

Afrikanske eksperter hylder Xi Jinpings perspektivplan for en 'ny afrikansk æra'

5. december, 2015 – Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, der nu afslutter sit højt priste Afrika-besøg, har i betydelig grad opgraderet det kinesisk-afrikanske forhold til at være "en vidtgående strategisk forbindelse" og fremlagt en omfattende strategi for afrikansk industrialisering. 'Hvirvelvinden' af en rundrejse, som den kinesiske præsident har foretaget – hans andet præsidentbesøg i Afrika – huer næppe iagttagerne i det Hvide Hus' Afrikakontor. I sin tale til det Kinesisk-Afrikanske Samarbejdsforum (FOCAC) d. 4. december understregede Xi den fundamentale betydning af at reducere fattigdom. "Fattigdom er den underliggende årsag til kaos", sagde han.

"Og udvikling er nøglen til at løse alle problemer." Han bemærkede, at den nuværende situation åbner for enorme muligheder for udvikling, men også farer, der må konfronteres, inklusiv terrorisme, miljøforringelser og hegemonisme.

Besøget har skabt en kolossal følelse af optimisme blandt afrikaeksperter. "Kinas strategier for udvikling og samarbejde har hjulpet det afrikanske kontinent med at skabe en ganske hurtig, synlig og betydelig økonomisk og social omstilling", sagde professor Gerishon Ikiara, meddirektør ved Nairobi Universitetets Institut for Diplomati og Internationale Studier i Kenya. "For tyve år siden indgik Kinas samarbejde med Afrika om industriel kapacitet dårligt nok i internationale diskussioner. I og med, at afrikanske lande nu betragter Kina som den mest velegnede partner i deres nationale industrialisering og andre udviklingsprogrammer, har denne situation imidlertid ændret sig radikalt", sagde Ikiara.

"Det er mislykkedes for Afrika opnå en meningsfuld udvikling inden for vareproduktion i de seneste årtier", sagde Fay Chung, en afrikansk lærd i Zimbabwe af kinesisk herkomst", men nu er der kæmpestørre muligheder for et industrielt samarbejde mellem de to parter, såvel som tilstrækkeligt rum for yderligere udvikling."

Da Forum for Kinesisk-Afrikansk Samarbejde blev etableret i år 2000, var handelsvolumenet mellem Kina og Afrika \$10 mia. Nu er Kina blevet kontinentets største handelspartner, med et tovejs handelsvolumen, der i henhold til Kinas Handelsministerium forventes at nå \$300 mia. i 2015. Men kurseren fokuserer nu klart på infrastruktur, i særdeleshed transport og "kapacitetsopbygning". Kina vil uddanne 200.000 afrikanere til kvalificeret teknisk personale i Afrika og vil give teknisk uddannelse til 40.000 afrikanere, der bringes til Kina for oplæring.

Alt imens præsident Xi, og senest udenrigsminister Wang Yi, har fremhævet behovet for skabelsen af et stærkt grundlag for Afrikas industrialisering, så vil kinesiske investeringer også blive rettet mod en stigende landbrugsproduktion og - produktivitet, med fokus på storlandbrug, oplagring og forarbejdning af korn og dyrehold. Kina vil starte landbrugsprojekter i 100 afrikanske landsbyer og vil sende 30 hold kinesiske landbrugsekspertes til at hjælpe med programmerne.

For at fremme den kulturelle udveksling – en af de fem vigtige "grundpiller", som den kinesiske præsident har anført som grundlæggende for det forstærkede forhold – vil Kina bygge fem kulturcentre, introducere TV-udsendelser via satellit i landsbyer og bringe 900 afrikanske, akademiske lærde til Kina. Kina vil også udvide antallet af direkte flyforbindelser mellem Kina og afrikanske byer, for at forøge kulturel udveksling og turisme.

Kinas plan om at gøre en ende på fattigdom i 2020 – stadig 70 millioner tilbage

*30. november 2015 – Kinas øverste lederskab mødtes i Beijing den 27.-28. nov. for at udarbejde konkrete planer for sit mål om at udrydde fattigdom i år 2020. Med Kinas indsats over de seneste 30 år, hvor de har løftet 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom (det er det tal, som *Xinhua* giver den 29. nov. – en stigning fra de 600 mio., der ofte nævnes), så er der stadig 70 mio. kinesere, der lever i fattigdom.*

Xi Jinping understregede, at det ikke blot er indkomsten, men den generelle levestandard, der må adresseres. Dette omfatter tilstrækkelig mad og beklædning, tvungen skolegang, sundhedsydeler og husly.

Xi sagde til konferencen, at, alt imens det er »en krævende opgave«, så vil »ingen enkeltstående, fattig region eller noget individ, der lever i fattigdom, blive ladt tilbage«, når landet opnår sit mål med »at bygge et moderat fremgangsrigt samfund« i 2020. Han sagde, at den disponible indkomst pr. person hos landmænd i fattige områder bør vokse med en hurtigere rate end det nationale gennemsnit, og basale offentlige tjenesteydeler for områderne bør være næsten oppe på niveauet for det gennemsnitlige nationale kriterium, iflg. *Xinhua*.

»Industriel udvikling er afgørende for at lette fattigdom«, sagde Xi og opfordrede til, at lokale ressourcer skulle

anvendes godt for at udvikle industrier og sikre beskæftigelse til de arbejdsløse bønder.

Premierminister Li Keqiang talte også ved konferencen og sagde, forbedringen af infrastrukturen på landet må have prioritet, inklusive veje, adgang til ferskvand, elektricitet og Internet. Han sagde, at omkring 10 mio. mennesker vil blive løftet ud af fattigdom gennem flytning.

COP21: Udviklingslande deltager kun i Klimatopmøde i Paris for at beskytte deres lande mod at blive offerlam på alteret for det globale opvarmnings-credo

*29. november 2015 – En artikel i dag af Gal Luft i Kinas statslige, engelsksprogede avis, *Global Times*, rapporterer, at morgendagens COP21 i Paris vil blive den største samling af statsoverhoveder nogensinde – hele 147 af slagsen – uden for FN's Generalforsamling. Men, hvorfor kommer de? »Mange af disse ledere vil ikke deltage i topmødet pga. bekymring for verdens klimaforandring, men snarere for at sikre, at deres lande, der for det meste er under udvikling, ikke ender som offerlam på 'klimatismens', dvs. den grønne kults globale opvarmnings-credos, alter.«*

Den indiske regering brugte sin officielle twitter-funktion for Topmødet til i dag at udstede en erklæring, forud for premierminister Narendra Modis afrejse til Paris. Erklæringen sagde, »resultatet af Topmødet må understøtte tilpasning til og udvikling af billige teknologier til at afbalancere periodisk forsyning af sol- og vindenergi«, rapporterede ANI.

Blandt disse billige eller prisbevidste teknologier er kul i dag stadig den førende. Artiklen i *Global Times* påpeger, at »kul er den brændselsform, der bruges i næsten 80 % af Kinas energisektor. Indien, hvor antallet af energi-berøvede mennesker tæller flere end den totale amerikanske befolkning, bruger kul i 60 % af sin energiproduktion. De sammenlagt 600 mio. mennesker i de 10 sydøst-asiatiske lande er også dybt afhængige af kul.« Artiklen opsummerer ved at sige, at arbejdshesten i Asien under udvikling, hvor de fleste af denne verdens fattige mennesker lever, altid har været, og fortsat er, kul.

Forfatteren udpeger korrekt den intention om folkemord, der ligger i COP21, selv om han desværre kun gør det implicit. Det er en fejltagelse ikke at pege på kernekraft og fusionskraft[1] som menneskehedens fremtid,[2] og det er en fejltagelse ikke at anklage de samme britiske imperialister,[3] der har arrangeret COP21, for at nægte adgang til disse højere teknologier.

[1] Se Specialrapport: **En Prometheus-tilgang til nye former for ild: Udvinding af helium-3 på Månen, for en menneskehed med fusionskraft**

[2] Se video: **En vision for fremtiden**

[3] Se specialartikel: **Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur**, af **Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

EU vil bestikke Tyrkiet med 3 mia. euro for at forhindre syrere i at komme til Europa, siger Reuters

29. november 2015 – I kølvandet på Tyrkiets ensidige brud på NATO's uskrevne regler for kamphandlinger med sin nedskydning af det russiske SU-24-fly, går EU nu frem med en belønning til Tyrkiet på 3 mia. euro og tilskynder Ankara til at forhindre sine syriske flygtninge i at gå ombord i plimsollere med kurs mod de nærliggende græske øer, rapporterer Reuters i dag og citerer et udkast, der er udfærdiget i kølvandet på dagens topmøde mellem EU og Tyrkiet i Bruxelles. Uden at nævne aftalen sagde EU-rådets præsident, Donald Tusk, til journalister, at hovedformålet for topmødet var at stemme op for strømmen af migranter til Europa. »Vi er nået frem til en aftale, som jeg håber, vil blive vedtaget af alle parter i dag«, sagde han.

Reuters bemærkede tidligere, at den tyske kansler Angela Merkel før mødet til reportere sagde, at »en væsentlig del af denne handleplan for EU og Tyrkiet vil dreje sig om, hvordan

vi kan erstatte illegal migration med legal migration, hvordan vi kan forbedre situationen for flygtninge i Tyrkiet. Tyrkiet giver husly til godt og vel 2 millioner flygtninge, og har kun modtaget minimal international støtte, så Tyrkiet har en retmæssig forventning om, at EU og dens medlemsstater vil hjælpe Tyrkiet med at klare denne byrde.«

Den tyrkiske premierminister Ahmet Davutoglu, der den 28. nov. i tre timer havde møde med statsledere i EU, sagde ved sin ankomst til drøftelserne i Bruxelles, at det var »en ny begyndelse« for Tyrkiets forsøg på at blive medlem af EU, der har været sat i stå i 10 år. »I dag er en historisk dag i vores optagelsesproces til EU«, sagde Davutoglu til reportere. »Jeg er taknemlig over for alle europæiske ledere for denne nye begyndelse«, sagde han iflg. Reuters.

Foto: Tyrkisk flygtningelejr i grænsebyen Suruc, med 35.000 flygtninge. Lejren har to hospitaler, syv sundhedsklinikker og klassesværelser til 10.000 børn.

**International LaRouchePAC
Fredags-webcast
den 27. november 2015:
LaRouche: »Med mindre, og
indtil, Obama smides ud,**

står verden på en knivsæg til atomkrig.

Strategisk analyse med Jeff Steinberg m. fl.

Lyndon LaRouche har hele vejen utvetydigt sagt, at med mindre, og indtil, Obama smides ud, står verden på en knivsæg til atomkrig. Spørgelset af denne fare sås skarpt i tirsdags med Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk fly, der var engageret i bombetogt nær den tyrkisk-syriske grænse. LaRouche kom omgående med en offentlig erklæring, der sagde, »Obama har organiseret en krigshandling, og således sat USA, såvel som resten af menneskeheden, i fare«. Han sagde, at det »var et overlagt forsøg fra Obamas side på at fremtvinge generel krig«. Engelsk udskrift.

