

Trump og Italiens Conte enige om dialog med Rusland; Trump siger han er villig til at mødes med Iran

På deres fælles pressekonference i eftermiddags i Det Hvide Hus gjorde den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump og den italienske premierminister Giuseppe Conte det klart, at de har etableret et venskab og et samarbejdsforhold om en række vigtige spørgsmål, selvom de ikke var enige om alle detaljerne. Præsidenten beskrev Conte som "min nye ven ... Vi kom overens lige fra begyndelsen." Han understregede, at "vi er begge udenforstående", og at de hver især føler et ansvar overfor de borgere, der har valgt dem. Han sendte sine varme lykønskninger til Conte med valget som premierminister.

På sådanne strategiske spørgsmål som forholdet til Rusland understregede Conte, at han favoriserer dialog, hvilke, som han også sagde, er grundlæggende i forholdet mellem USA og Rusland. Rusland er en nøglespiller internationalt og geopolitisk, bekræftede han, og mens en ophævelse af sanktioneerne er betinget af gennemførelsen af Minsk-aftalerne, kan sanktioner ikke være det sidste ord i sagen. Trump var mere ubøjelig. "Sanktioneerne vil forblive i kraft."

Da han af en journalist blev spurgt vedrørende Iran, om han ville møde præsident Hassan Rouhani for at lette spændingerne med dette land, svarede Trump: "Jeg vil mødes med alle og enhver," især når der er spørgsmål om krig og død på spil. Se på hvad der skete som et resultat af mødet med Nordkoreas Kim Jong-un, sagde han. Og "Jeg havde et godt møde med Putin med hensyn til fremtiden og sikkerhed. Jeg tror på at mødes." Han

understregede, at han til enhver tid ville mødes med Iran hvor som helst, og "uden forudgående betingelser ". Hvis en ny, meningsfuld aftale kan udarbejdes med Iran, så meget desto bedre, sagde han.

De to ledere understregede, at de ønsker at samarbejde i Middelhavsområdet og i bestræbelserne på at stabilisere Libyen. Både Italien og USA's ledende roller er afgørende, sagde præsidenten. Begge herrer sagde, at der skulle ske store forandringer i indvandringspolitikken for deres respektive lande: Trump sagde, at han ville være villig til at lukke regeringen, hvis Kongressen ikke kommer med ændringer i indvandrerpolitikken og den nødvendige finansiering; og Conte understregede, at Italien ikke kan bære hovedparten af indvandringsstrømmen fra Nordafrika alene. Han meddelte, at han snart vil indkalde til en konference om Libyen, herunder invitere alle interessenter og økonomiske interesser, for at drøfte strategier for stabilisering af landet med respekt for befolkningens rettigheder, for derved at bringe det til det punkt, hvor valg kan afholdes "under betingelser af total stabilitet." Han uddybede ikke den præcise karakter af amerikansk samarbejde i denne indsats.

Moskva Sikkerhedskonference – En meget farlig verden

26. april, 2017 – Den VI Moskva Sikkerhedskonference, som varer til og med den 27. april, begyndte i morges med indledende bemærkninger fra den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu og en velkomsthilsen, der blev oplæst, fra præsident Putin. De mange talere præsenterede et skarpt billede af den krisesituation, som menneskeheden står overfor.

Ifølge Forsvarsministeriet deltager flere end 750 gæster, inklusive forsvarsministre, delegationer fra militærafdelinger, eksperter fra 86 lande, så vel som lederskab af FN, OSCE, SCO, CIS og ICRC.

I sine indledende bemærkninger sagde Shoigu, at, alt imens der er en udbredt diskussion om terrorisme, så har man ikke etableret koordineringen af terrorismebekæmpelse, og nødvendige beslutninger for at udrydde det er ikke blevet truffet. Af denne grund, sagde han, vokser flygtningestrømmene, og oprørere strømmer med dem, med en henvisning til terrorhandlinger i hele Europa. Han henviste til de manglende resultater i stabiliseringen af Libyen, hvor national statsdannelse er blevet ødelagt af kollektive indsatser fra Vesten.

Med hensyn til Syrien sagde Shoigu: »Vi anser missilangrebet for at være en åbenlys overtrædelse af Folkeretten. Desuden udgjorde Washingtons handling en livsfare for vores militære personel, der har bekæmpet terrorisme i Syrien. I lyset af sådanne handlinger har vi truffet yderligere forholdsregler for at sikre vore styrkers sikkerhed«, sagde han. Men, fortsatte Shoigu, hvis USA er seriøs mht. at eliminere ISIS, »er vi rede til at støtte deres indsats«, og tilføjede, at det »kun er muligt at ødelægge IS i Syrien gennem alle interesserede landes fælles handlinger«.

Udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov tilføjede, at angrebet »forværrer de nuværende problemer og udskyder udsigterne til at etablere en bred anti-terrorismefront«, og han sammenlignede den aktuelle situation med de falske efterretninger i 2003 mht. Irak, der førte til landets ødelæggelse og fremkomsten af ISIS, idet han tilføjede, at der nu finder »lignende uforsigtige skridt« sted.

Russerne gentog deres krav om en fuld efterforskning af anklagerne om kemiske våben i Syrien.

Lavrov advarede også om, at deployeringen af USA/NATO missilforsvarssystemer rent faktisk kunne sænke tærsklen for atomkrig: »Antimissil-paraplyen kunne øge illusionen om usårlighed og straffrihed, og føre til fristelsen af at tage ensidige skridt i løsningen af globale og regionale problemer, inklusive reduktion af tærsklen for anvendelse af atomvåben.«

Om Ukraine sagde Lavrov: »Det er desværre krigspartiet, der hersker i Kiev: bevæbnede provokationer fortsætter på kontaktlinjen, hvilket bevises af rapporterne fra OSCE Særlige Overvågningsmission. Blokaden af Donbass forårsager ikke alene skade på denne region, men også på hele Ukraine.«

Om Korea sagde Lavrov: »Vi er enige i det globale samfunds konsoliderede position om Nordkoreas politik; der er imidlertid ingen tvivl om, at planer om anvendelse af militærmagt, som begynder at komme frem, er fulde af katastrofale konsekvenser for Koreahalvøen og hele Nordøstasien.«

Obama er en britisk agent, og han vil handle i overensstemmelse hermed, indtil han sparkes ud af embedet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. sept. 2016 – Præsident Barack Obamas fortsatte trussel om at nedlægge veto mod JASTA-

lovforslaget er en klar påmindelse om, at USA's præsident i realiteten er en agent for det britiske system, og han vil gøre præcis, hvad den britiske krone giver ham besked på – og give pokker i det amerikanske folk. Lyndon LaRouche advarede i dag om, at ingen bør forvente, at Obama vil gøre det rigtige ved at underskrive JASTA-lovforslaget og dermed gøre det til lov og lade retsvæsenet tage sig af det saudiske monarki, der muliggjorde angrebene den 11. sept., 2001.

