

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

USA og Rusland må samarbejde

—

Kun et nyt paradigme kan forhindre fascisme!

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 10. december 2015:

Er NATO allerede i krig med Rusland?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

USA bekræfter officielt:

Amerikanske F-15-fly er i Tyrkiet som Ruslands modstandere

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

Embedsmanden bekræftede således den erklæring, som kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-Hi.) kom med den 1. dec. i

Husets Komite for de Væbnede Styrker, da hun udspurgte forsvarsminister Ash Carter om truslen om atomkrig mod Rusland: »Så, den kendsgerning, at vi nu har vores F-15-fly, der afpatruljerer den tyrkisk-syriske grænse, med en primær luft-til-luft-operation – der er ingen luftkamp imod ISIS; de har ingen aktiver i form af luftvåben; så jeg kan kun gå ud fra, at disse flys mål er russiske fly«, sagde hun. Carter svarede aldrig på hendes erklæring om F-15C-flyene, men det er nu demonstreret, at hun har ret.

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

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

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

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

Spørgsmålet om Ruslands overlevelse efter Tyrkiets bombing af det russiske fly over Syrien blev udtrykt, da præsident Putin holdt sin magtfulde tale til parlamentet i militærets hal, og påkaldte Ruslands 15 år lange kamp for at bekæmpe terror i Rusland, og nu, international terror, og indkaldte hver eneste russiske borger til at se sig selv som en »soldat« i denne krig.

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

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

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

Obama driver nu nationen og planeten hen mod en atomar konfrontation, som den menneskelige civilisation ikke kan overleve. Atomvåbeneksperter kan se det og kommer med offentlige advarsler. Mindst ét kongresmedlem kan se det;

kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard fra Hawaii udfordrede forsvarsminister Carter med denne Obamas trussel om atomkrig i Husets Komite for de Bevæbnede Styrker. Præsident Putin og det kinesiske lederskab ser det helt bestemt og træffer enhver foranstaltning til at forberede sig, så vel som til at undgå krig.

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

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

Er nedtællingen til Tredje Verdenskrig allerede begyndt?

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

Dette kan skyldes, som han ildevarslende bemærker i begyndelsen, at, »når mobilisering for krig først begynder, følger det sin egen dynamik og er ukontrollerbart.«

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

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

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

angreb på jorden. Kampflyene er ikke deployeret for at angribe ISIS på jorden, men for at true de russiske bombefly, der angriber ISIS-mål på jorden.«

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

Rusland sender budskab med ubåds lancerede krydsermissiler

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 3. dec.: Tyrkiske tropper invaderede det nordlige Irak under den irakiske regerings skingre protester, igen med klar opbakning fra Obama. Dette eskalerede den 7. dec., da der rapporteredes om yderligere tyrkiske tropper, der gik ind i området, hvilket bragte tallet op på 900 iflg. guvernøren for provinsen Ninive, rapporterer Sputnik. Tyrkiet har nægtet at trække sine tropper tilbage; deres eneste »indrømmelse« har været endnu ikke at sende yderligere 350 tropper, der er opstillet på grænsen, ind.

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

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

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

Men alle disse provokationer på vegne af briterne og Obama går op imod Putins stålsatte beslutning og hans igangværende flankering af provokationerne. Tirsdag meddelte Putin og hans

forsvarsminister Shoigu, at Rusland havde lanceret krydsermissiler imod ISIS fra en russisk ubåd i Middelhavet. Putin tilføjede, at missilerne kan armeres med enten et konventionelt sprænghoved eller et atomsprænghoved, men at han håbede, atomsprænghoveder »aldrig vil blive nødvendige«.

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

»Det, vi har her, er et problem, der umiddelbart kan spores til det terrorregime, der ramte Paris og andre dele af Frankrig for nylig. Vi har nu i USA, i mindre skala, den samme type operation med en arabisk gruppe for panik, og som begår

massemord. De masse mord, der styres af Tyrkiet og andre netop nu, er en del af den samme ting, som nu dræber amerikanere i USA på samme basis. Og grunden til, at dette finder sted, er Barack Obama, der har magt til at håndtere dette problem, men ikke gør det. Man kan derfor ikke klage over disse ting, hvis man ikke handler med de midler, der er til rådighed, for at korrigere problemet.«

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

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

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

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

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

Senere i diskussionen gentog LaRouche:

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

LaRouches lederskab overlapper den voksende afsky i landet mod Obamas løgne, og hans afsindige fremstød mod en atomar konfrontation med Rusland og Kina – som på det seneste bruger Erdogans regering i Tyrkiet til at lancere den ene provokation efter den anden imod Rusland. Den 4. dec. var Melon-Scaifes *Pittsburgh Tribune Review* den seneste avis, der tog spalteskriver Charles Hurts artikel i *Washington Times* op, hvor denne rejser spørgsmålet om det nødvendige i at aktivere det 25. forfatningstillæg imod en præsident Obama, de er ansvarlig for, at ISIS nu »kommer til Amerika«. Andre medier, såsom *Boston Herald*, er oprørte over Obamas håndtering af San Bernadino-skyderiet og skriver: »Vold på arbejdspladsen? Virkelig?«

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

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

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

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

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

I løbet af de 10 dage, siden Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske bombefly ... , har de barske kendsgerninger, som hr.

LaRouche har advaret om i årevis, hævdet sig meget levende, og på uigendrivelig måde: at, under denne præsidents fortsatte politik befinder verden sig kun en hårs bredde fra en fuldt optrappet atomkrig, en krig, der kunne bryde ud, hvornår det skal være, og en krig, der ville blive absolut uden fortilfælde mht. det omfang af død og ødelæggelse, som en sådan krig ville udløse. Engelsk udskrift.

Utilize Your Unique Human Potential To Contribute

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

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's December 4, 2015. You're watching our regular Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. My name is Mathew Ogden, and I will be your host here this evening. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and by Benjamin Deniston from the LaRouche PAC Science Team. And the three of us did have an opportunity to meet with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche earlier today, and what we present here tonight will be informed as a reflection of the outcome of that discussion. We meet here tonight under very urgent circumstances. In the 10 days since the shooting-down of the Russian fighter jet by Turkey over Syrian territory, the stark reality of what Mr. LaRouche has been warning about for years has asserted itself very vividly, and in an indisputable way: that under the continued policies of this President, the world is currently only a hair's breadth away from all-out thermonuclear war, a war which could occur any hour of any day, and one whose consequences would be absolutely unprecedented in the magnitude of death and

devastation which such a war would unleash.

As Mr. LaRouche was very forthright in the hours following that incident on Nov. 24, and was echoed and confirmed later by

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Turkey was by no means acting alone in the decision to take this incredibly provocative

action, but must have possessed some sort of prior agreement directly from the United States to shoot this Russian plane down-the very first such direct military action against a Russian

military aircraft by a NATO member country in over 60 years, and

one taken with the obvious foreknowledge of everything that such

an attack implies in terms of the rapid chain of escalation of response, and counter-response, which can very quickly, under these circumstances, lead to the issuance of a command for the launch of a nuclear strike.

Thus, as Mr. LaRouche has not ceased to warn in very clear terms, every day that Obama has his finger on the red button of

the United States strategic nuclear arsenal, is a day of existential danger to the entirety of the human race.

Now in the aftermath of this incident, the dire urgency of this grim reality has begun to sink in. We saw the article that

we mentioned last week in {Politico} magazine on Nov. 27, by Bruce Blair, a nuclear security expert at Princeton University,

and one of the cofounders of the Global Zero movement for the elimination of nuclear arms. The article was titled "Could U.S.-Russian Tensions Go Nuclear?", and described in detail the

so-called launch-on-warning status which have the nuclear weapons

of both Russia and the United States on hair-trigger alert in

which the decision to launch a full-scale nuclear barrage by either side, must be made within a matter of mere minutes, if not

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and obsolete. But as we well know, Barack Obama is definitely

no

Ronald Reagan.

Now in addition to this article by Bruce Blair, yesterday former Defense Secretary William Perry, said in a very significant presentation which he made in Washington, D.C., the

following: "The U.S. is on the brink of kicking off a new nuclear

arms race that will elevate the risk of nuclear apocalypse to Cold War levels. " He said, "We're now at the precipice, maybe I

should say the brink, of a new arms race," and called for the dismantling of the ICBM component of the so-called nuclear triad.

And he went on to say, "the risk of nuclear war is exacerbated by

the dismantling of the relationship between Russia and the U.S.

that had been formed after the fall of the Soviet Union. Without

clear military to military communication between those two nations, the risk of conflict increases. I probably would not have said this 10 years ago," he said. But today we now face the

kind of dangers of a nuclear event like we had during the Cold War, an accidental war. I see an imperative, therefore, to stop

this damn nuclear arms race from accelerating again."

And finally, we have the confrontation by Congresswoman , Democratic Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard, during a hearing of the

House Armed Services Committee, of Obama's Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, which we're going to play a video clip for you in

just one minute. Representative Gabbard's remarks were covered quite extensively in the press, under headlines such as "Tulsi Gabbard says, Obama Policies could trigger war with Russia,"

which was in the Huffington Post, and “Democratic Congresswoman Warns, Obama Could Drag the U.S. into a devastating nuclear war

with Russia,” Daily Mail. What you’re about to hear Congresswoman

Gabbard say, also echoes statements that she made a few days earlier in a CNN interview, after having returned from Paris, in

which she warned that Obama’s policies in Syria ” put the United

States and Russia into a head-to-head conflict, with the possibility that one side will shoot down the other’s planes, kicking of what is much larger, potentially world war, and a nuclear war between the United States and Russia, and she said,

“We’ve got to ask ourselves: what will the costs of this be? The

devastation to the American people and to the world, and for what? What’s the benefit? Why are we trying to do this in Syria?

Why are we trying to go to war with Russia over this disagreement

concerning the overthrowing of the Syrian government of Bashar al-Assad. It’s crazy.”

So let’s see this short video clip of Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard and Ash Carter:

GABBARD: The policy to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad has thrown us into a potential direct head to head military

conflict with Russia. I have some important questions along this

line. How many nuclear warheads does Russia have aimed at the U.S., and how many does the U.S. have aimed at Russia?

CARTER: Congresswoman, I will get you those precise numbers

as best we know them. Let me just summarize it by the fact that we have a, I'm confident, a strong, safe, secure, reliable deterrent. But it's also true that Russia, like the Soviet Union that precedes it, has a massive nuclear arsenal.

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

CARTER: We do.

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

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

so important, that's why prudence in the field of nuclear matters by leaders all over the world is so essential.

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

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

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

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

CARTER: I have to correct something, Congresswoman, that you said; which is that I would characterize Russia's prospective differently. And by the way, what they say and what they do are two different things. What they said they were going to do was fight ISIL and pursue a political transition; and not support Assad endlessly, but instead, try to pursue a political solution.

