Congressional forum, and it's also addressed to you, the American people. When are you going to shed the disease of pragmatism and face the reality of the situation that you are

now living through? This is not something you watch on television, or read about in the newspapers or on your personal computer. This is the life that you are being subjected to; and there's no reason for it.

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

So, it's time to wake up to your own condition and do something about it, and as I say, there are leading political figures who are scared to death that we are on the cusp of thermonuclear war; they're now talking about it more openly. Don't get me wrong, it's not insignificant that leading American diplomats and members of Congress talked about the fact that we're on the edge of thermonuclear war at a public forum on Capitol Hill. But how many of you even knew about that before you heard this broadcast tonight? I can assure you, you did not read it on the front page of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*; you didn't hear about it on the six o'clock news. So, it's time to wake up; and those people, who are in responsible leading positions, have got to stop being pragmatic and pulling their

punches. And they've got to join us and join Mr. LaRouche in saying "We've got an immediate mission. We've got to bring down this Presidency, and we've got to bring down Wall Street." If you don't do that, then you're not serious about stopping thermonuclear war, and you're not serious about turning around the collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic region.

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

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

Now, to illustrate that a little bit, in 2013 there were 169,000 new users of heroin; many of them very young. Between 2013 and 2014, the rate of current heroin use – in other words, people who have used heroin in the past 30 days – rose

by 51%. Between 2007 and 2013 – or in other words, during the course of Obama's Presidency – the addiction to heroin rose 150%; and the deaths by overdose of heroin more than tripled.

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

But this picture of the epidemic use of drugs is just part of a broader picture. Death is on the rise under President Obama. A study was released just a few weeks ago in September, which is this week receiving wide coverage, which states that since 1999, over the course of the four terms of Bush and Obama, the death rate among middle-aged white Americans in the age range of 45-54 has risen dramatically; in an unprecedented way. 10 % overall, and 20 % among the poorer, less educated strata. This increase of the death rate of middle-aged people is not a natural shift in demographics; it's not due to some overall change in disease mortality rates. In fact, for comparison, in comparable industrialized countries around the world, the mortality rate for exactly this class of people has *fallen* by 25 % to 30 %. So, this is purely the result of a conscious

policy in the United States by Bush and Obama.

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

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

STEINBERG: I think it goes back to what I said earlier. Slowly, the level of culture, the level of real science that had permeated our culture even here in the United States in the 19th Century has been under steady and constant assault; largely coming from the British, particularly reflected in people like Lord Bertram Russell, who wrote books professing to be about science. He wrote a book in 1951, *The Impact of Science on Society*; he didn't talk about science. He talked about methods of destruction of young minds by turning the education system into a system that basically drives people into accepting their subservience to be trained, to be submissive, to be non-inquisitive. And again, the disease that Russell imposed from the beginning of the 20th Century, was the disease of replacing physical science with mathematics. Everything comes down to a formula; everything comes down to a probability. If it's not highly probable, then it's not

practical, and therefore, don't go there.

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

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

As Megan just said, he's presided over an invasion of drugs, whether it's over the counter, prescription or black-market illegal drugs; we have 94 million citizens of working age who are not working in the real economy. Clearly not every one of those people is sleeping under a bridge somewhere. How many of them are directly involved in the black market economy that's shoving heroin at a record rate into the arms of American citizens? It's all of a package.

And again, as I said earlier, and as Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion this afternoon, Obama's got to go, and the

book of evidence is absolutely there. It's comprehensive, it's irrefutable. Some of the crimes that he is documented to be guilty of are crimes that go beyond simply the question of impeachment. They may wind up being the basis for criminal prosecution, because the immunity afforded to elected officials does not extend to outright criminal action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said is, first of all, you've got to let the Russians conduct the investigation. The Russians are perfectly capable of conducting a thorough and honest and

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

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

"We need to obtain absolutely objective and verified data on the reasons for the crash of the plane. This is necessary for purposes of investigating the cause of this disaster, and for informing the public. This work must be done in the most meticulous fashion, taking as much time as may be required, and I want to state that until we determine the actual causes of what happened, I think it is appropriate to halt Russian civil aviation flights to Egypt. This chiefly involves tourism. At the same time, we find it necessary to cooperate actively with the Egyptian authorities in joint work on the investigation of the causes of this disaster. Now, Russia 1 then quoted the official spokesman for President Putin, Mr. Peskov, who said the President concurred with Bortnikov's recommendations; and he added "Halting the flights does not yet mean that the version that it was an act of terrorism is being viewed as the main one in the investigation of this air disaster. Experts continue to exclude nothing, including the possibility of a bomb explosion onboard the plane." So, this is the beginnings of an investigation into a serious tragedy;

224 people were killed in it. And it's not known yet; we don't have the results of that forensic investigation.