MEGAN BEETS: Good evening. It's November 27, 2015. My name is Megan Beets, and I'd like to welcome all of you to our regular

Friday evening broadcast here at LaRouche PAC. I'm joined in the

studio tonight by Jason Ross and I'm also joined, via video, by

Jeffrey Steinberg.

Now in discussions earlier this week, Mr. LaRouche made it very, very clear that the key issue facing all of us, is whether

the people of the United States, in particular, both the people

in positions of leadership, such as the Congress, but also the population in general, have the guts to stop compromising with Obama, to tell the truth, and to throw him out. Now, what we've

seen shaping up over the past weeks is a very dramatically and

a very rapidly shifting world strategic situation, including ongoing Russian military intervention into Syria; also including the recent wave of terrorist attacks, such as the bombing of the Russian plane over Egypt, and of course, the terrorist attacks which occurred just two weeks ago in Paris, which was followed by a shift in dynamic among world leaders, away from the failed Obama policy, and toward a broader collaboration with the Russians to defeat ISIS.

However, throughout all of this, Mr. LaRouche has been unequivocal that unless, and until you get Obama out of the U.S. presidency, the world stands on a razor's edge of thermonuclear war.

Now the spectre of that danger arose sharply this Tuesday, with the Turkish shooting down of a Russian plane which was involved in operations near the Turkish-Syria border. And Mr. LaRouche immediately issued a statement, a public statement, which said that "Obama has organized an act of war, and thus endangered the United States, as well as all humanity." He said that it "was a deliberate attempt by Obama to force general warfare."

Now, this act by Turkey and by Obama, and the aftermath, has catalyzed a very significant change in the world global dynamic, which we're seeing manifest, for example, in Europe, among other places. This shift is also the subject of tonight's institutional question, which makes reference to the ongoing talks in Vienna, which are aimed at resolving the situation in Syria. The

question
reads as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche, please give us your view of how Russia and Turkey can move once again to collaborate to save Syria under the Vienna process?" So now I'm going to turn it over to Jeff to give Mr. LaRouche's response to that question, as well as an elaboration of the general strategic picture.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Megan. Can you hear me there? Well I think that the starting point must be to tell the truth as we know it about the events of last Tuesday. It was immediately understood by leading political and military circles in the United States, in Europe, and most emphatically in Russia, that the action that was undertaken by the Turkish in shooting down that Russian SU-24 over a border area on the Turkey-Syria border right along the Mediterranean coast, that this was something that 1) was order top down in Turkey from President Erdogan, and 2) Erdogan would never have undertaken such an action if he did not have advance approval from Obama and the British. So, for the Russians, this represented a major act of war, and I can tell you that within the U.S. governing institutions, there was a deep and profound split that reflected immediately in actions that were diametrically opposite. Secretary of State John Kerry, leading circles within the Pentagon all the way up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, immediately activated channels with Russia, knowing full well that there was a very real prospect

that Russia would retaliate immediately after this unwarranted military provocation. And so, you have one element of the U.S. command that is not under British control, that moved immediately

to at least temporarily forestall a situation that was potentially moments away from a general war between NATO and Russia. And as we've been saying, as Mr. LaRouche has been warning since virtually the beginning of the Obama presidency, any such war between NATO and Russia would very rapidly devolve

into a thermonuclear war, in which the overwhelming majority of humankind would likely not survive.

So you had actions. There was red phone line communications activated immediately, between those elements in the U.S. Command

that were not on the British line, and top Russian officials. And

the first objective was simply to secure a commitment that the situation would not immediately go to a hot war. In other words,

this was the most dangerous situation since, and probably more so, than even the Cuban Missile crisis. Because in the Cuban missile crisis, there was no shoot down of an American or a Soviet ship or a plane.

On the other hand, President Obama, who was closer to Erdogan than virtually any foreign leader, perhaps with the sole

exception of David Cameron in Britain, immediately got on the phone with Erdogan and then issued public statements certifying

that, in his mind, Turkey acted perfectly within their sovereign

rights to shoot down a plane flying over its territory.

Now, never mind the fact that there are serious questions and disputes of whether that plane, that Russian plane, actually

ever even entered Turkish airspace. The fact is that, if it passed through Turkish air space at all, number one, there was never any intent—and nobody in Turkey even claimed there was any

intent on the part of the Russians—to carry out any kind of military action or provocation against Turkey. And secondly, even

after the first 24 hours following the shoot-down, the Turks were

even acknowledging that that plane, if it ever in fact crossed into Turkish territory, was there only for a matter of brief seconds, and no longer.

Now that also tells you that to shoot down that plane, was a premeditated, pre-determined decision. There was not enough time

for the Turkish air force to consult up the chain of command all

the way to President Erdogan, and to then get response orders back, and to fire at the Russian plane – all within a matter of

a timeframe that at most has been characterized as 17 seconds. So, again, it was a premeditated act of war; and Erdogan on his

own never would have undertaken that. It was done in conjunction

with both Obama and the British; and therefore, the responsibility lies there.

Now, let's again visit what the immediate context was of this incident. It occurred last Tuesday at a point that French President Hollande was in Washington to attempt to organize President Obama to join a trilateral military alliance of France,

Russia, and the United States, to wipe out the threat of ISIS and

Nusra, and all allied organizations inside Syria and inside Iraq

primarily. And so, the events that took place just as Obama

and

Hollande were sitting down, hijacked the agenda of that discussion. All you have to do is read the transcript, or even better, watch the video of the press conference that took place

later that same day between Obama and Hollande; and you'll see towards the end, Obama launching into a typical Obama tirade against Putin and against Russia. Obama was lying pathologically

in saying that the United States is leading a coalition of over

60 countries, and that Russia, when it comes to fighting against

the Islamic State is "the outlier"; and it went on from there. So, statements soon after that, again from the White House, fully

endorsed and adopted the Turkish line on what happened.

So, here you've got a situation where an act of war, an act of military aggression took place, carried out by Turkey – a NATO member – and was done with the full at least tacit backing

of the President of the United States, with the full support of

the British. How close do you have to get to provoking thermonuclear war before enough people in Congress and in the American population wake up and recognize that Lyndon LaRouche has been right for years in warning about the menace that President Obama represents if he's allowed to continue to remain

in office? We're down to the final 14 or so months of his Presidency, but you can see the kind of developments that can occur on literally a moment's notice. And so, there is no option

any longer other than removing the President from office by Constitutional means immediately. That means that the leading members of Congress and at least leading elements within the American population have got to finally wake up to strategic

reality.

Now, to put an added punctuation mark on the situation, let's not forget that there was another major series of provocations directed against Russia over the same recent timeframe of the last week. You had the Right Sector, the neo-Nazi apparatus in Ukraine, that is openly backed and promoted

by the Obama administration principally through Victoria Nuland,

the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, who carried out a bombing campaign against the power grid of Crimea; and has effectively shut off almost all power to

the entire Crimean peninsula. When Russian repair units attempted

to get to the sites to re-establish the power links, they were fired on by Right Sector militias; and to make matters even worse, at the end of last week, it was announced by Nuland's pet

prime minister, Yatsenyuk, that henceforth all Russian flights over Ukrainian airspace were cancelled. Now, that's tantamount to

a threat of yet a second country, a major ally of the US and the

British, threatening to carry out unprovoked strikes against Russian aircraft flying over Ukrainian airspace.

So, you've got a clear pattern here. You have – as Megan indicated – a phase shift with the series of ISIS terrorist attacks over the last several weeks, that began with the bombing

of the Russian Metro Jet over the Sinai; followed with a series

of suicide bombings on the southern portions of Beirut in Lebanon, targetting the Shi'ite area of that city. And then the

Paris attacks. The world was energized to finally launch an all-out serious campaign against the Islamic State. Russia

escalated the bombing campaign against the Islamic State and knocked out an estimated 1000 of the tanker trucks that have been

smuggling oil from the ISIS-controlled areas of northern Syria into Turkey, where they've been sold on the black market; and these funds have been fueling the operations of the Islamic State.

At the G-20 summit meeting that ironically took place in Turkey just days before the Turkish air force shot down the Russian SU-24, President Putin made very clear that Russia has aerial photographs showing lengthy caravans of these oil tanker

trucks crossing the border into Turkey from northern Syria; and

furthermore, he said he has the names of financial agents in 40

countries, including a number of the G-20 member countries, that

are involved in financing the Islamic State through black market

cooperation. So, the case is unambiguous. If you wanted to attribute narrow motives, you could say that Erdogan was furious

at the Russians for bombing these Turkish smuggling trucks, since

we know that the funds generated on the Turkish side from this black market activity largely go into the coffers of the ruling

AKP Party. We know that the son of President Erdogan is himself

one of the major people involved in this black market operation.

But in a very real sense, that's a much too narrow understanding of what happened here. It eliminates the crucial question, which is that Obama and the British were behind this,

and it was an attempt on a much grander scale to not just

simply
sabotage the Vienna initiatives; but it was an attempt to
trigger
a potential world war. And for that crime alone, despite the
fact
that there is a long list of Constitutional violations and
other
crimes committed by this President, for that reason alone he
must
be immediately removed from office. And therefore, every
person
listening to this broadcast, all of your friends, all of your
neighbors, all of your political associates, your co-workers,
are
going to have to do some serious soul searching; because we
came
inches away from world war last Tuesday morning, with the
Turkish
actions. And it was only a matter of intervention, but
particularly restraint on the part of Russian President Putin
and
the Russian military that averted that. There is still clearly
an
option, and lessons to be learned from this provocation, that
could and must lead to reaching an agreement in Vienna to end
the
five-year war and tragedy in Syria. But that must start with
the
kind of blunt truth which we have been discussing here over
the
last few minutes; and it cannot go forward so long as
President
Obama remains in office. So, there are urgent issues that must
be
taken up by the Congress and by the American people, if we are
going to avert a war; because I can assure you, if those
critical

actions are not taken in the immediate days ahead, then the chances that there will be {another} incident; {another} provocation, whether by Ukraine, whether by Erdogan and the Turks, whether by ISIS, and if actions aren't taken to solve the problem at its roots, we will be staring at the prospect of world war in the immediate days, perhaps hours ahead.

BEETS: Okay, thank you very much, Jeff. Now, upcoming this Monday, November 30th, we have the beginning of a two-week long genocidal COP21 depopulation climate conference, which is occurring in Paris, and despite the actual danger to humanity which Jeff just outlined in detail, and especially in the wake of the terrorist attacks in Paris just two weeks ago, this absolutely insane conference is going ahead as scheduled, to be attended by approximately 140 heads of state, along with thousands of other government, NGO, and other officials, notably Britain's Prince Charles, the dysfunctional and inbred son of Queen Elizabeth and her walking-dead husband, Prince Philip, will be one of the keynote speakers.