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

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

OGDEN: Having seen that, the question that you must ask is, what is the necessary action that must be taken to defuse this very real and immediate threat of thermonuclear war which threatens us as a direct consequence of Obama's policies, both in Syria and elsewhere. And I'm going to ask Jeff to come to the podium to address this question; but as Mr. LaRouche has repeatedly said, the only guarantee is for responsible parties

in

this country to take the Constitutional action necessary to remove Barack Obama from the Presidency of the United States, specifically through the activation of the 25th Amendment to the

US Constitution. Which stipulates that if the President is deemed

mentally incapable of serving in the role of Commander in Chief,

he can be removed and replaced through the predetermined line of

succession. Mr. LaRouche has been calling for this measure to be

taken for a number of years; but just this week, discussion of this measure has exploded into the mainstream press, including very significantly in an editorial that was published in the {Washington Times} by staff writer Charles Hurt, which was titled, "Has the President Lost His Ability to Discharge the Powers and Duties of Office?" The editorial begins by asking, "Has our President officially lost his ability to discharge the

powers and duties of his office? Anyone who listened to President

Obama speak to reporters in Paris on Tuesday, would reasonably conclude that it is high time to start drawing up the papers to

transmit to Congress for his removal." And after describing in detail the rambling and largely incoherent performance by Obama

during his press conference in Paris earlier this week, the author concludes by stating the following: "Someone alert the Senate Pro Tem; somebody call the Speaker of the House, and let's

all dust off the 25th Amendment."

So Jeff, with all this evidence of a growing acknowledgement in public discussion of the danger which Mr. LaRouche has been warning about for years, of world war resulting from the

continuation of Obama's policies, what can you tell us about what

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

than his narcissistic delusions would have him believe. Just prior to the attacks in Paris, on the 13th of November, the President issued a statement saying that ISIS was contained and on the way to being defeated, and didn't pose a threat. Earlier he had called them "the junior varsity of terrorism." I think reality tells us something quite different. Earlier this week, he said that there is no measurable security threat, here, inside the United States. And what we saw happen in San Bernardino, California several days ago, clearly demonstrates that that was not an accurate reflection of reality. The response of the White House has been to put pressure on FBI Director, [James] Comey, and on the media, to hold back from drawing the obvious conclusion, that virtually anybody in their right mind has drawn, from even the media coverage of that San Bernardino incident, namely, that it was a pre-meditated terrorist attack. It's very much reminiscent of what happened on September 11th, 2012, when President Obama ordered a false statement, a patently absurd false statement, about the attack in Benghazi [Libya] that led to the murder of U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other American officials. And that, of course, is still an issue that's pending before the House [Select Committee on Benghazi]. So, we're clearly dealing with a situation where the President's grip on reality is slipping precipitously. Under similar circumstances, back in the early 1970s, members of President Richard Nixon's own political party, were grounded enough in reality that they were willing to recognize

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

of incident that could get out of control and lead to nuclear war?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

32 miles from the Turkish border. The S-400 Air Defense Systems have a range of 250 miles. In other words, Russia has the ability to knock out Turkish aircraft 200 miles {inside} Turkish territory. That's an area in which U.S. fighter planes and drones are also operating.

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

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

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

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

an absolute denial of reality.

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

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

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

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

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

[U.S. and Russian nuclear security expert] Bruce Blair; reflected by Gen. [James] Cartwright, who was the former vice-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [and] former head of the U.S. Strategic Command, our nuclear triad; along with Russian [Maj.] Gen. [Vladimir] Dvorkin, who was the chief intelligence analyst for Russia's strategic rocket force – who've all said, "Let's immediately abandon launch-on-warning. We've got to, basically, create an alternative to this hair-trigger situation, where a decision about global nuclear annihilation, has to be made in a matter of seconds."

The reality is, that there is another option. It's the option that was referenced in the {Washington Times} and the {Washington Examiner}, and even implicitly in the {Washington Post}. And it's the option that Lyndon LaRouche has been discussing {for a very long time}. You've got to {remove} one of the most crucial factors that continues this threat, which is the continuation of President Barack Obama in office. The 25th Amendment is there. His behavior in Paris, his erratic behavior, has caused alarm bells to go off all over the place, and the question that's got to be posed, is: "Are {you}, Member of Congress; are {you}, American Citizen, willing to run the risk of maintaining a President in office, who may very well be "losing it" mentally, and who certainly has exhibited a policy of hatred towards Russia

and particularly towards President Putin, that under the

present

circumstances poses a grave danger of general war, a war that could be a nuclear war.

So, that's the question on the table. And now that Mr. LaRouche is no longer the only leading American political voice

openly talking about immediately invoking the 25th Amendment, maybe it's time for a serious national debate and dialogue on that issue to put the kind of pressure on Vice-President Biden,

Secretary Kerry, Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, to not run the

risk, to not play, to use a bad analogy, Russian roulette, with

nuclear warheads, and the barrel of a gun, when the survival of

humanity is at stake.

We are really now in a very different place than we even were a few weeks ago. The actions taken by Erdogan have brought

us to that moment of hair-trigger, and while there are many things that could be done to ameliorate that danger, the fact is

that none of them are possible so long as President Obama is in

office. So the tools are right there. The 25th Amendment can be

activated on a moment's notice. We could have a regime change, purely constitutional, here in the United States, as a measure of

caution against someone in a state of mental breakdown, being in

a position of having his finger on the nuclear trigger. And I see

no justification whatsoever for running the risk of mankind's survival, of waiting another day to activate that potential.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, I'm just going to pose the institutional question for this evening, and Jeff will deliver what Mr. LaRouche's response was to this, as well as Helga LaRouche's insights. The question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the German Bundestag has voted to support the U.S. coalition military operations in Syria against the Islamic State, and the British Parliament has also taken similar action. What is your view of German and British involvement in the fight against the Islamic state in Syria?"

STEINBERG: Well, I think that one thing that's obvious, the first comment from Mr. LaRouche on this was, yes, we've got to defeat the Islamic State. It's got to be done, and there's got to be an alliance of countries involved in doing that, and with that, he said, of course always be cautious. You can never trust the British. Now, the fact of the matter is that there are measures that could be taken, that would lead to the crushing of the Islamic State, to the taking back of Raqqa, their nominal capital, to the ouster of the Islamic State from Mosul—the military options are all quite clear and are being openly discussed, and are being proposed around the tables all over the place. Seal the border with Turkey. The Erdogan government in Turkey through the son Balal Erdogan, son of the president, has been the major source of black market revenue for the Islamic State, since the very beginning. We know that there are massive black market oil deals going on between ISIS and the Turkish black market, which is

really the mafia underbelly of Erdogan's AKP Party, and the MIT, which is the Turkish equivalent of the CIA, run by one of Erdogan's very close associates.

So, you can seal the borders. You can start the economic squeeze against the Islamic State. You could create a single joint military command operation fully integrating Russia, into whatever other military operations are going to be run.

President Hollande of France, when he was in Washington, and then in Moscow last week, specifically proposed that there be a consolidated unified air campaign against ISIS, and that on the ground the Syrian army be integrated with some of the rebel groups that are strictly made up of former Syrian military personnel—some element of the Free Syrian Army, in particular. That kind of ground force, maybe with some other assistance from the Iraqi military, along with a massive air campaign, through a single unified command, could wipe out the Islamic State, at least in so far as it's operating out of a major safe haven territory in Syria and Iraq.

The problem, however, as has been demonstrated by Paris, by San Bernardino now this week here in the United States—on a much lower scale, of course—by the bombing of the Metro jet, Russian metro jet over the Sinai, by the suicide bombings in Southern Beirut, all of these things indicate that you're dealing with a much larger problem that's not going to be solved overnight.

You

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

like that, and the place was relatively peaceful and stable. It was not the world's opium production capital. So, the point is that there are alternative policies that must be enacted to really defeat this Dark Age phenomenon. The Chinese have adopted the One Belt/One Road policy of developing vast corridors of infrastructure, of industrial and agricultural expansion, of water management, throughout much of Eurasia. For that program to work, it's going to be urgent that we achieve stability in places like Syria and Iraq, and in many parts of North Africa. So, the real question here is, if you're prepared to commit to defeating the phenomenon that ISIS right now is the most visible representation of, you've got to be prepared to fundamentally change your thinking. You've got to be willing to abandon geo-politics, altogether. Abandon the British Empire, because this policy of permanent warfare across this great big crescent running from North Africa through the Middle East and Central Asia, all along the southern borders of the former Soviet Union into Western China,—that's a British geo-political policy. It was called the Bernard Lewis plan back in the 1970s, of spreading fundamentalist chaos along that entire what they called crescent (arc) of crisis. That program hasn't changed. It's British geo-politics at its worst. It's population warfare at its worst. And those policies must be abandoned all together. There was even a commentary this week in the {Wall Street Journal} of all places, asking the question of whether or not China's New Silk Road

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

on

the table is, you can defeat ISIS militarily with some readily available tool; especially if you drop the war confrontation with

Russia, and get into an alliance with Russia, which means getting

Obama out of office under the 25th Amendment. It's doable, but you're not going to solve the deeper underlying problem of the consequences of the last 35 years or more of this hideous geopolitics of pitting one nation, one people against another, promoting irrationalism and fundamentalism. You've got to basically roll up your shirt sleeves and begin real development

of the kind that China has correctly defined as the win-win policy of the future.

At this conference, there was a leading representative from Russia, Dr. Yakunin, who said that the Russians have concluded that their Eurasian development plan for major infrastructure projects, is completely compatible with China's One Belt/One Road

policy. India, as a leading BRICS country, is fully on board with

that prospect. We're about to develop a plan and publish it in the coming days, for the United States to become fully integrated

into this global World Land-Bridge policy. But this requires an

overhaul of thinking; and that overhaul of thinking is now long

overdue, because the very survival of mankind is literally on the

table is we don't make that change.

So, we've got a much bigger challenge and a much bigger agenda. Even if we're serious about defeating the Islamic State

and other manifestations of this Dark Age policy. It's going

to
have to be done through a vast change in thinking, and a
return
to real human thinking about what kinds of projects can insure
not just the survival, but the betterment of mankind going
into
the future.

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

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

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

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

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

that this entire Dark Age situation which we now find
ourselves

in today – both internationally as Jeff just elaborated, and
also here domestically with the Dark Age of rising death
rates,

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

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

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

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

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

without the conscious elimination and overturning of the
failed

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

just discussing, just as with the Golden Renaissance of Filippo

Brunelleschi and Nicholas of Cusa, is never something which can

come about through an evolutionary change," as Mr. LaRouche said

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

more recently, you can use the example of Albert Einstein.

Geniuses who reject the failed ideas of the past, and instead introduce something completely new; a valid, newly discovered principle upon which a valid and viable future can be built.

So

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

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

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

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

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

think about very profoundly.

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

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

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

putting together a picture for the American people, what it would mean for the United States to join this New Silk Road orientation. What it would mean for us as a country to really return to our roots, as founded by people like Alexander Hamilton, as Mr. LaRouche has put a great deal of emphasis in his most recently developing flank in Manhattan being real soul of the nation where we could pivot the United States back to an orientation like Matt just referenced in terms of a real pursuit of mankind as a creative force. What will it actually mean for the United States to once again participate in that process? And this is something that, as was referenced, at least a thesis perspective on what that would look like for the United States. But I wanted to open by just referencing something that was mentioned earlier, just to get a sense to get at the real principle of what we were talking about. There was a rather unprecedented study that came out, a study that's rather shocking that pointed to an unprecedented reality which has been uncovered in just the last couple of months, which is the realization of the increase in death rates among white, American, working age people. And we have a graphic illustrating the comparison of the death rates for this particular demographic, in comparison with a number of other developed nations. [Figure 1] And we can see in red there, from 1990 up to past 2010, the change in the death rate for, again, white Americans from age 45 to 54. And I just want to put this on the screen for a minute, because there's a lot of stats we can go through in terms of what's happening, and

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

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

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

peak of their productive contribution to society, people who are

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

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

This dramatic acceleration, continual year to year increase, in

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

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

would expect from a healthy economic process.