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

So, ultimately, all roads lead back to what we've been discussing throughout the entire evening broadcast tonight; namely, as the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [dia], General Mike Flynn, told al-Jazeera, and has subsequently repeated in interviews with American and Russian

media; the President, the administration were warned that the actions that the US was taking in places like Benghazi, was fueling the growth of jihadist organizations. And it was not an oversight, or that the warnings were ignored, as General Flynn said, it was in pursuit of the ongoing current policy that they made a willful decision to keep doing what they were doing, having been fully informed that this was fueling the growth of not just al-Qaeda. But back in 2012, DIA was already looking at the prospects of the creation of a jihadist caliphate in the area on the territory of parts of Iraq and Syria.

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

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

the continuation of the policies of the Obama Presidency.

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

Thank you for joining us, and good night.

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

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

Det faktum, at de amerikanske massemedier har mørklagt betydningen af Drone-papirerne, var forventeligt. Det forringer ikke i mindste måde beviserne, ej heller gør det Obama mindre skyldig i krigsforbrydelser og forbrydelser mod menneskeheden.

Han sidder på toppen af en klart defineret, kriminel kommandovej, der har kommissioneret mord over hele verden,

inklusive imod amerikanske borgere. Forbrydelserne er klart dokumenteret i Drone-papirerne, der inkluderer en høring i Kongressens Efterretningskomite om CIA's og Fælleskommandoen for Specialoperationers drone-programmer til mange milliarder dollar om året, og som viser, at der ikke er nogen kontrol med dem, og at uskyldige civile rutinemæssigt bliver dræbt, for blot posthumt at blive kategoriseret som fjender, dræbt under kamp, for at skjule forbrydelsernes omgang.

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

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

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

politik og krig.

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

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

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

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

**men Obama sender
militærrådgivere til Syrien!**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Foto: Dmitri Rogozin, fra tidligere på året.

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

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

sandsynligvis få en borgerkrig i USA.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Leder, 30. oktober 2015: Hvis vi ikke lever op til det, Obama foretager sig imod Kina, er vores organisation i fare

29. oktober 2015 – Det virkelige problem kan ses af Obamas oprørende militære provokationer imod Kina tirsdag (27. okt.): Obama er fast besluttet på at lancere en atomkrig. Hvad vil der ske med os (organisationen), hvis vi ikke siger dette og fører kampagne på dette grundlag? Se på falskneriet med Obamas angreb mod Kina! Se på hans blodige poter! Han må fjernes! Under principperne for det amerikanske præsidentskab, kan han fjernes fra embedet – og gør vi ikke det, kommer vi hurtigt ind i en stadig farligere situation.

Man kan ikke fjolle rundt og forhandle, eller sige, »Nej, jeg tror ikke på det!« Lad være med at gå rundt og spørge, hvordan vi skal gøre det – han må holdes tilbage, eller vi er alle døde.

Vi må sætte det først på listen over sager: Kald det ikke for

noget andet: mord er mord! At sige noget andet er at lyve. Obama er i bund og grund en morder, en masse-morder. Hvis man vil redde USA, så må man sige dette, eller man kunne selv blive den næste, der ryger. Og hvis man ikke bruger den slags sprogbrug, også på gaden, er man i vanskeligheder. Sandheden er altafgørende: Obama er en morder!

Enhver, der forsøger at bagatellisere Obamas krigstræk mod Kina: sig til dem, at de er hjerneskadede. Folk bliver myrdet af Obama, mens du går rundt og hvisker og prætenderer intet at vide.

Til de mennesker, der hyler, at »Det er ikke ham; det er systemet«, så fortæl dem, »Nej, det er Obama«. Hvis man ikke siger, at det er Obama, har man ikke ret til at have en mening. For, hvis man dømmes folk til at retfærdiggøre, at de bliver myrdet, har man ingen rettigheder.

Det her er mord, slet og ret mord! Beviserne er entydige, og hvis man ikke siger det, hvad er man så? Et konfliktsky skvat!

Folk er bange for, at Obama også vil dræbe dem, hvis de mishager ham. Men, den eneste måde at redde sig selv på, er: Accepter ikke dette! Hvis man giver efter, eller billiger, at folk giver efter, skriver man måske selv sin egen dødsbillet. En opvisning i manglende ryggrad!

For at vinde en krig, må man besejre fjenden. Obama overgiver sig ikke, med mindre han besejres. Dette er et akut spørgsmål, ikke noget, der kan udsættes, ikke noget 'på sigt'. Hvis man ikke har tilstrækkelig ryggrad til at gennemføre det, så betyder ens mening ingen ting. Og Kongressens hidtidige passivitet er en fordømmelse af deres moral. De forstår ikke, at de, som alle mennesker, en dag skal dø. Vil det blive som væsener, der har været uden værdi for menneskeheden – eller som soldater, der ved, at de er dødelige, og er forsigtige med, hvordan de tilbringer denne tilstand som dødeligt væsen, for at redde menneskeheden? Fejhed er aldrig andet end

afskyeligt.