»Obama vil vride sig og lave undvigemanøvrer om spørgsmålet, lige til det sidste – og så vil han nedlægge veto mod JASTA – med mindre der kommer en sådan udladning af pres fra det amerikanske folk, at han ikke har andet valg«, erklærede LaRouche. »Til syvende og sidste er Obama en britisk agent, og han vil handle i overensstemmelse hermed.«

LaRouche tilføjede, »Obama er et falsum og skal ryges ud«. Obama holdes kunstigt oppe ved hjælp af en række Store Løgne, der faldbydes af de amerikanske mainstreammedier, der gentager regeringens løgne, inklusive den sindssyge påstand om, at den amerikanske økonomi er forbedret, lønningerne på vej op, arbejdsløsheden på et lavpunkt, osv. Dette er løgn alt sammen, som enhver ærlig amerikaner, der kommer fra den 90 % store, laveste indkomstgruppe, ved. Henvend 93,5 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsføre alder er ikke engang medregnet i arbejdsstyrken. Den Store Løgne-kampagne, der holder Obama kunstigt oppe, kan smadres. USA er blevet et land med ubegrænset statistisk forfalskning.

Lige så vel som, at JASTA-lovforslaget må vedtages nu, hvad enten det sker ved at tvinge Obamas hånd, eller det sker gennem en overvældende vedtagelse i Senatet og Repræsentanternes Hus, der gør et veto fra Obama ugyldigt, således må også Glass-Steagall omgående vedtages som lov – inden den totale disintegration af det transatlantiske finanssystem finder sted, hvilket kan ske når som helst. Forlad jer ikke på Elizabeth Warren (demokratisk senator) til at føre an i denne kamp – hun er for kompromitteret af sine

partiske ønsker om at forsvare Obama og Hillary Clinton. »Få det bare igennem!«, sagde LaRouche igen i dag.

De handlinger, som det britiske Underhus (House of Commons) traf beslutning om i denne uge, hvor de smed David Cameron ud af dennes plads i parlamentet pga. hans rolle i krigen i Libyen, baseret på løgne, er et signal om at vågne op og foretage en lignende handling, som den amerikanske Kongres skal gennemføre over for Barack Obama. Han skal sparkes ud af embedet nu.

Blandt Obamas mange forbrydelser er den brutale måde, hvorpå han terroriserede og dernæst brugte Hillary Clinton, især omkring invasionen i Libyen og mordet på Gaddafi. Denne handling, hvor Hillary Clinton fuldstændigt gav efter for Obama og herefter ikke mere blev den samme, var begyndelsen til Obamas krigsfremstød mod Rusland og Kina. LaRouche forudsagde dette, dengang Gaddafi blev myrdet, og alt, hvad der siden er sket efter disse begivenheder i 2011, har bevist, at han havde ret. Faren for en krig med Rusland og Kina har nu nået et punkt, hvor hele menneskeheden er i fare, hver eneste dag, hvor Obama fortsat sidder ved magten og kan starte en atomar verdenskrig. Og som begivenhederne i den seneste uge klart har demonstreret for offentligheden, så er Hillary Clinton nedbrudt, og hun må trække sig.

Det amerikanske folk har desperat brug for hjælp og for, at man tager i betragtning, hvilken dårlig forfatning, det befinder sig i. I stedet er Romklubben atter dukket frem med krav om et globalt folkemord, tilsløret af dens påstand om, at »en procents vækst« er alt, hvad verden behøver, og at det Ny Silkevejsprogram bør skrottes. Romklubben er stadig det samme redskab for folkemord, der lancerede den oprindelige Malthus-kampagne med Grænser for Vækst tilbage i 1972. Dengang førte Lyndon LaRouche og LaRouche-bevægelsen an i afsløringen af Romklubben som en bande morderiske løgnere, hvis sande dagsorden var at slå milliarder af mennesker ihjel – den præcis samme dagsorden som det britiske monarkis, og som

klarest er blevet udtrykt af den royale gemal, Prins Philip.

Denne politik må nu endelig lægges i graven.

Foto: Kong Salman af Saudi-Arabien byder præsident Barack Obama farvel, Saudi-Arabien, den 27. januar, 2015. (Foto: Det Hvide Hus)

Anbefalet læsning (dansk):

»Skræmmekampagne om global opvarmning er befolkningsreduktion – ikke videnskab!« (EIR-rapport i forbindelse med COP 2015, Paris)

»Det britiske Imperiums politik, der drejer sig om befolkningsreduktion ... for at reducere verdens befolkning med milliarder af mennesker«, EIR-hovedartikel.

**Det britiske parlament
stiller Cameron
under anklage for krig og
terrorisme:
Hvorfor sidder Obama stadig i**

embedet?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 14. sept. 2016 – Barack Obama bør ikke forblive i præsidentembedet, så han kan nedlægge veto mod Loven om retsforfølgelse af sponsorer af terror, JASTA, nu, hvor David Cameron er stillet under anklage af det britiske parlament.

De to begik sammen forbrydelserne i forbindelse med krigen i Libyen, dens spredning til krigen i Syrien og genoptagelsen af Bushs' krig i Irak, samt med at bevæbne og muliggøre Saudi-Arabiens folkemorderiske krig mod Yemen – alt sammen, mens Cameron var britisk premierminister og Obama præsident.

De to har mørklagt den saudiske sponsorering af terrorisme, herunder angrebene d. 11. september, og nægtet ofrene for disse angreb og deres familier retfærdighed.

Det britiske underhus holder, i en rapport, der er brutalt klar, og som blev udgivet d. 13. september af Udenrigsudvalgets Komité, Cameron »direkte ansvarlig« for spredningen af kaos og terrorisme i den disintegrerede stat Libyen. Han og Obama gik i spidsen for fjernelsen af, og mordet på, Muammar Gaddafi, hvis følgevirkninger slap ISIS løs over verden og genoplivede al-Qaeda.

Underhuset har tvunget Cameron til omgående at træde tilbage fra Parlamentet, dagen før rapporten udkom. Dette er kun retfærdigt; og det er blevet gennemført af et parlament, hvis flertal udgøres af Camerons eget parti. Der vil nu sandsynligvis blive gjort en ende på Storbritanniens uanstændige våbensalg til Saudi-Arabien, til brug for dettes invasion af Yemen.

Hvordan undslipper Obama for de samme forbrydelser, foretager de samme uanstændige våbensalg og nedlægger veto mod loven for juridisk retsforfølgelse for ofrene og overlevende fra 11. september, som Kongressen ellers enstemmigt har vedtaget?

Kongressen har ansvaret for at stille ham for en rigsret, selv nu, hvor han forsøger at bruge valgkampen til en panisk ophidselse af amerikanerne til fordel for en krigskonfrontation med Rusland og Kina. Amerikanere, der ønsker at stoppe denne »evindelige krig« og terrorismen, bør handle for at tvinge Kongressen til at leve op til dette ansvar.

Deres andet ansvar er at vedtage Glass/Steagall-lovforslaget, for langt om længe at gennemtvinge, at retfærdigheden over for Wall Street sker fyldest, samt udstede en »kreditkanal« til produktive investeringer og produktiv beskæftigelse.

G20-topmødet under kinesisk værtsskab tidligere i denne måned afviste Obamas fremstød for en konfrontation i det Sydkinesiske Hav og en ny Wall Street »handelsaftale«. Han er blevet isoleret i sit fortsatte fremstød for krig.

I stedet blev nationerne ved mødet enige om Kinas forslag om at skabe en ny finansiel arkitektur og gensidigt bygge kontinentale korridorer med ny infrastruktur – den »Nye Silkevej« og »Verdenslandbroen«.

Dette nye paradigme for en produktiv, økonomisk genrejsning står vidt åben for USA; Obama har isoleret landet fra det. Han synes endda underhånden at modsætte sig sin egen udenrigsministers forhandling af en fred i Syrien med Rusland.

Vi må rydde huset, for Obama og Wall Street, og vi må gøre det nu. Det er kun retfærdigt.

Foto: Præsident Barack Obama og den britiske premierminister David Cameron forlader nr. 10, Downing Street, mens krigen i Libyen raser; 24. maj, 2011. [flickr/whitehouse]

Obama lancerer endnu en kriminel krig mod Libyen

3. august 2016 (Leder) – Et hemmeligt kort blev i denne uge forelagt Det Hvide Hus og dernæst lækket til NBC, som udlagde det på deres webside, og som viste »fremskridtet« i Obamas krig mod ISIS i løbet af de seneste to år. ISIS og hermed tilknyttede organisationer er, viser kortet, nu aktive i 18 lande, hvor det i 2015 drejede sig om 13 lande og kun 7 i 2014. Mon det overbeviste kriger-præsidenten om, at hans politik var en fiasko, og at han burde acceptere præsident Putins gentagne forslag om at bringe verdens nationer sammen for at bekæmpe den fælles terroristfjende?

Selvfølgelig ikke. I stedet lancerede Obama endnu en krig mod Libyen og bombede byen Sirte (Gaddafis hjemby) i mandags og tirsdags, angiveligt for at forhindre ISIS i at konsolidere en base i landet. Obama gik på Tv tirsdag for at sige, at krigen var »afgørende« for at hjælpe Libyens nationale samlingsregering med at bekæmpe ISIS, og at krigen ville fortsætte så længe, det måtte være nødvendigt.

Der er, som sædvanligt, flere løgne involveret. Den nationale samlingsregering er ikke en national samlingsregering, men en pseudo-regering, der er håndplukket i FN og udskibet til Tripoli med den opgave at »invitere« USA til at påbegynde en bombekampagne ved hjælp af amerikanske specialstyrker på jorden som spejdere. Obama hverken bad om eller fik beføjelse fra FN, og heller ikke fra USA's Kongres, til at lancere endnu en krig og beviste endnu engang ægtheden af sine akkreditiver som krigsforbryder. Og så er der lige det, at ISIS selvfølgelig slet ikke ville have været der, hvis Obama ikke havde bombet landet tilbage til stenalderen og dræbt dets

anti-terrorist-leder i 2011, som, sammen med G.W. Bush' lignende behandling af Irak i 2003, udgør vor tids største krigsforbrydelser, som er ansvarlige for det internationale terroristkaos og den uhyrlige flygtningekrise i hele Sydvestasien og Europa.

Førende bankierer, inklusive investeringsbankierer, advarer nu om, at intet, undtagen en omgående afslutning af »universalbankmodellen« (dvs., en genindførelse af, eller en indledende, Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i hele det transatlantiske område) vil standse det fremstormende kollaps af det vestlige banksystem. En tidligere højtplaceret direktør i Goldman Sachs og embedsmand i EU-kommissionen, Paul Goldschmidt, skrev, at enhver fremgangsmåde, med undtagelse af en »afskaffelse af universalbankpraksissen«, ville forårsage ikke alene en sammenbrud af det finansielle system, men også en »destabilisering af fundamentet for europæisk demokrati« – dvs., ville føre til fascisme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der netop er hjemvendt fra Kina, bemærkede i dag, at kineserne faktisk er klar over faren for et kollaps af det vestlige finanssystem og de følgevirkninger, det ville få for Vesten og for verden. Det er dette finansielle sammenbrud, der er drivkraften bag Obamas gale fremstød for en militær konfrontation med Rusland og Kina, og som sætter verden på randen af en atomkrig.

Løsningen er klar og kan omgående iværksættes. Det kan ikke overdrives, hvor meget det haster med omgående at gennemføre Glass-Steagall i USA og Europa. LaRouche-bevægelsen, der har hovedansvaret for at få Glass/Steagall-lovforslagene fremstillet og støttet i den amerikanske Kongres, samt indføjet i begge partiers valgplatform ved de nylige partikonventer, har mobiliseret sin bevægelse til at inspirere den amerikanske befolkning til, på dette historiske tidspunkt for transformation, at række ud efter stjernerne, at genetablere den engang almene tiltro til videnskab, fremskridt og nationens opbygning, og til at bringe Wall Street-herrerne

og krigsherrerne, med samt disses redskab, Obama, til fald, før det er for sent.

Kina, Rusland og næsten hele verden er parat til at handle sammen med et rekonstrueret USA for at opnå en ny tingenes tilstand, på vegne af hele menneskeheden.