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

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

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

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

their own willful choice of these substance abuse, drug

addiction, suicide, what have you.

So I think this should be taken as a very clear signal of what's happened to the United States, what's happened to the American economy. And what we have to reverse. And what I want to

talk about just briefly is trying to get at the essence of the issue, to the degree possible. Because we can talk about putting

people back to work, we could talk about creating jobs, we could

talk about rebuilding things-but that's not going to get to the

real essence of what we confront right now as a nation. We have

to really re-find the purpose of the existence of our nation, as

Matthew referenced as Mr. LaRouche said last night, in an understanding of what is mankind's purpose as a creative force in

the Universe.

Why do people work? Why do people have jobs? Why do people work to contribute to society? What's the purpose of existence?

That's been eliminated really over two generations, increasingly

though in a rapid acceleration, under the Bush-Cheney regime. The

very idea that mankind is inherently creative species; I mean, that mankind creates its own existence meaning that {you}, as an

individual part of that species, part of that process, can participate in the actual physical creation of the future state

of society. That if society moves forward, ... And what do we mean by "move forward"? LaRouche has spent decades developing a

science of physical economy. What is economics for mankind? We

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

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

present,
but the creation of a state of existence for society which
would
not ever exist if not for the actions, the contributions, of
the
earlier generation of the earlier state.
That's what we have to return to. Creation of new states for
mankind, not just perpetuating or rebuilding what we had in
the
past, but rising to a new level. And we need that now more
than
ever. That has been at the root of our existence as a
republic,
again going back to Hamilton, people like Lincoln, people like
Franklin Roosevelt-that's been understood to varying degrees,
that this is what makes mankind unique, and we have to focus
our
efforts of government, of society, in exercising and
facilitating
that creative process.
So what do we need to do now, today? Just to go through some
of the obvious things that we should be focused on, and doing
as
a nation. One leading element is going to be rebuilding our
nation, rebuilding our infrastructure, and in a sense not
really
rebuilding, but building anew, building a higher level of
existence for our nation. And one of the things we're going to
be
featuring in our prospective program for the United States is
actually building a modern, high-speed rail system. This is
just
obvious. That transportation in the United States would be a
joke
if we didn't have to deal with it every single day. The idea
of
people just wasting their lives on these highways. Hours upon

hours upon hours daily, just wasted.

If you go to the third graphic here, we have a comparison, just to give people a sense of—in the green, we see existing high speed rail systems in the United States and China. Now, in

the United States this has been debatable whether we could actually include the green corridor we've included as technically

high-speed rail. Relative to what we have, we could consider it

high-speed rail, but that's not saying much. It's stretching the

definition, but it's the closest we have. and throughout the rest

of the United States, you see one proposal, among a number of proposals, for what kind of obvious, sane high-speed rail system

we should have: travelling 150 miles per hour, to get people to

different locations in a quick efficient manner.

You see China is doing this. You see China's program now, what they've built, and what they're committed to building I believe out to 2020, for their high-speed rail program. So this

could be done. This needs to be done.

We have the water issue. We have, to put it lightly, insane governor in California, who, despite living on the coast of the

largest body of water on the face of this planet, seems to think

that we've run out of water. Well, we have plenty of means available to us to provide all the water we need. Some of this is

illustrated in the next graphic, the fourth graphic. This is something we've covered in more detail on the LaRouche PAC website and other locations. But mankind fully has the capability

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

known

to be required to develop it; it's obvious. And various experts

have made clear, we can have a demonstration functioning fusion

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

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

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

reality that now we look at an unemployment problem; with this program, we're going to be confronted with a little more frightening reality. We actually have an unemployable problem; we

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

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

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

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

contribution to the economic process.

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

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

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

the state of the economy as it was 20, 30 years ago. This is

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

way

he understands it. What is it that mankind has that makes our species separate; that makes us distinct? What is that actual principle which mankind has the ability to tap into and employ if

he chooses to; if he chooses to organize his society in a truly

human way? And what would that mean for us today? Well, again, it

wouldn't mean just doing what we've done in the past. It would mean that right now, what we have to do is bring society to a level that we've never had before. And we have to fight to engage

the American population again into recognizing that their meaning

to history, their meaning, period, depends upon that. That the meaning of their very existence depends upon recognizing that they have a potential to contribute to the creation of a higher

state of existence for society. And for mankind, if we're not doing that, if we're not organizing society to do that and exercise that, and implement those creative leaps of mankind, then you're not being human; and your population is being denied

an actual efficient access to their true scientific immortality

as a human species.

There's obviously a lot that could be said, but I think that's the principle that we have to focus on; that it's not just

about creating jobs. It's not just about employing people who are

various economic statistics; it's about coming to a new, higher

understanding of economics really as an expression of this unique

spark of human creative potential. And we have to, again,

focus

on that as the number one issue; the cause, the substance of what

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

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

worth fighting for. Fighting for creating the future in a way that is truly, uniquely human.

OGDEN: Thank you, Ben. And what Ben referred to, is a forthcoming programmatic feature which is intended to be a supplement to the EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes

the World Land-Bridge". This is going to be titled, "Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road". I also know this will

be the bulk of the subject of the presentation which Helga delivered in Tokyo, which Jeff was referring to; and will be available in transcript form in the next edition of {Executive Intelligence Review}. So, I'm going to bring a conclusion to our

broadcast here tonight. I would encourage all of you to continue

participating in both the Thursday night Fireside Chats, which Mr. LaRouche hosts every week, as well as if you are present in

the New York City area, the Manhattan Project meetings, which occur every Saturday afternoon. Another one will occur tomorrow.

So, thank you very much for joining us. Thank you to both Jeff and Ben, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com

Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium briefer medier om Tyrkiets rolle i finansiering af ISIS; Flere efterretninger undervejs

2. december 2015 – Kl. 15.00 her til eftermiddag, Moskva-tid, gav højtrangerende officerer fra den Russiske Generalstab en omfattende briefing til medier om den ulovlige operation »på industriel skala«, gennem hvilken Tyrkiet – og mere specifikt præsident Recep Erdogan og hans familie – finansierer Islamisk Stat (ISIS) ved at købe den olie, som ISIS har stjålet fra Syrien og Irak. Viceforsvarsminister Anatoly Antonov, generalløjtnant, chef for Generalstabens operationelle hoveddirektorat, Sergei Rudskov, og generalløjtnant Mikhail Mizintsev, chef for det nationale center for statslig forsvarskontrols operationelle hoveddirektorat, brugte satellit- og rekognosceringsfotos, videoer og kort til at demonstrere omfanget af Tyrkiets »forretnings«-operationer med de islamiske terrorister og bemærkede, at dagens briefing kun udgjorde »en del« af deres efterretninger, og at mere ville følge.

Idet han detaljeret forklarede omfanget af den ulovlige operation, rapporterede gen. Rudskov, at denne i alt involverer 8.500 lastbiler, der transporterer op til 200.000

tons olie dagligt, og hvor de fleste af lastbilerne kommer ind i tyrkisk territorium fra Irak. I løbet af de to måneder, hvor de russiske luftstyrker har været i Syrien, fortsatte han, har de ødelagt 32 olieproduktionsfaciliteter, 11 raffinaderier og 23 oliepumpestationer, plus i alt 1.080 olietankbiler. Dette har reduceret den ulovlige omsætning af olie med næsten 50 %, og reduceret ulovlige olieindtægter fra 3 million dollar om dagen til 1,5 mio. dollar om dagen. Men terrorister modtager fortsat finansielle ressourcer, advarede han, så vel som våben, ammunition og andre forsyninger til deres aktiviteter.

»Visse nationer, primært Tyrkiet«, sagde gen. Rudskov, »er direkte involveret i Islamisk Stats storstilede forretningsprojekt og hjælper således terroristerne. Den Russiske Føderations Væbnede Styrkers Generalstab har uigendrivelige beviser for Tyrkiets involvering, baseret på rekognosceringsdata fra luften og fra rummet.« Viceforsvarsminister Antonov specificerede, at præsident Erdogan, hans familie og landets »øverste politiske lederskab« var skyldige i at muliggøre købet af olie fra ISIS. I Vesten, sagde han, »stillede ingen spørgsmål om den kendsgerning, at den tyrkiske præsidents søn er chef for et af de største energiselskaber, eller at hans svigersøn er blevet udnævnt til energiminister. Sikke et fantastisk familieforetagende!«

Generalløjtnant Mizintsev kom med yderligere detaljer om strømmen af militante kæmpere, ammunition og automobiludstyr, »der kom fra Tyrkiet«, og som har forsynet ISIS og Jabhat al-Nusra med afgørende forstærkninger.

Gen. Rudskov fremlagde den centrale del af den meget detaljerede rapport om de hovedtransportruter ind i Tyrkiet, der anvendes af jihadisterne. De mange kort, videoer og satellitbilleder, han brugte, viste konvojer af lastbiler, der frit krydsede den tyrkiske grænse fra syrisk territorium, der er kontrolleret af al-Nusra og ISIS. »Disse lastbiler tjekkes ikke på den tyrkiske side«, sagde han, og der er hundreder af sådanne lastbiler. De tyrkiske havne Dortyol og Iskenderum har

særlige fortøjningspladser til tankskibe; olie lastes om bord på fartøjer og sendes til olieforarbejdningsfabrikker uden for Tyrkiet. Rudskov forklarede detaljeret om andre olieudvindingsoperationer, såsom i regionen nær Deir ez-Zor, under ISIS' kontrol, hvor store koncentrationer af tankbiler ses vente på skibsladninger.

Han forklarede skarpt, at, »eftersom der ikke finder nogen angreb sted af den amerikanskledede koalition« mod nogen af disse konvojer, vil Forsvarsministeriet på sin webside udlægge »koordinaterne for de aktive koncentrationsområder for tankbiler«, så andre nationer kan bruge dem! »Den russiske flyvergruppe vil fortsætte med at udføre opgaver, der drejer sig om at likvidere olieinfrastrukturfaciliteter tilhørende ISIS-terroristorganisationen i den Syriske Arabiske Republik. Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium opfordrer ligeledes sine partnere i koalitionen til at tage en sådan handling«, erklærede gen. Rudskov.

(Hele briefinggen og video kan findes på <http://eng.syria.mil.ru/en/index/syria/brief.htm>)

Leder, 3. december 2015: Obama deployerer for krig, mens det 25. forfatningstillæg påkalder

Præsident Obama fortsætter sin mobilisering for krig med Rusland. NATO planlægger at sende kampfly og

antiluftforsvars-missiler til Tyrkiet – med Rusland som eneste mål for sådanne offensive våben – med USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carter, der tirsdag meddelte deployeringen af 200 amerikanske jagt-og-dræb specialstyrker til Irak for at finde og dræbe ISIS-ledere i både Irak og Syrien. Ikke »rådgivere« og »uddannelsesofficerer«, men dræberteams. Selv Irak reagerede imod den gale dræber, med premierminister al-Abdi, der til pressen sagde, at Irak har brug for uddannelse, våben og rådgivning fra det internationale samfund, »ikke udenlandske kamptropper på jorden, der kæmper på irakisk jord«. Han tilføjede, at en sådan deployering »ikke kan ske uden [regeringens] godkendelse, fuld koordinering og fuld respekt for Iraks suverænitet«.

