

For at kunne bekæmpe pandemien, må det Britiske Imperiums anti-kinesiske heksejagt bekæmpes

Den 20. maj (EIRNS) – De episke problemer, som vi er konfronteret med, i bekæmpelsen af pandemien, påbegyndelsen af en ny verdensøkonomi, og sideløbende minimering af kaos og nød, kræver en yderligere opgave: At kalde den nuværende, intense anti-Kina-kampagne hvad den er – en sort propaganda-operation. Den er antændt af de samme britiske netværk, som anstiftede "Russiagate", afsættelsesforsøget af Præsident Donald Trump, og alle sådanne operationer for at forhindre det potentielle samarbejde, mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og andre nationer, hen imod en ny struktur til verdens fordel. Dette ville markere enden på Londons kontrol baseret på geopolitik og monetarisme; og Trumps tidlige tilbøjelighed i retningen af venskabsdiplomati har været bandlyst af disse kredse.

I sit ugentlige Schiller Institut-webcast i dag, diskuterede Helga Zepp-LaRouche disse britiske netværk, inklusiv deres forsøg på at splitte Kina og USA, samt opbygningen af politiske blokke, ligesom under den kolde krig. Hun advarede at dette vil føre til et sammenbrud af økonomiske funktioner og hyperinflation. Hun anførte, at blandt de mest skingre stemmer, er dem fra Trumps økonomi- og handelsrådgiver, Peter Navarro, Forsvarsminister Mark Esper og Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo.

Hun sagde: "Det er tydeligt at Præsident Trump sættes under enormt pres, fordi han er oppe imod pandemien; der er enorme økonomiske konsekvenser – USA's centralbank har lige offentliggjort, at sammenbruddet af USA's økonomi i 2. kvartal vil være 30%; arbejdsløsheden stiger; og åbenlyst har det

faktum, at flere personer er blevet testet positive, og faktisk blev syge med coronaviruset i og omkring det Hvide Hus, skabt en atomsfære for Præsident Trump, hvor han virkelig sættes under et enormt pres.

Jeg mener at enhver, som er interesseret i at løse menneskehedens problemer, bør tale om, at denne heksejagt mod kinesere, den McCarthyisme stil med at anholde kinesiske videnskabsfolk, eller sågar amerikanske videnskabsfolk med kinesisk baggrund, det er virkelig ekstremt farligt og er et meget skidt varsel! Det skal stoppes og folk burde ikke falde for denne propaganda, fordi den er komplet ubegrundet."

Hun opfordrede folk til at se på, hvad der præsenteres som fakta mod Kina, eller andre mål, og se, at de i virkeligheden er geopolitiske angreb. De indeholder gentagelsen af "store løgne."

Ved dagens ugentlige briefing fra Udenrigsministeriet, overgik Pompeo sig selv. Han hævdede at Kina skylder verden "så meget som omkring 9 billioner dollars, ifølge vores skøn," for arbejdspladser og tabte liv i USA og globalt. Pompeo sagde, at han havde foreslået Trump forskellige måder, hvorpå Kina kunne tvinges til "at betale" for COVID-19-pandemien. Præsidenten er "begyndt at overveje at svare tilbage... Jeg ønsker ikke at komme ham i forkøbet med hensyn til at diskutere hvordan...".

Pompeo indledte disse bemærkninger med en svada. "Først, grundlæggende fakta. Kina har været regeret af et brutalt, autoritært regime, et kommunistregime siden 1949... Vi undervurderede gevaldigt i hvilken grad Beijing er ideologisk og politisk fjendtlighedsindret overfor frie nationer. Hele verden vågner op til dette faktum."

Som komplet modpol til disse spydigheder understregede Zepp-LaRouche, at idéen om USA's og Kinas samarbejde er "sandsynligvis det mest vigtige strategiske spørgsmål, fordi,

hvis disse to store økonomier, den tidligere stærkeste økonomi og den opkommende økonomi, som trods alt har 1,4 milliarder mennesker, hvis de samarbejder kan man næsten løse et hvilket som helst problem i hele verden; hvis de tørner sammen, kunne det føre til ødelæggelsen af hele menneskeheden.”

Hun gav eksemplet om nødvendigheden for at udvikle fusionskraft – grundlaget for et fuldstændigt nyt produktivitetsdomæne for fremtiden. Kinas arbejder med dette, og Kinas Eksperimentale Avancerede Superledende Tokamak (EAST) skrider fremad, som et afgørende projekt. Beskrivende CGTN’s TV-udsendelse ”Den kunstige Sols Kraft: Fusion,” sagde hun, at ”det de siger er, at fusion er revolutionært, af den simple årsag at når man kan skabe et gennembrud og har kommercielt brug af fusionskraft, vil det levere energi, ikke kun til 1,4 milliarder kinesere, men til hele verden i årtusinder fremover. Og det er grunden til at Kina lige nu forener de bedste hjerner i verden, lige netop for at få sådan et crashprogram.

De siger at fusionskraft er ligeså vigtigt, og ligeså stort som menneskets landing på månen. Folk, som kender dette program, vil indse, at det er præcis dette, som LaRouches ”Fire Love” handler om, nemlig, at vi bliver nødt til at have internationalt samarbejde for et crashprogram for fusionskraft; at vi har brug en ny fusionsøkonomisk platform, og at vi har brug for et internationalt samarbejde i rumforskning. Og det er vejen frem!”

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, May 20, 2020

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

America’s Historic Enemies – and the Russiagate Enemies of Donald Trump – Are Behind the Escalation Against China

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I’m Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to our webcast with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is May 20, 2020.

Helga, each week as we do these webcasts, it seems as though the danger in the world keeps escalating: We have a series of crises, and there's a definite push coming from especially the City of London and their allies in the United States to add to the destabilization. In the last couple of days there's been another escalation in the anti-China campaign around the World Health Assembly annual meeting. What was going on there, and what's the background to this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: First of all, most people in the United States and in Europe and elsewhere cannot have helped but notice that the anti-China tone has become absolutely shrill. If you listen to what people like Navarro and Esper, and Tucker Carlson, and Pompeo are saying, it's a kind of accusation which is really, if it all would be true, it would be casus belli, but if it's a lie, it's even more casus belli. One has to remember that a lot of the anti-China forces, it originated with British intelligence, MI5, MI6 – these were the same forces which were focussing for the first three years of the Trump Administration on Russiagate, all the accusations that Russia manipulated the 2016 election; and if one looks back now, what was coming out of this, what was the matter of it? Nothing! It was all a big lie. What was the ground for the impeachment? The same thing! And it is exactly that same apparatus which is now focussing on the effort to divide China and the United States, because these forces need the kind of geopolitical manipulation in order to keep control, because if the large powers of the world would work together then the role of the British diminishes into insignificance.

Now, obviously, the pandemic has created a total crisis, it's a health crisis which is very big. The "opening up" of the economy, so-called, which is a terrible word to even use, is creating all kinds of dangers, and obviously, there is an effort to get President Trump to go with this whole anti-China campaign. And unfortunately, he signed a letter – it's not clear if he really wrote all of it, which may not be the case,

because there's a lot of detail in there which I doubt the President would fill out himself – but he basically wrote a letter to the head of the World Health Organization, Dr. Tedros on the occasion of the World Health Assembly annual meeting in Geneva, or virtual, in which he basically repeats all of these accusations, that China covered up, that they didn't transmit the information in time, that they delayed, that they caused all these economic hardships; and he accuses the WHO of having been completely in the pocket of China. And he is demanding that the WHO should prove within 30 days that they are independent of China, or else the U.S. will even leave the WHO altogether let alone cutting off funding.

Now this is very unfortunate, because he has a lot of remarks in there which are simply factually not true. One of them is that he quotes the British medical journal The Lancet, that they would have already reported in the beginning of December about the virus, and so forth. That is too bad, because immediately the editor of The Lancet refuted it, and said that they never had published anything like that, but their first reporting was on Jan. 24th. This is really an Achilles' heel of Trump's, and one can only say that we need to point to the geopolitical nature of these lies. We should remember what Pompeo said that when he headed the CIA, they made it sort of a sport to lie, to cheat, and that is obviously what is going on right now.

I think this very dangerous, because if you accuse another country of such enormous accusations, this is normally the kind of black propaganda which is being put out before wars. And it's being noted in China as a very, very serious thing. And I think we should all try to do our best to undo this.

SCHLANGER:

...and Trump. Is this coming from the same British networks? We see it from Pompeo and others in the U.S., but we've

identified groups like the Henry Jackson Society, they're continuing their escalation against China, aren't they?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. And the aim is to really, potentially even decouple. Now, if you decouple the countries which are allied with the United States from those which are allied with China, in other words, you go at the minimum into a bloc building as what existed in the Cold War. I think under the present conditions, this would lead for sure to a collapse of the world financial system and a hyperinflationary blowout of the system, so I think this is absolutely playing with fire.

SCHLANGER: The letter from Trump was addressed to WHO director Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus; he spoke at the World Health Assembly annual meeting of the World Health Organization, as did Xi Jinping; the U.S. was there only represented by HHS Secretary Alex Azar, but what did they have to say in addressing the concerns of the entire world about the coronavirus pandemic?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: What Dr. Tedros said was that the World Health Organization must work so that this pandemic is never being repeated, in other words, that it caught the whole world relatively unprepared, because all the warnings were there. And he said the tools were all there, but they were not used, due to a "temporary amnesia." He called for a remedy of that, and really establish a world health system. And Xi Jinping made a really remarkable speech, and all those people who are being bombarded by the anti-China propaganda, I would really challenge you to just go to your laptop or whatever, print out or look at the speech which was given by Xi Jinping, because it's an extraordinary speech. [http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-05/18/c_139067018.htm] He says, for example, that world is hit with a pandemic; 210 countries and regions are affected, already many lives have been lost and that the most precious thing is human life.

Now I would wish that the former finance minister of Germany,

Wolfgang Schäuble would have such a noble conception of the human being, because he said, recently, that it's not the function of the state to protect life as the highest priority. So in that case, I would say that the leader of a Communist Party has a better standard on the question of human life – and I'm saying this deliberately as a polemic.

Now, Xi Jinping, then proceeds to say that there must be a focus on Africa, that the world community has to help Africa with this pandemic, and in general, has to work together as a community for a shared future of civilization.

So I think the effort to take over this World Health Organization annual meeting, there was a resolution which was anti-China, which did not succeed; and there was a resolution accepted, that, indeed, after the pandemic has been successfully defeated, there should be an investigation, into what was the origin of the virus to better understand how it functioned, in order to avoid and protect against future such problems, but it should be done under the auspices of the World Health Organization.

Those people who are right now falling into the propaganda that it's all Bill Gates, who's trying to become rich – even richer than he is already – by being behind the WHO, well, there are many private firms which help finance the WHO, but does it help if the U.S. is pulling out, if the governments are underpaying the WHO? I think the remedy is that the governments take responsibility and supply the World Health Organization with the necessary means, because from everything I have seen, and we have studied this from the very beginning, because we were extremely attentive to when the first information from Wuhan came, we compared the notes, what was put out when by the Chinese government; who did not respond, like the Health Minister Jens Spahn. He said in January, “oh, the virus will never come to Germany”; in February, he said “oh the German health system is perfectly prepared....” So we have studied this as it happened. So a lot of the facts which

are in the letter of President Trump to Dr. Tedros are simply factually not true.

But, once the pandemic is overcome, there must be an investigation because the world needs to better understand the nature of this virus, and viruses in general and also whether the present world health system can be improved. But it should be done in a cooperative spirit, in the spirit of a shared humanity and not as a part of a confrontation and geopolitical attacks.

SCHLANGER: It seems as though some of the discussion and the proposals that were adopted were along the lines of what you've called for in terms of what you've called for in terms of a global effort to improve health service everywhere. We've also seen other forms of cooperation – President Trump is sending ventilators to Russia that the U.S. is going to pay for. But where do we stand on the other question, of vaccine. There's a discussion of this of "Warp Speed" program: what do you make of that?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: We have to see. On the one side, it is naturally good to call on all labs to work high speed on vaccines, and it's also obviously important that the President of the United States takes a leading role in that, that all the resources must be mobilized. But I would really warn against rushing it, because there are many new labs which have promised vaccines soon – I think a vaccine, especially one which will be used by the entire world population is something which has to be really tested on the highest standards. And that has to be seen. China already has said they will provide the whole with that vaccine, and I think there must be a cooperative approach. This is such a big threat to all of humanity that the best would be if the United States, the Europeans, Russians, Chinese, and others would all work together, because the more time is lost to find an adequate vaccine, the more people will die, and that should really be taken as a change a paradigm shift to cooperate.

It is obvious that President Trump is being put under enormous pressure, because he is up against the pandemic; there is an incredible economic consequences – the Federal Reserve just said that the collapse of the U.S. economy in the second quarter will be 30%; unemployment is going up; and obviously the fact that there were several people who tested positive and actually became sick with coronavirus in and around the White House, has created an atmosphere for President Trump where he is really put under enormous pressure. I think anybody who is interested in solving humanity's problems should make their voice heard, that this witch-hunt against Chinese, the McCarthyite style of arresting Chinese scientists, or even American scientists with Chinese backgrounds, that is really extremely dangerous and forebodes very bad! It has to be stopped and people should not fall for this propaganda, because it is completely unjustified.

SCHLANGER: It should be noted that this started before the coronavirus: You had people like Marco Rubio, Senator from Florida, whom Trump had called "little Marco," who's now taken over the Senate Intelligence Committee, he's directly collaborating with the Henry Jackson Society in the anti-China campaign. You've had a lot of this ongoing in the background. Where do you think U.S.-China relations will go, and what's the view in China?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: That's probably the most important strategic question, because if the two largest economies, the previously strongest economy and the rising economy, which after all, has 1.4 billion people, if they work together, you can almost solve any problem of the entire world; if they clash, it could lead to the destruction of all of humanity. And in China, people are extremely aware of what's going on, naturally. There are many articles warning of a new McCarthyism in the United States, and the so-called Two Sessions meeting, which is about to start in China [May 21 and 22], that's the legislative body, called the National People's Congress and

the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference; these two bodies have put the U.S.-China relationship on their agenda. And we have to see – maybe we'll get some clarity on what China is intending to do in response to this McCarthyism coming from the United States.

But people don't understand China. They have these absolute prejudices, but they don't make the effort to find out what makes this country tick, and I want to give you a little window, which gives you a good insight: And that is the fact that CGTN, which is the official Chinese TV network, have started a series called "Decoding the Future," which will start exactly on the occasion of these two sessions. And the first such broadcast is "The Power of Artificial Sun: Fusion" [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3CKd4Syb0ak>]. They're discussing the EAST program; EAST stands for Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak, and it is the fusion research center in Hefei, where they already succeeded about a year ago, to confine a plasma at a high temperature of over 100 million degrees Celsius; that is six times the heat which exists in the core of the Sun, and they were able to confine that plasma for more than 10 seconds, which represents a world record. So, China, in terms of fusion research is right now a world leader, and they're also participating in the ITER [International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor] program in Cadarache, France, where 35 countries participate.

In any case, what they say is that fusion is revolutionary, for the very reason that once you can make a breakthrough and have commercial use of fusion power, it will provide energy security not only for 1.4 billion Chinese, but for the whole world for millennia to come. And that is why China right now uniting the best minds of the world to get exactly such a crash program. They say that fusion is as important, and as great as man's landing on the Moon. People who know this program will recognize that is exactly what the fourth point of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws is all about, namely that we

have to have international cooperation for a crash program for fusion power, that we need a new platform of the fusion economy, and that we need international cooperation space exploration. And that is the way to go!

I'm absolutely sure that the offers from China for all nations to cooperate in these programs are still on the table, and if we are avoiding a clash which could lead to World War III, it has to be the kind of visionary cooperation for these future decoding the secrets of the future of the universe and our human civilization, how we will get out of this terrible crisis. I think this is a very inspiring.

And people think this is a Communist China doing that – well, maybe, there is something to this approach which is right! People should not just say “Communist China...” If they're going to get a breakthrough in fusion and they put an absolute priority on that, maybe there is something in their policy which is right. I just want to put this out as a question mark.

SCHLANGER: And then you contrast that with the insanity of the Green financial bubble, which seems to be the approach that came out of this Merkel-Macron session to discuss the financial crisis in Europe. This is the BlackRock, the equity firm, the speculation firm, which was handed by the Federal Reserve the right to determine who gets the funds to engage in speculation, and they're behind the Green financial bubble. What happened with Macron and Merkel? And is Europe fully committed to this Green policy?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this Macron-Merkel – which is this deal whereby they want to buy EU500 billion worth of bonds; this is supposed to be financed by taking this money from the financial markets. But then it's supposed to be paid back through the EU budget – so it's not really a grant, because if the EU budget is supposed to finance it after three years, it will be paid by the taxpayers. So the southern Europeans, who

are all very happy, saying, "this is a grant" – it's not that. It's basically another effort to keep the banking system afloat.

It is opposed by Austria, Holland, Denmark, Sweden; also important layers within the CDU [the German Christian Democratic Union] are calling on all CDU Members of Parliament and the European Parliament to prevent it from happening... so I don't think it's necessarily agreed that it will go anywhere. But one should always keep in mind, this is happening in the context of the EU Commission having hired who? But BlackRock, the largest asset manager in the world, to write a new legislation to integrate the Green Deal with the general EU program. Now you can hire the Devil to do your job, because you have now the EU Commission being run by BlackRock and the Federal Reserve having hired BlackRock to manage their \$4 trillion program to keep the banking system afloat. So BlackRock is de facto running the financial policies of the United States and Europe. And it just happens to be that that is exactly what was discussed at the Jackson Hole meeting last August, the big meeting of bankers and central bank governors, which takes place every year in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. And that is where the central bankers, especially then Bank of England governor Mark Carney, and Michael Bloomberg, and BlackRock and others had put out this line that there needs to be a "regime change," that practically the power has to go entirely to the central banks, and they have to run the international financial system.

So what you see here in action, is exactly that. And given the fact that Mark Carney and Bloomberg are identical with this Green Deal agenda, this is not foreboding good at all. So, if they will impose the Green Deal ideas on top of the already extremely weakened economy as a result of the pandemic, you will have a collapse of Europe and the United States as industrial powers. You cannot do that.

I think you have contrast that with the opposite approach

taken by China with the fusion crash program, and I think that we have to do everything to change that, and that is why the Schiller Institute and our associates in the United States are working on crash program for a completely different approach: Namely, to answer the pandemic and the problems which are now really jumping into the eyes of everybody, with the issue of a 1.5 billion new jobs program, a program to create 1.5 billion new, productive jobs, which will be announced shortly on our channels.

SCHLANGER: Let me just remind people who don't remember, that Carney and BlackRock worked out a compact among leading banks by which they said they will not make any credit available to any bank or any corporation which is still engaging in creating a (quote) "carbon-footprint" (unquote). In other words, they're forcing the credit to go into the Green financial bubble.