Now, as we addressed in this webcast last week, if anyone involved had any morality, we would completely change the nature of the conference, to address the actual dangers and threats to humanity, such as the refugee crisis, the conditions of poverty around the world, and the lack of development that are actually threatening billions of people. So what I'd like to do now, is ask Jason to come to the podium to address this upcoming

conference in the context of what Jeff just presented.

JASON ROSS: This is almost like the worst joke you could imagine, holding this conference in Paris. This conference which,

starting in a few days – we've been opposing this, and we've got

a leaflet, a resolution that we've been getting out on this, called, "We Say No to the Paris COP21 CO2 Reduction Scheme." I want to read the bookends of this, the bookends. It opens,

"The

conditions for life of billions of people depend upon rejecting

the agenda being presented at the 2015 climate change conference

to be held in Paris this December. The COP21 Paris initiative to

adopt a legally-binding agreement to reduce CO2 emissions must be

rejected on two grounds: the scientific reality, that mankind's

activity, is {not} going to cause catastrophic climate change, and the very real lethal consequences of the CO2 reduction programs being demanded." It ends, that "Energy-intensive scientific, technological, and economic growth is essential to human existence. This can be measured by transitions to higher levels of energy-flux density per-capita and per-area. Such progress, growth, and development, is the universal right of man,

and CO2 emissions are presently a vital part of that process for

the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The adoption

of a legally-binding CO2 reduction scheme at the COP21 conference

in Paris will condemn billions of people to a lower quality of life, with higher death-rates, greater poverty, and no ability

to exercise their inherent human right to participate in the creation of a better condition for society as a whole. This is deeply immoral. For these reasons, the CO2 reduction scheme of the COP21 conference in Paris must be rejected."

So on the grounds of the fakery of the science, and the very, very real human costs of trying to meet the CO2 reduction goals, this can't go forward. However, obviously the push is there, the conference is going ahead despite the state of emergency currently in France, the terrorized population of Paris, changes in some of the agenda, but it's going ahead, and as a matter of fact, this conference is getting a kick-start over the weekend – today and the rest of the weekend – the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting is taking place in Malta. So this is where all the members of the former British Empire, now called the British Commonwealth, get together to – as in this case – hear speeches from the Queen and others about why they need to reduce CO2.

Prince Charles – who has been basically waiting for his mother to die for a half century to get a job – he said that the terrorism that we're seeing, the conflicts that we're seeing, are not because of conflict, not because of ISIS, not because of the Brits and Saudi Arabia helping ISIS, instead, Prince Charles said, "In fact, there is very good evidence indeed that one of the major reasons for this horror in Syria was a drought that lasted for about 5 or 6 years, which meant that huge numbers of people in the end had to leave the land." This is the guy that they're asking to give the keynote address at the COP21 conference – a man whose understanding of Syria seems to be

that all of the conflict is because of a drought which was caused by climate change. It's insane, and it's knowingly evil on his part.

So, what should be done instead, is re-purposing the conference would be a good thing, you know, recycling what's going to be done there. As Megan said, of course, addressing the refugee crisis, which is all over Europe at present, and beyond

– that's worth discussing. Really, what's worth discussing is a solution to this whole problem, which would be excellent if the Congress were to release the 28 pages, put them in the record, as Senator Gravel did with the Pentagon Papers, to be able to attack the cause of this conflict at its source, which as Jeff went through, as LaRouche has been stressing, is Obama, who by his nature as a killer personality, has qualified himself to be inserted into his role as President. That that is the cause of the conflicts. Releasing the 28 pages, discussing how to actually shut down terrorism in the region, working {with} Russia on this

– you know, Russia is serious about this – you know, that would be worth discussing.

And really, what would it mean to develop the world into the Silk Road? You know, EIR released, about a year ago now, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Landbridge." It's a 300 and – almost 400 page report. It goes through in incredible detail, with maps

and everything, what it would mean for China's One Belt One Road

project, its New Silk Road project, to continue its extension into a worldwide paradigm of development. What would those projects look like? And this is a policy that the LaRouches have

been promoting for decades, and Helga LaRouche in her visits to

China is acknowledged as "the Silk Road Lady," for her role in bringing this outlook into the current fruition that it's finding. So what would it mean for the U.S. to join the Silk Road? What would it mean for us to get our act together?

Well, we've been working on a report on this, in terms of what a U.S. recovery would look like, and there's a lot of aspects to this. I mean, if you think about the kinds of projects

that have, many, been on the books, and the kinds of projects that will drive us into the future, you recognize that it would

not be very difficult to create millions of jobs in a very short

period of time – meaningful, productive jobs – that lay the groundwork for a durable new, more productive economy for the future. Doing that will require eliminating Wall Street, getting

Glass-Steagall re-implemented, having those provisions back in place, shutting down Wall Street which we do not need.

Gambling

is not an essential part of economy. The productive process, science, creativity, the development of human beings and infrastructure – that is essential. Gambling is not.

So with Wall Street out of the way, with federal financing, with federal credit made available, some of the projects are things that we've discussed quite a bit. Take, for example, the

Bering Strait. Crossing the Bering Strait with a tunnel or a bridge, as engineers decide, would be a very key role, a very

key project, to put the U.S. on the Silk Road, literally, making it possible to get from the West Coast of the U.S., into Eurasia, much more quickly than by sending a ship across the ocean, with the added benefit that rail, or transportation corridors on land overall, allow for the ability to develop regions along the way. Something that a ship crossing the ocean doesn't do.

Ships

don't create wealth, or the potential to create it, as they cross the waters. Land connections do.

So the Bering Strait tunnel – that would be a key project. Overall, transportation has a tremendous way to go in the U.S. You know, China, which is a nation very similar in size to the United States, currently has 11,000 miles of high-speed rail, with plans to have 30,000 by 2020, and they'll do it – they do what they say. In contrast, we have under 500 miles of high-speed rail, and that's being very generous in counting the Acela service as high-speed. What we should have is 42,000 miles of electrified, decent rail in the United States, bringing down the costs of transportation, and of production throughout the nation, making it more possible to move intermediate goods from place to place, to move people, to move products in a way that will have a tremendous savings in time, and in energy costs.

Currently over half of rail-freight in the U.S. is coal. You know, in a nuclear economy we obviously wouldn't need so much coal, but it also goes to show how little else is being done with the system as it is, and maybe some idea of what it could be

like
in the future.

Along with the development of the basics which we naturally think of – things like transportation, rail, repairing roadways,

power plants, water systems, which I'll get into in a moment – the other aspect is cities. Now, India has committed itself to building scores of new cities across the country. Russia has created science cities. The United States – imagine the potential, not to keep adding more and more sprawl to the outsides of our current cities, but developing legitimately new

cities, actual cities, planned in a sensible way, with part of a

transportation backbone underlying it, with infrastructure that's

needed, canals and aqueducts as necessary, water, power, that sort of thing. But then also where the cities and where life is

oriented around the most key of economic processes – the creation of wealth by improving the productive powers of labor,

by the cultural role that can be played by a city.

So in addition to the ability to move goods and people easily, the density you find in a real city, where different members of the household can do their various things that anyone

having an hour and a half commute can't, you also have the other

role of the city itself as a social institution.

So, in a very interesting article that LaRouche wrote some decades ago, in a program for the development of Africa, he discusses the central role of the city, and the presence of a research and educational complex, a pedagogical museum where people, kids, their parents, etc. would be able to step themselves through how discoveries had been made in the past in a

hands-on way, doing experiments, themselves witnessing and understanding very directly how humanity has gotten where it is,

making it possible to have workers able to master new technologies, and scientists able to reflect on what science has

done in the past, to create the new discoveries needed in the future.

This sort of educational center of the city will be more than a museum retailing the past; it will be more than looking backwards. LaRouche wrote that to give vitality and direction to

the process, the educational zone of a new city must be engaged

in some aspect of scientific research which is itself of world importance. He says that "a modern nation has achieved true sovereignty in spirit, only if it achieves excellence in some important aspect of advancement of human knowledge generally.

A

people which can point to several institutions of its own nation,

and can identify several important contributions to human knowledge associated with such institutions, is a people which knows that its children are capable of equalling in importance to

humanity, the children of any other nation. To teach science is

to teach the principles of discovery."

So, with cities, with this as an included basis, cities of finite size (no more than one or two million people), with the

development made potential by rail, by water, by developing fusion power on a crash basis, and implementing the already-discovered abilities which have been improved on building

nuclear fission plants, we'll be able to dramatically increase the power, electrical power, available in the nation; to power

transportation; to power manufacturing. And to do all of this, we're also going to need revival of machine tools themselves. Now, machine tools – now not everyone's actually seen one of these in person. These are things like lathes, like mills, shapers – these are the devices that make everything that's required, that create metal, that shape metal to do machining.

To

the extent that you are able to innovate in this area, as has been done with new technologies over the decades – like electric

discharge machining around the time of the Apollo program, or electron-beam welding; or the more recent developments of laser

and plasma cutting, and the ability for these computer-controlled

machine tools to create things that would have taken ten times longer in earlier eras: to the extent that this technology improves, and to the extent that purchases are made, and as part

of an industrialization, the capital stock is increasingly of newer, and more productive machine tools, the entire economy sees

the benefits from them, by making easier, reducing the cost, of
all other production.

So, this machine tool principle is, in the small, an image of what it means to take discoveries and then implement them into

an economy, for new thought, new engineering, or scientific idea,

to become manifest in the economy. And this is a field that needs

motion on. As I said earlier, power; fusion research, which has

been starved of funding deliberately for decades, preventing the

kind of breakthroughs that would make power, as has been said,

too cheap to meter – or even if not that cheap, remarkably abundant power able to bring the next generation of production technologies into play. To transform our relationship with raw materials, and with reshaping those materials. Things like the plasma torch.

So, in this kind of economy, we can then re-approach such subjects as water. California is in what's called a water crisis,

despite being right next to the Pacific Ocean. Why do we not have

the power and the plants in place to be able to desalinate? To at

least provide for much of the needs in California? Why have we not done more research on how weather actually functions?

You know, one of the ironies of the global warming alarmists, hysterics, whatever you want to call them, is that this supposedly scientific outlook is actually stifling science.

Hypotheses about what's causing climate change over time, hypotheses about how cosmic radiation coming from our Galaxy, or

even beyond, plays a role in creating the cloud condensation nuclei to form clouds, to effect precipitation, to change the albedo, the reflectants of the Earth, and therefore its temperature – that's real science that's being held back by the

global warming mafia, who reject this kind of approach because it

doesn't come to the conclusion that they want: namely, that human-made CO₂ is {the} determining factor in global climate. It's just not true.