Flere amerikanske aviser havde i dag udgivet opfordringer til at tage det 25. forfatningstillæg i anvendelse som nødvendigt middel til at fjerne Obama fra embedet med den begrundelse, at han ikke længere er mentalt skikket til at udføre sine pligter. Lyndon LaRouche har gentagne gange krævet, at dette forfatningstillæg omgående blev taget i anvendelse, før det lykkes Obama at lancere en menneskelig udslettelseskrig.

Obamas optræden på Klimaforandringskonferencen i Paris var så usammenhængende, at selv en af hans faste tilhængere, reporter Richard Cohen fra *Washington Post*, skrev en spalte med overskriften, »Obama, en præsident, der mistede sin stemme« og sagde, at »hans veltalenhed var blevet erstattet af arrigskab, og han har mistet evnen til at overtale« og at »hans problem er, at han ofte ikke har noget at sige«.

Journalisten Mark Whittington fra *examiner.com* responderede imidlertid: »Har Barack Obama mistet sin stemme, eller har han mistet forstanden?« Han fortsatte: »I mangel af en rigsretssag kan vicepræsident Biden måske sammenkalde regeringen, påkalde det 25. forfatningstillæg og erklære præsident Obama mentalt uegnet til at sidde rest af sin embedsperiode ud.«

LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at det var Vladimir Putin, der satte

denne dynamik i gang med sin tale til FN's Generalforsamling[1] i september, da han roligt, men bestemt, fremlagde Obamaregeringens kriminelle handlinger, hvor de rev FN's Charter i stykker, lancerede ulovlige krige, gennemtvang regimeskift og udførte dronedrab i hele verden. Det internationale publikum var frastødt af sandheden om Obamas handlinger, og siden da har Obama selv været ude om det.

Frygten for Obama er det eneste, der holder det amerikanske folk, så vel som ledere i hele verden, tilbage fra at sige sandheden og kræve, at han fjernes, og at USA og Europa i stedet går sammen med Rusland, Kina og BRIKS-nationerne om at opbygge verden gennem processen med den Nye Silkevej, som det eneste middel til at standse Bush-Obama-politikken med overlagte, evindelige krige. Som Franklin Roosevelt sagde, stedt over for truslen om fascisme: »Vi har intet at frygte, ud over selve frygten«.[2]

[1] Præsident Putins fulde tale i FN, video, engelsk voice over.

[2] FDR's første indsættelsestale, dansk.

Leder, 2. december 2015: Hvad er rådet til den kriseramte verden i dag? Lær af Brunelleschi!

Rådet til den kriseramte verden i dag? 'Lær af Brunelleschi!' Det var det råd, som Lyndon LaRouche gav i går, da han udlagde Brunelleschis opdagelser, der på ingen måde var en

fortsættelse af den tidligere erfaring og tankegang, men var kreative gennembrud af Brunelleschi, både mht. princip og anvendelse. Historien markeres af »opdagelsesperioder«, adskilt af perioder med degeneration, sagde LaRouche. Forstå dette, for at forstå, hvor dødbringende det nuværende øjeblik er, og søg at opnå den intellektuelle og karaktermæssige kvalitet, der kræves for at standse »dårlig historie under skabelse«, og for at skabe fremtiden. Historien er ikke noget, der 'sker for én'; man skaber den.

Lige nu kræver fremtiden, at Obama kommer væk. Der er ingen fremtid, hvis han bliver. Den trussel, der kommer fra ham, kan ikke formildes gennem reform, forhandling eller ønsketænkning.

I går konfronterede et kongresmedlem, Tulsi Gabbard (D-Hawaii), Obamas to top-forsvarsregeringsfolk med sandheden om Obamas politik i Syrien, der truer med altomfattende atomkrig. I en omfattende høring i Husets Komite for de Bevæbnede Styrker begyndte Gabbard sine kommentarer til forsvarsminister Ash Carter og formand for Generalstabscheferne Joseph Dunford således: »Eftersom vores politik med at vælte Assads syriske regering grundlæggende set har bragt os til en frontal konflikt med Rusland, har jeg nogle vigtige spørgsmål at stille om dette emne.

»Hvor mange atomsprænghoveder har Rusland rettet mod USA, og hvor mange har USA, rettet mod Rusland?« Forsvarsminister Carter undveg og svarede, at han ville tilsende hende svaret på skrift. Gabbard fortsatte: »Godt. Og det ville være korrekt at sige, at begge vore lande har evnen til at affyre disse atomvåben inden for få minutter?« Carter svarede, »Det er det«: dernæst fortsatte Gabbard med sine spørgsmål, der trak detaljerne om Syrien skarpt frem, med Obamas anti-russiske politik, der nu udgør en umiddelbar, potentiel fare for et atomholocaust.

Samtidig med, at Gabbard konfronterede Kongressen med Obamas vanvid, begyndte NATO sit todages ministermøde i Bruxelles,

hvor dets London/Obama-dagsorden er at inkludere en forpligtelse til at sende mere luftforsvarsstøtte til Tyrkiet. Det kommer oven i de amerikanske F-15 fly, der allerede afpatruljerer den tyrkisk-syriske grænse. Som Gabbard sagde til Obamas regeringsfolk under høringsen i går: i betragtning af, at ISIS »ikke har nogen luftvåbensaktiver, kan jeg blot antage, at disse fly har russiske fly som deres mål ... «
(fremhævet af red.)

Det ligger ikke i den nuværende, degraderede 'amerikanske personlighed' let at fatte faren og finde modet til at handle. Men det er vores udfordring. Skab fremtiden!

Forslag til fordybelse: Redaktionen anbefaler:

»Skab en Ny Renæssance«, hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche ved Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris, juni 2015

»Ny renæssance eller Tredje Verdenskrig? Valget der dit!«, hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, april 2014,

**Diskussion med Lyndon
LaRouche
25. november 2015:**

»Obama har organiseret en krigshandling og har således sat USA, såvel som resten af menneskeheden, i fare.

*Uddrag af Lyndon LaRouches diskussion med aktivister i hele USA den 25. november. **LaRouche:** Godt, først og fremmest er det, som man skal bekymre sig om, det, som vi har brug for, Glass-Steagall. Og Glass-Steagall, hvis den bliver gennemført på rette vis nu, vil betyde, at vi automatisk – i hele USA i hvert fald, ville vi lukke alt det, der er baseret på investeringsbankpraksis, der ikke følger Glass-Steagall-standarden, fuldstændigt ned. Sagt på en anden måde: Vi ville gå tilbage til den form for system, som Franklin Roosevelt repræsenterede i løbet af sin præsidentperiode, især i løbet af 1930'erne.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Advarsel om en Ny Cubakrise

30. november 2015 – »Tyrkiet baner vejen for en Ny Cubakrise«, lyder den barske, advarende titel på en artikel i Sputnik den 29. nov., skrevet af den politiske analytiker Pyotr Iskenderov fra Ruslands Strategiske Kulturstiftelse, med undertitlen, »Invitation til ballade: Trækker Erdogan Europa ind i en Ny 'Cubakrise'?«

Iskenderovs advarsel påpeger først det, der skete den 24. nov.: »Tyrkiets uhørte provokation kunne meget vel føre til en konfrontation, der minder os om den Kolde Krigs mørkeste dage«; uhørt, fordi intet russisk militærfly er blevet skudt ned af et NATO-medlemsland i Alliancens historie. Artiklen advarer også imod den umiddelbare fremtid og Obamas rolle i opbakningen til Tyrkiet. »Tyrkiet besluttede at nedskyde det russiske bombefly, fordi præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan føler sig overbevist om, at NATO og især USA vil bakke ham op, uanset, hvad der sker. Ønsket om at udnytte modsigelserne mellem stormagter har altid været et redskab i det (Neo)-ottomanske Imperiums politik.«

Der er nogen, der bringer en diskussion på bane om, hvorvidt Tyrkiet skal spærre Bosporusstrædet for russiske skibe, der supplerer Ruslands styrker, som bekæmper terrorister i Syrien. Dette ville imidlertid ikke blive tolereret af Rusland; og Erdogans stilling over for sin egen kommando kunne vise sig temmelig svag.

En webside, der sporer skibsruter, atmarinetraffic.com, rapporterede mandag, at fartøjer under russisk flag nu forsinkes af Tyrkiet, når de søger at passere gennem Bosporus. Det Kiev-baserede Center for Transportstrategier rapporterede dette offentligt: »Søndag sejlede russiske fartøjer i zig-zag-kurs og i buede linjer, mens de i timevis ventede på tilladelse til at krydse strædet. Fartøjer fra andre lande blev ikke opholdt.«

*Foto: Russiske skibe venter i timevis for at passere Bosporus.
(RT)*

Hongkong-professor: Obama truer Kina med atomkrig

30. november 2015 – Zhang Baohui, en professor i statskundskab og direktør for Centret for Studier af det Asiatiske Stillehavsområde ved Lingnan Universitet i Hongkong, og som i omfattende mål har skrevet om Kinas atomkapaciteter, udstedte en kraftig advarsel til Obama om, at denne fremprovokerer en konflikt, der hurtigt kunne blive til en atomkrig.

I en artikel i *RSIS Commentary South China Sea Series Nov. 12*, skriver Zhang, at, da Obama sendte et amerikansk krigsskib inden for 12-milegrænsen omkring Kinas nyligt konstruerede øer i det Sydkinesiske Hav den 27. okt., »tog Kina denne gang ikke skridt til konkret handling for at konfrontere det amerikanske krigsskib, men sådanne fremtidige operationer kunne alvorligt destabilisere situationen i det Sydkinesiske Hav og endda freden og stabiliteten i hele regionen. De kunne igangsætte en utilsigtet optrapning og forcere de to lande hen imod en militær konflikt. Tankegangen er ganske indlysende.

»Yderligere handlinger fra den amerikanske flådes side vil trænge det kinesiske lederskab op i en krig og tvinge det til at respondere på opfattede provokationer mod landets nationale interesser og magtanseelse. Til syvende og sidst udgør det Sydkinesiske Hav en væsentlig del af Kinas geostrategiske interesser ... Desuden kunne Kina føle, at det var nødvendigt at stå fast for at afskrække en fremtidig optrapning af de amerikanske udfordringer over for landets interesser og anseelse.«

Zhang citerer både viceadmiral Yi Xiaoguang, der er vicestabschef i Folkets Befrielseshær (PLA), og som sagde, at

Kina »vil tage alle nødvendige midler i anvendelse for at forsvare sin suverænitet«, hvis USA udfører lignende handlinger, og også general Fan Changlong, vicepræsident for Kinas kommunistiske partis (CCP) Centrale Militærkommission, der til kommandør for USA's Stillehavskommando (PACOM), admiral Harry Harris, sagde, at alle fremtidige aktioner fra den amerikanske flådes side kunne udløse utilsigtede optrapninger, der skader begge landes interesser.