Now, Helga, this is in contrast, you talked about the program that we're about to put out, the 1.5 billion jobs, the emphasis on science and research and development investment – that's completely contrasted through the Hamiltonian credit system. And this, I think is what we have to emphasize, and our supporters have to take the LaRouche Four Laws and especially this idea of the Hamiltonian credit: that would be the complete opposite of this Green New Deal, and is the only way to get out of this crisis, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. People should just step back and look at the situation as it is now becoming obvious, as a result of this pandemic. You had the pandemic spreading, there was the lockdown of the economy, the lockdown already affected Europe, some European countries more than others, but also the United States very severely, and it's ongoing. But much, much worse was the effect on the so-called developing countries, which unfortunately are not so developing at all, because it hit what is generally called, in a nefarious way, the "informal economy." But that is just a PR word for the fact that it's a

shadow economy: It's people working from hand to mouth, who have no resources, who have no benefits, no social security, no health system, and when they are locked down, they are in danger of dying of starvation within days! And that is exactly the warning which was put out by the head of the World Food Program David Beasley, who said that the ongoing crisis of agriculture, the collapse of the farm sector in the United States and in Europe, these meat-packing plants, where people living and working in slave-labor conditions, immigrants became infected because the working conditions were so bad; these were shut down. Then the farmers had to "euthanize" – this is a terrible word to even use for animals – they had to kill tens of millions of hogs, chickens, bury them instead of processing them for food. This is leading to a collapse and interruption of the supply chain, while, at the same time as Beasley is warning, we are looking at famine of "biblical dimensions" where the danger is that up to 300,000 people per day could die in the short term of hunger!

Now, that is completely insane, and that in part is the result of the neo-liberal policies which denied development of the developing countries for the last 50 years at least; which is the result of an absolutely profit-oriented system of agriculture under the control of only five cartels – this is why these labor conditions are so absolutely horrendous. And that has to be changed: We need to go back to family farms. We have to have a parity price for agricultural goods, the farmers have to be able to live off their work. We have to double world production – this is a call I already made in 2008, that the 2.5-2.7 billion tons of food production has to be doubled! If you consider that the world population is increasing and you already have almost a billion people – not food secure, now being threatened with starvation – 2 billion people not having clean water, you need to build up agriculture. If you look at the condition of the world, it is now the time to completely reverse that and really industrialize the developing sector. Now, for the United

States, that means we will have to create 50 million productive jobs in the short term, but for the developing countries, we need more than a billion jobs, because you will have a lot of young people, who either will die, or try to migrate to the north, or, we will use this incredible crisis to really turn it around, and do what Franklin D. Roosevelt intended with the Bretton Woods system in the beginning – namely, that the development of Global South, or the developing countries, has to occur. Roosevelt, at the time of the preparation of the Bretton Woods system said, the increase of the living standard of the whole world population will be the basis for stability and peace in the world, and that is exactly the task we have in front of us, and that is the life work of Lyndon LaRouche, who after all, for 50 years worked on development programs for every single part of the world:

*He worked on an Africa development program, which we published in 1976 the first time;

*He worked on an “Oasis Plan,” for the development of the Middle East;

*He worked on a 50-year development program for the Pacific Basin;

*We worked with Indira Gandhi on a 40-year development program for India;

*We worked with José López Portillo on a Latin American-wide economic and infrastructure integration;

*Naturally a reindustrialization of the United States;

*And the Eurasian Land-Bridge, in response to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

So for the last 50 years, LaRouche, my late husband, and the LaRouche movement, we have worked on concrete development programs. We published that in an updated form in 2014 called

the “New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge,” and now is the time, under conditions of this crisis to upgrade this and create 1.5 billion new productive job, and really start a new chapter in the history of humanity. And that is what I’m calling on you to support and help us to put on the agenda instead of geopolitical confrontation.

SCHLANGER: And you can find the key to that on our website: Lyndon LaRouche’s four economic laws [https://larouchepub.com/lar/2014/4124four_laws.html]. Helga, I don’t have anything else to ask. Is there anything else you want to add?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: We will put under this program the petition for a world health system, a link to the video about this world health system. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2020/05/08/coronavirus-petition-for-global-health-infrastructure/>] And I would really ask you to help us to distribute this petition as widely as you can, all your social media, your email lists, your colleagues, your friends, and make it a snowballing demand, because we need a chorus of forces in the world to demand such a change in the strategic policies.

SCHLANGER: Helga, with that, thank you a lot, and I’ll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Till next week.

Storbritannien

burde

afkobles, ikke Kina

Den 17. maj (EIRNS) – Den farligste udvikling, der kan ske i den nuværende strategiske situation, er USA's afkobling fra Kina, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion i søndags. Verden står over for en eksistentiel krise med en kombineret pandemi og hungersnød "af bibelske proportioner", alt sammen som et resultat af et systemisk finansielt og økonomisk sammenbrud, der gentagne gange er blevet forudsagt af Lyndon LaRouche. Ingen løsning på denne krise er tilgængelig for menneskeheden uden USA's og Kinas tætte samarbejde – sammen med Rusland, Indien og andre nationer – centreret om den presserende, højteknologiske udvikling af den underudviklede sektor. Det er det centrale punkt i LaRouchePACs kommende "LaRouche-plan for genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har behov for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job."

Det faktum, at al snavset omkring det britiske-Obama-støttede kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump endelig kommer frem – og at Trump insisterer på, at folk vil blive fængslet for dette – hjælper med til at styrke denne politiske mulighed.

Men hvis forholdet mellem USA og Kina kører skævt, hvis der sker en alvorlig afkobling, af den slags som briterne aktivt arbejder for gennem deres agenter i positioner, som Mike Pompeo, vil planeten brække over i konkurrerende blokke, meget som det skete under Den kolde Krig – blot denne gang under forhold af en sammenbrudskrise. Zepp-LaRouche uddybede: Dette vil være ødelæggende for USA, det vil skabe kaos i hele Europa, og det vil sætte verden på en kurs mod krig mellem supermagterne.

Den amerikanske ambassadør i Polen, Georgette Mosbacher, agerer efter den samme britiske geopolitiske drejebog som Pompeo. Hun opfordrede til, at amerikanske atomvåben, der nu er stationeret i Tyskland, skulle overføres til et mere

føjeligt Polen – et stenkast fra Ruslands grænse. Den tidligere FN-våbeninspektør Scott Ritter svarede syrligt: "Simpelthen en af de dumme ideer i verden. Den russiske overkommando takker i øvrigt for at have gjort det lettere at overmande og bemægtige sig denne såkaldte nukleare afskrækkelse – Google 1st Guards Tank Army". Nyhedsbureauet Sputnik International bemærkede korrekt, at dette hurtigt kunne eskalere til en ny cubansk missilkrise.

‘Ingen overlevende’ Video fra LaRouchePAC Danske undertekster

En mørk, grusom, men helt igennem sandfærdig afbildning af truslen om en termonuklear krig og konsekvenserne, og Obamas deployering af hovedparten af USA's termonukleare kapacitet i flere områder, som truer både Rusland og Kina.

De vestlige samfund er i færd med

at kollapse – et Nyt Paradigme, eller en Ny Mørk Tidsalder

Det eneste, der stadig står, er kravet om Glass-Steagall, som i Kongressen og internationalt anerkendes som resultatet af Lyndon LaRouches ubøjelige kampagne hen over de seneste årtier, for at opdrage og mobilisere befolkningen og de politiske institutioner til at forstå, at udelukkende kun en tilbagevenden til den amerikanske præsident Franklin D. Roosevelts krig mod Wall Street kan omstøde det igangværende kollaps af de vestlige økonomier.

26. juli 2016 (Leder) – Blodige massedrab fylder nu hver dag medieoverskrifterne i alle den »avancerede sektors« nationer:

* En afsindig, tidligere ansat på en japansk institution for mentalt handicappede angreb og skar halsen over på 19 beboere og sårede yderligere 26 alvorligt, efter at han havde skrevet et brev til parlamentet, hvor han forklarede, hvad han havde til hensigt at gøre, som et udslag af »velgørende« medlidenhedsdrab;

* To terrorister angreb en kirke i Frankrig, hvor de skar halsen over på en præst og en nonne, før de selv blev dræbt af politiet. IS tog ansvaret for angrebet og bar således ved til det opildnede anti-muslimske bål i pressen.

* To selvmordsbombemænd fra al-Shabab sprængte deres køretøj i luften uden for en FN-fredsbevarende base i Somalias hovedstad, hvorved de dræbte 12 personer;

* To teenagere blev dræbt og 16 andre såret i Ft. Myers Florida, USA, da tre andre teenagere åbnede ild mod en gruppe mennesker uden for en natklub;

* Og i Tyskland fandt den femte drabsepisode på en uge sted, da en mand dræbte sin læge og sig selv på et hospital.

Dette er blot dagens tabstal. De er ikke alle terrorangreb, da nogle af dem er udført af mennesker, der er drevet til vanvid af deres håbløse situation i samfundet, eller voldskulturen, eller af de psykose-inducerende videospil og »populærunderholdningen«, eller af narkotika, eller af alle disse ting.

Det er et symptom på en døende kultur. Alt imens millioner drives fra deres hjem i Sydvestasien af Obamas politik for evindelige krige for »regimeskift«, og alt imens medierne i Vesten hyper Obamas løgn om, at Rusland og Kina er »aggressorstater«, der styres af diktatorer, som må konfronteres militært, så får befolkningen besked på at slutte sig til de politiske konventioners Romerske Cirkus og samle sig til støtte for ledere, der kun har mere økonomisk ødelæggelse og global krig at tilbyde dem.

Men, hjernevasken er ved at falde fra hinanden. I USA har begge de politiske partiers konventioner været fiaskoer, der har frembragt kandidater, som et flertal af befolkningen hader, og som efterlader deres partistruktur i total forvirring. Det eneste, der stadig står, er kravet om Glass-Steagall, som i Kongressen og internationalt anerkendes som resultatet af Lyndon LaRouches ubøjelige kampagne hen over de seneste årtier, for at opdrage og mobilisere befolkningen og de politiske institutioner til at forstå, at udelukkende kun en tilbagevenden til den amerikanske præsident Franklin D. Roosevelts krig mod Wall Street kan omstøde det igangværende kollaps af de vestlige økonomier.

Roosevelts berømte udtalelse, »det eneste, vi har at frygte, er selve frygten« er arbejdsprincippet i mobiliseringen af befolkningen til at gøre en ende på denne galskab – sammen med LaRouches advarsel imod enhver form for pragmatisme. Ingen delvise forholdsregler er mulige i en verden, der står ansigt

til ansigt med termonuklear krig. Lederne af Det forenede Kongerige (UK) og De forenede Stater (USA) er, af deres egen regering, blevet bevist at være krigsforbrydere, gennem udgivelsen af Chilcot-rapporten i England og de hidtil hemmeligholdte 28 sider af Den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, 2001, i USA. Blair, Bush og Obama er blevet bevist skyldige i at lancere illegale aggressionskrige og i samarbejde med (eller kontrol over) terrorister, der skulle forfølge disse krige. Og alligevel er de fortsat på fri fod, og Obama sidder stadig i Det Hvide Hus, med fingeren på atomknappen.

Obamas fremstød for krig med Rusland og Kina er også i fare. Putin og Lavrov har trukket Tyrkiet ud af mobiliseringen for krig med Syrien og Rusland, mens Kina har trukket hele Sammenslutningen af Sydøstasiatiske Nationer (ASEAN) ud af mobiliseringen for krig med Kina. Verden ser hen til Rusland og Kina for lederskab og udvikling, i stedet for Vestens nedskæringspolitik og krig. Selv de europæiske nationer begynder at se vanviddet i fremstødet for krig med Rusland, og i stedet se det gavnlige i fred og udvikling gennem samarbejde.

Det Nye Paradigme, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har foreslået, baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål, er inden for rækkevidde, hvis Vestens borgere har modet til at følge Schiller Instituttets lederskab med »Den Nye Silkevejs« udvikling for hele verden, og med Friedrich Schillers vise ord om, at vi både må være patrioter i vore nationer, og samtidigt være verdensborgere.

Foto: Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov den 26. juli 2016, før en bilateral samtale på sidelinjen af ASEAN. (Foto: USA's Udenrigsministerium)

NATO-forsvarsministre forventes at godkende militær ekspansion i Polen og Baltikum

6. februar 2016 – NATO-forsvarsministre forventes at godkende planer om at deployere flere tropper i Polen og de Baltiske Stater under deres møde i Bruxelles i næste uge. Dette kommer i kølvandet på den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ashton Carters meddelelse den 2. feb. om, at USA ville fordoble sit budget for militærstyrker i Østeuropa. NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg hilste Carters plan velkommen og sagde, det ville betyde »flere tropper i alliansens østlige del ... en fremskudt opstilling af udstyr, tanks, pansrede vogne ... flere øvelser og mere investering i infrastruktur«. Antallet af amerikanske tropper, der flytter rundt i Østeuropa, forventes at stige fra omkring 600 i dag til omkring 4.000. En amerikansk embedsmand sagde til *Wall Street Journal*, at Obamaregeringen håber, at dens eksempel vil anspore andre NATO-medlemmer til at sende flere tropper til Østeuropa.

Ifølge nyhedsrapporteringer mødtes NATO-embedsmænd i Bruxelles i går for at begynde at sammensætte pakken, der forventes at inkludere et netværk af små, østlige poster, roterende styrker, regelmæssige krigsspil og lagerudstyr, klart til en hurtig responsstyrke, iflg. *Reuters*. Det inkluderer ikke permanente baser, som den polske højrefløjsregering har krævet, eftersom USA, Tyskland og Storbritannien er imod at krænke NATO-Ruslands-Akten fra 1997[1]. Det er ikke desto mindre planen, at disse roterende styrker skal være til stede i Østeuropa på ubestemt tid, og således opfatter russerne den

planlagte deployering. »Som vi hører disse meddelelser fra USA, så skaber alt dette grundlag for at rulle militære planer imod Rusland ud og tage reelle, praktiske skridt til at fremrykke militær infrastruktur tættere til Ruslands grænser«, sagde talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium Maria Zakharova den 4. feb.

[1] Til eftertanke: Indledningen til Akten fra 1997: Grundlæggende Akt om gensidige forbindelser, samarbejde og sikkerhed mellem NATO og Den Russiske Føderation blev undertegnet i Paris, Frankrig.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation og dens medlemsstater på den ene side og Den Russiske Føderation på den anden side, i det følgende benævnt NATO og Rusland, vil, baseret på et varigt politisk tilsagn på højeste politiske niveau, sammen bygge en varig og altomfattende fred i det euro-atlantiske område på principperne om demokrati og kooperativ sikkerhed. NATO og Rusland anser ikke hinanden som modstandere. De deler målet om at overvinde levn fra tidligere konfrontation og konkurrence, og om at styrke den gensidige tillid og det gensidige samarbejde. Den nuværende lov bekræfter □□NATO's og Ruslands beslutning om at give konkret indhold til deres fælles forpligtelse til at opbygge et stabilt, fredeligt og udelt Europa, helt og frit, til gavn for alle dets folk. At denne forpligtelse indgås på højeste politiske niveau markerer indledningen af et fundamentalt nyt forhold mellem NATO og Rusland. De har, på grundlag af fælles interesse, gensidighed og gennemsigtighed, til hensigt at udvikle et stærkt, stabilt og varigt partnerskab. Loven definerer mål og mekanisme for konsultation, samarbejde, fælles beslutningstagning og fælles indsats, der vil udgøre kernen i de gensidige forbindelser mellem NATO og Rusland. (-red.)

Foto: USA's forsvarsminister Ashton Carter annoncerer det nye forsvarsbudget 2. februar 2016.

Stand den umiddelbare fare for atomkrig og skab i stedet en alliance mellem USA, Rusland og Kina om menneskehedens fælles mål

Uddrag af LPAC Fredags-webcast, 5. feb. 2016. Så hvis man ønsker at standse en umiddelbar krigsfare, hvis man har noget som helst ønske om, at USA skal genoptage sin indsats for menneskehedens fælles mål – hvilket vil sige en alliance med Rusland, en alliance med Kina for at avancere med disse store projekter i rummet, i vores Solsystem, for at udforske disse dybder og dernæst fortsætte ud i galaksen – så må man træffe visse omgående hasteforanstaltninger for grundlæggende set at afskære faren for krig, før vi befinder os i en situation, hvor denne planet vil befinde sig i den største fare i hele menneskehedens hidtidige eksistens.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Flyveblad – Alvorlig fare for krig:

Konsekvenserne af Martin O'Malleys tilbagetrækning af sit kandidatur til USA's præsidentskab

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Alvorlig fare for krig – Schiller Instituttet holder særligt møde om konsekvenserne af, at Martin O'Malley har trukket sig ud af valgkampen om USA's

præsidentskab

Schiller Instituttet afholder et særligt møde v/formand Tom Gillesberg torsdag den 4. februar kl. 19 om følgerne af den pludselige afbrydelse af Martin O'Malleys kampagne for at blive nomineret til det Demokratiske Partis præsidentkandidat i USA, og hvilke signaler, dette udsender om den umiddelbare fare for generel krig.

I dagene umiddelbart forud for valgkampagnebegivenhederne i delstaten Iowa havde Lyndon LaRouche skarpt intervenseret for at fastlægge den politik, der ville være forudsætningen for hans støtte til et O'Malley-præsidentskab med den bagtanke, at denne handling ville tvinge nogle af de førende fjender af Den amerikanske Republik til at spille deres kort ud og hermed afsløre deres intentioner.

Lyndon LaRouches konklusion i kølvandet på den pludselige afbrydelse af O'Malleys valgkampagne, endnu inden slutresultaterne fra Iowa var blevet annonceret, var, at ledende, britiske kredse, der kontrollerer Barack Obamas præsidentskab, desperat optrapper deres forberedelser til krig imod Rusland og Kina. Handlingerne imod O'Malley var i realiteten det afslørende, røde farvestof, der er en indikation af de krigsforberedelser, der allerede er i gang. Den kendsgerning, at der var eskalerende provokationer på vegne af den britiske krone imod den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der faldt sammen med aktionerne imod O'Malley, afgjorde sagen.

Tidspunktet for disse begivenheder var bestemt af den kendsgerning, at hele det transatlantiske finanssystem – Det britiske System – befinder sig i en accelererende sammenbrudsproces, som det indikeres af nedsmeltningen af hele det italienske banksystem, i et tempo, der overstiger Grækenlands, Portugals og Irlands tidligere kollaps.

De britiske imperiekræfter, inklusive deres Obama-præsidentskab, er forpligtet over for en hastig affolkning af planeten gennem krig og andre midler. Sammenfaldet af sammenbrudskrisen, den voldsomt overdrevne reaktion på LaRouches intervention på vegne af et levedygtigt O'Malley-kandidatur og den dramatiske optrapning af de målrettede provokationer imod både Rusland og Kina – som kommer fra London og Det Hvide Hus – er det tydeligste bevis, vi kan få, for, at menneskeheden er i færd med gå ind i en tid med en særdeles alvorlig krise.

Det faktum, at topledere i både Rusland og Kina i høj grad er sig betydningen af denne udvikling bevidst, betyder, at der findes modforholdsregler, der kan tages, hvis de fulde implikationer af de seneste dages begivenheder bliver forstået.

Torsdag aften den 4. februar kl 19,00 afholder Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg et særligt møde, hvor han vil diskutere denne ekstraordinære udvikling. (se andetsteds info om gratis telefonkonference – du kan være med i diskussionen over telefon, eller deltage direkte i mødet på vores kontor).

I USA afholder Lyndon LaRouche (udover et hastemøde, ligeledes torsdag aften) et møde lørdag den 6. februar på Manhattan, New York, med et levende publikum, hvor han diskuterer denne nødsituation med hele USA (via telefonkonference), og hvad der nødvendigvis må gøres.

Det er af den yderste vigtighed, at alle borgere, der er seriøse omkring at forhindre et umiddelbart forestående styrtud i global krig, der meget hurtigt vil eskalere til en atomkrigskonfrontation og således sætter selve menneskehedens overlevelse på spil, deltager i disse møder. Forbered dig på en intens og åbenhjertig diskussion, og på en ekstraordinær mobilisering.