Obamas masseorderiske krige i Mellemøsten – krige, der bygger på løgne – har forvandlet offerlandene til Helvede på Jord. Situationen i Tyskland er på randen af en eksplosion, hvor, på trods af en enorm udladning af næstekærlig hjælp gennem de mange frivillige og hjælpeorganisationer, men hvor, simpelt hen pga. det ekstremt store antal flygtninge – ti tusinder om dagen – der kommer til Bayern fra Østrig, man har nået grænsen mht. husly og personel. Den største forhindring for en løsning – en kombination af et forceret program for opførelse af offentlige boliger og en ny Marshallplan for Mellemøsten og Afrika og en forlængelse af den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen – er Schäuble (den tyske finansminister, -red.). Hans fastholdelse af det Sorte Nul, et budget, der balancerer, er det, der bærer ved til fremmedfjendskhedens bål som en tendens i dele af befolkningen.

Dette er i færd med at udløse et bagslag, der truer med at bryde koalitionsregeringen. Det er allerede koldt i Tyskland. Det er blot et spørgsmål om tid, før et flygtningebarn fryser ihjel i en interimistisk lejr. Vores **Fredags-webcast** vil indeholde dramatiske optagelser fra krisen. Vi har præsenteret anklageskriftet mod Obama – vi behøver ikke gentage beviserne. Vi må satse på en dramatisk effekt, der vil få publikum til at forandre sig, og handle!

Obama gør fremstød for tre krige samtidig

29. oktober 2015 – Præsident Obama bevæger USA stadig nærmere til global krig mod Rusland i Europa og Mellemøsten og mod

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

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

*I en anden artikel, der bygger på anonyme lækker fra Obamaregeringen, rapporterer Reuters, at det var Pentagon, der gjorde fremstød for provokationen i Det sydkinesiske Hav, under hvilken destroyeren USS Lassen sejlede frem til inden for 12 sømil fra de kunstige øer den 26. okt. i en »frihed for sejlads«-øvelse. De siger, at Pentagonfolk har krævet en sådan aktion for at udfordre Kina siden maj måned, men at det var Det Hvide Hus og Udenrigsministeriet, der »bremsede« det

indtil denne uge. Men aktionen byggede på en anmodning om »muligheder« fra forsvarsministeren Ash Carter – der trods alt er udnævnt af Obama – angiveligt for at respondere til den hurtige opbygning af disse øer. Det er den samme kampagne hen imod atomkrig, som Obama er engageret i, i Europa.

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

Kinas ambassadør til USA undsiger Obamas krigs- provokationer

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

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

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

fartøjer dertil, ifølge CNN.

Han siger at handlingen blev foretaget "i total ligegyldighed i forhold til international lov". I FN-konventionen om Havretsloven er der klare regler om sikkerhed for sejlads, sejladsfrihed og uskyldig transit, sagde Cui, idet han noterede at Kina har underskrevet UNCLOS, men at De Forenede Stater ikke har. "Det, USA gør, er totalt imod reglerne, ordlyden og ånden i konventionen.

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

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

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

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

Global Times, det regerende kommunistpartis officielle avis, udgav et mere giftigt svar. Idet de rådede Kina til "at forholde sig roligt", angiver de den nødvendige kurs: "Som modsvar mod de amerikanske chikanerier bør Kina omgås

Washington taktfuldt og være forberedt på det værste. Det kan overbevise Det Hvide Hus om, at Kina, på trods af uvilje, ikke er bange for at udkæmpe en krig med USA i regionen, og er fast besluttet på at tage vare på dets nationale sikkerhed og værdighed. Beijing bør udføre anti-chikane operationer. Vi skal først observere de amerikanske krigsskibe. Hvis de, i stedet for at passere forbi, stopper for yderligere handlinger, er det nødvendigt for os at indlede elektroniske indgreb, og endda sende krigsskibe, fastlåse dem med radarinformation til affyringskommandoen og flyve over de amerikanske skibe”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

hvorfor han ikke skal smides ud af embedet. Det er der beviser nok til.»

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

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

Amerikas befolkning – et system, der i stedet bør fjernes og erstattes med LaRouches økonomiske program med Verdenslandbroen.

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

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

I går understregede LaRouche:

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

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

der ryger.«

Med hensyn til dem, der har været så bange for Obama, at de har været paralyseret til handlingslammelse og til at tolerere hans nazistiske forbrydelser, erklærede LaRouche:

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