Kineserne har sidenhen udvidet sine militærøvelser i regionen og offentliggjort fotos af søbaserede strategiske missiler, der bæres på deres atomubåde, og som »har til hensigt at afskrække USA«, siger Zhang.

Under kapitel titlen »Defekt amerikansk opfattelse« advarer Zhang: »Diverse kinesisk retorik og forholdsregler indikerer, at Kina kunne ty til mere konkrete og magtfulde forholdsregler for at konfrontere den amerikanske flåde. I så tilfælde vil en konfrontation mellem de to flåder blive uundgåelig. Hvad der er endnu værre, så kunne konfrontationen udløse en optrapning mod militære konflikter.

Det amerikanske militær synes imidlertid at være intetanende om dette scenario ... Det er i høj grad sandsynligt, at amerikanske beslutningstagere antager, at Kina ville indtage en politik for ikke-handling, når konfronteret med indtrængende amerikanske flådefartøjer. Denne amerikanske forventning er defekt, eftersom Kina er en atomstormagt. Når de trænges op i en krog, kan stater med atomvåben true med en asymmetrisk optrapning for at afskrække en modstander fra at skade deres nøgleinteresser. Militærparaden i Beijing den 3. september afslørede, at Kinas nye generation af taktiske missiler, såsom DF-26, kan armeres med atomsprænghoveder. Nylig information indikerer også, at Kinas luftlancerede langtrækkende krydsermissiler ligeledes kan armeres med taktiske atomsprænghoveder. Faktisk kunne de seneste fotos af JL-2 søbaserede atommissiler, der affyres fra havet, være et gedulgt atomsignal, som Kina sender for at afskrække USA.«

Zhang bemærker, at, alt imens det Sydkinesiske Hav tydeligvis er en del af Kinas kerneinteresser, så gælder dette ikke for USA. »Når en krisesituation eskaleres og begynder at involvere potentielle atomare scenarier«, skriver han, »står USA over for det barske valg, at de enten er de første til at trække sig tilbage, eller også står over for at kæmpe mod et atombevæbnet Kina. Ingen af disse muligheder er attraktiv, og begge kræver høje omkostninger, enten for anseelse eller i menneskeliv, for USA.«

»Det vil derfor være uklogt af USA at udfordre Kina. Ved at undervurdere Beijings faste forsæt om at forsvare sine interesser, omdømme og evne til at afskrække, kunne denne plan igangsætte en eskalerende spiral, der sluttelig ville skade amerikanske interesser.«

Han konkluderer, at begge sider må overveje 'worst case scenarios' – de værst tænkelige scenarier.[1] »Det er bydende nødvendigt, at både Kina og USA overvejer, hvordan deres handlinger kunne medføre utilsigtede konsekvenser, isæt en utilsigtet optrapning mod en militær konflikt ... Der er ingen, især ikke lande i regionen, der ønsker dette scenarie.«

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at denne analyse er »fuldstændig korrekt«, bortset fra, at en sådan konsekvens ikke ville være »utilsigtet« fra Obamas side; det er hans plan at tvinge Kina og Rusland til et tilbagetog, eller også gå i krig.

[1] Se video fra LaRouchePAC: »**Ingen overlevende**«, 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.

Leder, 1. december 2015: Fjern den faktor, der fører til atomkrig – Obama

Nødvendigheden af at fjerne Barack Obama fra præsidentmyndigheden for at forhindre en ellers forestående atomar konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland og Kina blev på dramatisk vis tydeliggjort af begivenheder og advarsler i dag.

Efter Obamas (og NATO's) aggressive, offentlige støtte til Tyrkiets provokerende krigshandling imod Rusland, var Obamas møde med Putin i dag på konferencen i Paris en eskalering. Ifølge rapporter fra både Det Hvide Hus og Kreml om mødet, gentog Obama, at han insisterede på, at den syriske præsident Assad »skal gå« som en forudsætning for noget som helst samarbejde imod terrorbander i Syrien; at Rusland må slutte sig til den »amerikanskledede koalition« og må ophøre med at bombe i områder, der er bastioner for al-Nusra og andre jihadist-grupper, der bevæbnes af Saudi Arabien, Tyrkiet og USA og Storbritannien. Obama ignorerer de vurderinger og rapporter, der kommer fra militær-til-militær-efterretninger, for i stedet at fortsætte sin optrapning af konfrontationen med Vladimir Putin.

En russisk, strategisk analytiker advarer i Sputnik i dag om, at den tyrkiske provokation, bakket op af NATO og Obama, skubber verden frem mod en konfrontation som den i 1962 med Cubakrisen – denne gang uden en John F. Kennedy til at løse situationen, men tværtimod med hans modsætning, den arrogante dronedræber, Obama.

Og en kinesisk seniorekspert i eurasiske anliggender med

hjemsted i Hongkong kom med en endnu mere dramatisk advarsel: Hvis Obama fortsætter med at udføre provokationer i det Sydkinesiske Hav, kunne Kina meget vel respondere »asymmetrisk«, med atomkrig.

Stiftende redaktør for Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) Lyndon LaRouche insisterer på, at der ikke er anden udvej en hurtigt at fjerne Obama fra embedet og sagde i dag: »Putin havde ret i sin vurdering af sin position vis-a-vis Obama. Der bliver ingen kursændring eller tilbagetog fra Putins side; og han forstår fuldt ud, at intet samarbejde med Obama er muligt. Putin eksperimenterer ikke. Han er fast besluttet og anskuer konfrontationen fra et globalt standpunkt. Det er Obamas Hvide Hus, der laver alvorlige fejl, men alt, hvad det gør, er med fuldt overlæg.«

Dette var LaRouches udtrykkelige pointe om den kinesiske professor Zhang Baohuis advarsel om en amerikansk-kinesisk krig udløst af Obamas provokationer. Denne analyse af situationen er »fuldstændig korrekt«, bemærkede Larouche, for nær én ting – atomkonfrontationen er ikke »utilsigtet« eller »en fejl« fra Obamas side.

»Obama VED, hvad han gør«, sagde LaRouche. »Han er en dræber, og britisk kontrolleret.«

Obama truer med atomkrig og tror arrogant på et russisk eller kinesisk »tilbagetog«, der ikke eksisterer.

»Men han kan miste grebet om situationen, hvis han konfronteres af personer og kræfter, der rykker ud for at få ham fjernet fra embedet. Det er missionen – hvis vi kan gøre det i tide.«

Supplerende materiale:

Hongkong-professor: Obama truer Kina med atomkrig

30. november 2015 – Zhang Baohui, en professor i statskundskab og direktør for Centret for Studier af det Asiatiske Stillehavsområde ved Lingnan Universitet i Hongkong, og som i omfattende mål har skrevet om Kinas atomkapaciteter, udstedte en kraftig advarsel til Obama om, at denne fremprovokerer en konflikt, der hurtigt kunne blive til en atomkrig.

I en artikel i *RSIS Commentary South China Sea Series Nov. 12*, skriver Zhang, at, da Obama sendte et amerikansk krigsskib inden for 12-milegrænsen omkring Kinas nyligt konstruerede øer i det Sydkinesiske Hav den 27. okt., »tog Kina denne gang ikke skridt til konkret handling for at konfrontere det amerikanske krigsskib, men sådanne fremtidige operationer kunne alvorligt destabilisere situationen i det Sydkinesiske Hav og endda freden og stabiliteten i hele regionen. De kunne igangsætte en utilsigtet optrapning og forcere de to lande hen imod en militær konflikt. Tankegangen er ganske indlysende.

»Yderligere handlinger fra den amerikanske flådes side vil trænge det kinesiske lederskab op i en krig og tvinge det til at respondere på opfattede provokationer mod landets nationale interesser og magtanseelse. Til syvende og sidst udgør det Sydkinesiske Hav en væsentlig del af Kinas geostrategiske interesser ... Desuden kunne Kina føle, at det var nødvendigt at stå fast for at afskrække en fremtidig optrapning af de amerikanske udfordringer over for landets interesser og anseelse.«

Zhang citerer både viceadmiral Yi Xiaoguang, der er vicestabschef i Folkets Befrielseshær (PLA), og som sagde, at Kina »vil tage alle nødvendige midler i anvendelse for at forsvare sin suverænitet«, hvis USA udfører lignende

handlinger, og også general Fan Changlong, vicepræsident for Kinas kommunistiske partis (CCP) Centrale Militærkommission, der til kommandør for USA's Stillehavskommando (PACOM), admiral Harry Harris, sagde, at alle fremtidige aktioner fra den amerikanske flådes side kunne udløse utilsigtede optrapninger, der skader begge landes interesser.

Kineserne har sidenhen udvidet sine militærøvelser i regionen og offentliggjort fotos af søbaserede strategiske missiler, der bæres på deres atomubåde, og som »har til hensigt at afskrække USA«, siger Zhang.

Under kapitel titlen »Defekt amerikansk opfattelse« advarer Zhang: »Diverse kinesisk retorik og forholdsregler indikerer, at Kina kunne ty til mere konkrete og magtfulde forholdsregler for at konfrontere den amerikanske flåde. I så tilfælde vil en konfrontation mellem de to flåder blive uundgåelig. Hvad der er endnu værre, så kunne konfrontationen udløse en optrapning mod militære konflikter.

Det amerikanske militær synes imidlertid at være intetanende om dette scenario ... Det er i høj grad sandsynligt, at amerikanske beslutningstagere antager, at Kina ville indtage en politik for ikke-handling, når konfronteret med indtrængende amerikanske flådefartøjer. Denne amerikanske forventning er defekt, eftersom Kina er en atomstormagt. Når de trænges op i en krog, kan stater med atomvåben true med en asymmetrisk optrapning for at afskrække en modstander fra at skade deres nøgleinteresser. Militærparaden i Beijing den 3. september afslørede, at Kinas nye generation af taktiske missiler, såsom DF-26, kan armeres med atomspræghoveder. Nylig information indikerer også, at Kinas luftlancerede langtrækkende krydsermissiler ligeledes kan armeres med taktiske atomspræghoveder. Faktisk kunne de seneste fotos af JL-2 søbaserede atommissiler, der affyres fra havet, være et gedulgt atomsignal, som Kina sender for at afskrække USA.«

Zhang bemærker, at, alt imens det Sydkinesiske Hav tydeligvis

er en del af Kinas kerneinteresser, så gælder dette ikke for USA. »Når en krisesituation eskaleres og begynder at involvere potentielle atomare scenarier«, skriver han, »står USA over for det barske valg, at de enten er de første til at trække sig tilbage, eller også står over for at kæmpe mod et atombevæbnet Kina. Ingen af disse muligheder er attraktiv, og begge kræver høje omkostninger, enten for anseelse eller i menneskeliv, for USA.«

»Det vil derfor være uklogt af USA at udfordre Kina. Ved at undervurdere Beijings faste forsæt om at forsvare sine interesser, omdømme og evne til at afskrække, kunne denne plan igangsætte en eskalerende spiral, der sluttelig ville skade amerikanske interesser.«

Han konkluderer, at begge sider må overveje 'worst case scenarios' – de værst tænkelige scenarier.[1] »Det er bydende nødvendigt, at både Kina og USA overvejer, hvordan deres handlinger kunne medføre utilsigtede konsekvenser, isæt en utilsigtet optrapning mod en militær konflikt ... Der er ingen, især ikke lande i regionen, der ønsker dette scenarie.«

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at denne analyse er »fuldstændig korrekt«, bortset fra, at en sådan konsekvens ikke ville være »utilsigtet« fra Obamas side; det er hans plan at tvinge Kina og Rusland til et tilbagetog, eller også gå i krig.