DOKUMENTATION:

Barack Obama truer Rusland, mens USA's realøkonomi smuldrer

3. februar 2016 – Præsident Barack Obama fortsætter med at iscenesætte den ene provokation efter den anden imod Rusland og Kina, hvor forsvarsminister Ashton Carter i denne uge har fremlagt et forsvarsbudget, der kun kan beskrives som en helligelse til Tredje Verdenskrig. Dette budget kræver milliarder af dollars i nye udgifter for at opgradere USA's og NATO's styrker i Europa og det asiatiske Stillehavsområde, alt imens der også skal lanceres en modernisering af USA's termonukleare strategiske triade til 1 billion dollar.

I onsdags bemærkede Lyndon LaRouche, at hele dette svindelnummer er et farligt bluff i betragtning af, at USA befinder sig i de fremskredne stadier af et fysisk-økonomisk sammenbrud. »Der finder en stejl nedgang i de amerikanske borgeres intellektuelle liv sted«, advarede LaRouche. »Vores økonomisk-produktive evne som nation er væk. Det eneste, der er tilbage, er en lille rest for et syns skyld.«

USA's Federal Reserves (Centralbanken) undersøgelse fra januar måned af låneanmodninger fra varefremstillings- og handelssektoren viser en dramatisk nedgang – mere end 11 procent. Banksektoren på begge sider Atlanten er i færd med at bryde sammen. Blandt de store amerikanske og europæiske banker er aktiernes værdi faldet med mere end 30 procent siden 1. januar, 2016. I dag har den tyske erhvervsavis *Handelsblatt* erklæret, at »Deutsche Bank er i frit fald« og tilføjer, at det virkelige centrum for den europæiske finanssektors kollaps ikke er i periferien, men er centreret i Tyskland og Frankrig, Europas industrielle hjerte. En finanspublikation skønner, at Deutsche Bank sidder på et bjerg af gæld, som for 70 % 's

vedkommende er »forninget«.

Men, som Lyndon LaRouche understregede, så skyldes kollapset i finanssektoren kollapset i den produktive realøkonomi. Den fysisk-økonomiske sammenbrudsproces er drivkraften. »Obama er øverste chef for en inkompetent styrke, og det står ikke bedre til med briterne.«

Tilfældet Californien er et eksempel herpå. Ved afslutningen af Anden Verdenskrig var Californien vokset frem som et Arsenal for Demokrati, med skibsbyggeri, produktion af fly og store forskningslaboratorier, inklusive Lawrence Livermore, Jet Propulsion Lab og Cal Tech. Dette er alt sammen blevet udslettet i accelererende tempo i de seneste år under guvernørerne Arnold Schwarzenegger og Jerry Brown.

Vores interesse går således ud på at genopbygge realøkonomien, og det begynder med at erkende og omstøde de fejltagelser, der er blevet begået, uafbrudt, siden Franklin Roosevelts død. Det begynder med vore uddannelses- og erhvervspraktikprogrammer, der er blevet ødelagt. Den produktive evne hos den unge generation af amerikanere er ikkeeksisterende, især i sammenligning med niveauet af produktivitet for blot to generationer siden.

Denne kendsgerning understreger blot galskaben i præsident Obamas provokationer imod Rusland og Kina, der blot vil bevirke en accelerering af det fremstormende kollaps af det amerikanske folks produktive evner.

Barack Obama må fjernes fra embedet, før han, efter britiske ordrer, indleder en atomkrig. Wall Street og City of London, der allerede er håbløst bankerot, må fjernes. Vi må viske tavlen ren, hvilket begynder med en global annullering af hele den akkumulerede spillegæld. Den er værdiløs, så bare annuller det hele! Som den tidligere cheføkonom i Den internationale Betalingsbank, BIS, William White, sagde under det nyligt afholdte Verdensøkonomiske Forum i Davos, Schweiz, så har vi

behov for en samlet gældseftergivelsesfest sådan, som man har gjort det i de seneste 5000 år.

Udslet denne hasardspilsgæld, lancer en kreditpolitik efter Franklin Roosevelts model for at skabe jobs, lancer uddannelses- og praktikprogrammer til den manglende faglærte unge generation, og udnyt den ældre generations kundskaber, mens vi genopbygger – og fjern hele galskaben med at forberede til krig imod Rusland og Kina.

Kompetente vestlige militære strategiske analytikere anerkender, at Rusland har gennemgået en reel, kvalitativ revolution i sine kapaciteter til udkæmpelse af krig og til at forhindre krig. Dette inkluderer nye generationer af militært udstyr og veluddannet personel. NATO's øverste flådekommandør roste for nylig russerne for det teknologiske spring i deres ubådes krigsførelseskapaciteter.

Kun et sindssygt, desperat britisk oligarki – og dets lakajer, såsom Obama – kunne overveje moderne krig imod stormagter som Rusland og Kina, der ikke har nogen planer om at udgøre en strategisk trussel. Den alvorligste trussel mod verdensfreden og overlevelse er processen med det accelererende kollaps i det transatlantiske område. Nedlukningen af NASA og den næsten totale skrotning af automobilsektoren, med dens indbyggede kapaciteter for maskinværktøjsfremstilling, var dødstødet for USA's engang så magtfulde Amerikanske Økonomiske System.

Stop Tredje Verdenskrig:

Amerikansk universitetsprofessor Stephen Cohen:

Barack Obama kan ikke løbe fra sit ansvar for Tredje Verdenskrig!

3. februar 2016 – I går aftes under sin ugentlige optræden på John Batchelor radio-showet anbragte professor ved New Yorks Universitet Stephen Cohen ansvaret for den voksende krigsfare direkte på præsident Obamas skød. Han sagde, at Obama ikke kan løbe fra Pentagons beslutning om at opbygge USA's militære styrker i Østeuropa, som USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carter bebudede i går.

»Dette er hans beslutning«, sagde Cohen. »Vi vidste, at det var en mulighed, da NATO talte om det under topmødet i Wales [i september 2014]; nu er det sket. NATO har besluttet – dvs., Det Hvide Hus – at firdoble sin militære magt omkring Rusland.«

»Det, vi nu står med, er et øjeblik, hvor den nye, kolde krig er blevet meget varmere pga. en beslutning taget i Washington«, sagde Cohen. »Det gør den nye kolde krig mere militariseret og gør den farligere end den foregående kolde krig, fordi vi [dengang] ikke havde vores militærmagt stående ved Ruslands grænser.« Cohen fortsatte med at beskrive, hvordan USA, i begyndelsen af 1990'erne, erklærede, at faren for atomkrig var forbi, når den ikke var det. Rusland var ude af våbenkapløbet, men USA fortsatte, især med sine missilforsvarsprogrammer og med sin tilbagetrækning fra ABM-traktaten i 2002. USA hævdede, at dette skete for at imødegå Iran, men alle vidste, sagde Cohen, at det var rettet imod Rusland. Så Rusland responderede ved at indlede en genopbygning af sine atomkapaciteter, en indsats, der i dag fortsætter med en høj prioritering.

»Beslutningen om at forstærke NATO's grænser gør det nu klart, at Rusland vil forlade sig på sit meget store arsenal af taktiske atomvåben«, sagde Cohen. »Det er indskrevet i deres officielle doktrin, at 'vi forbeholder os retten til at

anvende vore atomvåben, hvis eksistensen af den russiske stat er truet af overvældende konventionelle styrker'. NATO kan i øjeblikket meget vel være i færd med at ophobe overvældende konventionelle styrker på Ruslands grænser.« Denne fare er forhøjet, påpegede Cohen senere i interviewet, af USA's modernisering af B61-12 atombomberne, en bombe, der er designet til at være mere »anvendelig«, et ord, der var blevet bandlyst fra atom-leksikonnet af Ronald Reagan i 1980'erne, men som Obama har bragt tilbage.

»At sige, at dette er farligt, er at underdrive situationen. Det var alt sammen forudsigeligt, og alligevel er Washington gået frem med det. Når Washington først gennemfører firdoblingen af sine styrker, befinder vi os i en langt farligere situation mht. en mulig atomar konfrontation, end vi nogensinde gjorde under den Kolde Krig. Obama kan ikke længere skjule sig for dette. Sorteper ender dér. Han har godkendt dette. Det udgør en enorm optrapning af den Kolde krig med kurs mod en Varm krig.«

Hele det 38 minutter lange interview kan høres her: <https://audioboom.com/boos/4139013-nato-rearms-against-russia->

Kina advarer om USA's trusler

om atomkrig

31. januar 2016 – Det kinesiske Kommunistpartis officielle avis *Global Times* udgav en lederartikel i dag, der advarer om, at USA forbereder krig, *atomkrig*, imod Kina, og krævede, at Kina »sætter tempoet op for opbygning af strategiske angrebsevner, inklusive en atomar gengældelsesevne«.

Under overskriften »Build up defense to thwart US provocation« (Opbyg forsvar til at forpurre USA's provokation) henviser lederartiklen til USA's deployering af et krigsskib inden for 12-milegrænsen af en af dets øer i Xisha (Paracel) øerne den 30. januar og bemærkede, at dette ikke er en ubesat ø, og heller ikke en kunstig ø, som tilfældet er med USA's provokationer i Nansha (Spratly) øerne, men at Zhongjian-øen snarere er »under Kinas aktuelle kontrol, og Kina har offentliggjort den territoriale kystlinje i havet for Xisha-øerne, inklusive Zhongjian-øen. USA's provokation er derfor denne gang mere ondsindet.«

Obamaregeringen brugte i tilfældet, hvor de sejlede ind 12-milegrænsen omkring den kunstige ø, Kina skabte, som påskud, at UNCLOS ikke anerkender territorial suverænitet omkring sådanne øer. Dette er tydeligvis ikke tilfældet med øen Zhongjian og demonstrerer udtrykkeligt løggen i Obamas påstand om, at han ikke er partisk i forhold til selve de territoriale krav. Den kendsgerning, at 90 % af handelen, der passerer gennem Kinas hævdede territorium i det Sydkinesiske Hav (»ni streger linjen«; demarkationslinje), er handel med Kina selv og demonstrerer, at det alene er Kina, der må bekymre sig om »sejladsfriheden« fra USA's provokationer og den igangværende amerikanske militære besættelse af Filippinerne.

Lederen i *Global Times* bemærker også, at »Kinas militære styrke stadig er betydeligt bagud i forhold til USA. Hvis USA er rede til en konfrontation i det Sydkinesiske Hav, kan det hurtigt samle sin militære styrke på trods af den store

afstand ... Kinas militærbudget udgør kun 2 % af landets BNP, meget lavere end USA's 4 %.

De slutter med det ovennævnte krav om en militær opbygning som forberedelse til at respondere til et atomangreb fra USA.

Kan vi forhindre Obamas og Det britiske Imperiums fremstød for atomkrig?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 31. januar 2016 – Lyndon LaRouche kom søndag aften med en skarp advarsel om, at »verden står på randen af generel atomkrig, og det kommer først og fremmest fra Storbritannien og Obama. Obama er, og har altid været, agent for det britiske imperiesystem, og de satser nu på at lancere generel atomkrig. De står nu på den yderste rand for at skubbe det ud over kanten, lige nu, især i Europa.«

LaRouche sagde, at han har fulgt udviklingen på den internationale scene tæt, og det er i løbet af de seneste uger blevet åbenbart, at det døende, britiske imperiesystem gør fremstød for krig, *nu*, udvirket af deres agent Obama som et opgør mellem USA og NATO, imod Rusland og Kina. Vi har nået et sammenbrudspunkt i historien, hvor der omgående må gribes ind med handling for at forhindre dette mareridt i at udspille sig.

»Det er det budskab, der bør præsenteres for alle, der ikke er dumme«, sagde LaRouche. »Og vi bør handle for at standse og forhindre, at en sådan krig lanceres. Med mindre de afskrækkes fra at gennemføre det, som de nu åbenlyst signalerer, at de vil gøre hurtigt, har vi kurs mod atomkrig

og massedød over hele planeten. Pointen er: Kan vi forhindre dette her, der allerede er sat i værk? Kan vi forhindre, at det gennemføres? Det er det eneste spørgsmål af betydning i øjeblikket.»

I dag introducerede LaRouche-bevægelsen (i USA) et betydningsfuldt skift i den strategiske situation med Kesha Rogers, medlem af LaRouche Komite for Politisk Strategi (LPAC) og tidligere to gange demokratisk kandidat til Kongressen for delstaten Texas, der kaldte til politisk kamp med en genoplivning af NASA fra det helvede, som Obamas politik har dømt det til, for at få USA tilbage i rummet og gå ind i et win-win-samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, i særdeleshed om Kinas plan om at landsætte en mission på Månens bagside i 2020.

Se: LPAC-medlem og to gange demokratisk nomineret til Texas-22, Kesha Rogers, uden for Johnson Space Center i Houston, Texas.

Denne kampagne kan også spille en afgørende rolle i at genindføre fornuften i institutionen Det amerikanske Præsidentskab, der i øjeblikket befinder sig i hænderne på en afsindig morder, der synes at mene, at han kan få Rusland og Kina til at bøje sig under trusler om en atomar konfrontation, eller med en decideret atomkrig.

Dette skifte kan ikke vente til november 2016. Obama må fjernes fra magten nu. Dette kan gøres, og en fungerende *præsidentiel institution* genoplives, ved at afsløre det, der nu er et manipuleret demokratisk væddeløb til præsidentvalget. Sänk Hillary Clintons og Bernie Sanders' pro-Obama-kandidaturer, og lancer en levedygtig politisk diskussion omkring Martin O'Malleys kampagne – den eneste kandidat, der offentligt har udtalt sig seriøst om at vende tilbage til Glass-Steagall-standarden for bankopdeling for at stoppe Wall Streets dødbringende politik, og som på anden vis har demonstreret egenskaber, der kvalificerer ham til

præsidentskabet.[1]

På samme tid er det nødvendigt omgående at lukke Wall Street og hele det spekulative, transatlantiske finanssystem ned, eftersom det er dette systems bankerot, der står bag fremstødet for krig. Hele det transatlantiske system var et hårs bredde fra at kollapse i sidste uge med bankkrisen i Italien, og det kunne eksplodere, hvad øjeblik, det skal være – og stort set hvor som helst. Dette system må begraves, så USA kan vende tilbage til den politik for økonomisk vækst, vi havde under Franklin Roosevelt, og som også reflekteredes af Kennedys rumprogram.

»Rumprogrammet er hemmeligheden bag den mekanisme, gennem hvilken vi kan bringe USA, og andre dele af verden, ind i et økonomisk genrejsningsforløb«, udtalte Lyndon LaRouche den 30. jan. Når denne politik først træder i kraft, »vi vil se begyndelsen til en virkelig revolution i rummet. Så lad os komme i gang!«

[1] Se: [Fredags-webcast fra LPAC, 29. jan., dansk oversættelse](#), uddrag, om LaRouche-bevægelsens støtte til O'Malley-kampagnen og Glass-Steagall, o.a.:

Vi bør modernisere vores tankegang, ikke vore våben

28. januar 2016 – I en artikel den 23. jan. fremfører Jonathan Marshall, en uafhængig forsker med hjemsted i Californien, der ofte skriver for *Consortium News*, at »en langt større risiko end noget, Rusland foretager sig« udgøres af »Obamaregeringens såkaldte atomare 'moderniserings'-program, som Pentagon promoverer samtidig med, at USA's politiske beslutningstagere

uophørligt dæmoniserer Rusland som hovedtruslen imod USA og dets allierede«. Ligesom andre har gjort, påpeger han ikke alene de enorme omkostninger forbundet med Obamas nye programmer, men også den fare, der ligger i at skabe våben, der er mere anvendelige.

»Et udbredt, om end tilsløret element i disse 'moderniserings'-programmer, er deres evne til at gøre 'udkæmpning' af atomkrig mere, ikke mindre, tænkelig ved at forbedre disse våbens målsøgningsfleksibilitet og i visse tilfælde ved at reducere deres sprængstofmængde, så de ligner meget store, konventionelle våben snarere end gode, gammeldags alt-eller-intet atombomber«, skriver Marshall med hensyn til B61-12-bomberne og de nye krydsermissiler. Dette skaber risikoen for, fremfører han, ikke en planlagt atomkrig, men for »utilsigtet atomar udveksling udløst af falsk alarm i en atmosfære af gensidig paranoia«, eftersom både USA og Rusland har hundreder af atomvåben under alarmberedskab, »affyring ved varsel«, der kan udløses ved mindste anledning.

Marshall konkluderer, at USA's atomvåbenpolitik bør være fokuseret på at reducere risikoen for en udveksling af atomvåben snarere end at udvikle nye teknologier, der gør atomkrig mere sandsynlig. »Vores største sikkerhedsopgave består i at modernisere vores tankegang omkring atomvåben, ikke vores atomvåbenteknologi«, skriver han.

Foto: B61 12

SPECIAL LaRouchePAC webcast 30. december 2015: Det er ét minut før midnat; vi må gennemtvinge handling nu!

Engelsk Udskrift. Vi står nu på tærsklen til året 2016, og hr. LaRouche advarer om, at dette er en af de farligste perioder i nyere historisk tid. Vi står over for en umiddelbart forestående nedsmeltning af det transatlantiske finanssystem, med mindre der tages skridt til de nødvendige og presserende forholdsregler for at forhindre dette. Vi står også over for en umiddelbart, overhængende konfrontation mellem USA under Obama, og bade Rusland og Kina, der, hvis den får lov til at udløses, ville føre til en global, atomar storbrand.

Engelsk udskrift.

SPECIAL International LaRouche PAC Webcast Wednesday December 30 2015

IT'S ONE MINUTE TO MIDNIGHT; WE MUST FORCE ACTION NOW!

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's December 30, 2015. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're watching an emergency New Year's Eve

broadcast here from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by both Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and this broadcast is immediately following a meeting that

the three of us had earlier this morning with both Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Now, right off the bat, I want to emphasize that immediately

following the conclusion of this broadcast here tonight, there will be a live question and answer session with Mr. Lyndon LaRouche personally, which is taking place as a broadcast of the regular weekly LaRouche PAC Fireside Chat. Many of you may have participated in this before. It's a national telephone discussion, which takes place at 9 o'clock Eastern Time. If you do not yet have the information on that, please contact the LaRouche PAC national office.

Again, let me just emphasize: Immediately upon the conclusion of this broadcast, we encourage you to participate in this live Fireside Chat with Mr. Lyndon LaRouche.

Now, to begin our broadcast tonight, let me just summarize very quickly what you're about to hear. Obviously, we're on the threshold of the end of 2015, and the beginning of 2016, and Mr.

Lyndon LaRouche is warning that this is among one of the most dangerous periods in recently recorded history. We have the impending blow-out of the trans-Atlantic financial system, if the

necessary urgent measures to prevent that are not taken. And we

also have the impending, looming confrontation between the United

States, under Obama, and both Russia and China, which, if it were

allowed to be unleashed, would lead to a global thermonuclear conflagration.

Now 2015, I think, can best be summarized by a series of failures that have been taken by those who should be the responsible leadership of the United States. Number one – the failure to have effectively opposed and defied Obama's unlawful

violations of the United States Constitution, which are indeed impeachable offenses. Number two – the failure, going all the way back to 2007-2008, to restore the Glass-Steagall Act, and to

reorganize and shut down the entire Wall Street casino speculative system. Number three – the failure, going all the way back to 2000-2001, to dismantle and expose the Saudi-British

apparatus that was responsible for the terrorism of September 11,

2001, and continue to exist, and continue to plague the world with the increasing threat of this kind of terror. And number four – perhaps most fundamentally, the failure to fundamentally

reverse the 100-year trend toward scientific and cultural degeneration, which has reigned increasingly since the turn of the 20th Century. This has brought the entire trans-Atlantic, extended European system to the point of an existential breakdown

crisis, and this will not be addressed unless we address the fundamentally failed model which has reigned over the last 100 to

120 years.