Kriserne i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika resultat af Vestens 'Elefant i en porcelænsbutik'- handlinger, siger russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov

22. juli 2016 – I et gennemførende angreb på vestens igangværende politik i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, der har resulteret i endeløse krige, ødelæggelse af institutioner og tab af hundreder tusinder af liv, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov: »Det, der foregår i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, er et direkte resultat af en meget inkompetent og uprofessionel holdning til situationen.« Som TASS i dag rapporterer, sagde Lavrov: »I deres ønske om at bevare deres dominans, handlede vore vestlige partnere som en elefant i en porcelænsbutik. I Irak blev den voldelige afsættelse af regeringen annonceret under falske påskud. Partnere siger, 'lad os løse problemet med Libyen, Syrien og Irak, arrangere valg og udradere terror'. De siger, 'Først må vi fjerne Assad [den syriske præsident Bashar Assad], og så tager vi kampen op mod terror bagefter.'«

Idet han bragte katastrofen i Libyen på banen, påpegede Lavrov, at »der var en autoritær leder der [i Libyen], der også var ilde lidt, men der var ingen terrorister overhovedet under hans regime«. Lavrov fortsatte: »Og da han blev fjernet, blev Libyen forvandlet til et udklækningssted for terrorisme, og det i et land, gennem hvilket militante kæmpere og våben passerer mod syd [Afrika], mens de selvsamme migranter, der er et problem for Europa, rejser mod nord.«

Med et udfald mod amerikanere, der siger, »hvis det ikke er gået i stykker, så lad være med at fikse det«, bemærkede Lavrov, at Vesten gjorde det modsatte. »Irak var ikke knækket, Libyen var ikke knækket og Syrien var ikke knækket. De begyndte at fikse det og fik det, der nu foregår der«, sagde Lavrov iflg. TASS.

**EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg
fremlægger
Lyndon LaRouches analyse af
Libyens rolle
i Nordafrikas og Mellemøstens
nuværende
situation, med fare for en
generel atomkrig,**

og Hillary Clintons rolle

Disse handlinger, denne operation for regimeskift i Libyen, førte, som nu er velkendt, direkte til, at Libyen blev til en mislykket stat og skabte et vakuum, i hvilket Libyen kunne blive stedet for iscenesættelse af det, der i dag kaldes ISIS – disse radikale, jihadistiske terrorister, der i mange områder bruger de våben, der blev kanaliseret ind i Libyen på tidspunktet for Hillary Clinton/Obama-operationen, med henblik på at vælte Gaddafi. De bruger nu disse våben til at overtage store bidder af territorium i Nordafrika og Mellemøsten. Dette skal naturligvis ses i forbindelse med de tragiske begivenheder, der udspillede sig den 11. september [2011] i Benghazi, hvor ambassadør Stevens og tre andre amerikanere blev dræbt. Men dette påpeger den mere betydningsfulde diskussion, der burde finde sted: Hvad var Hillary Clintons rolle? Hvad var Barack Obamas rolle i beslutningen om at gennemføre regimeskift i Libyen, og hvad vil resultatet blive, hvis vi tillader denne samme operation for regimeskift at finde sted i Syrien og mange andre lande?

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Titelfoto: En bevæbnet libysk oprørskæmper sparker til en fodbold i nærheden af Moammar Gaddafis kompleks Bab al-Aziziya, mens dette omsluttet af flammer. Libyske oprørere indtog paladset efter flere dages kampe for at vinde kontrollen over Tripoli, 2011. (Maxppp/ZUMAPRESS)

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-Webcast 4. marts 2016: Vi må udvikle rumprogrammet for hele menneskeheden. Engelsk udskrift

Megan Beets fra LPAC Videnskabsteam rapporterer fra en begivenhed med Kesha Rogers i Texas om rumprogrammets betydning for USA og hele menneskeheden; Jeffrey Steinberg fremlægger en analyse af begivenhederne omkring Libyen, som Hillary Clinton var en del af, med afsættelsen og mordet på Gaddafi, og hele operationens konsekvenser for den aktuelle situation i Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, der kan føre til generel atomkrig; og Jeff Steinberg fremlægger hr. LaRouches tanker om en genrejsning af USA's økonomi, med en genoplivning af rumprogrammet som spydspids. Engelsk udskrift.

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's March 4th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you are joining us for our weekly broadcast here on Friday evenings for the LaRouche PAC webcast, at larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio this evening by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Megan Beets from the LaRouche Pac Science Team. And Megan Beets just returned from a trip to Houston, Texas where she was involved in a very significant event and other meetings with Kesha Rogers. Many of you might have seen the recording of this event, which was

also

live-streamed on this website last Saturday. It featured Tom Wismueller, and Kesha Rogers, as well as Megan Beets.

We're going to begin our broadcast this evening with some remarks from Megan Beets, coming off the discussion that we had

with Mr. LaRouche this morning. As many of you know, Mr. LaRouche

has placed a premium on Kesha Rogers' role as a champion, a unique champion, of the resurgence of the United States space program. Kesha Rogers very aggressively campaigned for this cause

in her three campaigns for Federal office that she has run so far

– 2010, 2012, and 2014, in which she was the Democratic nominee

two elections in a row, in the 22nd District of Texas, for the United States House of Representatives, and also ran an internationally profiled Senate campaign in 2014.

So, without further adieu, I would like to ask Megan Beets to come to the podium to deliver a few opening remarks, and then

after that, we'll feature some more discussion coming off of the

meeting we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning, with Jeffrey Steinberg filling in some of those details.

MEGAN BEETS: Thanks, Matt. I can tell you from my visit to Texas that at this moment, when the breakdown of the trans-Atlantic system is undeniable – we're witnessing the complete malfunctioning and shutdown of this old system – we're

also see the reopening of the space program down in Texas.

Now the event that I was privileged to participate in with Kesha and Tom Wismueller down in Texas, represents a real beginning of a change of direction of the United States, a rebirth, so to speak, of the United States as a nation. Now,

the requirement today is that the United States dump our commitment, our addiction, to this dead, dying trans-Atlantic system, and decide once again to take up a mission in the sense of purpose and contribution to mankind.

Now, you look around today. You look around at our citizens. You look at the heroin epidemic. You look at the death, the self-induced deaths from drugs, from suicide, from alcoholism, and so forth. You look at the breakdown in cities like Flint, Michigan, the breakdown in places like certain counties of West

Virginia that were once booming coal towns. There's no reflection in the United States of reality.

Now, what's reality? Look at the leadership coming from Asia, particularly from China. Look at the kinds of optimistic developments, the progress for humanity, that's coming from the

leadership of China and their space program; and in their commitment to development projects which are beginning to take hold and take place all across Eurasia. That's reality. There's

no reflection of this yet inside the United States. And so when

we look around, it's not just that the U. S. economy has disappeared. The United States has disappeared. There's no sense

of a unified purpose. There's no sense of a unified mission for

the existence of the United States as a nation, and there's no sense within our people of what {we}, as a nation, will organize

ourselves to contribute to the purposes of mankind.

Now you contrast that with the U.S. sense of purpose and mission as under John F. Kennedy and his Presidency, and his leadership within the United States, and his dedication to the

space program. Now, as anyone who truthfully remembers – and most especially, those people who were directly involved – can tell you, this wasn't just a mission for the United States. This

was a real mission for all of mankind. And this was reflected in

some anecdotes in the event last Saturday from some of the attendees, who themselves were engineers or otherwise employed in

NASA during the Apollo missions.

One anecdote that was told by someone saying that he disagreed with Werner von Braun that we should be sharing some of

our technology with the Russians, and his mind was changed by von

Braun. There was another former NASA employee who said that at first in the 1990s, he disagreed with President Clinton's sharing

of U.S. space technology with the former Soviet Union – with Russia. And he said once he started working with Russian engineers, he realized that our mission is mankind; it's unified;

it's the same. And this was reflected throughout the entire event: the sense that our work during the space program was contributing fundamental developments and contributions, not to

the progress of the United States, but to the progress of man as

a whole.

Now, why? What is the space program? What happened during the space program in the United States?

Well, not only was the common, the general citizen, transformed. Not only were there innumerable and immeasurable benefits from the economic spin-offs. But most importantly, the

people were transformed. The astronauts were fundamentally transformed. The engineers working in a space program were

fundamentally transformed, as we confronted problems in space, problems that forced us to overturn our assumptions about the principles which govern and control the Universe that we lived in. And each of these problems that we confronted, we were to conquer. And you see that in the accounts of the people who were involved during that time in the space program: that we were able to pull together around a common mission, thousands and thousands of people across the country to confront these challenges in our knowledge about the Universe, and to conquer them. And in that way, in a very short period of time, man began to rapidly transform and change into a more powerful species. We began to progress into a species with more power and control over the processes in the Universe, so much to the point that we were able to land people on the surface of the Moon, which fundamentally transformed our ideas and our knowledge of what the Moon itself is, of what potential the Moon holds for a new platform of development for man, which was completely unknown until the accomplishments of Apollo. Now this is what the Chinese are doing today with their space program. In 2018, just two years from now, the Chinese plan to land on the far side of the Moon. This has never been done before. The far side of the Moon has been imaged with satellites, it's been seen by human eyes in the American astronauts who travelled there. But nobody has ever landed on the far side of the Moon. Now, people may say, "Well, we know what the Moon is; we've looked at it. We've taken pictures." But the fact is, the far

side of the Moon is a completely unknown quantity to us. When we land there, for example, what do we think the far side can teach us? When we land there, we'll have a chance to confront our fundamental notions about the formation of the Moon, the formation of the Earth, and possibly other planets in the Solar System with the unique geological investigations that we'll be able to perform there.

When we land there, and when we're able to set up astronomical observatories in the very low radio frequency range, which is a band of the electromagnetic spectrum which is impossible to look at the Solar System in from anywhere attainable to us besides the far side of the Moon; when we are able to look at the Solar System in this new range, we're very likely going to discover that the planets, the interstellar medium, distant galaxies, different stars, could exhibit processes to us which were completely invisible before. It's this kind of potential for mankind to transform our powers, to transform our relationship to the Solar System itself, that's being offered by the Chinese actions today. And it's this sense of meaning, this sense of mobilization and commitment to progress for all of mankind, which is what we, down in Texas, are reminding people of. What Kesha is reminding people of – even people who participated in these great accomplishments 40 or 50 years ago, and who might have encountered now a sense of demoralization with the actions since that time. We're drawing people back out to a commitment of this mission. And Kesha is showing once again that the United States can, and must, commit itself to this kind of purpose for all of mankind.

So I can just conclude by reporting that the beginnings of these developments that we're seeing coming out of Texas, is that people down there still associate themselves with reality, and are now playing a leading role, with Kesha, in being moved toward recognizing that this is the viable option for the United States.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Megan. And like I said, if you haven't gotten a chance to see the recording of the event that occurred down in Texas last Saturday, it is archived on the larouchepac youtube channel, and I would encourage you to watch

it. It was a very uplifting event, and we can expect to hear much, much more from Kesha Rogers, obviously.

Now, the second item on our agenda tonight is something which you may have heard Mr. LaRouche emphasize during the discussion with the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee this past Monday. Towards the end of that show, you might have caught Mr.

LaRouche's reference to a series of very significant articles that were published in the {New York Times} over the weekend. They were titled: "Hillary Clinton, Smart Power, and a Dictator's

Fall: The Role of Hillary Clinton in the ouster and killing of Colonel Muammar Qaddafi That Left Libya a Failed State and a Terrorist Haven." This article, or series of articles, which were

based on a number of interviews from people who were right on the

inside of the entire decision-making process that led into the decision to overthrow Qaddafi, and to ultimately have him killing, very vividly paints the picture of the months leading up

into that decision, and Hillary Clinton's central role in making

that decision on the inside of the Obama White House. And this, despite dire warnings from intelligence experts, and military experts, as to what the aftermath of that decision would be, and also even overtures of peace that were coming from Libya itself, and the Libyan government – overtures for a peaceful transition, which were directly and decisively ignored by the Clinton State Department and the Obama White House. These actions, this regime-change operation in Libya, as we know now very well, directly led to Libya becoming a failed state, and creating the vacuum in which Libya could be the staging ground for what has now come to be called ISIS today – these radical jihadist terrorist who in many parts are using the weapons that were channeled into Libya at that time by the Hillary Clinton-Obama operation, in order to overthrow Qaddafi. They are now using those weapons to take over large swaths of territory in Northern Africa, and in the Middle East. Obviously, this is the context for the tragic events that unfolded on Sept. 11 in Benghazi in which Ambassador Stevens and three other Americans were killed. However, I think this point to the more important discussion that should be being had: What was Hillary Clinton's role? What was Barack Obama's role in the decision for regime change in Libya, and what will be the outcome if we allow this same regime-change operation to continue to take place in Syria and in many other countries? One note I would say just before inviting Jeff up to the podium to discuss this more in detail, is the importance of the

coincidence of the publication of these series of articles in the {New York Times} with Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard's surprise announcement that she was resigning as vice-chair of the DNC in order to more aggressively campaign against Hillary Clinton, explicitly because of Hillary Clinton's identity as a strong and vocal advocate of the policy of regime change what Tulsi Gabbard has said she personally witnessed the tragic and disastrous consequences of on the ground in Iraq, after the decision to have regime change against Saddam Hussein. Tulsi Gabbard was active service military. And we saw the decision again in the case of Libya, and now we are confronting directly head-on whether or not that decision will be made in Syria. This also obviously has a lot to do with the context of Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts to create the framework for a ceasefire, along with Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in Syria. Now, what I would like to ask Jeff to discuss at the podium is what Mr. LaRouche's take has been on the significance of these articles, and also the very precise timing of these articles being published right now, during this Presidential campaign season, and what the implications of this should be seen in terms of the ongoing fight behind the scenes continuing to this day in the Obama Administration.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Well, the two-part series, lengthy articles that were published late last week, early this

week, in the New York Times bring back into stark relief and memory, the fact that the decision to overthrow and execute Qaddafi was not only a turning point in recent history. It unleashed a flood of instability. Massive amounts of weapons flooded out of Libya. All across Africa a structure was set up for laundering those weapons into Syria, where they ultimately wound up in the hands of both the al-Qaeda, and later the Islamic

State forces. This has been a source of mass death, grave instability, throughout the entire Africa and Middle East region, and beyond.

Now, what the {New York Times} articles make clear is something that was well-known to us and which Mr. LaRouche commented on exhaustively as these events were playing out. But

from the standpoint of the current elections and things related

to the ongoing war danger, now at the threshold of the danger of

a general war, a nuclear war, it's very important to reflect back

on this.

Effectively, as the result of Hillary Clinton joining the White House, joining President Obama, joining Samantha Power, joining Susan Rice and Valerie Jarrett, in pressing for the violent overthrow of the Qaddafi government, the assassination of

Qaddafi, and effectively the installation of the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda into power in Libya, this meant that Hillary Clinton had completely capitulated to Obama. Prior to that point, during the Obama administration, despite the fact that it was a grave political mistake on the part of Hillary Clinton to have become a part of the Obama Administration in the

first place, the fact is that she had generally aligned herself

with Defense Secretary Gates, with General Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and had been a barrier to the worst kinds of British policies coming out of Obama, Jarrett, Rice, Power, and the others grouped around this President. Obama is a British agent, plain and simple, and that was one of the first points that Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion earlier today. And he said, Look, Hillary Clinton was terrified into playing the role that she played in Libya. She was not the only person pushing for regime change; she was, in the words of Roberts Gates, "the tilt factor". The decisive vote in a very close 51-49 vote, where Gates himself, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were opposed to launching the no-fly zone. Launching what was being mislabelled a humanitarian intervention, when from the very outset it was always about regime change. You've got to remember that the characteristic of the Obama Presidency is to be found in those Tuesday kill sessions; where the President sits down with a group of national security advisors, Cabinet members, representatives of the military and intelligence community, and makes life-or-death arbitrary decisions to add people's names to the kill lists. In some cases – we know in at least four instances – people were put on that kill list who were American citizens; who were deprived of any day in court, any due process, and were summarily assassinated. Whether by special forces, whether by drone attacks, or combinations of both.

So, that's the character of the Obama administration. And with the 2011 decision to overthrow Qaddafi, Hillary Clinton – out of absolute fear – remember, you're dealing with a President who relishes the idea of coming up with weekly lists of targets for assassination. With that Libya decision, with Clinton's decision to side with her own worst enemies, going all the way back to the 2008 campaign when she campaigned against Barack Obama; when Samantha Power publicly went out on the stump calling her a witch. When she capitulated and sided with those British forces in the Libya operation, she not only participated in the unleashing of absolute Hell across much of Africa and the Middle East region; but she caved in to people who, at an earlier point, she knew were absolutely despicable and were her avowed enemies. That capitulation is something that she will live with forever. Now, recently, in the course of reviewing the Africa events, the Libya events, some additional information has come out that even puts a further punctuation point on the fact that there was a top-down decision in which Secretary Clinton participated, along with President Obama, to overthrow Qaddafi; no questions asked, no second thoughts. There's a very precise timeline that has been provided by a retired US Navy Rear Admiral named Charles Kubic, who was retired from the Navy and was a business man working in Libya – also a trained engineer. And when the United

Nations Security Council passed the resolution to establish a no-fly zone and a "humanitarian corridor" around Benghazi – this

was on March 19, 2011 – on that very day, Rear Admiral Kubic was

contacted by people in the inner circle of Qaddafi; and they said, "Let's talk." Let's not go with diplomatic formulations.

Let's immediately convene a battlefield 72-hour truce. And during that time, let's discuss an orderly procedure for standing

down the Libyan forces that were moving on Benghazi, and on an orderly transition of power. Qaddafi was prepared to leave Libya, to go into exile; to arrange a negotiated government to follow from him, and to basically stand down the Libyan forces that were, in fact, battling al-Qaeda and other jihadist networks

in the area around Benghazi and Misurata inside Libya. Admiral

Kubic conveyed immediately the approach that he had gotten from

the head of Qaddafi's personal security. He conveyed it to Stuttgart, Germany; it was reported to General Carter Ham, the head of the Africa Command, and General Ham responded favorably.

Details were being worked out the very next day to convene exactly this kind of battlefield truce and negotiating process;

either in Tripoli, or right off the shores of Libya on a designated US military ship. And in fact, there was a halt on the part of Qaddafi of the military movement toward Benghazi and

Misurata. So, in other words, everything was there within the first 24 hours of when the bombing began of Libya, for the conflict to stop right there; for Qaddafi's departure; for none

of the death and destruction that followed to actually take

place. On the evening of March 20, 2011, General Carter Ham issued a statement saying that the United States had no interest in targetting Qaddafi. That was the return signal that the Libyans were looking for, coming from AFRICOM, that the negotiations could begin perhaps as early as the next morning. However that entire situation was cancelled; Admiral Kubic was ordered to stand down, to drop the contact. AFRICOM was ordered to stand down and abandon any plans for any such negotiation for Qaddafi's departure. Because the decision had been made "higher up in the administration" that there would be no turning back; that this was a regime change operation, and in fact, a part of that was the fact that the British – who had agents inside the inner circle of Qaddafi's own personal security detail – were the ones who fingered his location and set up his assassination later that year. So, in other words, the destruction of Libya, the destruction of Africa, that came in part as a measure of Hillary Clinton's capitulation to President Obama, and above all else, to the British; could have been at least short-circuited and the worst damage prevented. The death of Ambassador Stephens and the three other American officials a year and later probably could have been averted. But none of that happened, because there was a willful decision; undoubtedly the decision was made in London, was passed in through Obama. And rather than fighting against that, Hillary Clinton capitulated; and it was out of a fear of Obama, out of a fear that this was a killer President. There

were a number of opportunities where she had the possibility to resign and put the spotlight where it properly belonged; but none of those things happened.

And as the result of that, all of the African continent is now one extended battle zone. As the result of that, we have the

existence of the Islamic State; because Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar flooded Syria and Iraq with the kinds of weapons that had

been derived from what was at one point a secured Qaddafi arsenal

of all kinds of weapons. And those weapons have now spread chaos, death, and destruction across that entire swath of North

Africa and the Middle East. That's the legacy, that's the consequence of the fact that, as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton failed to uphold her responsibilities; capitulated to her

own worst avowed enemies in the Obama administration, and unfortunately, the rest is history.

Mr. LaRouche, at the time, pointedly said, from the moment that he heard that Qaddafi had been assassinated, that the real

targets were Russia and China; and that these events in 2011 were

the beginning of a process that would now accelerate towards the

general warfare – potentially thermonuclear warfare – involving

the United States, Russia, and China. So, look back with a certain degree of hindsight, and understand the consequences of

what happened in that critical moment of March of 2011; and see

how all of the events that have followed from that, and why we

are on the verge of a potential thermonuclear war of annihilation of mankind. Understand how critical decisions in critical moments, shape events for long periods of time to come.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, in the context of what Jeff just said about the overarching policy that has emanated from this Obama administration against Russia and against China, you've seen obvious economic warfare also that's taken place from the United States against both of those countries. The next question pertains to one of those aspects; and I know that it will also give Jeff an opportunity to discuss a little bit about what Mr. LaRouche's views are on the necessity of a massive mobilization inside the United States to rebuild our economy, spearheaded by Kesha Rogers' efforts in Texas to revive the legacy of the NASA space program.

So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the US Department of Commerce has imposed a 265% tariff on Chinese cold-rolled steel. The Department of Commerce stated that the tariffs are meant to punish China for dumping cold-rolled steel onto the market; which is used to make auto parts, appliances, and shipping containers. In your view, will these imposed tariffs help the US steel industry? And if not, what measures do you recommend to revitalize our steel industry?"

STEINBERG: Well, the first thing that Mr. LaRouche said was, if you want to revitalize the US economy, then you've got to start out by shutting down Wall Street; because Wall Street

right

now is about the only steel sector left in the United States – they steal everything that's available to be stolen.

Now, I think that this move by the Commerce Department came as the result of pressure from a number of members of Congress;

most of whom are simply desperate and misguided and are not even

among the worst people in the US Congress. The idea that somehow

or other, putting prohibitive tariffs on the importing of Chinese

steel at this stage of the game, when the entire real economy of

the United States is in a state of absolute collapse, is the ultimate folly. Now, let's just look at some of the basic facts

of what's been going on inside the US economy; and particularly,

let's look at the steel sector. We don't have the data for all

of 2015, but we know that between 2014 and 2015 there was actually a 26% decline in the amount of steel imported from China. And the reason for that is because there was an even greater decline in the overall steel utilization inside the US economy; because the US economy is in a state of physical, economic collapse. One of the areas where you had substantial use of steel, not on a gigantic scale, but on a significant scale, was in the shale oil and gas sector; which we know is in a

state of collapse right now. And the fact that it was that sector that was a major source of steel use in the US economy, just tells you how far down the scale of real economic development that we have fallen.

Now, the fact of the matter is, that on a global scale centered in the trans-Atlantic region, you have a significant collapse in physical economic output. Real production in the

United States has collapsed; we've gone through 15 consecutive months of a decline in industrial output. The shale oil and gas sector collapse is a small piece at the tail end of a 40-year process of economic collapse, disintegration, out-sourcing of what little real economic activity was going on. So the idea that a tariff, at this point, is going to protect a domestic industry that collapsed over the past 40 years, is an act of desperation; when in fact, we need real creative thinking. Now, {Executive Intelligence Review} has recently – we've talked about it on this show before – produced a supplement to the World Land-Bridge report, called "The United States Must Join the World Land-Bridge"; and it lays out a clear game plan for a genuine economic revival of the United States. It starts by shutting down Wall Street; they're hopelessly bankrupt. And the bankruptcy of Wall Street is now in the process of advancing the disintegration of the real economy of the United States; and the real economy of the United States means the American people. When we were discussing earlier today with Mr. LaRouche, he said, "Look, what's the most chilling indication of the real rate of collapse of the US economy? It's the exponential increase in the number of people dying of heroin overdoses; it's the number of people, the exponential rise in the number of people committing suicide in other ways, as well. It's the desperation and demoralization of a population that was once inspired, that was once the most productive population in the world; and is now fallen into a state of complete collapse." In 2005, we saw the

takedown of the auto sector; and what that meant was the machine tool design sector associated with the US auto sector was wiped out. Under President Obama, there has been a conscious and systematic policy of shutting down our space program; and it's only through that space exploration, as Megan just emphasized, that you have any prospect of a genuine future for mankind. The good news is that the report coming out of Texas is that some of the leading circles historically associated with NASA, current and former NASA employees, have reached the point where they realize: 1) that it's all over for the United States if there's not a real fight to revive the space program. They see certain glimmers of reflection of what was once a driving force in the growth of real productivity in the American economy; namely, the space program, centered in NASA Houston. You had the return to Earth of Scott Kelly, who spent a year up in space; an exciting development, it's a glimmer. It's a sort of smell or fragrance of the fact that NASA can be revived; that we can have a resurgence of the kind of optimism that we had during the Kennedy Presidency, before he was assassinated. Where the Apollo program was the centerpiece for the whole development of the real US economy. You've got NASA people now beginning to say, "Yes, we're ready for a real fight." The fight is on; and you've got reflections of that that you'll see emerging as a tendency in other parts of the country. Southern California used to be a major center of our space program; you had the Jet Propulsion

Lab

in the Los Angeles area, a crucial component. And you, of course, had the Lawrence Livermore Lab up in the Bay area. These

are centers that can be revived; but only if we get a core revival of that NASA mission. The mission to join with China, with Russia, with India, with other nations, in exploring and developing the universe as part of man's extraterrestrial mission.