[1] Se video fra LaRouchePAC: [»Ingen overlevende«](#), 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.

Advarsel om en Ny Cubakrise

30. november 2015 – »Tyrkiet baner vejen for en Ny Cubakrise«, lyder den barske, advarende titel på en artikel i Sputnik den 29. nov., skrevet af den politiske analytiker Pyotr Iskenderov fra Ruslands Strategiske Kulturstiftelse, med undertitlen, »Invitation til ballade: Trækker Erdogan Europa ind i en Ny 'Cubakrise'?«

Iskenderovs advarsel påpeger først det, der skete den 24. nov.: »Tyrkiets uhørte provokation kunne meget vel føre til en konfrontation, der minder os om den Kolde Krigs mørkeste dage«; uhørt, fordi intet russisk militærfly er blevet skudt ned af et NATO-medlemsland i Alliancens historie. Artiklen advarer også imod den umiddelbare fremtid og Obamas rolle i opbakningen til Tyrkiet. »Tyrkiet besluttede at nedskyde det russiske bombefly, fordi præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan føler sig overbevist om, at NATO og især USA vil bakke ham op, uanset, hvad der sker. Ønsket om at udnytte modsigelserne mellem stormagter har altid været et redskab i det (Neo)-ottomanske Imperiums politik.«

Der er nogen, der bringer en diskussion på bane om, hvorvidt Tyrkiet skal spærre Bosporusstrædet for russiske skibe, der supplerer Ruslands styrker, som bekæmper terrorister i Syrien. Dette ville imidlertid ikke blive tolereret af Rusland; og Erdogans stilling over for sin egen kommando kunne vise sig temmelig svag.

En webside, der sporer skibsruter, atmarinetraffic.com, rapporterede mandag, at fartøjer under russisk flag nu forsinkes af Tyrkiet, når de søger at passere gennem Bosporus. Det Kiev-baserede Center for Transportstrategier rapporterede dette offentligt: »Søndag sejlede russiske fartøjer i zig-zag-kurs og i buede linjer, mens de i timevis ventede på tilladelse til at krydse strædet. Fartøjer fra andre lande blev ikke opholdt.«

**RADIO SCHILLER den 30.
november 2015:
COP21-klimakonferencen:
udvikling, ikke
befolkningsreduktion //
advarsler om atomkrig**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Inkluderer også: Høring om atomkraft (thorium) i Folketinget
/ Stem NEJ: bevar retsforbeholdet!

**Leder, 29. november 2015:
»Spær Obama inde bag lås og
slå for at**

afværgen af den umiddelbare fare for atomkrig«

STOP 3. VERDENSKRIG:

Følgende erklæring blev udlagt på LaRouchePAC websiden her til aften, den 28. nov.:

Lyndon LaRouche gentog i dag sin tidligere advarsel, der nu er endnu mere overhængende nødvendig, om, at den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama er fast besluttet på at følge en kurs mod atomkrig og omgående må fjernes fra embedet. Advarslen kommer som respons på optrapningen af Obamas igangværende politik for en atomar konfrontation med Rusland, som det eksemplificeres af nedskydningen af et russisk militærfly over Syrien af medlem af NATO og USA's allierede, Tyrkiet. Tyrkiets handling kunne kun være forekommet med Obamas velsignelse. LaRouches advarsler understreges af amerikanske sikkerhedseksperter vurderinger. Alligevel er der en tåbelig tilbageholdenhed med hensyn til at kræve det eneste middel, der kan trække verden tilbage fra truslen om atomkrig – at fjerne Obama fra kontrollen over USA's atomstyrker ved at stille ham for en rigsret, eller ved at aktivere det 25. tillæg til den amerikanske Forfatning.

Den seneste advarsel om en mulig umiddelbart overhængende atomkrig er netop blevet publiceret i *Politico Magazine* af en tidligere atommissil-affyringsofficer, Bruce G. Blair, med titlen »**Kunne spændinger mellem USA og Rusland eskalere atomart?**«. Blair påpeger Obamaregeringens politik med affyr-på-varsel (launch on warning) og den korte responstid til at træffe beslutningen om at lancere atomstyrker. Han erklærer, at dette sætter verden på en hårs bredde fra atomkrig, der er farligere end under den Kolde Krig.

Blair advarer:

»Det er især sandt, eftersom offentligheden ikke gør sig klart, hvor lidt tid, der er, for vore ledere til at træffe afgørelsen om at bruge atomvåben, selv i dag – og om noget, så gør atmosfæren det til en endnu mere hårfin udløsermekanisme med truslen om cyberkrig. En affyringsordre er på længde med et tweet. Missilmandskabet transmitterer dernæst en kort strøm af computersignaler, der omgående antænder raketmotorerne til mange hundrede landbaserede missiler. For USA's vedkommende tager dette 1 minut. Som forhenværende atommissil-affyringsofficer har jeg personligt trænet dette hundreder af gange. Vi blev kaldt for Minutmænd. Amerikansk ubådsmandskab bruger lidt længere tid; de kan affyre deres missiler efter 12 minutter.«

»I betragtning af den 11- til 30-minutters flyvetid for angrebsmissiler (11 for ubåde, der lurder ud for modpartens kyster, og 30 for raketter, der flyver over polerne til den anden siden af planeten), er beslutningstagningen for atomanvendelse, under 'launch on warning' – altså processen fra varsling til beslutning om handling – ekstremt forceret, følelsesmæssigt højspændt og proforma, drevet frem af checklister. Jeg beskriver det som den mekanisk rutinemæssige iværksættelse af et forberedt manuskript. Under nogle scenarier modtager præsidenten, efter en blot 3 minutter lang vurdering af de første varslingsdata, en 30 sekunder lang briefing om sine atomare responsmuligheder og disses konsekvenser. Han har dernæst nogle få minutter – maksimalt 12, mere sandsynligt 3 til 6 – til at vælge en af dem.«

I denne sammenhæng kan Obamas deployering af amerikanske og allierede styrker imod Rusland kun ses som en eskalering imod en konflikt med atomvåben. For eksempel nævner Blair deployeringen af amerikanske Aegis-krigsskibe til Sortehavet, armeret med krydsermissiler, der kunne angribe Moskva på få minutter. Eller deployeringen af amerikanske strategiske

bombefly, der flyver mod Rusland. Dette tvinger så igen Rusland ind i en optrappende respons.

Blair spørger:

»Forstår amerikanske ledere, at russerne har grund til at frygte, at en trussel om halshugning (dvs. lamme en regering ved at fjerne dens ledelse, -red.) er ved at vokse frem, og at denne trussel meget vel kunne være den underliggende drivkraft, der hæver indsatsen for Rusland til et niveau med en eksistentiel trussel, der påbyder forberedelse til at anvende atomvåben? Det tvivler jeg på, at de gør.«

Den skræmmende konklusion, som Blair ikke drager, er imidlertid, at USA's præsident Barack Obama forstår dette og har til hensigt at skabe en eksistentiel krise for Rusland, og således bringe verden ud på randen af atomkrig. Siden begyndelsen af Barack Obamas præsidentskab har LaRouche advaret om, at Obama er en narcissistisk dræber. Alt, hvad Obama sidenhen har gjort, har bevist, at LaRouche havde ret. Man behøver blot se på Obamas indtræden i rollen som global bøddel, der præsiderer over de regulære tirsdagsmøder, hvor han personligt træffer beslutning om de amerikanske droneangrebs dræberlister. Eller hans konfronterende adfærd mod Rusland i kølvandet på den tyrkiske nedskydning af det russiske militærfly.

Der er ikke tid eller plads til en lang debat om dette spørgsmål. Obamas atomkrigsprovokationer udgør en trussel mod den menneskelige arts eksistens. Han må fjernes nu. Et enkelt medlem af Kongressen kan retmæssigt indlede en rigsretsprocedure. Ansvarlige regeringsfolk i præsidentskabet kan retmæssigt indlede det 25. forfatningstillæg med den begrundelse, at en præsident, der har til hensigt at fremprovokere atomkrig, ikke længere er skikket til embedet.

**Det amerikanske folk må nu agte på
LaRouches advarsel. Fjern Obama Nu!**

Supplerende materiale:

Putin og Hollande mødes i Moskva – Aftale om koordinering –
Går efter oliesmugling m.m. – Obama på sidelinjen; afsløret

**International LaRouchePAC
Fredags-webcast
den 27. november 2015:
LaRouche: »Med mindre, og
indtil, Obama smides ud,
står verden på en knivsæg til
atomkrig.
Strategisk analyse med Jeff
Steinberg m. fl.**

*Lyndon LaRouche har hele vejen utvetydigt sagt, at med mindre,
og indtil, Obama smides ud, står verden på en knivsæg til*

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

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

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

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

Jeffrey Steinberg.

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

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

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

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

very rapidly shifting world strategic situation, including ongoing Russian military intervention into Syria; also including

the recent wave of terrorist attacks, such as the bombing of the

Russian plane over Egypt, and of course, the terrorist attacks which occurred just two weeks ago in Paris, which was followed by

a shift in dynamic among world leaders, away from the failed

Obama policy, and toward a broader collaboration with the Russians to defeat ISIS.

However, throughout all of this, Mr. LaRouche has been unequivocal that unless, and until you get Obama out of the U.S.

presidency, the world stands on a razor's edge of thermonuclear war.

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

that it "was a deliberate attempt by Obama to force general warfare."

Now, this act by Turkey and by Obama, and the aftermath, has catalyzed a very significant change in the world global dynamic,

which we're seeing manifest, for example, in Europe, among other

places. This shift is also the subject of tonight's institutional

question, which makes reference to the ongoing talks in Vienna,

which are aimed at resolving the situation in Syria. The question

reads as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche, please give us your view of how Russia and Turkey can move once again to collaborate to save Syria under the

Vienna process?" So now I'm going to turn it over to Jeff to give

Mr. LaRouche's response to that question, as well as an elaboration of the general strategic picture.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Megan. Can you hear me there?

Well I think that the starting point must be to tell the truth as we know it about the events of last Tuesday. It was immediately understood by leading political and military circles in the United States, in Europe, and most emphatically in Russia, that the action that was undertaken by the Turkish in shooting down that Russian SU-24 over a border area on the Turkey-Syria border right along the Mediterranean coast, that this was something that 1) was order top down in Turkey from President Erdogan, and 2) Erdogan would never have undertaken such an action if he did not have advance approval from Obama and the British. So, for the Russians, this represented a major act of war, and I can tell you that within the U.S. governing institutions, there was a deep and profound split that reflected immediately in actions that were diametrically opposite. Secretary of State John Kerry, leading circles within the Pentagon all the way up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, immediately activated channels with Russia, knowing full well that there was a very real prospect that Russia would retaliate immediately after this unwarranted military provocation. And so, you have one element of the U.S. command that is not under British control, that moved immediately to at least temporarily forestall a situation that was potentially moments away from a general war between NATO and Russia. And as we've been saying, as Mr. LaRouche has been warning since virtually the beginning of the Obama presidency, any such war between NATO and Russia would very rapidly devolve

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

So you had actions. There was red phone line communications activated immediately, between those elements in the U.S. Command that were not on the British line, and top Russian officials. And the first objective was simply to secure a commitment that the situation would not immediately go to a hot war. In other words, this was the most dangerous situation since, and probably more so, than even the Cuban Missile crisis. Because in the Cuban missile crisis, there was no shoot down of an American or a Soviet ship or a plane.