Now, this will be the subject of a much broader discussion later in the broadcast, but I think it sets us up directly for our first question, which was the subject of a lot of discussion

earlier today with Mr. LaRouche.

The question is our institutional question for the evening, which addressed exactly this coming, looming failure of the extended European system. The question reads as follows:

“Mr. LaRouche. Columnist Leo McKinstrie in an article featured by the

{Daily Telegraph} predicted that 2016 could be the year that the

EU falls apart. What are your thoughts on the EU’s immigration

and economic challenges in 2016?"

So, in order to answer that question directly, and also to give us a broader context from the discussion earlier today with

Mr. LaRouche, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to come to the podium.

JEFF STEINBERG:

Thanks, Matt. I would say that, barring a dramatic change in policy, really a revolutionary change in policy, the future of the European Union is absolutely doomed, and that what we're looking at is the fact, as of January 1, under the dictates of the European Union, under agreements that were reached at the very outset of the Obama Administration during the very first meeting of the Group of 20, a system of bail-in has been established. It goes into effect in Europe, European-wide, as of the 1st of January of 2016. In the United States it has already been policy, although the overwhelming majority of Americans have no idea of this. In fact, most members of Congress don't even know that Section 2 of the Dodd-Frank bill of 2010, which was written on Wall Street, and dictated through the likes of the Obama White House and people like Barney Frank on Capitol Hill, already provides for bail-in. What this means is that, as financial institutions go through a spiralling collapse, which is already underway – you've had quite a number of hedge funds, a number of European regional banks in Italy and elsewhere, have already collapsed in recent weeks and months. Under bail-in, depositors' funds, bondholders' money, shareholders' funds in those banks will be looted as the first step towards trying to salvage a system that

is already hopefully and irreversibly bankrupt. In other words,

the entire trans-Atlantic region is on the very edge of extinction. The danger of a complete catastrophic financial collapse is imminent, as of the beginning of next week. Friday obviously, New Year's Day, the banks are closed; the weekend they're closed. But as of January 4, Monday, this coming Monday,

anything goes; and there is an increasing likelihood that the whole trans-Atlantic system will blow up in the early days, if not the early weeks of 2016.

Now, those are knowable and virtually irrefutable facts.

It's been widely discussed in the trans-Atlantic financial press.

The {Daily Telegraph} article referenced in the institutional question is but one of the recent flurry of articles that have basically said, 2015 was a nightmare, but 2016 will be radically

worse, and could be the end of the system, the European Union, and most trans-Atlantic nation-states as we know them.

There's a report today in the international edition of {Handelsblatt}, the major German financial daily newspaper, which

talks about a proliferation of zombie banks in Europe, and says,

get on with the bail-in immediately. The whole system is coming

apart. Yes, it's Mediterranean regional banks, but it's German banks as well, and therefore we've got to take advantage of these

new laws, and literally loot the population to the point that there's nothing left to loot. That's the significance of policies

that go into effect as of the first of January.

Now, the discussion that we had with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche today took this question up from a very different standpoint.

Because the appropriate question that really must be asked

right

now, well, if these facts are known, if the doom of the trans-Atlantic financial system is widely known and understood,

then why is it that nothing is being done to stop it from happening? Why is it that Congress did not stay in Washington to

enact Glass-Steagall, before they left for the Christmas recess?

That would have meant the doom of Wall Street. It would have bankrupted the entire British system, and set forward at least an

initial framework for beginning an economic recovery, modelled on

the policies of Franklin Roosevelt.

Why in the case of Europe, is there toleration for the continuing existence of a Eurozone which was bankrupt conceptually from the day it was created? Why is there a continuing toleration for a European Commission in Brussels, and

a European Union, that is a purely destructive, virtually a Satanic institution? What is there toleration and a tip-toeing around the fact that the Pope, in his encyclical on global warming, embraced a British policy of population genocide?

Well, the simple answer comes down to the fact that the population of the trans-Atlantic region has become generally very, very stupid, very corrupt, very immoral, bordering on Satanic. In fact, some leading political figures in the trans-Atlantic – Schäuble in Germany, Blair in Britain and the whole Blair tradition, the entire Bush-Obama succession of presidential administrations over the last 15 years in the United

States – these could all very appropriately and scientifically be defined as outright Satanic.

This was the point that Mr. LaRouche was making emphatically.

But to understand why we have reached this point, you can't

just look at explanations that date back a week, or a month, or even a decade. You can't look at 2008, or the end of Glass-Steagall in 1999, and appreciate why these things happened, unless you're willing to take a much longer-term and deeper look at the actual roots of this entire degeneration of the trans-Atlantic region. It goes back to the transition from the 19th to the 20th Century. Look at the 19th Century. You had enormous scientific breakthroughs. You had the work of Gauss, you had the work of Riemann. You had the revolution in Classical culture through the likes of Beethoven, of Brahms, of Schubert, of Schumann. The 19th Century was a period of a Renaissance in the trans-Atlantic region. In the domain of politics, you had the emergence of Germany as a modern and sovereign nation-state under American System economic policies during the period of Bismarck. There was a spreading, a proliferation, of the Hamiltonian concepts of how to build a nation-state, and how to create truly cooperative relationships among modern nations. Today, most everyone alive is familiar with the fact that China has initiated a "One Belt, One Road" policy, otherwise known as the New Silk Road, as the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and that this policy offers a tremendous opportunity for the integration and economic development of not just the Eurasian region, but the Eurasian region stretching into Africa. Through the prospect of the Bering Straits tunnel program, which has been on the books since the end of the 19th [Century], you could integrate the

entire Western Hemisphere into this Eurasian-African development region.

Well, the fact of the matter is that these ideas were not only prevalent, but were being fully implemented in the last decades of the 19th Century. You had in 1869 the completion of Lincoln's great project to bind the nation together under the Transcontinental Railroad. Although Lincoln was assassinated by

the British, precisely for those policies of saving the Union and

going on for this kind of economic development, those policies nevertheless continued, and were realized.

President Ulysses S. Grant was the continuation in many respects of the policies represented by President Lincoln. You had leading American friends and advisers working closely with Bismarck in Germany. Bismarck, in his office as Chancellor, had a

portrait of Ulysses S. Grant on the wall. They visited together

when Grant made his world tour following his Presidency. In Russia, beginning in 1890, you had the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Many of the American Army Corps of Engineers participated in that project, which was completed by the end of the 1890s. The original locomotive that was the first

to pass along the Trans-Siberian Railroad was built in Philadelphia.

You had a flourishing of international collaboration for great projects of development. Bismarck himself had the Berlin to

Baghdad rail project. In France, under Hanotaux and Carnot, you

had plans for a crisscrossing of the African continent with railroads. You had the Paris to Vladivostok planned rail routes.

Czar Nicholas himself proposed in the 1890s that there should

be

a bridge or tunnel across the Bering Straits, to establish the obvious and natural links between the Western Hemisphere, and the

Eurasia. You had Sun Yat-sen in China, during the transition into

the 20th Century, and in the 1870s you had the Meiji Restoration

in Japan. Again, leading American advisers were involved in all

of these projects.

What was the response? There was a proliferation of Classical culture, of great Classical musical composition. There

were scientific breakthroughs. The work of Riemann anticipated a

20th Century that should have been an era of man beginning to venture out into the Solar System, and on into the Galaxy, to make great discoveries about the nature of mankind in the universe. Instead, the British Empire stepped in decisively.

You had the British manipulation of regional wars throughout Eurasia. You had the Japanese wars against China, the Japanese wars against Russia. You had wars in the Balkans. You had the Crimean War, and ultimately the British strategy was to destroy

the American System expansion into Eurasia, by launching what came to be known as World War I.

On a much more profound level, individuals like Lord Bertrand Russell launched a vicious assault against the foundations of science that had been established through people

like Kepler, like Gauss, like Riemann. Earlier, [people] like Leibniz, and before that, Nicholas of Cusa, and back in the Renaissance, Brunelleschi. This entire sweep of scientific progress coming out the Renaissance was crushed and destroyed, and a tyranny was established. Europe went through one of the most hellacious wars in history in World War I. Atrocious

crimes

were committed. Cities were destroyed. Populations were ruined.

At the end of that war, the Versailles Treaty imposed a looting scheme on Germany that led inevitably to another world war; in effect, the First World War never really ended. There was

an interwar period of preparation for the next phase of that war.

Science was destroyed. Education came under vicious attack because the Classical culture tradition that had been alive in the 19th Century, was destroyed in the sweep of cultural pessimism that hit Europe and the United States throughout the 20th Century.

The British resorted frequently to political assassinations of leading figures. You had the assassination of Sadi Carnot in

France; you had the assassination of William McKinley in the United States, following off of the assassination earlier of Abraham Lincoln and, in fact, going all the way back to Aaron Burr's assassination, for the British, of Alexander Hamilton.

You had the assault on science as I indicated, through the work of Bertrand Russell and his cohorts in the Solvay Conferences, to where you could say that the entire sweep of the

20th Century – now well into the 21st Century – the only truly sovereign scientific genius of that entire period was Albert Einstein. There were engineering discoveries, but the general course of science was a digression, not an advancement. So, we

find ourselves today with a population in the trans-Atlantic region that has been deprived of a competent education; with each

successive generation the degeneration has accelerated. At one

point, it was something important to be a physicist or a bio-chemist; now, if you study these areas, you're told that

it's

a waste of time and that the only true science is computer science.

So, we've got this process of cultural, educational, scientific degeneration; and about the only point during the entire 20th Century when you had any kind of significant pushback

against the trend line, was during the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt. And if the truth be told, the assault against the policies of Franklin Roosevelt had already reached the point where his Presidency had been destroyed even before his untimely

death. The Republican Party was used as one of the instruments

of that destruction; the FBI emerged as the literally blackmail

arm of Wall Street, deployed against Franklin Roosevelt. So, you

had effectively only a brief period in the entire sweep of the 20th Century, where there were genuinely American System policies

being carried out here in the United States; the place of origin

of those concepts. Now you look at the last 15 years, it makes

sense how it is that a degenerate population could vote in a George W. Bush; could then follow that up by voting in a Barack

Obama. And then tolerate the bail-out of Wall Street after the

2008 crash; could tolerate President Obama openly holding kill meetings at the White House every Tuesday, to map out the latest

targets for assassination. There is no accounting for how many

American citizens have been assassinated under Obama orders without any due process, or without any even public

acknowledgment.

So, it's very important today to realize that the current generations are the fruits of 100 years or more of persistent, cultural moral degeneration in which science has been destroyed.

Now, this is not irreversible, because human beings are fundamentally creative; but it's very important to recognize that

we are at a minute before midnight. And the reality is, that we

have very few opportunities left to buy the time to turn this situation around. If President Obama remains in office as this

financial blow-out hits, then the prospects of being able to avert a catastrophic destruction and a degeneration into chaos across the entire trans-Atlantic region converge on zero. And that's if we are lucky enough, through the strong leadership in

China and Russia, to avoid the kind of thermonuclear war that Matt mentioned a few moments ago; because that is the policy of

the British Empire. And President Obama is really not a President of the United States; he's a stooge of that British Empire system.

Now, that system is, itself, bankrupt and doomed; but they are more prepared to bring the entire population of mankind down

with them, if there's a prospect of them genuinely losing power.

So, there are a few options: The removal of President Obama is

absolutely existentially essential. The immediate reinstatement

of Glass-Steagall as the concrete measure that wipes out Wall Street's existence; and along with it, wipes out the power of the

City of London and the power of the British Empire. These are

the measures that have to be taken in the immediate days ahead.

As soon as the new year commences, we are already well into the danger zone, where there is no alternative left to those critical

actions. The question is whether or not there will be enough of

a return of reality to where the successive degeneration of thinking among leading strata and the general population of the

trans-Atlantic region, reaches a point where the threat is so immediate and existential that the right steps will be taken.

Up

until this moment, that has not happened; and therefore, we go into the new year facing the greatest peril that mankind has faced probably in history.

OGDEN: Very quickly, I just want to address one thing, and ask Jeff to comment on it briefly before we get to Ben Deniston.

But the bail-in law that is going into effect in Europe on January 1st – just within a few hours – is something that as Jeff said, is already written into the law in the United States;

in Dodd-Frank, Title II, where derivatives get priority and people's deposits are no longer protected as they formerly were.

Now the architect of this law is none other than Barney Frank; who, despite the fact that he is no longer an active member of Congress, is still playing a very active and destructive role within the politics of the United States as an agent of the Wall

Street faction inside the Democrat Party. And as one of the leading proponents of the lies that are being told against Glass-Steagall; for example, in an article which exposes the fact

that Barney Frank is one of the leading economic advisors of the Hillary Clinton campaign. Hillary Clinton being up to this point, an opponent of the restoration of Glass-Steagall. Barney Frank says, "The Glass-Steagall debate is an artificial debate at this point. It's 85 years old. Most people can see if it had an effect, it wouldn't have stopped AIG; it wouldn't have stopped sub-prime mortgages that shouldn't have been granted. This is the lie that has been used for the last five years or more against the restoration of Glass-Steagall; and I think that I would Jeff to address this just very quickly. When Franklin Roosevelt became President, he became President despite the fact that most of the leadership of his own party were agents of the Wall Street interests; and he had to, in order to both secure the nomination and also in order to win the election as the United States President, had to identify and root out exactly who were serving the interests of Wall Street in the leadership of his own party.

If we're going to save the United States, Obama has to be identified as an agent of those Wall Street interests; Barney Frank as well, and others. And I would just like Jeff to comment very quickly what Mr. LaRouche's remarks were concerning how we can restore the Franklin Roosevelt precedent on an emergency basis right now, in opposition to these agents of the Wall Street interests who are dominating the Democratic Party as we see it right now, as well as the Republican Party.

STEINBERG: Well, I think that you've got to take the case of Barney Frank as a perfect example of what I was discussing just a few moments ago. Long before the Glass-Steagall which Barney Frank personally played a leading role in, and long before the 2008 crisis, Barney Frank got in a whole lot of trouble because his roommate, his lover was running a pedophile prostitution ring out of his apartment. And this was not something that was a deep dark secret; it came out in all of the major Washington DC and related newspapers at the time. The fact that there was a toleration for this kind of person, this kind of behavior, is indicative of the deeper cultural issues that I addressed earlier. In effect, Barney Frank was the Roy Cohn of the Democratic Party.

So, I think that the measures themselves are clear and straightforward; there are bills in both houses of Congress to re-instate Glass-Steagall. The very first act of business when Congress returns next week should be a debate and vote and immediate passage of Glass-Steagall. Time is running out; it may even be that as of Monday of next week, we see the first explosions, the detonations of this crash. Glass-Steagall merely clears the decks; it means that undercapitalized commercial banks can be restored, and all of the zombie debt of Wall Street, all of the derivatives, all of the other kinds of exotic financial instruments that are un-payable and worthless, are going to be written off the books. And as a result of that, Wall Street will disintegrate; the power of Wall Street to dictate terms to

Congress will disintegrate. And I think along with the disintegration of Wall Street, you will see an immediate meltdown

of the Obama Presidency.

But once you've re-instated Glass-Steagall, all you've done is created a clean platform to begin a much more significant and

challenging process. There has to be a massive emission of new

Federal credits into the commercial banking system, for earmarked projects of real economic development, job creation.

We've got to have a clear concept of reversing the last 100 years

of decline in productivity of labor power here in the United States, in Europe. So, we've got to develop, on the model of Franklin Roosevelt, a series of initiatives that will create jobs, that will rebuild infrastructure; but on a higher level.

We've got to do several other things as well. Number one, we've got to really launch a serious revival of science; we've got to basically revive all of the NASA programs. We've got to

conquer the final remaining steps towards having thermonuclear fusion power. These are big projects, and they're more challenging today than they were 20 or 30 years ago. When President Kennedy announced that we were going to put a man on the Moon before the end of the decade, and launched the Apollo project, there was a scientific capability still in place to have

done that. That capability has been severely, severely eroded;

so we're going to have to do an enormous amount of rebuilding. In a sense, the productive powers of labor today are less than they were on the day Franklin Roosevelt took office as President

in March of 1933.

We've got to launch a cultural revival. We had a foretaste

of what can and must be done in the Handel's {Messiah} concerts

that took place in Manhattan and Brooklyn one week ago. They were a shining example of how you can begin to draw out the humanity in people, using Classical music as a medium to do that.

So, all of these things have to be done; but they will not happen

if the American people don't immediately develop the moral courage to face reality. To face the fact that it's a minute before midnight; and take the necessary steps, starting with removing this President from office, re-instating Glass-Steagall, and going on from there.

OGDEN: Now, let me just announce that, as many of the viewers of this webcast may already know, the LaRouche Political

Action Committee has released a new very important Special Report, which is entitled "The United States Joins the New Silk

Road; a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance". This is

a supplement to the much longer report that was published by {Executive Intelligence Review} a number of months ago, called "The New Silk Road Becomes the Eurasian Land-Bridge". And this

specifically addresses the role the United States must play in this development perspective for the entire globe. The electronic version of this is available on the LaRouche PAC website; however, we do intend to print a large number of physical copies of this to get out across the United States, particularly in Manhattan and elsewhere.

Now, I'm going to ask Benjamin Deniston to address some of the crucial factors that are contained within this report, which

apply directly to what's been discussed here tonight. But let

me

just put it into the context of the fact that if you look at over

just the last few days, there has been a concerted propaganda effort in some of the leading United States media, in order to slander China, and especially China's President Xi Jinping; who

as you all probably know has made the Silk Road policy, the One

Belt-One Road policy as he calls it, the cornerstone policy of the Chinese economic development perspective. Now, the Chinese

Foreign Minister responded to these slanders that have been appearing in the {New York Times} yesterday, and today in the {Washington Post}; saying the One Belt-One Road policy, the Silk

Road policy, which was put forward two years ago, has now attracted the interest of more than 60 countries and other organizations along the One Belt-One Road corridor, who have responded positively to participate in its initiative. And he stated, "Many countries have signed cooperation agreements or reach consensus on aligning their strategies for development with

China. These include multi-lateral and bilateral cooperation projects. Emphatically, the One Belt-One Road initiative is not

a tool for geopolitics," the Foreign Ministry said. "China has

not political motives to seek in so-called 'spheres of influence'. The principle is that of jointly building the initiative in order to meet the interests of all, and to deepen

cooperation in various fields of development along the One Belt-One Road corridor in order to achieve win-win results."

Now, it's exactly this principle of the "win-win" policy which serves as the principle behind the composition of this Special Report; why the United States must join the New Silk

Road. And if you just look over the last 8-16 years of the United States, the period defined by the Obama Presidency, and then preceding that, the Bush/Cheney Presidency, and compare it to a similar period in China, you can see exactly what the effect of these two opposite policies have been. During Obama's Presidency, you've had a substantial increase in poverty in the United States; where prior to Obama's Presidency, 37 million Americans were officially living in poverty. Now, that's risen to 47 million Americans. Prior to Obama's Presidency, those receiving food stamps were 28 million; now that has risen to 47 million. And currently, one in every five children in the United States, lives below the Federal poverty line. And if you look at blacks, African-Americans, that's two out of every five children live below the Federal poverty line. Compare that to what China's done over the last decade, over the last several decades. Over the last 30 years, China has lifted 600 million people out of poverty; they have built 11,000 miles of high-speed rail in scarcely a decade, and they have plans on the books to triple that number of miles by the year 2020. In comparison, the United States has a grand total of just over 450 miles of so-called high speed rail, and it barely fits the definition. Now, as people might recall, during the APEC summit of 2014, contrary to this being a geopolitical strategy on the part of Xi Jinping for some sort of revival of Chinese imperialism – as

is

being claimed by the {New York Times} and the {Washington Post}

– Xi Jinping actually offered to President Obama that the United

States could join this New Silk Road policy in addition to the new Asian Infrastructure Development Bank policy. This was an offer to say you can participate in this win-win policy. Now, of

course, Obama has not reciprocated that offer, but we can see the

foundations for a completely new vision of international economic

and strategic relationships among nations; based on this win-win

policy. So, that is the substance of this new report from LaRouche PAC, “The United States Joins the New Silk Road”; and that’s what I want to ask Ben Deniston to elaborate on in a little bit more depth in the conclusion of tonight’s broadcast.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Matthew. I think just picking up off of what Matthew said, I think that’s the most – obviously, if you believe the media today in the United States,

I’ve got some unfortunate news for you. This is ridiculous propaganda that’s been coming out, attacking China, attacking Russia. So, if you still believe that stuff, you’ve got to start

reading our website much more in depth and thoroughly.

This is ridiculous; this is an offer to the United States to join in a new orientation for the planet. And I think this report we put out is – not only should you read this, you should

be circulating this to your friends, to your neighbors. This is

a life or death issue for the United States right now; this is

an
opportunity for us to actually save our nation by moving into
a
new future of cooperation and development. So, we have put
out
now what's on the site, and what we're asking you to
contribute
to support the printing of, is a life or death roadmap for the
United States to join into this new orientation led by China,
Russia and other nations.
I just want to take a couple of minutes just to emphasize
the importance of this offer. Because as Matt said, this is
explicitly not a geopolitical move by China; this is not an
attempt to defeat the United States. This is not an attempt
by
China, or China in cooperation with Russia, to control
resources
to the detriment of the United States; or to control regions
of
the planet to the detriment of the United States. This, as
was
stated repeatedly, explicitly by China, is based on a
conception
of win-win cooperation. And understanding that the
development
of fundamental science for mankind in cooperation with
different
nations, creates a net increase in the amount of wealth and
resources available to everybody. And we're at the point in
mankind's development that if we don't rise to a level of
international relations and global cooperation premised on
that
understanding, we're not going to be able to exist as a
species
on this planet. If we continue this mode of geopolitical
conflict, we'll destroy ourselves; as Obama is threatening to
do

right now.

But as Mr. LaRouche was discussing on Monday earlier this week, there is a true higher form of natural law that we have to come to now organize ourselves around; to rise to. And that is, mankind's fundamental nature is to progress, is to develop; this idea of win-win cooperation. I think you see maybe the most stark difference between China's orientation, the New Silk Road orientation, premised on this idea of win-win cooperation and development; and you compare that to what the Pope is now supporting with this Green policy, with this British Malthusian, global population reduction program. Premised somehow on this insane idea that the climate never changes unless mankind eats a hamburger or drives his car around the corner or something ridiculous like that. You have this typification of the genocidal, zero-growth imperial policy, with this Green movement, with this climate change fraud. And with the Pope now supporting this entire fraud; on the one side typifying the evil of this anti-human anti-mankind view, which needs to be eliminated, versus this other direction that's now available for us. But the fundamental premise of the whole thing is that mankind has to progress, that creative progress is not just nice; it's not just good, it is absolutely necessary for mankind to exist. If we ever stop progressing, society degenerates like we've been discussing here; like the 20th Century typifies, already shows us. If you stop progressing, society destroys itself. But progress not in mathematical forms, not in logical forms, but the type of unique, human, creative scientific

progress typified by Kepler, typified by Einstein. That that's what's been attacked by Russell; attacked by this British imperial system, attacked throughout the 20th Century. It's this understanding of human creativity as a unique principle in the universe that is the only substance; the cause of what enables mankind to act differently than animals, to fundamentally increase his relationship to the universe. As we've discussed, to in effect, begin to separate himself from being just an Earth-based species; and being able to exist in the universe by mediating his existence through his relationship with the Solar System as a whole. That's a creative act that doesn't come from the fraudulent type of science that Bertrand Russell had attempted to impose on the world; that comes from a unique form of human creative generation, unique acts of the human mind that do not come from sense perception, do not come from your empirical study of the world. But come from human creativity per se; the process of human creative development, which again, has been attacked throughout the 20th Century. So that I think is the challenge we have; is not just to reverse the degeneration that's occurred. But we need a new fundamental law of human creative progress to rise as the guide stone for where mankind must go. Mr. LaRouche has been explicit on this; we're not just talking about reversing some policy. Mankind's survival today depends upon a new Renaissance. A new creation of a higher understanding of mankind's nature and unique purpose and mission

in this universe as a creative force going into the Solar System.

Going beyond the Solar System into the Galaxy; and understanding

that it is something unique about the human mind and its creative

potential that gives mankind the ability to do that. So, this is

not just about reversing some bad policy; this is about developing a positive conception, a new discovery of what it is

that enables mankind to progress. What it is that enables mankind to fulfill his true nature; what it is that makes mankind

a unique force on this planet. A potential that no animal species exhibits. If we don't understand that, if we don't premise the future on a new pursuit of those capabilities, mankind is not going to make it. Because that is what defines our existence; that is what defines the future. And if we don't

rise to that level, as Mr. LaRouche has been warning, we're not

going to make it through the current crisis.

So, I think that's the challenge we have before us. And I would refer back to Mr. LaRouche's remarks on Monday, in his discussion with the Policy Committee on the LaRouche PAC website.

We have to come forward with this higher conception of the true

natural law that mankind must rise to; and I think we have to come to it today.

OGDEN: I would like to thank both Jeff Steinberg and Ben Deniston very much for joining me here tonight. Again, the full

contents of this "US Must Join the New Silk Road" report is available on the LaRouche PAC website; but we would ask you to

donate and make sure that this can be spread as widely as possible. This is a crucial document for the future of the United States.

Now, as I announced at the very beginning of this broadcast, immediately following the conclusion of our broadcast tonight, there will be a live question and answer session with Mr. Lyndon

LaRouche on the normal channels of the Fireside Chat. This is a

telephone discussion; if you've not been a participant in these

before, please contact the LaRouche PAC office, and you can get

the information to become a participant. And please ask Mr. Lyndon LaRouche a question; these are crucial opportunities for

the American people to engage in a live question and answer dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche. So we would ask you to go immediately from viewing this broadcast to participating in this

emergency Fireside Chat, which is taking place tonight, December

30, as part of our emergency initiatives on the threshold of the

new year. So thank you, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**USA: Tidl. forsvarsminister
William Perry:**

Stands dette forbandede atomvåbenkapløb!

29. december 2015 – Den tidligere amerikanske forsvarsminister (feb. 1994 – jan. 1997 under præsident Bill Clinton) William Perrys advarsler mod faren for atomkrig omtales på *Sputnik* i anledning af udgivelsen af hans nye memoirer, »My Journey at the Nuclear Brink« ('Min rejse på randen af atomkrig'). Perry, der spillede en hovedrolle i moderniseringen af USA's atomvåbenarsenal under den Kolde Krig, rapporterer, at, under Cubakrisen blev han i hemmelighed kaldt til Washington for at analysere efterretninger om Sovjetunionens våben på Cuba.

»Hver dag på vej til analysecentret troede jeg, det ville blive min sidste dag på Jorden«, skriver han i sin bog. Han siger, at han dengang mente, og stadig mener, at verden undgik et atomholocaust lige så meget pga. held som pga. god regering.

Perry var også embedsmand i Forsvarsministeriet i 1979, på tidspunktet for »telefonopkaldet kl. 3 om morgenen«, en falsk varsling om et sovjetisk missilangreb mod USA. Han sagde, at dette var en af mange oplevelser i løbet af den Kolde Krig og i tiden efter, som gav ham et »enestående og isnende udsigtspunkt, ud fra hvilket han kunne konkludere, at atomvåben ikke længere giver os sikkerhed; de sætter nu vores sikkerhed på spil«. Perry er tilhænger af afskaffelsen af de tilbageværende amerikanske interkontinentale ballistiske missiler i den amerikanske bombefly-styrke.

Perry undersøger Ruslands modernisering af sine atomstyrker, og ligeledes USA's planer om at bruge milliarder på at gøre det samme, og ser her et irrationelt atomvåbenkapløb. »Jeg ser, at det er bydende nødvendigt, at vi standser dette forbandede kapløb, før det atter kommer i gang, ikke kun pga. omkostningerne forbundet med det, men pga. den fare, det

sætter os alle sammen i«, sagde han.

Foto: Præsident Bill Clinton (t.v.) og forsvarsminister William J. Perry (t.h.) eskorteres af oberst David H. Hunton under en militær inspektion i 1997.

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. december 2015: Genrejs princippet om fremskridt – Bryd med Obama og sikr det nye år

I takt med, at vi nærmer os dommedag den 1. januar, står menneskeheden over for muligheden for sin egen udslettelse, hvis ikke gennem atomkrig, fremkaldt af præsident Obamas galskab, med hans trusler om krig med Rusland og Kina, så gennem økonomisk disintegration forårsaget af fejheden i Kongressen, der ikke lukker Wall Street ned gennem en Glass/Steagall-lovgivning, efter Franklin Roosevelts model.

Roden til problemet, insisterede Lyndon LaRouche under en diskussion med sine medarbejdere den 28. dec., skal findes i den kendsgerning, at menneskeheden har glemt naturlig lov – ja, i realiteten regeres de transatlantiske nationer i stigende grad af satanisk lov, der skaber såkaldt legal retfærdiggørelse af masse mord, ulovlige krige, negativ

økonomisk vækst og af tyveri af penge, sundhedssystemer og endda mad fra befolkningen, for i stedet at opretholde de bankerotte New York- og London-banker.

»Der er tale om et spørgsmål af en højere orden her, et spørgsmål, som jeg lejlighedsvis har rejst, men som ikke ofte rejses«, sagde LaRouche. »Problemet er, at mennesket rent faktisk ikke skaber loven! Det vil sige, at menneskeheden rent faktisk ikke, gennem sin egen myndighed som sådan, gennem individuelle medlemmer af samfundet, skaber loven. For loven er princippet om menneskeslægtens fremskridt, og hvis menneskeslægten ikke gør fremskridt i sin udvikling og opfyldelse, så er loven blevet krænket! Og det er der, problemet ligger.

Se på de forfærdelige ting, der er sket under diverse renæssancer, der er blevet knust; se på disse masse mord. Vi taler nu om et masse mordsproblem. Vi taler om den amerikanske regerings politik netop nu, i det mindste under den aktuelle præsident og den forudgående præsident: Masse mord!

Pointen er, at mennesket adlyder en højere lov, for mennesket er ikke en Jordbo! Mennesket er baseret på et princip, som ikke er Jordboernes princip. Det er menneskehedens forpligtelse at udvikle fremtidige befolkninger, der er mere passende. Antagelsen er den, at hver generation bør gå progressivt fremad i overensstemmelse med naturlig lov, og denne naturlige lov vil sige forbedringen, selv-forbedringen, af den menneskelige art. Kun mennesket har evnen til at gøre dette ... Det er loven, den virkelige lov. Tekniske love, juridiske love, love for transportveje på privat jord, det er ikke loven. Loven er, at menneskeheden ifølge sin natur må gøre fremskridt. Folk dør, det ved vi. Hvad er loven? Ja, sørgede de for at frembringe bedre mennesker i deres familie? Var deres familier i stand til at gøre fremskridt og hæve sig op til et højere præstationsniveau for menneskeheden? Er vi f.eks.

*ikke ansvarlige for at tage os af (take care of) Galaksen?
Det er vores ansvar!«*

Stedt over for den største trussel mod civilisationen i moderne historie, må vore borgere og alle verdens borgere stræbe efter denne højere standard, ikke alene for vores egen skyld, men for menneskehedens fremtidige eksistens. De, der følger en lavere lov, den sataniske lov, må omgående fjernes fra lederskabspositioner, med præsident Obama som den første, der skal fjernes.

RADIO SCHILLER den 28. december 2015: Faseskifte til finanskrak i begyndelsen af januar

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Ekstraordinær hastekonference 'Fireside Chat', 23. december

2015 – Lyndon Larouche diskuterer med aktivister i hele USA

God aften. Vi har i aften en ekstraordinær konference over telefon, som vi har indkaldt til, konfronteret med den kendsgerning, at vi står på randen af et finanskollaps, den 1. eller 2. januar.

Spørgsmål 1: Hej, jeg er J. fra Columbia, Maryland. Mit spørgsmål lyder: Med alt, hvad der er sket, med krigen mod terror og de nylige angreb i Paris og nedskydningen af det russiske kampfly, hvordan er finanssammenbruddet forbundet med alt dette? Og hvad gør vi ved immigrationen af mennesker fra Syrien?

LaRouche: Det sidste spørgsmål ville jeg ikke bekymre mig om. Det er ikke et virkelig alvorligt problem. Det har eftervirkninger, men de er ikke alvorlige, og bør ikke tage vores opmærksomhed.

Det, vi må gøre, er, at vi må erkende, selvfølgelig, det transatlantiske samfund, og dets rolle med hensyn til os. Vi må grundlæggende set koncentrere os om USA som sådan, og USA er vores eget problem. For vi har kræfter i USA, der er enten feje, især blandt medlemmerne af Kongressen, der har vist deres fejhed, deres rådne fejhed i dette spørgsmål, eller de forsøger at etablere noget, der vil ødelægge retten til livet, for USA's borgere. Hvis denne handling bliver tilladt, så vil der blive en masse døde mennesker i USA, og USA vil ikke have nogen fremtid.

Vi må derfor indtage dette standpunkt. Der er visse principper, der må indføres. Hvis vi ikke indfører disse principper i praksis, så er I udslettet; I betyder ikke længere noget.

Så pointen er, at I kæmper for jeres egen identitet, og det er jeres forpligtelse at forsøge at understøtte jeres egen identitet, gennem intelligent respons til de problemer, der umiddelbart konfronterer os, lige nu.

Engelsk udskrift.

Tune in this week for a very important live Q&A discussion with Lyndon LaRouche. Mr. LaRouche has forecast the nation is on the verge of a financial collapse come January 1 or 2. **Note:** This week's call will be on Wednesday the 23rd, not Thursday.

Transcript

JOHN ASCHER: Good evening everyone, this is John Ascher here in Virginia, and we are here for an extraordinary conference call this evening, called by LaRouche PAC, in the face of the looming financial collapse of the trans-Atlantic system. I'd like to welcome everyone back this evening for our discussion with Lyndon LaRouche, who I hope I have on the line.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: You do. Can you hear me?

ASCHER: I can hear you loud and clear, Lyn. I think many people who were on the call just watched the webcast which concluded , just a half-hour ago. Would you like me to read a little part of the emergency message that you authorized written by Jeff Steinberg, that was put up on our website? ("Make Sure That There Is a New Year: Dump Obama and Wall Street!")

LAROUCHE: I think we have it already from Jeff, which was already broadcast. So, let's get into this thing and if it becomes meritorious to bring more consideration on that, then you and I can do that.

ASCHER: OK, excellent. So, I'm turning on the Q&A queue.

Q1: Hi, my name is A-J- from Columbia, Maryland, and I have a question: With everything that's been going on with the war on terror, and the recent attacks in Paris and the downing of the Russian jet, how does the financial collapse tie into all of this? And what should we do about the immigration of people coming from Syria?

LAROUCHE: I wouldn't worry about that, the latter problem. That is not really a serious one. It has effects, but it's not one that's a serious one and one that should occupy our attention.

What we have to do, is we have to recognize, of course, the trans-Atlantic community, and its role in dealing with us. We have to concentrate essentially on the United States as such, and the United States is our one worry. Because we've got forces in the United States who are either cowardly, especially among the members of Congress who have shown their cowardice, their stinking cowardice in this matter, or trying to set something up, which will destroy the rights of life, of the citizens of the United States. If that action is permitted, then the United States will have a lot of dead people inside it, and there will be no future of the United States.

So therefore we have to take that view. There are certain principles which must be applied. If we don't apply those principles in practice, then you are wiped out; you don't mean anything any more.

So the point is, you're fighting for your own identity, and your obligation is to try to support your own identity, by intelligent responses, to the problems which are facing us immediately, right now.

Q2: [internet] Lyn, I have a question from M- from Dearborn, Michigan. He says, "Lyn, since the battle lines are being more and more openly, publicly declared with Russia, China,

India, Iran on one side, and the British and Obama, and the other allies of the British Empire on the other, do you think that what some might think is a miracle, can occur soon: that is the total elimination and end of the British Empire? Do you see that could happen soon?"

LAROUCHE: One question has to be asked: Are the people prepared to take their own authority and use it? The suckers will not win.

The problem we have, I think there are a lot of members of the Congress who would like, would prefer, to do what I've been indicating has to be done. But there's some forces, including Obama most particularly, and some of the other people there.

Hillary Clinton, for example, is one of the problems. She's one of the big sources of destruction, and I hope she's soon thrown out of the candidacy for the Presidency. I don't think we want her around any more; she is actually an agent of Obama, she's a supporter of his. I don't think she was originally, but he terrified her, she became a victim of his influence and since that time she has tended to be increasingly, more and more dishonest. And actually a bit evil.

So I think we want to get her out. We want to get Trump out of the picture, things like that. And we want to also take the members of Congress who are gutless wonders, and get some of the people who shouldn't be gutless wonders among the members of Congress and say, "No! We were wrong! We accepted you, we accepted your proposal on this campaign, and you committed a fraud. And we're wrong, because we didn't turn that down." And what we require now, is that honest members of the United States organization, must say, "We were wrong. Our leaders were wrong. They were a bunch of cowards and they were selling us down the river. They were selling the United States down the river." And that has to be stated.

Q3: Hi John, hi Lyn: What's the possibility of you know, taking our rights into our own hands? There's a lot of like-minded individuals where I live in California that – well, they don't like the way that this government is, well, you know....?

LAROUCHE: We had a meeting in California which I attended, for a number of leading representatives, historically leading members of the California popular leadership. And that works. We have a core in California, around certain circles, who have all the credentials you need, to speak up and say, we should be in charge, of shaping the policy of California.

After all you've got a governor there who's no damned good! He's stupid, and he's corrupt, and he's a Satanic figure. That is, he belongs to a cult of a Satanic belief, together with a certain member of the Pope, an agent of the Pope, who's also a Satanic creature. And so these are problems we have to deal with.

But the point is, we do have a crisis. And I would say that those of us who are actually leading some of these things, particularly the two things that happened on Saturday and Sunday, were among the most successful presentation of musical performance that we've had in a very long time. And what this involved, is from people of Italian background and so forth, who are highly professional; and creating an institution which builds up a base for the kind of popular organization, organization of the United States. And we have it.

And our job is to defend that fight. We have our rights, this is our right: We have the right to pull the members of the Congress, who turn cowardly or stupid. And we have a right to kick their little asses – you know, in a certain manner of speaking. And I think that little privilege has to be applied more vigorously, right now.

Q4: Good evening Lyn and John, this is J- calling from

Michigan. In talking with people, besides the cynicism, everybody does agree, that we are in a collapse phase now, especially like in southeast Michigan. Everybody's tied to the Detroit water system and water bills are skyrocketing and people are getting shut off like crazy. The policy forces are being reduced drastically.

And my point is, when the credit system is introduced, do you agree that there should also be price controls on utilities, as well as food stocks, food pricing?

LAROUCHE: I wouldn't approach it exactly that way. The effect that you're talking about might have validity. But I think the way to approach this is quite different. What you have to do, is you have to get the citizens of the United States, who is by and large a coward; they've given in on everything. They're afraid, they're afraid, they're afraid. Everything's been taken away from there: their careers have been taken away; their children are worthless.

For example, in California, but not only in California, the young human beings, in California, are by and large, are not really human. That is, they don't have any of the patriotic characteristics; and therefore we have a real problem. We have to mobilize a force, because most of the young people in our generation now, are not fit to make judgment. And they're brainwashed, really, literally brainwashed.

And you have people who are members of Congress, who are not really brainwashed as such, but they lack the guts to stand up and denounce what they know is wrong. And that's what the last session of Congress did, is exactly that.

So you have to say, the leadership of the Congress is a bunch of cheating cowards. But the people who know better say, "well, we can't fight it, we can't fight it. We don't have the power to fight it." And that's where the problem comes. And what is needed, is to get people to understand, that they

have a *responsibility*, with an element of risk which is involved in that, and they have to take a position *against* those members of the Congress who have sold their asses down the street.

ASCHER: I know we're going to get some reports also Lyn on our activities from New York this past weekend; and later on, I'm going to announce some the activities coming up here over Christmastime for the Manhattan Project.

Q5: Hi this is Alvin, here in New York. Hi Lyn, and everyone listening. Well, we had a pretty big weekend that actually, as I've been reflecting upon it, really began about two weeks before, with a relatively small number of people; but for myself, the quality of the organizing was much different, much improved from that of a year ago, and it was something that I've felt existed within the population on the need for Handel's *Messiah*. But also emanating from those of us that were out there doing this work to help build this audience.

And so, the process of engaging in the chorus has been helping me and helping us all along, to produce that type of result. And then the effect that it had. People are knowing and will be reading more about the reports and the responses and the effect of what was demonstrated, in a very powerful way in the two concerts that we presented to the public. And that's a very, very encouraging thing for us all.

What I wanted to reference is the personal effect that I'm sure others share is, in going through this process and finishing with this weekend, as imperfect as many things were going through it, we did it. And now that we're confronted with the immediate crisis of how to act, I can't express how much clearer I find myself able to both think and act, and not be confused or allow myself to be confused, where this was not the case before.

So the breakthrough was for the Manhattan Project, but I think

each one of us, and I would even imagine those that have been doing this for a while, that or members for a long time, – I won't speak for them, but I think the effects of this are far-reaching; certainly for those of us that were for the first time onstage and really working at this process.

So, on the one hand, I would say "Oh, the timing of this crisis is terrible!" My thinking now is that, the crisis is here and I feel ready for it, which means now, I have to organize a number of people, and activate them, so that when we go into our Congressmen's office, we are of one force that can hopefully move these wretched folks into the action we need.

LAROCHE: Well, to bring to bear the issues, the real issues, in this process, you have to go back to a certain point, where there was a debate between Obama and Putin; and, Obama lost, clearly.

Now, from that point on, you've had an increasing receptivity on this matter. But what's happened is, Putin has been gaining weight, against the British and against other forces, and against other forces in Europe. Obama was defeated, but in terms of the population, it was a symbol of that debate: Obama was defeated and discredited fully. So he's been operating on a lame issue ever since that time.

He's operating on the basis of rage. Now, Obama of course is a killer. Obama kills people every Tuesday; he kills citizens of the United States every Tuesday. That's his favorite sport. And people are afraid, they're afraid to take him on. But Putin is not afraid to take him on.

Now the fact, however, that Putin did intervene, in that show, and did defeat Obama, Obama has been weak in conviction ever since. He had rage, he has all kinds of things, but he's a loser. Now, Obama is not a human being; he has a jockstrap he has in a certain area that I don't know if he ever washes it;

it's in this little niche inside the White House. But I think, whether he stinks or not, I think that his attitude about life stinks. And that's enough to take care of it.

But the point is now, what's happened, is because of the defeat of Obama, by Putin, in that session, you've had a rising tendency, to revolve against Obama. And that's what's happened. Now, we've encouraged it, and that's what we should do. But the problem is, the members of Congress have a problem with Obama.

But what's the problem with Obama? Obama kills people every Tuesday! Obama *kills* innocent citizens of the United States and kills them every Tuesday. So therefore, you have members of Congress and so forth, who by themselves, if they weren't terrified, would not tolerate Obama; but they're afraid that Obama, with his Tuesday kills *will* kill them! Members of major press organizations in Manhattan or in the capital of this, yet some people are scared! Just plain scared! That they're not going to cross Obama, because they think Obama will kill them, and they're probably right. Obama will kill them, sooner or later.

So, we've come to a point now, where we have actually had progress, in trying to deal with this thing, since that United Nations matter. We're succeeding.

Now, naturally, we have locations which are very significant. Manhattan is the most important area, politically, for us in the United States. We have some people in California, a respectively small group, and they demonstrated their commitment. We have other people who have a commitment; mostly they're in the minority. *But!* underneath that, they wish they had the guts, to speak out. And so, everything is on that basis.

Now, what we did, in the Saturday and Sunday events, in Manhattan and around there, what we did, is we got 1,000

people in two successive performances, on Saturday and Sunday, and this changed the course of history, in terms of that operation. And this is going to reverberate. The problem is, is you've still got people who are terrified. And just plain terrified. And when the Congress comes in, and certain hound dogs in the Congress come in, and say "we're going to bail everything out," hmm? And then the bail-out comes.

Now, what we're at, now, that no citizen of the United States, legally, on the basis of the most recent seating in the Congress, would defend the United States. None of these people in the majority, would defend the existence of the United States. They would kiss the rear end of Obama. Even though he's despised, and he's in a wretched condition, and therefore, what happens, the British forces, which are generally the British Empire; remember, the whole thing is the British Empire. It goes all the way back to the British Empire, and the fighting, by the United States against the British Empire.

So the British Empire is still, directly or indirectly, the controlling force over the United States, except for where the citizens got their guts working up; and lately, they still don't have much in the way of guts. That's the problem.

Now, what we've done, is, we've presented the evidence, that the Congress has to stop selling out. They cannot go through this season, this year, this New Year, we cannot let that happen!*We must throw this thing out of this thing, right now* – before the New Year! And this is what the issue is.

In other words, if we don't do that, you're going to a general war, a global general war, and the general war will come *fast*. Quick and fast! The mass killing of people, which has been going on in Canada, for example, and going on in other areas, it's going on.

So we're at a point, where we have to do things which are not

in any way on most people's agenda. On the other hand, we have people who do have a conscience, but their conscience does not allow them to speak on the subject. Our job is to give them the power to speak their conscience. And that's where we are.

So I think the idea of the practical exposition, on what the problems are, anybody who wants to be practical in interpreting what the problems are, is making a big mistake. Our job is to stimulate the citizens, who *are* citizens, who wish to be citizens, who don't like this, to get up on their hind legs, and kick the asses where they belong to be kicked.

And our job is to find the people who will, – you know, this thing about the 1000 people in two successive events, service events, on Saturday and Sunday following, this has changed everything, potentially. And our concern has to be now, to make sure that that potential victory, becomes an actualized victory.

Q6: Hello Lyn, this is R-A-, I live in Mansfield, Massachusetts; I grew up in New Hampshire and I was born in New York, so I have a lot of touch points with a lot of folks.

Anyway, clearly there's a lot of things that need to be improved in the country. Since the advent of 1871, when the United States became a corporation, that was run by essentially the bank, and then in 1913 when the Federal Reserve Act was passed along with the Internal Revenue Service, which was nothing more than a collection agency for the Federal Reserve, you know, America has been at constant war. Constant war in a central bankster cabal, they go together like Popeye and Olive Oil.

Now, if Americans want to be a constant war, it leaves the system in place. But if they want peace, prosperity, tranquillity, they need to nationalize the bank, and have the government issue the currency, and the government issue the

low-interest rate loans to stimulate the economy.

In addition, the United States has to raise tariffs and eliminate NAFTA in order to protect American industry, which during the '80s and '90s got outsourced to China and the Pacific Rim, and what I'm talking about is the steel, auto, computer, electronic, industries, which were primarily the circulatory system of the great American economy.

ASCHER: Excuse me, is this getting to a question here?

Q7: Well, here's the question, the thing is, if you can centralize bank and have it a National Bank, you can save \$1.2 trillion in interest a year, essentially, \$19 trillion in debt times 6%. That money of \$1.2 trillion a year can then be cuddled into the re-industrialization of America.

ASCHER: OK, so Lyn would you like to respond?

LAROCHE: Yes! I would say it sounds loud and convincing, I suppose, to some people, but it's not convincing to me. Because, yes, you're just talking around certain things; but my reading of these things is different from yours. I mean, for example, this idea, this pragmatic approach to the interpretation of the function of economy in the United States, and under popular opinion, is wrong. It's just plain wrong. Because most people don't have any understanding of what makes mankind work. That is, what the intention of mankind's mind is. And therefore, they come up with the solutions which he just did. And it has the real taint of something is intended to be convincing, but from my standpoint, scientifically, it's bunk, frankly.

Because, mankind is not an animal. And that's what the assumption is. His argument is implicitly states that mankind is essentially an animal. Now, mankind is not essentially an animal. But unfortunately, people who are made ignorant, behave like animals, mentally and otherwise. And the fact that they are induced to adopt that kind of view of life, puts

them in the wrong direction.

What he's laid out there will not work! It flat [will not work! *The problem is, that we've stooped – Bertrand Russell is probably the key to this whole problem. Bertrand Russell destroyed the mind of the people of the United States. He did that through his whole career, until he died. And when he was dying, he was still rotting. Same thing.*

And what you have to do, you have to look at what mankind is, and it's the creative powers of mankind, the ability of a senior person to understand more than all of the practical people, and that's the key to the thing. Look, we've got a case in California: the young people in California are, by and large are degenerated. Why are they degenerated? They were degenerated, by for example the California school system! They did it.

Same thing in Texas; you got Texas all over the place; it's got real corruption. All Southern states are, in the main, degenerate. Now that doesn't mean every citizen of these states is degenerate, but it means that those who are not degenerate, are having to defend themselves against those who are voluntarily degenerate. And therefore, if we're going to solve the problem, we have to lay the case on, on what is the intelligent viewpoint as against the so-called practical viewpoint. Practical people are stupid people! They may not know it, but if you look at the children today, the young people throughout the United States: They're stupid! And worse. They don't have minds of their own. And therefore, what our problem is, we have to pull together, a group of people, who will provide leadership to people who are prepared to *think!* Not to imitate somebody's babbling.

And we have to pay close attention, to what are the actual, physical principles, or the effect of the principles, as laid out by people like Nicholas of Cusa, and the people like that. And they've laid these things out, and they were

intelligent. The alternate views were *not* intelligent! And that's what the problem is.

The popular opinion in its more popular form, popular opinion is the degeneration of the mind of the human being. And we've got to cure that, we've got to get rid of that stuff, otherwise we'll not survive. Mankind will not survive under these conditions.

What we're on the verge of, we're on a general, which is orchestrated by the whole British Empire system, which has always been the enemy here, and people are trying to kowtow, to gratify people who are thinking like British agents or British mentalities. And what we have to do, is we have to go deeply, more profoundly, and not be superficial in terms of discussing these kinds of matters.

We've got to get to the root of the thing, and Einstein of course is the typical person, who was actually a genius, and most of the other leading scientists were not geniuses; some of them were competent, but they were not geniuses. And so, this kind of characteristic, you have to be more precise on this thing. You may have good intentions, but you've got to get good results, too.

Q8: Hi, this is S- from Manhattan. And I was so happy to be part of the concert Saturday and Sunday. It was so uplifting, that it gave a new purpose to my life, a new direction. I'm 72 and I can still sort of sing!

My question is financial: I'm afraid of the bail-ins. I can't take a certain amount of money and carry it home, but I can convert to silver coin or gold coin, and that's all I have to live on. I sold the family home, which broke my heart, but - how fast do I have, to make a move, to convert the little bit of money that I did get from the sale of my home, into a form that will retain its value even if the whole system falls down? That I'll be able to buy my food and pay my

rent and all the activities of daily living.

I have a list of names to call, you know, to kick the behinds of Congress and the Senate. But you know, they hang up the phone and they forget about you.

I'm worried about the little bit of money I have on which to survive. And what would you do? What would you do, sir? How do you protect the money? Now if I open a safety deposit box, can they still steal that money in a safety deposit box? What would you do?

LAROUCHE: OK, fine. You've got two areas. First of all, you've got the economic system that runs the United States right now. Now that's a problem that you've to deal with. It's not easy to deal with, but it has to be done. Now, that's the only way you're going to get justice. And what you're talking about is what I would understand as justice. And you're talking about being deprived or in anxiety with respect to the prospects of justice.

Now, what we've had, with these things that happened on Saturday and Sunday, which were musical assemblies which added up to attended of 1,000 people, both in Manhattan and earlier in Brooklyn. So, this gives you an idea of exactly what is possible. Now the fact that this thing happened, it means that this has not happened in the United States for a long time. It has not happened. But suddenly we have, we've organized assemblies of musicians and audiences in the order of magnitude of 1,000 persons total. Now that is something *new*. That is something which has *not* happened beforehand.

So therefore, if we change that tune, shall we say, if we do that, then you have the people who feel that they're cast aside, from the prospect of survival, they have a reason to be confident, because their interest and what they understand, will inspire other people in the population to spread this kind of approach, and that's the only way you win.

When you're in that kind of situation, like Manhattan is now, among popular masses, they don't have a chance! They live on the edge of disaster, one way or the other. If you create a social process, a mass social process which increases its authority, then that problem begins to disappear, and therefore, that's what we have to do. We have to take all those kinds of factors which correspond to what I just described, and that's the only solution; that's the only thing. You cannot be an isolated person, or a person isolated in the community; that doesn't work, you don't have enough fight. When you get a 1,000 people in two successive assemblies, of audience and performers, and it's a beautiful job like that, *now!* – *now*, you represent something. And what she's saying, really requires *that*; it requires the participation, in the body of people, who feel that they're part of that same process. And that process will give them power.

Q9: I live in the country in Rhode Island, and I have a connection to my little local town representative that connects my and everybody; and I just want to know that that's my best connection. Because if I go up to see my representatives – the state of Rhode Island is very corrupt – and if I go up to see them in their offices, or at their houses or whatever, like that, I'm likely to end up in jail. And then released, of course, with no charges.

But my point is, how can I get my message across, in full, outside of what I hear from you guys? I mean, I meet the elitist people in my work, and I sort of scare them, or they go "Wow," with what I say, all coming from the larouche.com group. And just this week, a couple that retired from teaching high school and now work with the University of Rhode Island, hit my with a question, and just looked at 'em and said, flatly, "shut down Wall Street, reinstall Glass-Steagall, and let's go with it from there, and we're going to have to make adjustments, and to make things

work from that day forward.” And I said, “that’s what, I believe it was Teddy Roosevelt that did that.” And I astounded them, and now they’re doing research and working on it.

OK, so I’m reaching some of my intelligent customers. But, how can I be more effective?

LAROUCHE: Just what we’re doing. What we did in New York, the New York City areas on Saturday, and in Manhattan afterward. And this process, if continued, will change the tempo. Just sitting around and waiting and for something to harvest, like you’re waiting for a chicken to lay an egg, that does not really work. You have to get more chickens to do more egg laying, and this is my progressive thing.

No, we’re in a position, if we can bring people more closer together, on these kinds of issues, you find out you can change things. And I think the Manhattan – I spent a lot of effort since October of last year, on building up an organization based on Manhattan. Other things don’t work. New Jersey? That’s sort of, off and on. Leesburg? Ohhh!! Almost hopeless. And Texas, doubtful.

But so therefore, you actually have to bring into play, forces which are moving ahead in the right direction. And you find that the authority that they carry by the increase of their authority... for example right now, right now, you had a bunch of people in the Congress, and they sold out. Hmm? They sold out because they were intimidated. And the muscle came down on them and said, “No, you’re shut down. We’re going to wipe out everything. At the beginning of next year, you’re not going to have anything. Everything is going to be cancelled.” And that’s fact right now! *Right now*, on the first day and second day of the next year, you’re going to find, under the present conditions, a general collapse of the people of the United States. and it’s going to get excessively worse. Hmm?

So therefore, our role is to understand what the forces are that we have to bring into play, to create an increase of the forces, which are qualified to change the thing. And that's the problem. What we're doing now, yeah, we have the members of Congress; well, most of the members of Congress are gutless wonders. And a lot of the other members of the Congress, are intimidated by the gutless wonders. And if you can't get something in motion, and I would say, what happened in these two things on Saturday and Sunday, in the most recent events, and that probably is worth more than *anything* else.

I mean, that's the principle which will work. Because people find themselves with this, their voices are now beautiful, at least the singers are beautiful; and others are there. So you've changed the environment. And you have to change the environment; it's not building up on one person after another person after another person, it's changing the environment. Because most people are operating on an understanding of mankind, which is not right. It's incompetent. You have to give them the courage, to recognize that there is another way, which is necessary, whereas the old one that they thought was practical, is not. And that's where the problem lies.

If you can't inspire people, to find in themselves or in their circles of friends, they can't find something in themselves, which gives them a sense of potency, you can't win. So therefore, the primary thing is, can you supply a real meaning of potency to people around you?

ASCHER: Let me just announce for those on the phone, in terms of the ongoing Manhattan Project, I've been supplied the follow schedule, which is that it will be continuing tomorrow ... on Saturday, our regular Town Meeting with Lyndon LaRouche will occur between 2 and 5, and after that there will be a candlelight vigil and singing at the Lincoln Center in Manhattan.

Q10: Hello Lyn, this is W-B- in Denver. And what I was

wondering about was, in this oncoming financial crisis, leading to the destruction of economies, do the BRICS nations have any sort of cushion perhaps to soften the blow, so to speak, from this spreading disaster?

LAROUCHE: Well, what we're doing, if we don't, as of this weekend, – and it's this weekend, after what we've done in terms of Manhattan both on the Saturday and Sunday events where we had 1,000 people total, in these events, you don't have much of a chance. And if you're going to talk about technologies and things, and how this is going to work, and how this will or will not work, it's nonsense; it doesn't work.

What you have to do, above all, you have to change attitude of a growing part of the population! And why are they being cheated? Well, in the main, it's the fact that they are not being very practical; what they call "being practical" is not being practical! They're trying to muscle in on something and exploit an opportunity which they think is an opportunity; but mankind is not a collection of animals. It's not a zoo! Mankind is a species, which as a *whole*, that is the overall process, moves the population. It is not this individual or a few individuals, it's this process. And when people are convinced, to adopt a process which is a viable one, or an improvement of things, it works.

When they say, you're trying to muscle in on some deal and make a handful of your friends are going to make a deal and you're going to get a successful operation, that is bunk! Society doesn't work that way.

Q11: [internet] Lyn, I just got a question from B– in Fair Oaks, California. Here is his question: "Mr. LaRouche, I just returned from visiting the Federal Building in Sacramento, California, where I met with the office of Sen. Barbara Boxer of California, urging her to move the Glass-Steagall bill through right away. My question may be a

difficult one to answer, but, how much time is there left, before we must absolutely pass Glass-Steagall?"

LAROCHE: We don't have any lapse of time available to us. We have to do it immediately, and can do it effectively, immediately. And the problem is, if you do that in the proper way, then you will actually overrun the conventional attitudes now.

People don't have the guts to stand up and look at the other guy in the eye, and say, "Hey, hey, Joe. You're bullshitting aren't you? Why don't you come around and be honest?" And that's the only way to do it.

What do you think's wrong with these members of Congress? Well, some of these members of Congress are Plump or Dunk or whatever he is – or, Bump, I guess is the better term – and this thing is not really of any importance. It's garbage; we know him, well. He was an associate of the FBI; he wasn't a member of the FBI, he was an associate of it, and he was an opportunist and he got payoffs and he got little generosityes, and he got all kinds of things; and he would go around, and start a deal. Look at all these "Bump" people, that fill all these skyscrapers. What they doing? They're just dirtying up the sky, scratching up the sky! But he doesn't mean anything. But he's around and he's used as an agent, and he's not worth anything.

And Hillary herself has lost any asset that she's ever had and she quit that because she capitulated to Obama. And she's an Obama agent. And Obama is an agent of British Empire. So, that's where it goes.

So therefore, people have to stand up for themselves on the basis of principle, not on "my gimmicks" but on what the principle is that they want to defend. And that's the only solution. And I think we were doing it successfully in Manhattan during Saturday and Sunday. I think that's the

right thing. And the question, we have to sustain it. That's the approach you want to take.

Q12: Hi Lyn, this is T-W- from Lake Arrowhead, California. I'm calling in with a sort of a report, because I'm closely located next to where the San Bernardino shooting incident took place. I'll try to make a long story short: when it was happening, I happened to be in an auto shop, where I live in Lake Arrowhead, and the billing lady there, told me that she had just heard on the police radio that the husband of her friend was one of the ones killed. And so, I said, "What's her name?" and she said it's Renée Wetzel. So I then looked up in the paper, and the man that was killed was named Mike Wetzel and he's a resident of Lake Arrowhead where I live.

So, I decided I had to go to his memorial service, which was last Saturday, and it was a very beautiful event. It was in a large gymnasium, there were 1,000 people there and many people gave moving memorial addresses; he was very well known and very much loved in the Lake Arrowhead community. He had six children who were all there, a wife and an ex-wife, his father was there, three of co-workers were there, two ministers that have known him from childhood; they all gave beautiful memorial addresses. It was just a very moving ceremony.

And I'm sitting and I didn't actually know Mike, but I'm thinking to myself, "Gosh if only these people could possibly understand what was really the cause of Michael's death," but it wasn't really these FBI-concocted terrorists, the two people that supposedly were the shooters; one of them was a normal guy with a job at the Inland center, with no history of anything strange; they were a couple, they had a baby. The baby was dropped off at her mother's house so she could grab a couple of Kalashnikovs and go shoot up the place, supposedly, you know?

Well, the story doesn't add up, it doesn't make sense in any way; I've come to the conclusion that that couple couldn't

have had anything to do with it. They were just patsies, who are cultivated for the purpose by the FBI. And the actual killings, I believe were done by some hired killers. I don't believe it was actually them that did it.

But you know, and one thing I did, afterward I wanted to confirm some of this, so yesterday I called a local newspaper, the *San Bernardino Sun*, and I said: "Look, there were supposedly 100 people in that room, 14 of them were killed. That leaves 86 eyewitnesses. Now, I would like to know why we have not seen a single interview, with any of those eyewitnesses, since the day that the killings took place? There were two interviews on that day, and those two interviews, both witnesses indicated there were three, white male shooters."

So I called the reporter and said, "why haven't there been any interviews with eyewitnesses? Wouldn't that be a huge scoop? Why are you guys out there interviewing people, and why don't I see anything?" So then he starts giving me excuses. Like he said, "we don't want to traumatize the victims, we have to give them some time and so on, before we disturb them." That was the first thing. And I kind of scoffed at that, I said, "those 86 witnesses, most of them were unharmed and I'm sure lots of them would like to tell their stories, so there ought to be investigative journalists all over the place trying to interview them, on TV, newspapers, everywhere. And there hasn't been a single interview? Why? Why haven't you been out there?"

And so the reporter basically told me, "we can't interview those witnesses because they might say something that would contradict the FBI's story. And we can't do that, we can't question the FBI. That is not allowed." And I sort of had an insight into how this whole thing works, like there is this total atmosphere of intimidation, and one thing you don't do is question the authority of the FBI or suggest for one second that what they're saying might not be true! That is not

allowed. And everybody knows that, it's like this undercover of fear. There's things that you can't say; while in some sense, it's unconscious fear, you know, it's like they don't even know it, but they just don't go there. It's like an unconscious inhibition, let's say, has been put into them. And so, that's I think how this whole atmosphere of terror and intimidation is being created.

So that's why I could...

LAROUCHE: It's being created, yes. But it's being created not by the FBI, it's being created by Obama personally. You follow the press coverage on that thing: Obama was the one who put the lid suppressing that, suppressing the story.

Now, the truth was, there were a lot of other untruths around this whole thing. Now, these people were recruited, they were Saudi connections, Saudi influence. It was the same factor, and the same ratios, of events were the same thing that happened in France, in the assassinations there in France. And this is run by the Saudis; it's run by things like the Saudis which Obama works for. Obama is part of that, but Obama actually works for the British, the British Monarchy. The British Monarchy *created* this whole thing. And if you ever looked into 9/11, and who did what in 9/11 – and I was an expert in this area, with a friend of mine and some others – and that's what the whole story is.

Why did the Congress not deal with the 9/11 case? Why'd they put the lid on it? That's where the problem lies. Obama? Obama's on the wrong side; he's not an American, he's something else. He's like his stepfather, has the same kind of disease that his stepfather had, he was a man who kills people. Obama kills people, every Tuesday, he kills innocent people! And you have even important people who have important positions, they have been threatened. They will not speak up; they will not tell the truth.

So you've got a nation of gutless wonders! Now it's not all the fact that they're gutless wonders, it's the point is, they don't see any way that they can survive under these conditions. And there's nobody up there, there's no FBI up there, who's doing very much in terms of defending the citizens of the United States; or defending any other part of the planet.

The whole thing comes down, from the British Empire, the British system! That's what's been going on all along. And you get different versions of it, you get different flavors of it, so forth, but it's all the same thing: Without the British Empire and what it represents, and you take 9/11: Why was 9/11 never exposed, publicly? Never! Why? Because they had a payoff, with the British and the Saudis; and the Saudis did it.

The Saudis are the ones who actually, personally, sank the towers in Manhattan. It was two guys who captured each plane, they went up around that area, around the Towers up there; they brought them down. A similar thing was done in Washington, itself, and other things like that.

And what happened? The damned Congress, as a whole, as a body, has *refused* to tell the facts, about how the citizens of Manhattan were killed! And it was done by the Saudis, it was done by a mass of Saudis. Remember: Everything was shut down, under the Bush family, everything was shut down. And the Saudi families who were guilty in this process, part of the team, woke, safely walked out of the United States, and were sent back to Saudi Arabia. And many of these people were the active agents who did the killing!

And the leading interests in Saudi Arabia, actually orchestrated the killing. Who did it? It was the British Empire that did, and it was done under the rate of oil speculation. And that's how Saudi Arabia got powerful, because the British protected them, as the United States,

under Bush and Obama, defended them.

So if you want to find a complaint there, look at Bush, the Bush family, and look at Obama, and then trace it all back from there. That gets to the core of why you get this kind of a sense of experience of what's going on. Yes, the FBI is involved in this kind of thing, but they're only subordinate agents when they do that.

The point was, it's done by the British Queen and the British interests. And the British interests and the Saudis and Obama are all the same thing. So get the facts right and you'll find out the solutions can become transparent.

By the way, I did a personal investigation on this thing; Jeff Steinberg came in on the same operation, but in parallel. Jeff and I had worked together; I was working for Ronald Reagan at that point, and Jeff had followed in on what I was doing at that point. So Jeff and I had this relationship with that thing, we both knew the story about Saudis, how the Saudi thing was done. We were expert in it; I independently I worked with these British agents who were political agents who were actually investigating this problem; and most of them got killed, or something similar happened to them.

But I'm a known factor in this thing, I'm an expert in this thing. And there's no doubt about it; and any justice means that anybody who is supporting Obama, now, is an agent of the enemy of the United States. And that's the thing. Because you make the comment that everything you say is plausible to me, as the fact, but the secret body of evidence is what you didn't get into. But what you were doing, what your investigation, your appreciation is an accurate one except it doesn't go far enough because you didn't have any rules to follow it adequately.

Q13: Good evening, Mr. LaRouche, this is P- from Connecticut. I agree with Alvin: After enjoying the

wonderful concert of Handel's *Messiah* I felt so inspired by this. I guess it was the same way that Thomas Paine's letter to George Washington, and that George Washington read it to his men, Dec. 23rd of 1776: Well, I have no doubts or fear to take this fight with the people to the Capitol and bring in Glass-Steagall. And this is my declaration.

LAROUCHE: It's a good one. [laughter]

Q14: Yes, this time I'm in Long Island. Steinmetz and I started having the argument, [inaudible 1:07:22.6] couldn't come here. But yes, he could come here. But we have to go out and be like Roosevelt, when there is no Roosevelt. We have an anti-Roosevelt in the White House. How are we going to move so fast?

LAROUCHE: Well, it's a question of how many people have got guts? And who's got the guts to understand things and look at things honestly. Because you know the typical American is generally a liar. Now it's not that they like to tell lies, though some of them do. In fact, many of them do. But as a generality, no; the fact is, they're ignorant.

Now, the ignorance is not necessarily honest ignorance; like the member of the Congress who supported a piece of legislation, which swindles every citizen in the United States of their life savings. And it's because these members of the Congress were gutless, or worse, that that legislation was shoved through. And if we don't change that now, you're all dead, sooner or later. And it's all because of your gutlessness, by a few of you who wouldn't take action, through the Presidency and the Congress, and wouldn't present the truth in law.

So therefore, it's the liars, the cheats and liars who didn't tell the truth, about that matter of legislation: They are the guilty parties. And they are shameful, and what they need their little rumps kicked, by a big shoe, from the rear.

That's the best way: It's uplifting. The most uplifting: Kick 'em in the rear end and that's the most uplifting way you can deal with problems.

But no, that's the problem. These kinds of cowards, they're implicitly treasonous, because they knew what they did. And the other people who gave in, gave in because they were intimidated. Now you've got to have a citizenry with guts, and I don't know if we can say we have one.

ASCHER: Lyn, are you referring there to the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act and the bail-in provisions?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely, that is a genocidal policy. It's mass murder, and anybody who supported that legislation, is guilty of mass murder, criminal activity. And the only way they can do that is cancel their vote on that issue. And it was wrong, it was a crime, it shouldn't have happened.

ASCHER: And of course this is the same provision that's going into effect already in Europe and officially on Jan. 1st in Europe as well.

LAROUCHE: This is the same thing which came out of the Pope, the official Pope. The Pope was a guy who was used as a stooge, to bring this about. He's the one that did that. Now the Pope himself probably is not the author of this thing, but the Pope was the guilty party. He was the criminal in the case. Now he may be mentally – I would grant him the possibility he may be just insane, and doesn't know any better. And the effect is, that the Pope is a criminal in his behavior, a mass criminal.

And everything that this crew does, because it was a British operation, entirely a British operation, nothing else. So if you want to do something, you have to go in and take the Royal Family and give them a Royal outcome.

ASCHER: This is the Pope and the Green agenda and his

relationship to Schellnhuber.

LAROUCHE: Absolutely. But the point is, the Pope is not insane. He's just a corrupt coward, and he doesn't deserve to be called the Pope. We'll call him the Pump.

Oh, he's evil, the guy who would do this, the only excuse that he could have for the crimes that he's committed, is to say he was terrified. This Pope has got to be removed from office. But we've got to get the whole British Royal Family up there at the same time.

Q15: Hi, this is Jessica from Brooklyn, New York.

LAROUCHE: Oh good! How do you do?

Q15: OK! I was part of the fantastic, wonderful presentation of Handel's *Messiah* on Saturday and Sunday. I was particularly enthralled with the Saturday performance because it was Brooklyn. [LaRouche laughs] But the Sunday performance was a little different, but it was good, too. And it was interesting that the Saturday performance had a lot of families; the community was really rallied to come out to that church and support their church, *and* our singing. And the children's faces – I just remember looking at the children and seeing them watching the orchestra play, and how it was just so enlightening to them; and of course, that passed on to their parents, not the other way around.

So that's one thing I wanted to say; it was just very uplifting and like you said, there's nothing like that type of thing to make us understand that we are human beings and we have this creative power, in us, and that we can spread that idea of creativity in human beings and the worth of your life, what you're living for, to other people.

And with that said, I was also thinking about something else: There have been decisive points in history, and these decisive points have made people decide that it's all or nothing, that,

I get fearful, too; I'm listening to people on the call, and people are trying to figure out, "Should I store water? Should I take my money out of the bank, and have something on hand? Should I quickly go and buy up a bunch of gold coins, because I'll have to barter with that, when the banks crash? I have to have some gold coins on hand or some silver or something, in case the money is worthless, even if you do manage to get it out of the bank before the doors close?" That kind of thing.

And then, I thought, since this concert happened, I thought about the decisive points in history and it gets to me, where I have to *I* have to decide, what kind of thing can I do, to implement my best efforts? Now there's calling Congress people; there's talking to the news stations, the TV stations, social media; there's radio, unions, there a union meeting coming for me, where I intend to bash them about Glass-Steagall and rally the members to the point of calling their congressmen – again – calling the offices; somebody's going to be there, and forcing them to come back into session and pass Glass-Steagall.

So I think we all have to think about what we can do to implement our best efforts to not fail at this. Because like these different times, there's Joan of Arc; there's the crossing of the Delaware; there's the Gettysburg battle; there's landing at Normandy in World War II; there's Iwo Jima; there's these decisive points where you cannot lose. It's not even a matter of what should I do if this happens? It's that, *we can't lose*. This is something that has to be done.

I think when Washington crossed the Delaware, he knew that this was something that they had to succeed at. And that's what I'm starting to come to, especially since this concert. So we have to implement our best effort, whatever that effort is. I'm not good at social media, and I tend to shy away from that. But I'm good at Congress, I'm good at calling them; I'm good at union meetings; I'm good at interventions, where I

call these people on the carpet. Those kinds of things I'm good at. I'm good at leafletting, I'm good at talking to people on the street. So those kinds of things are what we have to really think about.

And my question to you, Mr. LaRouche is, which one of these things do you think – or maybe two or three things – do you think we should all put our best efforts into? Is it trying to get the Congress back into session? Or are all these things, like I'm saying, something that we should do according to what we do can best as an individual?

LAROUCHE: You have to go to President Gen. George Washington. George Washington a decision, a very tough decision. He had the British agents and their accompaniment were celebrating in New Jersey. And so he moved all of his forces, and under most difficult conditions; under wet conditions and very dangerous conditions, and what he did is he wiped out the British and their complement, and that was what made the United States' existence a possibility. It was George Washington's decision, under absolutely adverse conditions, with the British and their minions, assumed that they were celebrating, and Washington moved in and took them all over: and that's how the United States was created.

Q16: This is C- from Santa Rosa, California. Lyn, in converting each Congressman or people that I try to organize, I have come out front and said, "What's really at the root is that you're afraid. Your cynicism or your pessimism is you're afraid. You're maybe directly afraid of Obama, or afraid of Big Brother or whatever." And I got some very interesting reactions off that, and I want to go into that, because what I found is, my way out, which is not a technique or anything, is that I found that referencing back to what I asked you last week is I have to develop myself, culturally, intellectually, and that's the thing that gives one strength. You have to do your reading, you have to try to understand music, which I'm still trying to struggle with understand the role of music. I

listen to it, but there's things about it I don't understand.

So I want you to talk about this thing that the fears that these Congress people, and the fears that the common people out here that we're organizing are essentially the same. So, could you take it from there?

LAROUCHE: OK, let's take the George Washington case, for example, because that's very pertinent. Washington made a move, which all his opponents at that time, said would never happen. And the fact that he did that, that he crossed the Delaware, he landed on the other shore, and took the enemy in hand before the enemy could really mobilize its own forces; if he hadn't done that, we would never have had the United States! And the same thing is what you're talking about now.

There is a point in history, a point in the current of history, at which something can happen, and a solution will come only because some people have undertaken to follow through on something that other people said "oh, that would never happen"; and that's what it is. It's just like that.

See because mankind is not just a simple human being, the idea of mankind and the individual human being is rubbish, actually, it doesn't function. Because mankind doesn't function that way. Only very rare people will function in that direction, very, very rare, and they're almost named in history against all the others of the same time. And therefore, the problem that we have to face is the fact that, do we have the ability, to recognize the opportunity which is in correspondence to what Franklin would have done, what George Washington did.

And very few people do that. Because they don't do it on the basis of being practical. They do it on the basis of knowing that mankind requires this to be accomplished, and very few people have that view. They say "well, that's not practical." I don't give a damn about what who thinks is

practical! I never did. I'd have been a fool if I ever did.

And therefore I often do things like that, you know, not just George Washington's things, but I will do that; I have don't it often, I've led the charge, often, on these kinds of things. Because it has to be done! People say "No, no, that won't work, that won't work. You can't do that, you can't do that." I say, "You're wrong. I'm going to do it." [laughs] And that's the way I operate, and that's the right way to operate: George Washington's way.

ASCHER: Well, just to reiterate, there's available on the larouchepac website, a statement "Emergency Christmas Eve Message: January 1st Is Doomsday! Only an FDR Action Can Save You." I've already announced there will be distributions of this in Manhattan tomorrow; a town meeting [with LaRouche] on Saturday. Others around the country will be getting this out widely.

Secondly, the recording of the *Messiah* performance is going to be available on the Schiller Institute website, probably tomorrow. They've been working on the audio file, but for those of you want to hear the impact this had, it will be up on the website some time soon, so stay tuned to the www.schillerinstitute.org website, particularly under the Manhattan Project link and you should be able to find that performance available

Lyn, did you have any final remarks that you wanted to conclude this evening with?

LAROCHE: I think I want to put the whole thing into a package. Let's hope that would cumulatively make a package which would be useful for people. Let them decide themselves on that one.

ASCHER: All right, and thank you very much. And we will be next Wednesday, Dec. 30, the day before New Year's Eve. Thank you very much Lyn.

Leder, 25. december 2015: SØRG FOR, AT DER BLIVER ET NYTÅR: DUMP OBAMA OG WALL STREET!

I den sammenbrudsproces, der allerede er i gang, af hele det døde, transatlantiske finanssystem, ser vi nu time for time nye tilfælde af insolvens og stormløb for udtræk, alt imens en vifte af »officielle« regler træder i kraft den 1. januar, som vil bære atombrændsel til bålet. Om denne proces sagde Lyndon LaRouche i sidste uge, »Det, der vil ske, er, at der bliver en acceleration af krisen.« Han sagde: »Accelerationsraten – processens selv-acceleration – er sådan, at, inden for en uge, kunne det hele være udslettet. Det er en sådan situation, vi er i.«

Vi står ved et punkt, hvor det er 'do-or-die' – knald eller fald – denne Jul: enten fremtvinger vi en handling for genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall og de relaterede nødforanstaltninger, eller også får vi massehelvede og forbandelse.

Wall Street Journal præsenterede i går en oversigt af de seneste opdateringer om den finansielle disintegration ved at opremse navnene på de hedgefonde, der er bukket under, og ved også at dække status for flere mere fremtrædende selskaber, der nominelt set stadig er aktive, men kun ved at gennemtvinge »betaling i afdrag« til de spekulantkunder, der ønsker at få deres penge. For eksempel forventes en enhed under det berygtede Carlyle Group LP, Claren Road Asset Management, pr. den 1. januar at have en sum af 1,25 mia. dollar under deres

forvaltning, hvilket er langt under de 8,5 mia. dollar, de havde for kun 15 måneder siden, før deres kunde-investorer begynde at forlange masseudbetalinger i løbet af 2015. Men eftersom Claren Road-operationen har gennemtvunget en politik med »betaling i afdrag« over seks måneder, så dækker disse 1,25 mia. dollar ved årsafslutningen ikke engang de udestående krav om afdrag for tredje og fjerde kvartal 2015. Den samme situation gør sig gældende for mange andre af Wall Streets spekulationshuse, store så vel som små fisk.