So, as was said in that resolution I read at the beginning, and as is covered in this other EIR special report, "Global Warming Scare is Population Reduction, Not Science," the science

is clear. We are not causing catastrophic warming of the planet.

Mankind is not a virus destroying the Earth. What is destroying the planet is oligarchism; the outlook that human beings are a disease, the anti-growth and enforced poverty promoted by the City of London, by Wall Street, by that system which has to be removed. In its place, as far as an actual concept of humanity,

let me read another quote from LaRouche here. He says, "Every infant born in any part of the world has the potential for development of his or her mental powers to the level sufficient

for adult competence in use of modern technology." And this also

means real technology, not iPhones. "That child can achieve at least an approximation for practice of the highest levels of productive powers of labor in the world generally today. It is that potential development which is the only source of wealth."

Let's remember that; the source of wealth, the increasing of the

productive powers of labor, as Hamilton put it, lies in that ability for human beings creatively to develop new understandings

about nature, and thereby reform the economy in an entire way. That's real economic science, and with that approach, the programs that are needed, the development projects which we can

implement, the jobs that will create; this can all follow from an

outlook of what economics truly is, and breaking free from the false ideas about it which have been promoted by Wall Street and

which have affected, unfortunately, a very great number of our fellow citizens.

BEETS: Thanks, Jason. Two days ago, on Wednesday of this week, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of Einstein's

publication of his paper on general relativity. Now, LaRouche has reiterated many times in the recent period that Einstein was the only true scientist in the 20th Century; someone who held out against the corruption in thinking that was ushered in 1900 by Bertrand Russell. And someone who was attacked and isolated for his commitment to the paradigm of thinking which represents the actual human mind; the paradigm which was responsible for all of human progress up to this point. So, what I'd like to do is ask Jason to come back to the podium and ask him this question: Given the task ahead of us today to rebuild society, rebuild civilization, and to create a new paradigm for mankind, I'd like to ask Jason to give us a sense of the importance of Einstein's work and his commitment.

ROSS: Sure. I think what Einstein accomplished represents a key concept under which science can be understood; that of metaphor. LaRouche has repeatedly stressed the importance of metaphor as the key to science; meaning the development of language in such a way that you express a new scientific truth in a way that could not even have been stated in the preceding language. It's not something mathematical; it's not a formula or an expression. Discoveries in their true form can't be. After the fact, you might be able to write them down; but what makes them a discovery is an overthrowing of the past, the development of a

new basis for thinking incompatible with what came before. That's

the kernel of what a discovery is. None of these thoughts are really eternal; what is, is that process of developing new ones.

Which is the incredible error in science education today, based

upon understanding how to apply the fruits of discovery to specific problems; but not going through how they were developed.

So, 100 years ago, 1915, Einstein successfully expanded his special theory of relativity, which he had developed in 1905, into a more general form; making it the general theory of relativity. So, I do want to say a bit about what Einstein did; I

think it would be wrong not to; and then get into what it would

mean for us today, what's the relevance. Einstein's not just someone to idolize, or say, "Wow, he was a real genius."

Figure

out what he did.

So, going back ten years earlier to 1905 – 110 years ago – Einstein, in his what's now called special theory of relativity,

changed the basis on which scientific thought was based. At that

time, the prevailing view was of a Newtonian outlook to space and

time. Isaac Newton had said that space and time were independent

of things within them; space is space, within it, things exist and take place, or occur in different relations to each other.

According to Newton, time flows on its own, without reference to

the things in it; they take place over time, but time is an independent existence.

Well, Einstein tore that apart in 1905; in some ways with

rather simple thoughts. For example, he demonstrated that the concept of simultaneity does not exist; that depending on who it is that you ask, and their motion with respect to two events that are occurring, that observer might say yes they occurred at the same time. Meaning the light from those two events reaching them, to make a determination which one occurred first, or second, or whether they occurred simultaneously, depending on the motion of an observer, they might appear to occur at the same time or not.

He gave the example of someone on a train witnessing two lightning bolts, versus someone on the ground witnessing two lightning bolts. To someone on the ground, two lightning bolts occurring at equal distances in either direction, the light will come and reach the person at the same time. To someone on a train, who is at the middle of that platform right when the bolts occur, at the same time according to the person on the platform, because of the train's motion, they're going to see this bolt before the other one. Who's right? What does it really mean to say "at the same time"? Because all the laws of nature work the same, whether you're standing still supposedly, or you're in constant motion, there's no way to say who's right; what the right time should be. And the idea of having a universality of simultaneity, to say "at this moment in the universe" disappears, and it becomes relative to the observer. What does that mean? It means that time itself no longer

exists as a basis for thought in the way that it had before. There's still time, but it's no longer an untouched permanence;

the same thing is the case for space. Where space and time are skewed, and distances have to take place or be considered in space-time, rather than in only one or the other. So, by then, by

1905 in his special theory of relativity, Einstein had replaced

the concepts of space and time as a basis for physics with something physical; light's motion. In this way, he was implementing the revolutions in physics that Riemann said would

take place; that our understanding of geometry would take place

not by looking at geometry, but by an understanding of those binding forces of nature which give rise to what is then observed. A bent space; a curved space; a skewed space.

With his general theory of relativity in 1915, Einstein went beyond frames of reference which are either at rest with respect

to each other or in uniform motion; and he considered acceleration. He considered the fact that there is a relativistic

equivalence between somebody in a room where they feel the floor

pushing up against their feet, or their feet pushing down against

the floor, that without reference to what's outside that room, they might be sitting on the Earth, or they might be out in space, where the top of the building is attached to a rope which

is being pulled at an accelerating rate, constantly pulling the

building up against their feet. No experiment, nothing you could

do inside the room, would be able to distinguish the one from

the other. From this equivalence then, Einstein derived his general theory of relativity, by which not only motion, but gravitation changes the shape of space and time.

This was a very, and still is, a very wild shocking idea. Space and time were considered to be such fundamental things that the possibility of them even being curved was rejected out of hand by people like Immanuel Kant, Isaac Newton, Bertrand Russell.

So, what Einstein was able to do, though, is demonstrate that he was right. Two quick examples. One was the orbit of Mercury. Every orbit, every planet, has a place that's farthest from the Sun, and one where it's closest to the Sun. You draw the line through them. That line for the orbit doesn't stay stationary. It actually moves over time. For Mercury that line moves a degree and a half every century. And based on calculations and gravity, as it was understood, people were able to explain almost all of that change. There remained a very, very small – about .01 degree per century – change in Mercury's orbit that no one had explained, but which Einstein was able to explain with his theory.

Also his prediction about how light would bend going around large objects, was borne out in the experiments around the eclipse of 1919, in which photographs taken of stars near the eclipsed Sun – since the Sun was covered, you could actually see stars near the Sun, which you can't ordinarily do in the daytime, because you can't see anything – and comparing those same

stars

when the Sun was not in the sky near them, showed again that Einstein was right; that the path of light coming from the stars

towards us was deformed, was shaped, by the presence of the Sun

in the way.

So, these are the things that people are most familiar with about Einstein, things that are indisputably advances that he made. But there's more to him than that. I think that the great

importance that LaRouche attributes to him in what Megan was bringing up about calling him the only scientist we had here in

the Twentieth Century, the only one who stuck to science, lies elsewhere as well.

The other great work that Einstein had done was on the quantum. So in 1905, in addition to Special Relativity, he also

wrote a paper to explain the photo-electric effect, and it was actually this that got him his Nobel Prize later. This expanded

the theories of Planck in showing how light itself must come in

pieces: that it's not purely a wave phenomenon; that there's something particle-like about it. Experiments, however, required

light to also have wave-like properties, making it impossible to

in a simple way decide on this question. Is light a particle, or

is light a wave? This is one of the difficulties of quantum physics.

What Einstein held out against was the interpretation by scientists in his day, led by Bohr, mainly, Neils Bohr the Dane,

to say that science had reached a limit; that to ask why was

really no longer admissible, and that in the quantum world, physics, instead of saying what nature is, is limited to describing how nature appears. Against that Einstein – Einstein

would not accept that. Einstein never accepted the idea that we

had reached an end to the ability to know things, and that quantum theory as it was known at that time, was final, complete.

Something that's never been true of, really, any theory in history.

This is seen now with the ongoing difficulties around completing quantum theory, and also the anomalies in the fields

of life and the potential for a higher understanding of these quantum processes in the fields of cognition. It's also seen in

his own work, with the theory of gravitation; with the difficulties – I hope you've been watching the series of presentations our colleague Ben Deniston has been doing on the Galaxy on this website every other Wednesday – it's also seen in

the difficulty in understanding the speed of rotation of galaxies. The basis for hypotheses that people make about dark matter now. A lot of what this can indicate is that we have simply reached the limits to the applicability of our physical theories, and need to go beyond them.

That's not done mathematically by positing ways to keep our old laws, to explain the new phenomena, but it can require going

beyond it.

So, we don't have answers to these questions. We shouldn't fool ourselves into thinking that we do already have the answers

to these questions. And the importance of Einstein for us today,

is that of a successful discoverer who overthrew what had been

thought, developed a higher theory to explain things, and was guided by an understanding of the role of the human mind in developing new, successful concepts about nature. With that as a

basis for how we relate to other human beings, with that as a basis for social relations, we can forge a much higher level of

cooperation on this planet, and develop a culture that's really

suitable for human beings that participate in it.

MEGAN BEETS: Thank you very much, Jason. With that, I'm going to bring our broadcast to a close. I would like to thank Jason for joining me, and Jeff for joining us via video, and I'd

like to thank all of you for watching tonight. Please stay tuned

to larouchepac.com. Good night.

**Delegerede på COP21:
Her er det klima-spørgsmål, I
bør diskutere:
Terrorismen og flygtninge-
krisen i en kold vinter!**

Klimakonferencen i Paris må fokusere på de reelle og umiddelbare farer for menneskeheden: denne hastigt voksende

flygtningekrise, de afgrundsdybe EU-økonomier og tab af arbejdspladser, samt de milliarder af mennesker over hele verden, der stadig lider under manglen på tilstrækkelig, stabil og billig energi, som er nødvendig for at gøre en ende på deres knusende fattigdom, fejlernæring, sygdom og tidlige død ved at sikre rent vand, ordentlige sanitære forhold, moderne hospitaler, lys, køleskabe og rigelig mad. Klimakonferencedeltagerne må adressere de følgende, langt mere presserende nødvendige spørgsmål.

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

EIR: Den virkelige krise: Det er krigens, ikke klimaet!