On the other hand, President Obama, who was closer to Erdogan than virtually any foreign leader, perhaps with the sole exception of David Cameron in Britain, immediately got on the phone with Erdogan and then issued public statements certifying that, in his mind, Turkey acted perfectly within their sovereign rights to shoot down a plane flying over its territory.

Now, never mind the fact that there are serious questions and disputes of whether that plane, that Russian plane, actually ever even entered Turkish airspace. The fact is that, if it passed through Turkish air space at all, number one, there was never any intent—and nobody in Turkey even claimed there was any intent on the part of the Russians—to carry out any kind of military action or provocation against Turkey. And secondly, even after the first 24 hours following the shoot-down, the Turks were even acknowledging that that plane, if it ever in fact crossed

into Turkish territory, was there only for a matter of brief seconds, and no longer.

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

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

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

a timeframe that at most has been characterized as 17 seconds.

So, again, it was a premeditated act of war; and Erdogan on his

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

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

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

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

Nusra, and all allied organizations inside Syria and inside Iraq

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

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

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

in saying that the United States is leading a coalition of

over

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

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

endorsed and adopted the Turkish line on what happened.

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

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

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

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

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

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

by the Obama administration principally through Victoria Nuland,

the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian

Affairs, who carried out a bombing campaign against the power grid of Crimea; and has effectively shut off almost all power to the entire Crimean peninsula. When Russian repair units attempted to get to the sites to re-establish the power links, they were fired on by Right Sector militias; and to make matters even worse, at the end of last week, it was announced by Nuland's pet prime minister, Yatsenyuk, that henceforth all Russian flights over Ukrainian airspace were cancelled. Now, that's tantamount to a threat of yet a second country, a major ally of the US and the British, threatening to carry out unprovoked strikes against Russian aircraft flying over Ukrainian airspace.

So, you've got a clear pattern here. You have – as Megan indicated – a phase shift with the series of ISIS terrorist attacks over the last several weeks, that began with the bombing of the Russian Metro Jet over the Sinai; followed with a series of suicide bombings on the southern portions of Beirut in Lebanon, targetting the Shi'ite area of that city. And then the Paris attacks. The world was energized to finally launch an all-out serious campaign against the Islamic State. Russia escalated the bombing campaign against the Islamic State and knocked out an estimated 1000 of the tanker trucks that have been smuggling oil from the ISIS-controlled areas of northern Syria into Turkey, where they've been sold on the black market; and these funds have been fueling the operations of the Islamic State.

At the G-20 summit meeting that ironically took place in Turkey just days before the Turkish air force shot down the Russian SU-24, President Putin made very clear that Russia has

aerial photographs showing lengthy caravans of these oil tanker trucks crossing the border into Turkey from northern Syria; and furthermore, he said he has the names of financial agents in 40 countries, including a number of the G-20 member countries, that are involved in financing the Islamic State through black market cooperation. So, the case is unambiguous. If you wanted to attribute narrow motives, you could say that Erdogan was furious at the Russians for bombing these Turkish smuggling trucks, since we know that the funds generated on the Turkish side from this black market activity largely go into the coffers of the ruling AKP Party. We know that the son of President Erdogan is himself one of the major people involved in this black market operation. But in a very real sense, that's a much too narrow understanding of what happened here. It eliminates the crucial question, which is that Obama and the British were behind this, and it was an attempt on a much grander scale to not just simply sabotage the Vienna initiatives; but it was an attempt to trigger a potential world war. And for that crime alone, despite the fact that there is a long list of Constitutional violations and other crimes committed by this President, for that reason alone he must be immediately removed from office. And therefore, every

person

listening to this broadcast, all of your friends, all of your neighbors, all of your political associates, your co-workers, are

going to have to do some serious soul searching; because we came

inches away from world war last Tuesday morning, with the Turkish

actions. And it was only a matter of intervention, but particularly restraint on the part of Russian President Putin and

the Russian military that averted that. There is still clearly an

option, and lessons to be learned from this provocation, that could and must lead to reaching an agreement in Vienna to end the

five-year war and tragedy in Syria. But that must start with the

kind of blunt truth which we have been discussing here over the

last few minutes; and it cannot go forward so long as President

Obama remains in office. So, there are urgent issues that must be

taken up by the Congress and by the American people, if we are going to avert a war; because I can assure you, if those critical

actions are not taken in the immediate days ahead, then the chances that there will be {another} incident; {another} provocation, whether by Ukraine, whether by Erdogan and the Turks, whether by ISIS, and if actions aren't taken to solve the

problem at its roots, we will be staring at the prospect of world

war in the immediate days, perhaps hours ahead.

BEETS: Okay, thank you very much, Jeff. Now, upcoming this

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

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

JASON ROSS: This is almost like the worst joke you could imagine, holding this conference in Paris. This conference which, starting in a few days – we've been opposing this, and we've got a leaflet, a resolution that we've been getting out on this, called, "We Say No to the Paris COP21 CO2 Reduction Scheme." I want to read the bookmarks of this, the bookends. It opens,

“The conditions for life of billions of people depend upon rejecting the agenda being presented at the 2015 climate change conference to be held in Paris this December. The COP21 Paris initiative to adopt a legally-binding agreement to reduce CO2 emissions must be rejected on two grounds: the scientific reality, that mankind’s activity, is {not} going to cause catastrophic climate change, and the very real lethal consequences of the CO2 reduction programs being demanded.” It ends, that “Energy-intensive scientific, technological, and economic growth is essential to human existence. This can be measured by transitions to higher levels of energy-flux density per-capita and per-area. Such progress, growth, and development, is the universal right of man, and CO2 emissions are presently a vital part of that process for the overwhelming majority of the world’s population. The adoption of a legally-binding CO2 reduction scheme at the COP21 conference in Paris will condemn billions of people to a lower quality of life, with higher death-rates, greater poverty, and no ability to exercise their inherent human right to participate in the creation of a better condition for society as a whole. This is deeply immoral. For these reasons, the CO2 reduction scheme of the COP21 conference in Paris must be rejected.”

So on the grounds of the fakery of the science, and the very, very real human costs of trying to meet the CO2 reduction goals, this can’t go forward. However, obviously the push is there, the conference is going ahead despite the state of

emergency currently in France, the terrorized population of Paris, changes in some of the agenda, but it's going ahead, and as a matter of fact, this conference is getting a kick-start over the weekend – today and the rest of the weekend – the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting is taking place in Malta. So this is where all the members of the former British Empire, now called the British Commonwealth, get together to – as in this case – hear speeches from the Queen and others about why they need to reduce CO2.

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

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

beyond

– that’s worth discussing. Really, what’s worth discussing is a

solution to this whole problem, which would be excellent if the

Congress were to release the 28 pages, put them in the record, as

Senator Gravel did with the Pentagon Papers, to be able to attack

the cause of this conflict at its source, which as Jeff went through, as LaRouche has been stressing, is Obama, who by his nature as a killer personality, has qualified himself to be inserted into his role as President. That that is the cause of the conflicts. Releasing the 28 pages, discussing how to actually

shut down terrorism in the region, working {with} Russia on this

– you know, Russia is serious about this – you know, that would

be worth discussing.

And really, what would it mean to develop the world into the Silk Road? You know, EIR released, about a year ago now, “The New

Silk Road Becomes the World Landbridge.” It’s a 300 and – almost

400 page report. It goes through in incredible detail, with maps

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

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

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

China is acknowledged as “the Silk Road Lady,” for her role in bringing this outlook into the current fruition that it’s

finding. So what would it mean for the U.S. to join the Silk Road? What would it mean for us to get our act together? Well, we've been working on a report on this, in terms of what a U.S. recovery would look like, and there's a lot of aspects to this. I mean, if you think about the kinds of projects that have, many, been on the books, and the kinds of projects that will drive us into the future, you recognize that it would not be very difficult to create millions of jobs in a very short period of time – meaningful, productive jobs – that lay the groundwork for a durable new, more productive economy for the future. Doing that will require eliminating Wall Street, getting Glass-Steagall re-implemented, having those provisions back in place, shutting down Wall Street which we do not need. Gambling is not an essential part of economy. The productive process, science, creativity, the development of human beings and infrastructure – that is essential. Gambling is not. So with Wall Street out of the way, with federal financing, with federal credit made available, some of the projects are things that we've discussed quite a bit. Take, for example, the Bering Strait. Crossing the Bering Strait with a tunnel or a bridge, as engineers decide, would be a very key role, a very key project, to put the U.S. on the Silk Road, literally, making it possible to get from the West Coast of the U.S., into Eurasia, much more quickly than by sending a ship across the ocean, with the added benefit that rail, or transportation corridors on land overall, allow for the ability to develop regions along the way. Something that a ship crossing the ocean doesn't do.

Ships

don't create wealth, or the potential to create it, as they cross

the waters. Land connections do.

So the Bering Strait tunnel – that would be a key project.

Overall, transportation has a tremendous way to go in the U.S. You know, China, which is a nation very similar in size to the United States, currently has 11,000 miles of high-speed rail, with plans to have 30,000 by 2020, and they'll do it – they do what they say. In contrast, we have under 500 miles of high-speed

rail, and that's being very generous in counting the Acela service as high-speed. What we should have is 42,000 miles of electrified, decent rail in the United States, bringing down the

costs of transportation, and of production throughout the nation,

making it more possible to move intermediate goods from place to

place, to move people, to move products in a way that will have a

tremendous savings in time, and in energy costs.

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

the system as it is, and maybe some idea of what it could be like

in the future.

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

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

outsides of our current cities, but developing legitimately new cities, actual cities, planned in a sensible way, with part of a transportation backbone underlying it, with infrastructure that's needed, canals and aqueducts as necessary, water, power, that sort of thing. But then also where the cities and where life is oriented around the most key of economic processes – the creation of wealth by improving the productive powers of labor, by the cultural role that can be played by a city. So in addition to the ability to move goods and people easily, the density you find in a real city, where different members of the household can do their various things that anyone having an hour and a half commute can't, you also have the other role of the city itself as a social institution. So, in a very interesting article that LaRouche wrote some decades ago, in a program for the development of Africa, he discusses the central role of the city, and the presence of a research and educational complex, a pedagogical museum where people, kids, their parents, etc. would be able to step themselves through how discoveries had been made in the past in a hands-on way, doing experiments, themselves witnessing and understanding very directly how humanity has gotten where it is, making it possible to have workers able to master new technologies, and scientists able to reflect on what science has done in the past, to create the new discoveries needed in the future.