Sjoverne er bankerot! Nogle af udtrækkene og udsalgene, der finder sted, skyldes, udover et stormløb mod udgangen, forsøg på at honorere kontrakter og de sædvanlige krav om kontantreserver, men det markerer, at systemet er færdigt. Så kommer vi til 1. januar og mange nye punkter for en detonering.

I Den europæiske Union træder nye regler for bail-in i kraft på denne dato (1. jan.) efter at politikken allerede er blevet gennemført i Cypern, Italien, Portugal, Spanien og andre steder, med dræbende konsekvenser. Denne EU-forholdsregels officielle navn er Artikel 55, med titlen BRRD (Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive) ('direktivet for bank-genrejsning og bankopløsning').

I Eurasien træder Ukraines frie handelsaftale med EU i kraft den 1. jan. Samtidig var der et sammenbrud i drøftelserne den 21. dec. mellem Rusland, Ukraine og EU om, hvordan man skulle gå videre. »Ukraine er på vej ned«, bemærkede LaRouche. De kan ikke komme nogen vegne.

I Amerika er Puerto Rico på vej mod betalingsstandsning den 1. januar, med Washington, D.C., der ikke har taget skridt til nogen handling i den forbindelse.

Generelt set vil tredje del af Baselaftalerne træde i kraft den 1. januar. Det, som 2016 Basel III-reglerne gør, er, at de beordrer banker til at sælge massive mængder af dødelige bail-

in-obligationer; med andre ord, så skal banker udstede »rottegift« til bankkunder og investorer. Det går under betegnelserne »med lang løbetid« eller »absorbering af tab«, eller mere elegant, obligationer »i overensstemmelse med Basel III«.

Læg hertil Obama/Londons fremstød for krig, og konsekvenserne af at tillade dette vanvid at fortsætte en dag mere er dødbringende. LaRouche indkalder til en »mobilisering af de villige« – af dem, der er villige til at se problemet, af dem, der er villige til at handle.

Evindelige krige er Imperiets økonomi

21. december 2015 – Et indsigtsfuldt, om end alternativt syn på forbindelsen mellem krig og økonomisk kollaps blev for nylig præsenteret af Lawrence Wilkerson, der – udover at være pensioneret oberst og tidl. stabschef for udenrigsminister Colin Powell, og særlig assistent til Powell, som formand for Generalstabscheferne – er nu med dr. Ron Pauls Institut for Fred og Fremgang. Som en del af en række artikler med titlen, »Imperie-papirerne« havde dette tredje afsnit, der gik i luften den 13. dec., titlen »Skibet synker«, og det omhandlede den økonomi, der findes i et imperium, der udelukkende bygger på ikke-produktive, udplyndrende finansaktiviteter.

Det 24 minutter lange interview, der blev udført af den tidligere vært på RT Abbey Martin, der nu er hos netværket TeleSUR (<http://theempirefiles.tv/>), begyndte med, at Wilkerson beskrev USA's udenrigspolitik ud fra Wall Streets perspektiv. »I dag«, sagde Wilkerson, »er formålet med USA's udenrigspolitik at støtte et kompleks, som vi skabte i den nationale sikkerhedsstat, og som tilføres brændstof, finansiering og kraft gennem krige, der aldrig ender, og disses forgreninger og konsekvenser. Det er en sørgelig kommentar til det, USA er blevet til, men det er en realistisk og, mener jeg, ærlig vurdering af det, som Amerika er blevet til.«

Wilkerson sporer korrekt oprindelsen til denne kræftstruktur til en Kolde Krigs dage og til det, som præsident Eisenhower kaldte det Militær-industrielle Komplex. Men denne struktur har imidlertid ikke alene mislykkedes med at øge vores magt i verden, sagde han, men den har tværtimod virket direkte modsat. »Det er i den grad mislykkedes, at det har formindsket vores magt i verden. Det er dette, der foruroliger mig«, sagde han, »for historien fortæller mig, at dette netop er, hvad der sker med imperier, når de er rede til at kollapse.« Det militær-industrielle kompleks (MIC) har skabt en koncentration af ikke-produktiv rigdom i en fraktion af befolkningen, der udgør mindre end 1 % af denne.

»Vi taler nu om en koncentration af rigdom, der er ... samvittighedsløs ... det er forkasteligt. Og det er ikke holdbart, men det er nu kommet til et punkt, hvor magtstrukturen – som jeg ville definere som den finansielle magt, som dette apparat har skabt, og dens økonomiske aspekter – er mindre og mindre industrialiseret og produktiv, og derfor mere og mere leger med penge, og pengeinteresserne og kapitalen generelt.«

I dag kan vi ikke engang kalde vores hær for en »frivillig« hær, den er snarere en »rekrutteret« hær, med Wall Street, der bruger »milliarder« på at overbevise desperate unge mennesker

om at ofre sig for Imperiet. Med hensyn til »efterretningerne« (fiaskoer, inklusive hans egen og Colin Powells), der førte til disse krige, så gav han direkte Storbritanniens udenrigsefterretningstjeneste MI6 (med et billede af en grinende Tony Blair i baggrunden) skylden og tilføjede, at »efterretningerne blev tilpasset politikken«. Det »frosne billede« af videoen viser arkitekten bag oprør general Petraeus, der klamrer sig til sin bimbo-kæreste Paula Broadwell.

Video, med et link fra siden med artiklerne på <http://theempirefiles.tv/> er tilgængelig på https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0agQ_nfCes

I en ny dokumentar på russisk Tv angriber præsident Putin Vestens brug af koldkrigstaktik og tilskynder til samarbejde om fred og udvikling

21. december 2015 – Den russiske Rossiya-1 Tv-station sendte den 20. december dokumentarudsendelsen "Verdensordenen", som indeholder flere interviews med præsident Vladimir Putin, hvor han diskuterer Ruslands syn på den globale strategiske krise

og truslen om terror og skarpt kritiserer den amerikanske forkærlighed for at påtvinge andre nationer (som f.eks. Ukraine) Vestens forestillinger om "demokrati" – idet man herved overtræder international lov, fremfor at samarbejde med alle parter for at opnå fred og økonomisk udvikling og besejre terrorismen.

RT, Sputnik, nyhedswebsiten Vestnik Kavkaza (vestnikkavkaza.net) og amerikanske medier rapporterede om Putins vidtrækkende bemærkninger til den prominente russiske journalist Vladimir Soloviev, der har produceret dokumentaren.

"Det bipolære system kollapsede, og vore partnere burde have tænkt over, hvordan de skulle blive til de moralske ledere af de nyligt opståede, globale relationer", sagde Putin. "I stedet fortsatte de med at tænke og agere på de gamle måder, med koldkrigsklichéer." USA og dets vestlige allierede klynger sig til den absurde idé, at Rusland ønsker at genrejse Sovjetunionen, anklagede Putin. Hvad der er endnu værre: Europa har opgivet sin suverænitet og underkastet sig USA. "Europa har overhovedet ingen selvstændig udenrigspolitik."

Han sagde desuden, at Vesten tror, det kan pålægge andre områder sin egen standard for demokrati. "Da de forskellige operationer begyndte ... i Afghanistan, Irak eller Libyen, var det altid min holdning, at vi må handle forsigtigt. Man kan ikke have sine egne begreber om godt og ondt og tro, at demokrati automatisk kan overføres til andre lande og folk, andre kulturer, andre religioner og traditioner." Se, sagde han, på katastrofen i dag i Ukraine, som køres af oligarker, der kontrolleres af Vesten, som er i færd med at afindustrialisere landet.

Den russiske præsident understregede, at han uden vanskeligheder kan arbejde sammen med Syrien, USA, Saudi Arabien og andre arabiske nationer, fordi han opretholder en konsekvent holdning, der ikke ændrer sig. Med hensyn til atomvåben, så understregede Putin, at, alt imens "atom-triaden

er den klippefaste grund, hvorpå vores atomare sikkerhedspolitik hviler, så har vi aldrig truet, og vil heller aldrig true nogen med denne atomare kølle, selv om det er et vigtigt element i vores militærdoktrin ... Jeg håber ikke, at der er nogen mennesker på planeten Jorden, der er vanvittige nok til at vove at bruge atomvåben." Men, advarede han, det virker, som om nogle lande – Obama? – "har mistet deres virkelighedsfornemmelse" og tror, man kan diktere Rusland, hvordan det skal føre sin politik. "Det kommer ikke til at ske", sagde han.

Kampen for at standse USA's militære besættelse af Filippinerne skrider frem

17. december, 2015 – Det var oprindeligt planlagt til dagen før Obamas ankomst til Manila for at deltage i APEC-mødet den 18. november, at den Filippinske Højesteret skulle træffe en afgørelse om at opretholde den ulovlige og forfatningsstridige aftale mellem præsidenterne Obama og Aquino om at overdrage alle de filippinske militærbaser til amerikansk besættelse. Dette skete imidlertid ikke, fordi en kombination af kræfter, inklusiv den tidligere amerikanske senator Mike Gravel, lederen af den filippinske LaRouche-bevægelse Butch Valdes, nogle venstreorienterede organisationer i Filippinerne samt den filippinske senator Miriam Defensor Santiago, med succes overtalte Senatet til at afgøre, at præsident Aquino og Højesteret ikke på egen hånd kunne gennemtvinge det kolonialistiske kup, men at der er tale om en traktat, der således skal godkendes i Senatet.

På det tidspunkt udsatte Højesteret afgørelsen indtil 16. december – måske i håb om, at det forfatningsmæssige spørgsmål om magtens deling på en eller anden måde ville forsvinde. Men 16. december kom og gik, og der kom ingen beslutning. Faktisk lod flere dommere det vide anonymt, at de var meget bekymrede med hensyn til Senatets forfatningsmæssige ret til at træffe beslutninger vedrørende traktater.

Dette er en delvis sejr, ikke kun for Filippinerne, men for verden, i forsøget på at standse Obamas vanvittige stormløb hen imod krig med Kina, med benyttelse af Filippinerne som en afgørende base i krigen.

Kilder på Filippinerne er bekymrede for, at dræberen Obama måske vil tage skridt til at støtte en særlig forrykt kandidat, Rodrigo Duterte, til det filippinske præsidentvalg, der er berammet til maj 2016, og påvirke ham til enten at orkestrere en "revolutionær regering" eller, hvis han vinder valget, at erklære militær undtagelsestilstand, med henblik på effektivt at sætte både Retten og Senatet ud af spillet og gennemtvinge Obamas militære besættelse – som grundlæggende set ville udgøre en gen-kolonisering af Filippinerne. Duterte kontrolleres af general Fidel Ramos, der var hitmand for George Schultz i det amerikansk orkestrerede kup imod den nationalistiske præsident Ferdinand Marcos i 1986.

Foto: Præsidenterne Aquino og Obama ved APEC 2015 i Manila, Filippinerne.

Leder, 21. december 2015:

Fjern City of London, eller sammenbruddet vil være uden for kontrol

Under diskussioner med sine kolleger søndag aften opsummerede Lyndon LaRouche den globale, strategiske krise i præcise vendinger: Londons og Det britiske Imperiums magt må omgående elimineres, eller også vil hele det transatlantiske område, med start i USA, hastigt styrtdykke ud i et ukontrollerbart kaos. Forholdsregler til kontrol må indføres, og dette betyder, at Det britiske Imperiums magt, der kontrollerer Obama, må fjernes.

Problemet er, at ledende personer i regeringsinstitutionerne i Washington, med start i den amerikanske Kongres, der allerede burde være trådt i aktion imod Obama, ikke har handlet. Obama leder stadig sine tirsdagsmøder for (drone-)drab, på trods af den kendsgerning, at hans tilstand er under hastig degeneration, i accelererende tempo. Det britiske monarki er fortsat den institution, der regerer over det transatlantiske område.

LaRouche bemærkede, at Rusland er anderledes, og Kina er også anderledes. Det er nationer, der samarbejder, og ser hen til en udvidelse af deres samarbejde. Men der er alvorlige problemer, med at skaffe tilstrækkeligt med vand og mad til en begyndelse. Rusland og Kina er i dag de eneste, virkelige magter, der potentielt set handler imod Det britiske Imperiums stadigt eksisterende magt, og imod deres redskab, præsident Obama.

I realiteten, erklærede LaRouche, så har kræfterne bag 11. september (2001) magten over USA. Der har været et utilstrækkeligt angreb imod det anglo-saudiske apparat, der stod bag 11. september. Som følge heraf har de kræfter, der

repræsenteres af Bush og Obama, fået fribillet til at handle. Hvis arven efter det britiske monarki og dets Bush- og Obama-operationer kan knuses, kan USA og store dele af den øvrige verden reddes.

LaRouche understregede, at centrum for kampen imod det britiske tyranni, der repræsenteres af Bush og Obama, skal findes på Manhattan og nærmeste omgivelser. Denne pointe blev tydelig i denne weekend gennem to koncerter, der blev afholdt af Schiller Instituttet, der præsenterede Händels Messias i Brooklyn og Manhattan. Alt i alt blev de to forestillinger besøgt af flere end 1.000 mennesker, med kun ståpladser til begge forestillinger. Den strøm af støtte til forestillingerne og til ideen om forbindelsen mellem klassisk kultur, videnskab og den politiske kamp for en genoplivning af Det amerikanske System, illustrerer den kendsgerning, at der i den amerikanske befolkning er en kerne, centreret omkring Manhattan og dele af det nordlige Californien især, der kan redde nationen. Disse områders førende borgeres særlige egenskaber kan spredes i hele landet, men kun med fokus på ånden og aktiveringen fra Manhattan.

Nedsmeltningen af hele systemet er i fuld gang. Det globale blodbad kan udelukkende standses af et gennembrud i USA, med start i fjernelsen af Wall Street og genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall. Dette må ske inden krakket finder sted, og det kunne ske, hvornår det skal være, fra nu af og fremefter. Dette er ikke et 'hype' eller et slogan. Den 1. januar 2016 træder reglerne for bail-out i kraft i Europa. Samme dag vil Puerto Rico gå i betalingsstandsning med de første 1,4 mia. dollar i gæld til gribbefondene.

Enten får man Glass-Steagall vedtaget nu, eller også vil følgen blive kaos i hele det transatlantiske område, og under disse omstændigheder er det næsten sikkert, at kræfterne i Det britiske Imperium vil satse på krig med Rusland og Kina.



Amerikansk missilforsvar kan ikke standse russiske interkontinentale ballistiske missiler, siger russisk kommandør

17. december 2015 – Generalløjtnant Sergei Karakaev, kommandør over Ruslands Strategiske Missilforsvarsstyrker, sagde til reportere under en pressekonference i Moskva i går, at det amerikanske missilforsvarssystem ikke er i stand til at modstå et massivt angreb fra russiske interkontinentale, ballistiske atommissiler. Russiske militæreksperters analyser har fundet, at »at hverken ildkraftpotentialet eller databehandlingsevnen hos de nuværende, deployerede amerikanske missilforsvarsinstallationer«, var i stand til at klare et masseangreb fra den russiske atom-triade, sagde han.

Ifølge RT påpegede Karakaev amerikanske eksperters vurderinger, der mener, at et effektivt missilforsvarssystem må bestå af forskellige integrerede typer af midler til at forhindre missiler (et »forsvar i flere tempi«, (amr. 'layered defense'), som det kaldes i det amerikanske militær, -red.), det være sig kinetiske eller lasersystemer, der deployeres i alle omgivelser, inklusive i rummet. Derfor er de langfristede udviklingsplaner for Ruslands Strategiske Missiltropper blevet rettet til at tage det forudsagte omfang og tempo for den amerikanske udvikling af missilforsvar i betragtning, sagde generalen.

De Strategiske Missiltropper har planer om at introducere

nogle »splinternye og effektive midler og teknikker til at gennemtrænge ethvert missilforsvarssystem«, sagde general Karakaev og understregede, at russiske ballistiske missiler er i stand til at ramme mål »hvor som helst i verden«. Den næste generation af ballistiske missiler med banebrydende karakteristika, og med nye midler til at gennemtrænge missilforsvarssystemer, ville »garantere neutraliseringen af de fremvoksende, potentielle trusler«, sagde Karakaev.

<https://www.rt.com/news/326121-us-missile-shield-russian-icbm/>

Foto: Et RS-24 Yars / SS-27 Mod 2 solid propellant interkontinentalt ballistisk missil.

**Leder, 16. december 2015:
Wall Streets kollaps er
uafvendeligt –
Kun Franklin Roosevelts
politik, med**

Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit til realøkonomisk investering, kan forhindre et kollaps ned i Helvede

En fjerde New York-hedgefond lukkede i dag for udtræk, som følge af, at hele junk- og højrente-obligationsmarkedet er i færd med at nedsmelte. I takt med, at de raketstore spekulative lån i olie, gas og mineraler løber ind i kollapsende priser under en sløv økonomi, er flere »markedseksperter« (gribbeinvestorer) såsom Wilbur Ross og Carl Icahn kommet med erklæringer, hvor de siger, at de ser en trussel om, at kollapset i junkkredit kan sprede sig til det langt større kreditmarked for kreditvurderings-selskaber – hvilket muligvis kunne få hele det vestlige finanssystem til at krakke.

Under alle omstændigheder står systemet ikke til at redde. Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag, at alle pengene på Wall Street er nominelle, spekulative værdipapirer, der ikke er en rød øre værd og må afskrives på samme måde, som Franklin Roosevelt gjorde det, da han tiltrådte sit embede i 1933. FDR kunne dernæst sætte folk i arbejde og atter give en befolkning, der nær var blevet drevet ud i døden, sin værdighed tilbage. Men situationen i dag er langt værre. LaRouche påpegede de tusinder, måske millioner, af midaldrende, aktive mennesker, der er drevet ud af arbejdsstyrken, og som kommer ud i stofmisbrug, hvilket er, hvad der ligger bag den seneste tids voldsomme stigning i selvmord. Han påpegede den italienske borger, hvis livsopsparing blev stjålet under en bank »bail-in« (dvs. ekspropriering af kundernes indeståender) i sidste uge – »et signal om, at gribbene er gået for vidt«.

Obama står i vejen for den eneste løsning på katastrofen, som er en gennemførelse af Glass-Steagall og en lukning af »for store til at lade gå ned«-bankerne og den efterfølgende opbygning af et nyt system. Det, der mangler, er lederskab – der kan fjerne Obama, gennemføre Glass-Steagall og skabe en genrejsning af USA's og verdens økonomi gennem store infrastrukturprojekter sammen med BRIKS og Kinas programmer under den Nye Silkevej. »Det kræver ikke et stort antal mennesker«, sagde LaRouche i dag, »men et antal store mennesker«.

Hvis den rablende fascist Donald Trump og Obama-marionetten Hillary Clinton blev fjernet som kandidater, så kunne de anstændige kandidater og andre fra både det demokratiske og republikanske parti komme sammen for at udføre jobbet, nu, før finanssystemet imploderer, og før Obama kan begynde sin krig med Rusland og Kina.

I dag meddelte (udenrigsminister) John Kerry, efter et møde med Sergei Lavrov og Vladimir Putin i Moskva, at USA ikke længere stillede krav om, at Assad skulle afsættes, før en koalition imod terroristerne kan lanceres og en overgangsproces til en ny regering initieres i Syrien. Som Putin gentagne gange har sagt, så er det kun det syriske folk, der kan beslutte, hvem, der skal regere Syrien, på trods af Obamas kriminelle regimeskift-galskab. John Kerry har nu brudt med denne Obama-politik – men, så længe, Obama forbliver ved magten, så længe eskalerer faren for krig ganske enkelt, alt imens finanssystemets krak kommer stadig nærmere – måske i de næste par dage.

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

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

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

terrorisme, er en tiltagende oplagt nødvendighed.”

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

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

Russisk forsvarsminister: NATO kommer stadig tættere på Rusland

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

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

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

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

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