So, if you think about the steel issue again, from that standpoint, how much steel would be required for the kind of nationwide high-speed rail system that is part of the "US joins

the World Land-Bridge"? How much steel will be required for a proliferation of nuclear power plants throughout the United States? The modernization of the existing plants, and their replacement where appropriate, by fourth generation nuclear power

plants. What would be the requirements once we've actually completed the process of successfully commercializing fusion? These are the issues for the future; but these fights have to won

today. And if you want to understand the biggest mass kill factor with President Obama, it has been his killing of the NASA

space program; because that is a mass execution of the future. And so, these issues are all very much inextricably tied together. Unless we get a revolutionary change in policy, which

means a return to the kind of Hamiltonian principles that we last

saw on display in the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency overall, and

in the Kennedy Apollo program in particular. These ideas are there; and we're getting now, coming from the Houston vicinity,

from the NASA center there, a rumbling. The start of a real

fight to basically bring the United States back into space; as part of a collaborative mission for all of mankind. And as I say, once that happens, the issue of steel, the issue of dumping; all of this becomes meaningless. Because the actual physical requirements will be so enormous, the return to optimism and the benefits of that – particularly for a lost generation of young people, who represent a high percentage of those who are going off as heroin addicts, who are committing suicide, who have no sense of future. We've got to restore the future; and that starts with a fight to revive NASA. And the good news is that that fight is now beginning; it's in its early moments, but it's a fight that is winnable. And the future of the United States hangs in the balance.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. Because Jeff mentioned it, I would just encourage our viewers to revisit the pamphlet; which is both available in print form, and in digital form: "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; A Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance"; which features much of what Jeff just discussed in terms of a national high-speed rail program, a Bering Straits tunnel or bridge project to connect us to Eurasia. To the phenomenal developments that are happening now in China; but it also has an entire section on a science-driver development mission, which includes much of the cutting edge work that needs to be done with a revived space program – not just in the United States, but also collaboration that we must begin to cooperate

with China's and Russia's space programs. And have what Mr. LaRouche has so aptly termed the common aims of mankind; that is the truest form of a war avoidance program for a durable piece.

So, with that said, I would like to thank Jeff; and I would also like to thank Megan Beets for joining us here this evening.

And I would encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Thank you very much.

Regimeskift-maskinen op i omdrejninger i Nordafrika, Mellemøsten og på Balkan

21. maj 2015 – Der fejer i øjeblikket en vind af regimeskiftkrige og -opstande, som er konstrueret af London/Washington/Riyadh-aksen, hen over det eurasiske kontinents Middelhavsområde, med, i forreste linje, Libyen, Syrien og Makedonien, men hvor andre scener for handling ikke er udelukket.

* Libyen: Den legitime regering, der i øjeblikket har base i Tobruk, sendte et brev til FN, hvori der stod, at regeringen er åben for at diskutere planer med EU/NATO om at kontrollere mennesketrafikken fra de libyske kyster. Dette ses som en sindelagsændring, idet både regeringen i Tobruk og putsch-regeringen i Tripoli begge hidtil har været modstandere af enhver udstationering af EU/NATO-flådefartøjer imod disse menneskehandlere. Rusland skal fortsat være modstandere af tiltaget.

EU/NATO-planen, hvis gennemført, vil føre til en militær involvering og vil forøge den bevæbnede modstand. Det må ses som en britisk operation for at fortsætte den ødelæggelse, som Imperiet indledte med den voldelige afsættelse af Gaddafi i 2011.

* Makedonien: Russiske medier citerer serbiske kilder, der rapporterer, at både den amerikanske ambassadør og EU's repræsentant havde deltaget i anti-regeringsdemonstrationen den 18. maj i hovedstaden Skopje. Alt imens ingen andre kilder bekræfter denne rapport, så er der masser af beviser på, at Makedonien er udset som mål for en operation i Maidan-stil.

En centraleuropæisk kilde, der i øjeblikket befinder sig i Moskva, sagde til *EIR*, at han ser et lignende scenario blive forberedt: anti-regeringsdemonstrationer og dødsfald eller tilskadekomne, der tilskrives regeringens ansvar, med det formål at få et påskud til at gennemføre et kup, støttet af folkemængden.

Den politiske analytiker Stefan Haderer skrev i dag i *Wiener Zeitung*, at »Makedoniens vej har længe været fastlagt af Obamaregeringen. I juli 2014 besøgte Victoria Nuland, den førende, amerikanske diplomat [sic] for Europa og hustru til den neokonservative Robert Kagan, Gruevski-regeringen i Makedoniens hovedstad, Skopje. Her lovede promoteren af 'Euromaidan', den ukrainske revolution, at NATO's udvidelse var en prioritet for fremtiden. Makedonien, sagde hun udtrykkeligt, fortjener sin 'retmæssige plads i NATO og Den europæiske Union'«.

Foto: Fra demonstrationerne den 18. maj 2015 i Skopje.

Nyhedsorientering juli 2014: Støt Argentinas kamp imod gribbefondene

USA's højesteret nægter at gribe ind over for en domstols kendelser imod Argentina og til gavn for »gribbefonde«, som truer med at forårsage en argentinsk statsbankerot. Verden mobiliseres til støtte for Argentina, og Ruslands og Kinas præsidenter forbereder besøg til landet. Sydamerika og G77 er på vej ind i Kina-Rusland-Indien-alliancen. Afsløringer fra Hillary Clinton i den nye bog Blodfejde afdækker Obama løgne om Benghaziangrebet, som kan føre til Obamas afsættelse. Rusland vil ikke hoppe i krigsfælden, men afstår i stedet fra at bruge militær i Ukraine. ISIS/ISIL's fremgang i Irak er det forudsigelige resultat af Tony Blairs anti-nationalstatspolitik. Vil Obama starte en ny Irakkrig?

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