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, formand for det tyske, politiske parti BüSo (Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet), er den eneste, tyske leder, der har fremlagt løsningen: Tyskland må omgående trække sig ud af briternes og Obamas politik med regimeskift og krig og droppe den grønne dagsorden, til fordel for en total accept af den kinesisk anførte bevægelse for global opbygning gennem en Ny Silkevej. I denne ånd har Zepp-LaRouche helhjertet støttet opfordringen fra videnskabsfolkene Paul Dreissen og Joe D'Aleo om at forvandle topmødet i Paris til en begivenhed til mobilisering til fordel for at redde flygtningene med en reel, økonomisk genopbygningsplan.

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Verdensbanken vil promovere en fond for Afrika på COP21 for at håndtere klimachok

26. november 2015 – Verdensbanken annoncerede den 24. nov. en Klimaforretningsplan til 16 milliard dollar, der skal hjælpe Afrika håndtere »presserende klimaudfordringer«. Planen, der skal fremlægges den 30. nov. på COP21-folkemordskonferencen, vil yde minimal finansiering for at hjælpe Afrika opbygge, hvad den kalder »modstandsdygtighed over for klimachok«, i stedet for at fremme den vækst i infrastruktur, som Afrika har brug for at udvikle.

Præsidenten for Verdensbankgruppen Jim Yong Kim sagde, at »Sub-Sahara Afrika er yderst sårbart over for klimachok«. Det er planen at yde hjælp til at håndtere malaria, tørke og fødevaremangel – der alle angiveligt skyldes klimaforandring, og ikke manglende udvikling. Planen foreslår at hjælpe Afrika med at tilpasse sig klimaforandringer samtidig med en reduktion af udledning af 'drivhusgasser' ved at opgradere energikilder med lavt kulstofindhold.

Et af planens mål for handling er at »muliggøre modstandsdygtighed ved at yde afgørende data, information og redskaber til politisk beslutningstagning om klima-modstandsdygtig udvikling«.

Verdensbanken påstår, at denne anti-udviklingsplan vil »levere klima-smart udvikling«.

Forslag til fordybelse:

“Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur”, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

“Et økonomisk mirakel for Sydeuropa, Middelhavsområdet og Det afrikanske Kontinent”, Schiller Institut Specialrapport

“Skræmmekampagnen om global opvarmning handler om befolkningsreduktion – ikke videnskab”

Forslag til Bank for Genopbygning diskuteret i Damaskus

af Ulf Sandmark, økonom, *EIR*, 25. november 2015.

Et forslag om en Bank for Genopbygning i Syrien tog et stort skridt fremad, da en delegation på 15 personer, der inkluderede denne forfatter, fra den svenske Syrisk Støtte-komité for Demokrati, aflagde et 9-dages besøg i Damaskus. Delegationen mødtes med mange topfolk, der alle fik den arabiske version af artiklen 'Phoenix Projekt Syrien: Diskussionspunkter om Syriens genopbygning'[1], og som blev modtaget, som det mindste, med stor interesse, og for det meste med entusiasme fra de embedsfolk og journalister, som man mødtes med.

Den svenske organisation Syrisk Støtte-komité for Demokrati er en af de mest velkendte eksil-organisationer, der hjælper i Syrien i dag, og blev derfor modtaget med stor åbenhed hele vejen igennem det meget travle besøgsprogram. Medierne var

også meget åbne, og møderne blev dækket fem dage i træk på TV, inklusive tre længere interviews på arabisk, hvor medlemmer af delegationen rapporterede om de aktiviteter til gavn for Syrien, der foregår i Sverige, men tillige om ideen om en Genopbygnings-bank og politikken for den Nye Silkevej. Ideen om en Genopbygnings-bank blev taget op mere og mere, også i mange aviser.

Det vigtigste møde var med dr. Bouthania Shaaban, der er politisk rådgiver og medierådgiver til den syriske præsident dr. Bashar Assad. Hun er en mangeårig, næsten legendarisk, syrisk politiker, der også, igennem 10 år, har taget del i internationale forhandlinger om Palæstina. Der blev holdt et separat møde med premierminister Wael Al-Halqi og repræsentanter for hans instans, der er ansvarlig for genopbygning, Syrisk Investeringsagentur. Ulf gav en præsentation af forslaget til en syrisk Genopbygnings-bank og muligheden for herigennem at koble sig på projekterne i den Nye Silkevej. En sådan Hamilton-Bank (dvs. i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton, USA's første finansminister, -red.) er Syriens eneste chance for at samle landet. En fortsættelse af den nuværende monetaristiske, økonomiske politik ville ruinere Syrien og skabe risiko for disintegration. Et kreditsystem kunne løse det presserende behov for at sætte den disponible, ledige arbejdskraft i arbejde med genopbygning og udvikling. Af særlig vigtighed er det, at der dermed skabes mulighed for at bringe de tidlige, nu forsonede, oprørere ind i en fælles indsats for landet, og også tilbage-rekruttere den 'fortabte ungdom', der er draget til udlandet som flygtninge. Det ville også være et værktøj til bekæmpelse af korruption, da det kunne sætte alle produktive virksomheder i arbejde, således at ingen bliver 'ladt tilbage'. Det ville fremme en 'Mittelstand' (middelklasse), der kunne blive en stærk samfundsmæssig kraft for demokrati og udvikling.

Konceptet om en Noas Ark for at få Europa ud af sin økonomiske krise[2] blev også taget op ved de fleste af møderne. Dette

fik en speciel betydning, da terrorangrebet i Paris viste, at Europa nu ikke længere kan kontrollere terrorisme. Med Syrien og dets hær i frontlinjen imod terroristerne, er det Syrien og dets allierede – Rusland, Kina og BRIKS, der ligeledes tilbyder en Noas Ark imod terrorisme. Europa har derfor behov for en Noas Ark til både at overvinde sin økonomiske krise og terrorismen, der er ude af kontrol. Betydningen af Noas Ark er, at forhandlingssituationen er vendt rundt, så det nu er Europa, der har behov for hjælp.

Sammenfattende mødtes delegationen med fire andre ministerier, tre religiøse topledere og fem nationale hjælpeorganisationer, og den besøgte to militære rehabiliterings-hospitaler og et privathospital.

Generelt er situationen langt mere optimistisk efter at russerne kom ind, selv på trods af, at krigen slider på samfundet. Damaskus er stadig en travl by fuld af trafik, hvor man kan færdes i bil uden at se spor af krigen, med undtagelse at et hav af militære checkpoints, der kontrollerer alle forbipasserende. Krigen kunne høres fra tid til anden med nogle ekspllosioner på afstand, specielt i morgentimerne. Hver gang en granat eksploderede i byen, blev sporene fjernet, og gader og huse repareret. Sammenlignet med sidste år er der mange flere folk på gaderne om aftenen, og det er muligt at bevæge sig rundt i flere områder. Kun i forstæderne så man områder med beskadigelser, men selv her er arbejdet med reparationer allerede begyndt.

Syrien er på vej tilbage og mobiliserer på hjemmefronten med en hovedstad, der fungerer..

[1] **Se forslaget:** <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=9128>

[2] Se lederartikel, Helga Zepp-LaRouche: **Den Nye Silkevej i Sydvestasien og Afrika må blive til en Noas Ark for flygtningene,** <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=9194>

Leder, 24. november 2015: Der bliver ingen fred, før det britiske monarki afsættes

– Den britiske marionet Obama er en foragtelig person

Hvor den russiske præsident Putin lancerede en flanke, der kunne føre til den totale ødelæggelse af ISIS og al-Qaeda-terroristers base i Syrien og Irak, så har briterne nu aggressivt interveneret imod denne flanke, som hele planeten så desperat har brug for.

Den britiske premierminister Camerons aktuelle, hektiske deployering har til formål at forstærke den krigspolitik, der nu er modstand imod – Tony Blairs, George W. Bush' og Barack Obamas katastrofale politik – britiske agenter og marionetter. Cameron insisterer: Nej, ødelæg ikke baserne for de terrorister, der nu myrder løs i Mellemøsten og Europa. Assad må først væltes som Syriens præsident.

Og marionetten Obama har i hele den forgangne uge gentaget: Intet samarbejde imod ISIS; forudsætningen er, at Rusland må gå med til, at Assad først må smides ud.

Det britiske monarki og finansielle imperium insisterer: Gå ikke efter ISIS' finansierer og våbenleverandører i Saudi Arabien; gå ikke efter dets hjälper i den tyrkiske regering. Og frem for alt, gå ikke imod den britisk-saudiske politik for regimeskift-krige, der føres af Bush og Obama, og som bevidst

har skabt og udbredt ISIS og drevet hundrede tusinder af desperate flygtninge ind i Europa.

Til Frankrig og andre nationer lyder ordren: Gå ikke i partnerskab med Rusland eller opfordr USA til at gå med Rusland for at knuse ISIS; men kræv, at Assad først må gå af. Grib ikke den chance, som tilbydes gennem Putins nylige, åbenlyst globale rolle, bakket op af Kinas tilbud om at forlænge udviklingen med den Nye Silkevej ind i Mellemøsten.

Samtidig forbereder de britiske kongelige sig på at åbne COP21-klimakonferencen om »global opvarmning« i Paris og styre den i henhold til deres besættelse – at reducere den menneskelige befolkning. Prins Charles, der er udvalgt til at holde åbningstalen til konferencen, påstod i et interview den 21. nov., at klimaforandring var årsagen til de folkemorderiske krige i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika – ikke Tony Blair, ikke George W. Bush og Barack Obama, men klimaforandringen forårsagede disse krige.

Og den britiske marionet Obama gentog i en tale den 21. nov., at »klimaforandring er USA's sikkerhedstrussel nummer ét«.

Er han sindssyg? Nej, han er en marionet for det britiske monarki og det britiske finansimperium, og af Wall Street.

Lyndon LaRouche har insisteret på dette. Obama er en britisk marionet og en præsident for evindelige krige og dronedrab. Han må fjernes fra embedet. For dernæst at skabe en økonomisk genrejsning, »må alt, hvad vi gør i USA, følge de principper, som præsident Franklin Roosevelt stod for, imod Wall Street«.

»Der kan ikke blive nogen fred, før det britiske monarki er fjernet«, sagde LaRouche den 22. nov. Vær opmærksom på LaRouches insisteren på dette; det betyder menneskehedens fremtid.

Fire forhenværende drone-operatører kræver, at Obama standser drone-drabene nu

20. november 2015 – Fire veteraner fra det amerikanske luftvåben med sammenlagt mere end 20 års erfaring med drone-operationer, tre af dem som 'sensor-operatører' og den fjerde som kommunikations-tekniker, har skrevet til præsident Obama og opfordret ham til at genoverveje politikken med målrettede drone-drab, fordi, som de siger, det er en drivkraft bag ISIS og andre jihadistiske grupper. I et passioneret brev stilet til Obama, forsvarsminister Ash Carter og CIA direktør John Brennan skriver de, at taktikken har "leveret brændstof til de hadefulde følelser, der har opildnet terrorismen og grupper som ISIS og samtidig tjent som et grundlæggende rekrutterings-værktøj i lighed med Guantánamo Bay".

Den ældste af de fire, Brandon Bryant, der gjorde tjeneste i drone-eskadroner fra 2005 til 2011, fortalte til *Guardian*, at han var en del af det hold, der opsporedt Anwar al-Awlaki med droner gennem 10 måneder kort tid før han blev dræbt. Bryant sagde, at iflg. hans mening er han blevet tvunget til at bryde sin militære ed ved at blive tildelt en mission, der dræbte en amerikansk landsmand. "Vi fik at vide, at al-Awlaki fortjente at dø, at han fortjente at blive dræbt som en forræder, men artikel 3 af sektion 2 i den amerikanske forfatning siger, at selv en forræder har fortjent en retfærdig retssag foran en jury af ligemænd."

De betegnede drone-strategien som selvødelæggende, fordi de

civile tab skaber had rettet mod USA. "Lige nu ser det ud til at være politisk hensigtsmæssigt," sagde Cian Westmoreland, kommunikations-teknikeren. "Men i det lange løb vil det kun være den negative side af Hellfire-missilerne og de brummende drone-overflyvninger, som mange af disse mennesker kender til USA og Storbritannien.

Her følger ordlyden af deres brev:

"Vi er forhenværende militærfolk i luftvåbnet. Vi gik ind i luftvåbnet for at beskytte amerikanske liv og vores forfatning. Vi kom til erkendelse af, at de uskyldige civile, vi dræbte, kun leverede brændstof til de følelser af had, der antændte terrorismen og grupper som ISIS, og som samtidig tjente som et grundlæggende rekrutterings-værktøj i lighed med Guantánamo Bay." Denne regering og dens forgængere har opbygget et drone-program, der er en af de mest ødelæggende drivkræfter bag terrorisme og destabilisering i hele verden.

"Da skyldfølelsen over vores rolle i at fremme dette systematiske tab af uskyldige liv blev for meget, bukkede vi alle under for PTSD (post-traumatisk stress-syndrom). Vi blev afskrevet af den selvsamme regering, som vi havde givet så meget, og sendt ud i verden uden tilstrækkelig lægebehandling, hjælp fra det offentlige sundhedssystem eller nødvendig understøttelse. Nogle af os er nu hjemløse. Andre af os kan kun lige klare dagen og vejen."

"Vi var vidner til groft spild, inkompetent ledelse, magtmisbrug samt, at vort lands ledere løj i fuld offentlighed om effektiviteten af drone-programmet. Vi kan ikke se tavst til og være vidner til tragedier som angrebene i Paris, vel vidende om drone-programmets ødelæggende effekt i udlandet og hjemme. En sådan tavshed ville krænke selve den ed, vi aflagde, om at støtte og forsvare forfatningen."

"Vi anmoder Dem om at tage vores perspektiv i betragtning, selv om, i betragtning af den uhørte forfølgelse af

sandhedsvidner, der kom før os, såsom Chelsea Manning, Julian Assange og Edward Snowden, denne opfordring muligvis er forgæves. For dette lands skyld håber vi dog, at det forholder sig anderledes.”

Brevet er undertegnet af Brandon Bryant, sensor-operatør; Cian Westmoreland, RF transmissions-systemtekniker; Stephen Lewis, sensor-operatør; og Michael Haas, sensor-operatør.

Fremmedfjendske 'Alternativ for Tyskland'-partiet er allerede den tredjestørste magt i landet

19. november 2015 – Ifølge opinionsundersøgelser er det fremmedfjendske parti, Alternativ for Tyskland, AfD, allerede blevet det tredjestørste parti i Tyskland. Støtte til AfD er hastigt steget i de seneste måneder og uger, først som en reaktion på flygtningekrisen, og nu efter terrorangrebene i Paris og den politiske debat, der er domineret af panik.

Krisen og den politiske debat »er som et program, der er skræddersyet til at fremme AfD«, sagde prof. Jürgen Falter, der har hjemme i Mainz, på tysk Tv i dag. AfD »nærmer sig tocifrede tal nationalt – i de østlige stater nåede de derop for længe siden. Med andre ord, så har vi her en politisk magt, der er ved at komme ind i delstatsparlamente og slutteligt i det nationale parlament (Forbundsdagen), og som vil styre det politiske spil i en totalt anden retning. Denne

magt vil af de andre parter blive anset som værende uegnet til at indgå koalition med.«

COP21: Den eneste klimakrise, vi skal diskutere, er, hvordan vi forhindrer ti tusinder af flygtninge i at fryse ihjel

20. november 2015 – Hvis klimaforandrings-alarmisterne ønsker at diskutere den virkelige klimakrise i horisonten ved den forestående FN-COP21 Paris klimaforandrings-extravaganza, bør de formulere en plan til at forhindre, at ti tusinder af flygtninge fryser ihjel i Europa. Dette er temaet i en ny erklæring, »Terrorisme og Flygtningekrise i en Kold Vinter«, der blev udlagt den 19. november af videnskabsfolkene Paul Dreissen og Joe D'Aleo, med Allan MacRae og Madhav Khandekar, på icecap.us og nu også på mange andre websider.

Som de forklarer, så er ti tusinder af europæiske borgere frosset ihjel i vintre med ekstremt koldt vejr, hvilket er, hvad Europa har oplevet i en stor del af det forgangne årti. Disse dramatiske udsving i temperaturen er i realiteten fremkaldt, ikke af menneskelig aktivitet, men af Solen og andre relaterede kræfter. Men det er de handlinger, som de politiske beslutningstagere skrider til, der vil udgøre forskellen mellem liv og død.

Forfatterne påpeger, at, i ekstremt kolde år kan USA opleve omkring 100.000 ekstraordinære dødsfald. De rapporterer, at der generelt forekommer mere end 20 gange så mange dødsfald som følge af ekstrem kulde end ekstrem varme. For flygtningene, der lever i »ekstrem fattigdom, med dårlig ernæring, utilstrækkelig beklædning og tæpper, og som i forvejen er syge og har improviseret husly«, kunne tallet for ekstraordinære vinterdødsfald blive svimlende; endda højere end de ekstraordinære vinterdødsfald på 50.000 mennesker i Storbritannien.

»Når en million flygtninge fryser under forringede omgivelser med utilstrækkeligt husly, mad, varme, beklædning og lægehjælp, og når 1,3 milliard mennesker stadig ikke har elektricitet – hvorfor i alverden skulle verden så indgå et forpligtende engagement om at bruge milliarder på angivelige, fremtidige katastrofer som følge af global opvarmning?«, spørger de. »Vi må anerkende, at rædselsfulde scenarier, fremkommet i computermodeller, ikke er en refleksion af virkeligheden på planeten ... «

»Det ville være en samvittighedsløs forbrydelse imod menneskeheden, hvis de nationer, der mødes i Paris, gennemtvinger politiske tiltag for at beskytte vores planets energi-berøvede masser fra hypotetiske, menneskeskabte klimakatastrofer, der skulle optræde årtier frem i tiden, ved at forevige fattigdom og sygdom, der dræber millioner af flere mennesker i morgen. Dette er de virkelige grunde til, at klimaforandring er et afgørende, moralsk spørgsmål, understreger de. »Dette er, hvad vi må erkende, og holde op med at lege med menneskers liv.«

Paul Dreissen er analytiker for Komiteen for et Konstruktivt I morgen (CFACT). Jason Ross fra LPAC's Videnskabsteam interviewede for nylig Paul Dreissen, forfatter af 'Miljø-imperialisme: Grøn magt, Sort død', til EIR's seneste Specialrapport, »Skræmmekampagne mod Global Opvarmning er Befolkningsreduktion – ikke Videnskab« ([Se interviewet på](#)

dansk). Joe D'Aleo, akademisk seniorstabsmedlem ved American Meteorological Society, er medstifter af The Weather Channel.

Tyrkiet-EU flygtningeplan undervejs

13. november 2015 – Det forlyder, at der er en aftale på vej mellem Den europæiske Union og Tyrkiet om flygtningespørgsmålet, der, som forventet, er fuldstændig utilstrækkelig i forhold til opgaven. *The Guardian* rapporterer, at det blev besluttet, under et EU-hastetopmøde på Malta på sidelinjen af EU-Afrika-topmødet, at tilbyde Tyrkiet 3 mia. euro til gengæld for at systematisere flygtningestrømmen til Europa, og som ville omfatte registrering af flygtninge i Tyrkiet og med Europa, der indvilliger i at tage et vist antal hvert år. Tyrkiet skal så acceptere ikke-syriske flygtninge, der forlod Tyrkiet for Europa, men som ikke kvalificerer til flygtningestatus. Pengene skal gå til flygtningenes underhold i Tyrkiet. Der skal være et topmøde senere på måneden eller i december med Tyrkiet for en endelig aftale.

Den tyrkiske avis *Hurriyet* rapporterer ligeledes, at der har været forhandlinger mellem EU-kommissionsvicepræsident Frans Timmermans og højtrangerende tyrkiske regeringsfolk den 11. nov. i Ankara, hvor en flygtningeaftale, der er parallel med den, *Guardian* rapporterer om, blev udarbejdet i udkast. Udkastet kræver også en genoplivelse af forhandlinger om Tyrkiets medlemskab af EU, ved at åbne for flere kapitler og bestemmelser om tyrkiske borgeres rejse uden visum til

Schengen-zonen. Til gengæld vil Tyrkiet begynde at gennemføre en aftale om, at migranter igen kan komme ind i landet. Aftalen skal ratificeres af regeringslederne. Timmermans vil fremlægge aftalen for EU-rådet i december, hvor man vil søge enstemmig godkendelse.

I mellemtiden vil præsident for EU-kommissionen Jean-Claude Juncker afholde diskussioner med den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, den 15.-16. nov.

Det er interessant, at, alt imens Tyrkiet tilbydes 3 mia. euro, så har EU-medlemmet Grækenland, hvor henved 600.000 flygtninge er ankommet til siden januar i år, modtaget sølle 8 mio. euro.

EU-Afrika-topmødet den 10. nov. domineredes også af flygtningespørgsmålet, hvor europæerne krævede, at de afrikanske lande tager såkaldte økonomiske flygtninge tilbage til gengæld for blot 2 mia. euro. De afrikanske ledere siges at have været rasende over EU's holdning.

USA: Kerry: Ingen bindende aftale på COP21; franske Hollande rasende

12. november 2015 – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry sagde onsdag til *Financial Times* mht. **COP21-klimakonferencen for global opvarmning i Paris:** »Der bliver ganske bestemt ikke nogen traktat ... Der bliver ikke nogen

juridisk bindende mål for nedbringelse som i Kyoto, eller sådan noget.«

Den franske præsident Hollande fik bersærkergang. »Hvis aftalen ikke er juridisk bindende, bliver der ingen aftale«, sagde han til international presse på Malta på sidelinjen af EU-Afrika-migrationskonferencen. »Jeg ved, hvor vanskeligt, det er«, sagde Hollande, med henvisning til modstanden mod en bindende aftale i USA's Kongres. »Men vi må give Paris-aftalen, hvis der er en, en bindende karakter i den forstand, at de forpligtelser, der indgås, må overholdes og respekteres.«

Guardian rapporterede, at en global opinionsundersøgelse fandt, at indbyggere i Kina og USA var blandt de mindst bekymrede for klimaforandringen.

Talsmanden for EU's Klimakommission, Miquel Arias Canete, sagde som svar på Kerrys kommentar: »Paris-aftalen må være en internationalt juridisk bindende aftale.« Den franske udenrigsminister Laurent Fabius havde sagt, at det var indlysende, at enhver aftale i Paris ville indeholde elementer, der var juridisk bindende, og foreslog, at Kerry var »forvirret« på det punkt.

Det er selvfølgelig ikke kun den amerikanske Kongres, men også Indien og Kina, der ikke vil underkaste sig bindende selvmord i Paris, som de også nægtede at gøre det i København i 2009 (COP15).

Der er hidtil ikke kommet nogen kommentar fra Det Hvide Hus.

Leder, 11. november 2015: De forenede Staters mission ligger i Den nye Silkevej

10. november 2015 – USA kan ophøre med at dræbe og dø, og begynde at bygge igen.

Den 2. november bragte nyheder for dagen, der var et forfærdende chok for USA: Dødsraten for hvide amerikanere i alderen 45-54 – henved 44 millioner mennesker – er steget støt siden 1999, og er steget med mindst 15 % i denne periode, der dækker George W. Bush' og Barack Obamas samlede præsidentskaber. Intet tilsvarende fandt sted under 1930'ernes Store Depression, ej heller på noget andet tidspunkt i det 20. århundrede; og intet tilsvarende har fundet sted i noget andet industrialiseret land siden Anden Verdenskrig.

Årsagerne er i en overvældende grad forgiftning gennem indtagelse af narkotika og alkohol, selvmord og leversygdomme med tilknytning til stofmisbrug. Denne »håbløsheds sygdom«, for at citere en borgmester i 'Rustbältet'[1], er en sygdom forårsaget af afindustrialisering og konstant krig. Forfatterne til undersøgelsen, der afslørede denne chokerende kendsgerning, siger, at »disse amerikanske borgere vil være den første generation, der, som midaldrende, finder, at de ikke vil have bedre kår end deres forældre«.

Alle nationer har en mission for menneskeheden; og alle nationers mission for sig selv er at give hver generation mulighed for at overlade pladsen til en ny generation, der stiger højere og er til større gavn for den fremtidige menneskehed.

USA's mission, for at redde sig selv, stirrer os direkte i ansigtet. Vi må standse George W. Bush og Barack Obamas illegale drab i USA's navn af mindst hundreder af tusinder af

mennesker i krige og dronekrige. Det er ulovligt og forfatningsstridigt, og det optrappes fortsat af Obama. Han må fjernes fra embedet for at stoppe det.

Vi bør lukke Wall Streets spekulation ved at genindføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven. Dernæst må vi begynde at bygge igen ved at koble os til det mest magtfulde initiativ, der bygger moderne infrastruktur for at udvikle verdensøkonomien: Projekterne under 'Den nye Silkevej', initieret af Kina, i hele Eurasien over land og vand. Vi bør få dette ind i USA gennem højhastigheds-jernbaner over Beringstrædet og ned langs den amerikanske vestkyst; og udbygge et højhastigheds-jernbanenetværk, der kan stå mål med Kinas 11.000 miles netværk, der allerede er i drift.

Amerika bør påtage sig ansvaret for den enorme flygtningekrise i Europa, som blev skabt gennem Obamas og Bush' krige i Libyen, Syrien, Irak og Afghanistan – ved at tage føringen med at bygge Den nye Silkevej ind i Mellemøsten. Som en **artikel af en tysk forfatter i går** udtrykte det:

»Blot en hensigtserklæring fra EU om at gå med i dette projekt, eller blot en erklæring fra EU's medlemsstater, ville ændre det politiske klima. Når de første aktiviteter med projektering og konstruktion først begynder at vise sig på mobile skærme, vil mange skimte den første gryende, lange savnede blå himmel bag de sorte skyer ude i horisonten. En sådan strategi ville forbedre situationen i Sydvestasien og på afgørende vis svække Islamisk Stat: Når folk er grebet af håb og optimisme, vil fundamentalisme ophøre med at finde næring.«

På samme måde vil »håbløshedens sygdom» ophøre i USA.

[1] 'Rustbæltet' er et udryk for området, der strækker sig fra den øvre del af det nordøstlige USA, de store søer og staterne i Midtvesten, og det refererer til den økonomiske nedgang, befolkningsnedgangen og byernes forfald pga., at områdets

engang så magtfulde industrisektor er skrumpet ind. Udtrykket blev populært i USA i 1980'erne.

Leder, 12. november 2015: Putin har ret: Obama gör 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 termonukleart 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 narkoterrorist FARC.

Præsidenten for Boston Federal Reserve Bank er også kommet ud i denne uge med svare advarsler om en nedsmelting af den commercielle ejendomsboble og bemærkede, at situationen er mere alvorlig end i september 2007, hvor bolig- og erhvervsejendomsmarkedet først nedsmeltede; dette førte til

nedsmelningen 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 kollapset, 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 relatede til farene 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 kamppositioner 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.

Filippinsk senator Kit Tatad udgiver en magtfuld rapport om EIR's Specialrapport, »Skræmmekampagne om Global Opvarmning er Befolkningsreduktion – ikke Videnskab« og støtter Resolutionen imod COP21-Klimakonference i Paris

10. november 2015 – Tidligere filippinsk senator Kit Tatad har udgivet en artikel, hvor han gennemgår og roser *Executive Intelligence Reviews* rapport, »**Skræmmekampagne om Global Opvarmning er Befolkningsreduktion – ikke Videnskab**«. Artiklen udgives i hans sædvanlig spalte i *Manila Times*.

Senator Tatad, en fremtrædende politisk skikkelse, så vel som også journalist og forfatter som katolsk lægmand, identifierer først **Pavens seneste Encyklika, 'Laudato Si'**, som et, der »er blevet lovprist af mange, der lovpriser hvad som helst, Paven siger«, og siger dernæst, at mange »hengivne katolikker« mener, at det, at kalde »Moder Jord som oprindelsen til alt liv er poesi, ikke teologi eller videnskab, og en mulig glidebane hen imod hedenskab«.

Han henviser dernæst til EIR's rapport, der tilsigter at forhindre COP21-konferencen mod global opvarmning, der skal finde sted i Paris i slutningen af november, i at tvinge en

politik, der medfører en dødbringende befolkningsreduktion, ned over verden, baseret på falsk videnskab. Han citerer **Helga Zepp-LaRouche**, nævner de hovedskyldige (**Prins Philip af England og Kommandør af Det britiske Imperium, Martin Schellnhuber, Tyskland**), deres plan om at reducere befolkningen til en milliard og opfordrer folk til at underskrive EIR's (Schiller Instituttets) »**RESOLUTION: Nej til COP21-klimakonference for befolkningsreduktion**«, med en gengivelse af resolutionen i sin helhed.

(Kit Tatads artikel vil i sin helhed snarest komme på dansk på vores hjemmeside.)

Læger uden Grænser advarer om, at, med TPP-aftalen, vil prisbillig medicin til millioner af mennesker forsvinde

8. november, 2015 – I en skarpt formuleret udtalelse publiceret 5. november advarede Læger uden Grænser/Medicins Sans Frontieres (MSF) om, at aftalen om Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), hvis ordlyd netop er blevet offentliggjort, "er en dårlig aftale for lægehjælp; den er dårlig for dem, der yder humanitær lægehjælp, som MSF, og den er dårlig for mennesker, der har brug for billig medicin i heleverden, inklusive i USA." Erklæringen blev udsendt i Judit Rius Sanjuans navn, amerikansk chef og juridisk rådgiver for MSF's Kampagne for Adgang til Vigtig Medicin.

Med en skarp henvisning til Obamaregeringen advarer erklæringen om, at "bestemmelserne i TPP-aftalen vil ikke alene hæve prisen på medicin og forårsage unødvendig lidelse, men de vil også repræsentere en fuldstændig afslutning på den amerikanske regerings tidligere forpligtende engagement over for den globale sundhed, inklusive garantier, der er omfattet af USA's 'Nye Handelspolitik' fra 2007."

"MSF er fortsat alvorligt bekymret over den effekt, som TPP-handelsaftalen vil få for millioner af menneskers adgang til billig medicin, hvis den sættes i kraft," udtales MSF. TPP-aftalens ordlyd "bekræfter, at aftalen yderligere vil forsinke generel, prissænkende konkurrence ved at udvide og styrke farmaceutiske virksomheders beskyttede monopolmarkeder ... Det er meget foruroligende at se, at det er lykkedes den amerikanske regering og farmaceutiske virksomheder at indsluse regler, der vil fastholde høje medicinpriser i længere tid og begrænse de værktøjer, som regeringer og civilsamfundet har til at forsøge at forøge generel konkurrence ..."

Hvis TPP-aftalen træder i kraft, advarer MSF, vil den ikke tillade nationale reguleringsmyndigheder at benytte eksisterende data, der viser et biologisk produkts sikkerhed og virkeevne, til at bemyndige salget af konkurrerende produkter, selv, når der ikke foreligger patenter. TPP ville også tvinge regeringer til at forlænge eksisterende patentmonopoler udover den nuværende 20 års-periode, hvis de farmaceutiske virksomheder kræver det ..."

MSF opfordrer alle lovgivere eller parlementer i de nationer, der har underskrevet TPP, "til nøje at overveje, hvorvidt den aftalte TPP-tekst reflekterer den retning, de ønsker at gå, med hensyn til adgang til prisbillig medicin og fremme af biomedicinsk innovation; hvis ikke, bør TPP-aftalen modificeres eller forkastes".

Udenrigsministre fra Grækenland og Tyskland fremlægger de hårde kendsgerninger om flygtningesituationen

9. november 2015 – Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier var på officielt besøg i Athen den 29. okt. for drøftelser med græske regeringsfolk, inkl. udenrigsminister Nikos Kotzias. Højt på dagsordenen for begge parter stod flygtningekrisen og krigen i Syrien. Den 30. okt. udgav det græske Udenrigsministerium et **udskrift på engelsk af deres pressekonference den 29. okt.**, under hvilken de begge kom med vigtige erklæringer.

Med hensyn til flygtningekrisen understregede udenrigsminister Kotzias, som også andre græske regeringsfolk har gjort, at hovedspørsgsmålet er at løse krigen i Syrien, samt den kendsgerning, at FN's Flygtningehøjkommissariat (UNHCR) er blevet ribbet for finansiering.

Kotzias sagde, at han tilbage i februar i tyske medier advarede om, at nedskæringerne i finansieringen af FN's hjælpeoperationer for flygtninge ville føre til en massiv stigning i flygtningestrømmen. Han advarede igen under pressekonferencen, at han har informationer om, at herved 300.000 flygtninge er en route fra lejre i Jordan og Libanon, og at flygtninge i tyrkiske lejre er ved at sælge alle deres ejendele for at kunne foretage den lange rejse.

Kozias siger, at disse mennesker kun er en del af 3 millioner

mennesker, der lever i flygtningelejrene, og som nu rejser, fordi de bogstavelig talt sulter i lejrene. Han uddybede nedskæringerne i finansieringen, der er faldet fra 150 dollar pr. familie i lejrene til nu 13 dollar, dvs. ca. 0,43 dollar om dagen. Steinmeier var enig og sagde, at Tyskland havde sammenkaldt et G7-møde på sidelinjen af FN's Generalforsamling, som havde rejst 1,7 mia. dollar blot til at finansiere mad i lejrene, men at det ikke var nær nok.

Kotzias kom også med en magtfuld intervention til støtte for den ægyptiske regering og sagde: »Der er ingen, der bør lege med ilden og destabilisere andre lande i regionen. Nogle kan godt lide at mødes med det Muslimske Broderskab i Egypten. Det forstår jeg. Jeg har aldrig været tilhænger af militærregimer. Min generation sad i militærjuntaens fængsler. Stabilitet og sikkerhed i regionen kommer først. Har nogen overvejet, hvad der ville ske i tilfælde af et kaotisk kollaps af det egyptiske regime, med 96 mio. mennesker, af hvilke 62 mio. er unge og uden identitet, fremtid, jobs? Og bag disse titals millioner er der 45 mio., der nu er ved at komme frem fra borgerkrigen i Sudan, så vel som også den fejlslagne stat Somalia. Efter min mening må vi afvende destabiliseringen i denne region fra toppen og ned, for ellers vil flygtningesituationen i Middelhavet virkelig komme ud af kontrol. Som følge heraf må vi træffe mange, mange flere forholdsregler.«

Steinmeier pointerede også, at der ikke kan findes en løsning og afslutning på krigen i Syrien uden at involvere præsident Bashar al-Assad.

Foto: Tyrkiet: De sælger, pakker og rejser. For at overleve.

Demografisk sammenbrud: Det russiske tilfælde.

LaRouche 2001: Hvis vi ikke reformerer IMF, får vi Ny Mørk Tidsalder

8. november 2015 – Efter Sovjetunionens kollaps og under Det britiske Imperiums udplyndringspolitik, gennemgik Rusland et chokerende, befolkningsmæssigt sammenbrud, ikke ulig det, der nu rapporteres at finde sted i USA under Bush- og Obamapræsidentskaberne. Som den russiske økonom, tidl. medlem af Dumaen og nuværende rådgiver til præsident Putin, Sergei Glazyev, skrev i sin bog fra 1999 'Folkemord': »Den årlige rate af nedgang i befolkningstallet [i Rusland i 1990'erne] har været mere end det dobbelte af nedgangen under perioden af Stalinistisk undertrykkelse og massehungersnød i første halvdel af 1930'erne ... Intet tilsvarende dette er forekommet i Ruslands tusindårige historie.«

Lyndon LaRouche havde, i en historisk vidneberetning, han aflagde den 29. juni 2001 for den russiske Statsdumas Økonomiske Komite, som Glazyev dengang var formand for, advaret:

»I øjeblikket er verden som helhed domineret af den kendsgerning, at vi befinner os i IMF-systemets slutfase, i hvert fald i den form, det udviklede i kølvandet på den amerikanske præsident Nixons introduktion af den monetære orden med den såkaldte 'flydende vekselkurs' medio august 1971. I modstrid med den hysteriske propaganda, der kommer fra

Bushregeringen, der nu er i store vanskeligheder, så er der intet, der kan redde det nuværende globale finanssystem og monetære system i sin nuværende form.

Den fortsatte afvisning af at acceptere visse nødvendige, omfattende reformer i disse systemer ville frembringe ikke alene en økonomisk katastrofe værre end den værste periode i 1930'ernes økonomiske depression. Den aktuelle krise vil også, med mindre den stoppes af nødvendige, drastiske reformer, udvikle sig til en demografisk katastrofe, som mere eller mindre kan sammenlignes med det, historikere kalder 'den Nye Mørke Tidsalder', der dominerede over Europa i kølvandet på det såkaldte Lombard-banksystems bankerot i det fjortende århundrede. At tale om en økonomisk politik, der ikke inkluderer en snarlig og omfattende reform af IMF-systemet, er derfor værre end tidsspilde.

Vi kan besejre dette kollaps, men kun, hvis vi er i stand til at frembringe en vis grad af internationalt samarbejde», erklærede LaRouche.

Foretag nu en sammenligning mellem den totale vending, der finder sted i Rusland under præsident Putins politik, og i hans BRIKS-allierede lande mere alment, og så det accelererende, demografiske sammenbrud og den Nye Mørke Tidsalder i Amerika under Bush og nu Obama.

Hvorfor sidder Obama stadig i Det Hvide Hus?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sender en

hilsen til musikaften på Manhattan i anledning af Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag

De fleste mennesker er så bebyrdet med at sørge for deres elementære livsfornødenheder, at de ikke ønsker, og ikke kan klare den yderligere byrde, det er, at tænke. De er derfor tilbøjelige til at overtage deres meninger fra en eller anden gruppe, som de tilhører, det være sig kirke, præst, klub, deres samfundsklasse, medier eller en hvilken som helst anden gruppe. For at være i besiddelse af visdom, være klog, og for at elske visdom, må man allerede være i besiddelse af visdom for at påskønne den.

GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid

Obama og Bush er ansvarlige for en halv million unødvendige dødsfald i USA

siden 1999

4. november 2015 – Det var ikke med droner, men med en ligeså dødelig politik på det sociale og økonomiske område under Bush- og Obamaregeringerne, under direkte ordre fra Wall Street, at dødeligheden for hvide, ikke-latinamerikanske amerikanere mellem 45-54 steg med en chokerende voldsomhed. Dette viser en undersøgelse, der blev offentliggjort i en rapport, som nu nyder udbredt mediebevågenhed. Rapporten blev offentliggjort midt i september af to økonomer fra Princetons universitet, Anne Case og nobelpriskandidat i 2015 for økonomi, Angus Deaton.

Case og Deaton viste yderligere, at, hvis dødeligheden "fortsat var faldet med samme hastighed som fra 1979-1998, ville en halv million dødsfald have været undgået i perioden fra 1999-2013". En halv million dødsfald, som Obama, Bush og deres Wall Street-politik må stå direkte til ansvar for.

Disse afsløringer understreger, hvad Lyndon LaRouche gentagende gange har fastholdt: at Obamas politik fører til en drastisk stigning i antallet af dødsfald i den amerikanske befolkning. LaRouche havde følgende kommentar: "Hvorfor greb vi som nation ikke ind for mange år siden, for at forhindre, at dette skulle ske? Hvordan blev folk narret til at godtage en økonomisk politik, der ødelagde videnskab og industri og samtidig førte til ubegrænsede redningspakker til Wall Street? Hvordan blev vi forført til at gøre dette mod os selv?"

LaRouche forklarede, at der må handles straks for at få Obama afsat ved forfatningsmæssige midler. Ellers vil den sataniske Obama fortsætte med at dræbe med sin økonomiske politik, med sine droneangreb, med flere ulovlige krige og de deraf følgende strømme af desperate flygtninge. Og han vil dræbe med truslen om en atomar konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina. Obama er ikke et geni, forklarede LaRouche; han er bare satansk og har sat folk i en tilstand af angst, inklusiv det meste af

USA's kongres. Men hvis man ikke går op imod Obama og ændrer hans politik, er man inkompetent – og snart en død sild.

Rapporten fra Case og Deaton viser, at, fra 1999-2014 – årene under Obama og Bush – steg dødeligheden blandt hvide, ikke-latinamerikanske amerikanere mellem 45-54 år med mere end 10 %. Blandt den fattigere, mindre veluddannede del af denne aldersgruppe steg antallet af dødsfald med 22 % i denne periode. Ifølge rapportens forfattere "har denne ændring sat en stopper for flere årtiers fremgang. Og dette kun i USA: Ingen anden rig nation oplevede en lignende ændring." Faktisk oplevede mange lande som f.eks. Tyskland og Frankrig i samme periode et fald i dødeligheden på 25-30 % blandt de tilsvarende befolkningsgrupper.

Årsagerne til stigningen i dødelighed er ligeså chokerende som selve stigningen:

"Denne stigning hos hvide var primært forårsaget af en øget dødelighed som resultat af narko- og alkoholforgiftninger, selvmord og kroniske leversygdomme samt skrumpelever", skrev forfatterne og bemærkede især himmelflugten i brugen af opium- og heroinnarkotika i denne aldersgruppe. De nåede frem til følgende, isnende konklusion:

"Folk, der aktuelt befinder sig som midaldrende, kunne være en 'fortabt generation', hvis fremtid ser mindre lys ud end deres forgængeres."

Dette er et tegn på den nye, mørke tidsalder, der nu skyller ind over USA. Overskriften i New York Times' artikel fra 2. nov., der dækkede denne rapport, var "Dødsfald blandt midaldrende." Den kunne ligeså godt have været "Dødsfald i Middelalderen."

Husbyggeri på samlebånd foreslået i Tyskland

6. november 2015 – Konfronteret med de særlige udfordringer, som den store indstrømning af flygtninge har skabt, opfordrer den tyske byggeindustri nu til, at man tager metoder til »industrifremstillet husbyggeri« i anvendelse, med prototyper, der kan bygges billigt i hele Tyskland inden for blot få måneder. Dette er, hvad Michael Knipper, adm. dir. for byggeindustriens sammenslutning i Tyskland, sagde i et interview til Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung.

Et forceret program, og ikke kun for husbyggeri, er så sandelig presserende nødvendigt: Nye statistiktal over industriproduktionen i Tyskland viser, at der i september var et fald på 1,1 %, sammenlignet med august. Faldet var størst i industrien med 1,4 %, det samme som i maskinværktøjsfremstillingssektoren. Produktion af forbrugsvarer faldt endda 3,2 %. Byggesektoren blot minus 0,9 %.

Tiden er kommet for et nationalt, forceret program: bolig-/husbyggeri, infrastruktur og nye industrifabrikker!

<http://orf.at/stories/2308569/2308570/>

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

Dette webcast: Obama beordrer mediecensur af dækning af afsløringer af Drone-papirerne. Seneste afsløringer om bombning 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 Rangell, 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 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 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.