This sort of educational center of the city will be more than a museum retailing the past; it will be more than looking

backwards. LaRouche wrote that to give vitality and direction to the process, the educational zone of a new city must be engaged

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

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

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

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

to teach the principles of discovery."

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

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

nuclear fission plants, we'll be able to dramatically increase the power, electrical power, available in the nation; to power transportation; to power manufacturing. And to do all of this, we're also going to need revival of machine tools themselves.

Now, machine tools – now not everyone's actually seen one of these in person. These are things like lathes, like mills, shapers – these are the devices that make everything that's required, that create metal, that shape metal to do machining.

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

discharge machining around the time of the Apollo program, or electron-beam welding; or the more recent developments of laser and plasma cutting, and the ability for these computer-controlled machine tools to create things that would have taken ten times longer in earlier eras: to the extent that this technology improves, and to the extent that purchases are made, and as part of an industrialization, the capital stock is increasingly of newer, and more productive machine tools, the entire economy sees the benefits from them, by making easier, reducing the cost, of all other production.

So, this machine tool principle is, in the small, an image of what it means to take discoveries and then implement them into an economy, for new thought, new engineering, or scientific idea, to become manifest in the economy. And this is a field that needs motion on. As I said earlier, power; fusion research, which has been starved of funding deliberately for decades, preventing the kind of breakthroughs that would make power, as has been said, too cheap to meter – or even if not that cheap, remarkably abundant power able to bring the next generation of production technologies into play. To transform our relationship with raw materials, and with reshaping those materials. Things like the plasma torch.

So, in this kind of economy, we can then re-approach such subjects as water. California is in what's called a water crisis, despite being right next to the Pacific Ocean. Why do we not have

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mankind is not a virus destroying the Earth. What is destroying

the planet is oligarchism; the outlook that human beings are a disease, the anti-growth and enforced poverty promoted by the City of London, by Wall Street, by that system which has to be removed. In its place, as far as an actual concept of humanity,

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

sufficient

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

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

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

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

about nature, and thereby reform the economy in an entire way.

That’s real economic science, and with that approach, the programs that are needed, the development projects which we can

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

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

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

BEETS: Thanks, Jason. Two days ago, on Wednesday of this week, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of Einstein’s publication of his paper on general relativity. Now, LaRouche has

reiterated many times in the recent period that Einstein was the

only true scientist in the 20th Century; someone who held out against the corruption in thinking that was ushered in 1900 by Bertrand Russell. And someone who was attacked and isolated for

his commitment to the paradigm of thinking which represents the

actual human mind; the paradigm which was responsible for all of human progress up to this point. So, what I'd like to do is ask Jason to come back to the podium and ask him this question: Given the task ahead of us today to rebuild society, rebuild civilization, and to create a new paradigm for mankind, I'd like to ask Jason to give us a sense of the importance of Einstein's work and his commitment.

ROSS: Sure. I think what Einstein accomplished represents a key concept under which science can be understood; that of metaphor. LaRouche has repeatedly stressed the importance of metaphor as the key to science; meaning the development of language in such a way that you express a new scientific truth in a way that could not even have been stated in the preceding language. It's not something mathematical; it's not a formula or an expression. Discoveries in their true form can't be. After the fact, you might be able to write them down; but what makes them a discovery is an overthrowing of the past, the development of a new basis for thinking incompatible with what came before. That's the kernel of what a discovery is. None of these thoughts are really eternal; what is, is that process of developing new ones. Which is the incredible error in science education today, based upon understanding how to apply the fruits of discovery to specific problems; but not going through how they were developed.

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

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

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

Figure

out what he did.

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

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

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

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

of things within them; space is space, within it, things exist and take place, or occur in different relations to each other. According to Newton, time flows on its own, without reference to

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

Well, Einstein tore that apart in 1905; in some ways with rather simple thoughts. For example, he demonstrated that the concept of simultaneity does not exist; that depending on who it

is that you ask, and their motion with respect to two events that

are occurring, that observer might say yes they occurred at the

same time. Meaning the light from those two events reaching them,

to make a determination which one occurred first, or second,

or

whether they occurred simultaneously, depending on the motion of an observer, they might appear to occur at the same time or not.

He gave the example of someone on a train witnessing two lightning bolts, versus someone on the ground witnessing two lightning bolts. To someone on the ground, two lightning bolts

occurring at equal distances in either direction, the light will

come and reach the person at the same time. To someone on a train, who is at the middle of that platform right when the bolts

occur, at the same time according to the person on the platform,

because of the train's motion, they're going to see this bolt before the other one. Who's right? What does it really mean to say "at the same time"? Because all the laws of nature work the

same, whether you're standing still supposedly, or you're in constant motion, there's no way to say who's right; what the right time should be. And the idea of having a universality of simultaneity, to say "at this moment in the universe" disappears,

and it becomes relative to the observer.

What does that mean? It means that time itself no longer exists as a basis for thought in the way that it had before. There's still time, but it's no longer an untouchable permanence;

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

1905 in his special theory of relativity, Einstein had replaced

the concepts of space and time as a basis for physics with

something physical; light's motion. In this way, he was implementing the revolutions in physics that Riemann said would take place; that our understanding of geometry would take place not by looking at geometry, but by an understanding of those binding forces of nature which give rise to what is then observed. A bent space; a curved space; a skewed space. With his general theory of relativity in 1915, Einstein went beyond frames of reference which are either at rest with respect to each other or in uniform motion; and he considered acceleration. He considered the fact that there is a relativistic equivalence between somebody in a room where they feel the floor pushing up against their feet, or their feet pushing down against the floor, that without reference to what's outside that room, they might be sitting on the Earth, or they might be out in space, where the top of the building is attached to a rope which is being pulled at an accelerating rate, constantly pulling the building up against their feet. No experiment, nothing you could do inside the room, would be able to distinguish the one from the other. From this equivalence then, Einstein derived his general theory of relativity, by which not only motion, but gravitation changes the shape of space and time. This was a very, and still is, a very wild shocking idea. Space and time were considered to be such fundamental things that the possibility of them even being curved was rejected out of

hand by people like Immanuel Kant, Isaac Newton, Bertrand Russell.

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

Also his prediction about how light would bend going around large objects, was borne out in the experiments around the eclipse of 1919, in which photographs taken of stars near the eclipsed Sun – since the Sun was covered, you could actually see stars near the Sun, which you can't ordinarily do in the daytime, because you can't see anything – and comparing those same stars when the Sun was not in the sky near them, showed again that Einstein was right; that the path of light coming from the stars towards us was deformed, was shaped, by the presence of the Sun in the way.

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

great

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to say that science had reached a limit; that to ask why was really no longer admissible, and that in the quantum world, physics, instead of saying what nature is, is limited to describing how nature appears. Against that Einstein – Einstein

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

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

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

history.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

suitable for human beings that participate in it.

MEGAN BEETS: Thank you very much, Jason. With that, I'm going to bring our broadcast to a close. I would like to thank Jason for joining me, and Jeff for joining us via video, and I'd like to thank all of you for watching tonight. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Rusland: Alt samarbejde med Tyrkiet om forsvar er blevet stoppet

26. november 2015 – I en række af bevidst beherskede russiske svar på Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk militærfly og drab af russisk militærpersonel meddelte Rusland den 26. nov., at alt samarbejde med Tyrkiet om forsvar er blevet stoppet. Et regeringsmøde samme dag, præsideret af premierminister Medvedev, sagde, at en række økonomiske og finansielle restriktioner mod Tyrkiet vil blive meddelt inden for to dage.

Leder, 27. november 2015: I har meget lidt tid til at ændre jeres tankegang

... LaRouche refererede herefter til et møde tirsdag aften, hvor han havde insisteret på, at Obama omgående må ydmyges og degraderes i en grad, hvor han ikke længere vil være i stand til at gennemtvinge de sidste, tilbageværende, korte skridt mod en atomkrig, og heller ikke vil være i stand til at forhindre, at han brat tvinges fra embedet. Dette er et spørgsmål om liv eller død for menneskeheden – ikke uger ud i fremtiden, men lige nu, på Thanksgiving Day, og fredag morgen.

Under en telefonkonference onsdag morgen, den 25. nov., med

sin Politiske Komite sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Jeg mener ikke, vi befinder os i en god tid. Vi er i en desorganiseret tid, en tid med nederlag. Vi er ikke særligt effektive lige nu. Vores organisation som helhed lykkes ikke, med hensyn til vores præstationer; dette må vi rette op på.«

LaRouche refererede herefter til et møde tirsdag aften, hvor han havde insisteret på, at Obama omgående må ydmyges og degraderes i en grad, hvor han ikke længere vil være i stand til at gennemtvinge de sidste, tilbageværende, korte skridt mod en atomkrig, og heller ikke vil være i stand til at forhindre, at han brat tvinges fra embedet. Dette er et spørgsmål om liv eller død for menneskeheden – ikke uger ud i fremtiden, men lige nu, på Thanksgiving Day[1], og fredag morgen.

For alle, der stadig er i tvivl, så blev det offentligt indrømmet denne tirsdag morgen, at de fleste af jer ikke har denne tankegang, og derfor ikke præsterer denne adfærd.

Under sin haste-diskussion med aktivister i hele USA, (den såkaldte 'Fireside Chat') om aftenen den 25. kom det sidste spørgsmål fra en texaner, som sagde, at en rigsretssag mod Obama var udelukket, eftersom dette kræver to tredjedele af Senatet, og aldrig før er sket. Obama burde smides ud i et militærkup efter krav fra befolkningen, ligesom den egyptiske diktator Morsi, fortsatte spørgeren, men dette er ikke muligt, eftersom Obama har fyret alle de gode generaler. Hvordan kan vi få det amerikanske folk til at rejse sig en masse og kræve Obamas afsættelse, spurgte han?

LaRouche svarede, at der ikke er noget systemisk princip, der forhindrer dette. Folk må mobiliseres til at uddanne sig selv på den rette måde. De værdier, man har lært dem at tilpasse sig til, har fordærvet dem. Det er ikke kun et spørgsmål om at fjerne skidt fra folks hoveder: de må bringes til at forstå de sygdomme, som de har inficeret deres egne hjerner med. Det vil virke.

Hvis man ønsker at kontrollere samfundet, korrumperer (fordærver) man samfundet; man inducerer folk til at tro på noget, der ikke er sandt; hvorimod sandfærdig viden ikke er alment praktiseret. Dette skyldes, at vore regeringssystemer så ofte er korrupte.

Man må få folk til at se på sig selv og sige, »Hvad gør jeg forkert?« De kan forstå dette, men de må begynde et studie af sig selv og gennemgå, hvad det er, de burde tænke på, med de rette ideer. Dette kan gøres, men den eneste måde, det kan gøres på, er ved, at folk inspicerer sig selv meget grundigt. At de genovervejer, hvad det er, de har vedtaget som deres mening. Under visse omstændigheder er dette sket med held. Det har vi nu igen brug for.

[1] I USA en overvejende sekulariseret helligdag den fjerde torsdag i november, der er blevet fejret lige siden de første europæere kom til Den nye Verden; oprindeligt en taksigelse for årets høst.

POLITISK ORIENTERING
den 26. november 2015:
Det er Obamas ansvar, at
Tyrkiet
skød et russisk fly ned over

Syrien

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

Lyd: