

For fredens skyld må Obama opgive sin Nobelpris

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 10. januar, 2017 – Med blot få dage tilbage af sit præsidentskab fortsætter Barack Obama med at optrappe en potentiel krigskonfrontation med Rusland, mens hans regimeskiftkriges dødbringende kaos, i Libyen, Yemen og Afghanistan, fortsat forværres.

Foruden en ny, hurtig deployering af yderligere 6.000 soldater til Ruslands grænser, med fuld jord-og-luft kampbevæbning, er Obama og hans Pentagonchefer gået i gang med at skabe en 2.000 mand stærk »dræberenhed«, der skal uddannes til at myrde nordkoreanske ledere. Obama har indledt, været med til at starte eller fortsat ni separate krige, mens han har været præsident, alle uden bemyndigelse fra, eller blot væsentlige konsultationer med, Kongressen. Han er den eneste præsident i USA's historie, der har været i krig hver eneste dag i to konsekutive embedsperioder, som kongresmedlem Ron Paul påpegede på sin webside 9. jan. Hans dronedrab stiller George W. Bush' i skyggen, og hans erklærede politik for dronedrab fjerner grundlæggende set enhver grænse for præsidenters magt til at dræbe via droner overalt i verden.

Nogle af disse handlinger, såsom Obamas massive, \$115 mia. store bevæbning af saudiarabiske styrker for at bombe og invadere Yemen, har haft et sandt folkemord til følge; nogle af disse handlinger har næret fremvæksten af flere terroristgrupper; andre truer med generel krig med Rusland og/eller Kina.

At denne krigspræsident kan prale med en Nobels Fredspris er en vederstyggelighed og en trussel mod freden, både i krigen i Syrien, og i hele verden.

Den 9. jan. krævede Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga

Zepp-LaRouche, at præsident Obama tilbageleverede Nobels Fredspris, som han fik i 2009 kort tid efter, at han overtog embedet. Pentagon har netop annonceret »dræberenheden« i Korea – en afgående præsident sammen med en koreansk regering, der selv er ved at blive fjernet gennem en rigsretssag! – samt de store, nye styrker, der nu deployeres, for at »standse russisk aggression« i Europa.

Det er nødvendigt at respondere til sådanne eskalerende krigshandlinger i Obamas sidste dage i embedet, med et krav om, at han omgående skal tilbagelevere sin Nobels Fredspris; og at dette krav udbredes internationalt og fortsætter efter, at han har forladt embedet.

Hvis Obama tvinges til at opgive sin uretmæssigt tildelte Fredspris, vil hans administrations forsøg på at tvinge det tiltrædende Trump-team til at *fortsætte* disse krige og stormagtskonfrontationer blive slået ned. Hans sidste øjeblikke optrapninger er nu i færd med at skabe så meget kaos og forvirring for hans efterfølger som overhovedet muligt.

Krigene, og truslerne om krige, kan få deres helt eget liv, med mindre de tilbagevises, og det på en synlig og stærk måde.

For fredens og udviklingens skyld må Obamas fredspris inddrages eller opgives.

**Lyndon LaRouche:
Obamas ord er en trussel om**

at dræbe

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. december, 2016 – Fredag erklærede præsident Barack Obama i et truende tonefald i et interview på NPR Morning Edition, der blev landsdækkende transmitteret, angiveligt som respons på beskyldninger om, at russerne skulle have hacket Demokraternes Nationalkomite,

»Jeg mener, at der ikke kan være nogen tvivl om, at, når en fremmed regering forsøger at få indflydelse på integriteten af vore valg, så må vi gribe til handling, og det vil vi gøre på et tidspunkt og et sted, som vi vælger. Men, hr. Putin er udmærket bekendt med mine følelser om dette, for jeg talte direkte med ham om det.«

Lyndon LaRouche sagde:

»Disse ord er en trussel om at myrde betydningsfulde mennesker. Det er, hvad han lærte af sin [sted-]fader.«

LaRouche opfordrede borgerne til at *»holde øje med denne fyr, så han ikke dræber«*. Obama truer offentligt verden. *»Planetens nationer trues nu af Obamas plan om massedrab af mennesker ... «*

Dernæst gentog Obama, under sin pressekonference i Det hvide Hus her til eftermiddag, sin trussel mod *»russisk hacking«*. Han sagde, at han havde sagt til Rusland, at

»de skal ophøre med det og indikerede, at der vil blive konsekvenser, når de gør det ... Vores mål er fortsat at sende Rusland et klart budskab.«

Desuden erklærede Obama sig enig opsummeringen fra CNN-reporteren i Det Hvide Hus om, at *»præsidenten mener, Vladimir Putin autoriserede hackingen«*.

Anklagen om russiske indgreb i selve valget lugter langt væk, i betragtning af, at der nu i månedsvis ikke er blevet fremlagt noget bevis, der viser Ruslands skyld, men kun

uophørligt gentagede påstande. I dag sagde talsmand for den russiske præsident, Dmitry Peskov, at USA bør ophøre med ubegrundede beskyldninger om russisk indgriben.

»De bør enten holde op med at tale om dette, eller også i det mindste fremlægge nogle beviser.«

Torsdag nægtede efterretningsfolk fra Obama-administrationen direkte at gå til Kongressen, da de blev bedt om at gøre det af Repræsentanternes Hus' Efterretningskomite, for at levere beviser under et møde bag lukkede døre. Der har været mange indikationer på, at andre efterretningstjenester ikke er enige med CIA-direktør John Brennans konklusion om russisk hacking.

Faren kommer fra Obamas forkærlighed for mord – samt den kendsgerning, at han snart vil forlade embedet og derfor hverken vil have eksekutive magtbeføjelser, eller beskyttelse mod eventuel retsforfølgelse for sine forbrydelser.

Lad os kigge på Obamas kendte meriter. Der er hans tirsdagsmøder, hvor han udarbejder mållister over de ofre, der skal dræbes ved hjælp af droner. Der er de forsatte deployeringer af amerikanske mænd og kvinder, som udsættes for skade og død, i amerikansk militærtjeneste i de 16 år, hvor Obama/Bush/briterne har ført krige for regimeskifte (Irak, Afghanistan, Libyen, Syrien). I selve USA er der et massivt antal borgere, der lider og dør pga. Obamas katastrofale økonomiske politik, som han selv kalder en succesfuld, økonomisk genrejsning. Der er en voldsom stigning i tilfælde af overdosis af narkotika og dødsraten generelt.

Lad os se på Obamas historie. Hans trang til at dræbe stammer fra hans egen opvækst, har LaRouche mange gange understreget. Hans stedfar, Lolo Soetero i Indonesien, var en drabsagent i den undergravende virksomhed og nedslagtning (1965-66), der skulle vælte præsident Sukarnos regering. I sin selvbiografi skriver han, hvordan han i denne periode lærte, at drab på de svage er, hvad de stærke gør. (*Dreams from My Father*)

LaRouche bemærkede, at

»internationalt har vi netop nu folk, der leder et globalt program for udvikling og fred [den eurasiske Nye Silkevej, med præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin, og andre], men Obama vil ikke bare lade tingene forløbe på en fredelig måde«.

De vil dræbe; så har vi problemet, og det hele er blodig uorden. LaRouche understregede, at *»Alle signalerne er til stede. Obama har gjort det ganske klart«.*

LaRouche krævede, at man tog skridt til at advare folk. *»Obama har gentagne gange vist, at han er parat til drab i stor skala i USA og andre nationer.«* Det, der må gøres, er, at *»Obama må lukkes ned«* for at forhindre det, han har til hensigt at gøre.

Foto: Præsident Obama kæmper for TPP under et møde i House Democratic Caucus på Capitol Hill, juni, 2015. (Foto: Whitehouse.gov)

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

20. november 2015 – Fire veteraner fra det amerikanske luftvåben med sammenlagt mere end 20 års erfaring med drone-operationer, tre af dem som 'sensor-operatører' og den fjerde som kommunikations-tekniker, har skrevet til præsident Obama og opfordret ham til at genoverveje politikken med målrettede drone-drab, fordi, som de siger, det er en drivkraft bag ISIS

og andre jihadistiske grupper. I et passioneret brev stilet til Obama, forsvarsminister Ash Carter og CIA direktør John Brennan skriver de, at taktikken har "leveret brændstof til de hadefulde følelser, der har opildnet terrorismen og grupper som ISIS og samtidig tjent som et grundlæggende rekrutterings-værktøj i lighed med Guantánamo Bay".

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

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

Her følger ordlyden af deres brev:

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

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

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

“Vi anmoder Dem om at tage vores perspektiv i betragtning, selv om, i betragtning af den uhørte forfølgelse af sandhedsvidner, der kom før os, såsom Chelsea Manning, Julian Assange og Edward Snowden, denne opfordring muligvis er forgæves. For dette lands skyld håber vi dog, at det forholder sig anderledes.”

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

LPAC Fredags-webcast 13. nov.

2015:

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

**Times ikke offentliggøre de
lækkede »Drone-papirer«?**

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

Engelsk udskrift.

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

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

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

evening, during this broadcast, as pertains to these horrific

events.

But this evening we're going to be beginning our broadcast with an on-the-ground video report from New York City, where the LaRouche Political Action Committee held a rally earlier today in front of the headquarters of the {New York Times}. I'm sure many of our viewers have had a chance to see on the front page of the LaRouche PAC website a press release which was published on this website yesterday, which is titled, "Why won't the {New York Times} publish Obama's Drone Papers?", which makes the point that, despite the fact that the Times played a central role back in 1971 in publishing the so-called "Pentagon Papers", which were revealed by Daniel Ellsberg, and were released to the American people by the courageous actions which Senator Mike Gravel took by reading them into the {Congressional Record} – despite the fact that the Times was instrumental in this action, which was instrumental in laying the foundation for the downfall of Richard Nixon, and the ultimate end of the Vietnam War – today the {New York Times} has made the willful choice {not} to publish any serious coverage of the so-called "Drone Papers", which were likewise leaked by a courageous whistleblower from within the drone program itself, a so-called second Edward Snowden, and published by Glenn Greenwald's internet-based publication, {The Intercept.}

Despite thoroughly damning new details that have emerged and are contained within these documents, the Drone Papers, which pull back the curtain on the murderous and completely out of

control targetted assassination program that's being run, top-down by President Barack Obama, in his weekly kill sessions,

without any due oversight, and from behind closed doors, despite

this, the editors of the {New York Times} have publicly stated that in their opinion, these new revelations do not "warrant their own story."

The truth is – and you can be assured that the {New York Times} editorial staff well knows this – any widespread and serious coverage of the "Drone Papers" today. by a major national

newspaper of record, such as the New York Times, in the fashion

of the Times' own coverage of the Pentagon Papers in 1971, would

have an utterly devastating effect on revealing to the American

people the true reality of how this secret drone program is actually run, and the character of the President who runs it.

And

just as the Pentagon Papers did back then, major publication of

the "Drone Papers" today would likewise lay the foundation for the indictment and political downfall of this President – as his

murderous proclivities are put on full display for the entire country to see.

The question is: Knowing all of this, as the press release puts it, "Is the {New York Times} more afraid of Barack Obama than it was of Richard Nixon? And will that fear of taking on the

true characteristic of what this President stands for, cause the

{New York Times} to fail to address that awful reality at the very time that Obama is leading the United States into unprecedented war-provocations against both Russia and China,

and

by failing to do so, thus finding themselves – the {New York Times} – complicit in actions which threaten the outbreak of a

Third World War, and endanger the continued existence of all mankind.

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

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

“At the moment, we are on the brink of a thermonuclear war, because of the fact that this man has been tolerated, and his provocations against Russia, and against China, are unprecedented

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

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

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

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

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

of
weeks ago, and then they justified this, by claiming that it
did
not warrant its own story.

“So, we stand here to specifically indicate the editors, the
writers, who were involved in this cover-up; demand that this
be
brought to justice; and in the meanwhile to consider that what
we
need today is for one Senator to stand up, and to move against
Obama. This is what happened with Richard Nixon, and it was in
that case that the {New York Times} had the courage in 1971 to
publish the ‘Pentagon Papers’. Why will they remain silent on
these Satanic murders from Barack Obama?”

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

the center of his strategy to restore the United States to its
original founding principle as embodied in Alexander Hamilton,
the very opposite of everything that Obama has come to
represent

today. Further coverage of this rally will be available on the
LaRouche PAC website, including a longer version of this
on-the-ground report, as well as the text of the press
release,

which I mentioned at the outset of tonight’s proceedings.

But, when you place Obama’s drone program in the context of
his open and blatant war provocations against both Russia and
now

increasingly against China, in the recent days and weeks,
which

will lead to a global thermonuclear war if not stopped. In
that

context, I would like to ask Jeff to elaborate a little bit on
what Mr. LaRouche’s assessment was of the importance of using
this campaign, as you just saw, centered in Manhattan around
the

revelations that are now contained and released in the “Drone Papers” in order to drive Obama from office before he has the chance to lead the world into World War III.

STEINBERG: I learned earlier today that there is a joke circulating very widely in Israel, and I’m sure in other places

around the world. And the joke goes something like this: What’s

the difference between God and Barack Obama? The answer? God doesn’t think he’s Barack Obama.

What we’re dealing with here is truly a Satanic personality, and yet, he’s been permitted to carry out atrocity after atrocity; all on behalf of the British, whose policy, at the level of the British Empire, at the level of the British monarchy, has been always one of massive population reduction through policies of genocide. I think that’s the way you’ve got

to understand the events that are unfolding right now in Paris.

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

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

random targetted popular nightspots all around the city of Paris,

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

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

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

roots of this Islamic State jihadist apparatus?

Well, remember that the former head of the Defense

Intelligence Agency, General Michael Flynn, warned earlier this

year in a now widely circulated interview with Al-Jazeera America, that he had gone to President Obama in the summer of 2012 and warned that the policies that the US was pursuing – particularly the policies of facilitating the running of heavy weapons from the Libyan port city of Benghazi into various Syrian rebel groups – was going to result in the creation of a jihadist caliphate on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and in that general Middle Eastern region. Now, this was two years prior to the formal surfacing of the Islamic State, which really launched its operations in Iraq with the dramatic takeover of Mosul; and that was in June of 2014. So you've got high-level US Defense Intelligence officials telling the President of the United States, "Drop your fixation with the overthrow of the Assad government in Syria. Halt the flow of weapons that were unleashed on the world as the result of the overthrow of Qaddafi and his instant execution back in the fall of 2011; which unleashed floods of weapons throughout Africa. And through this Benghazi operation of British Intelligence and John Brennan as the Counterintelligence Director of the Obama administration, the weapons began to flow into Syria; and these weapons went into the hands of the very jihadist networks that we've now seen operating on the streets of Paris.

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

Flynn

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

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

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

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

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

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

the 7-plus years of Barack Obama. So you're dealing with somebody

who is by his character, pursuing outright policies that are evil, that are Satanic, and that at their core are British; that

directly go to the demands of the Prince Philips of the world, who call for mass population reduction.

Now we know that in two weeks, the COP21 climate change conference is scheduled to happen in Paris; we may very well find

that there was a relationship between these attacks that we're now just seeing unfolding on the streets of Paris right now, and

that upcoming conference. Earlier this week, Secretary of State

John Kerry bluntly stated what has now become obvious; namely that that COP21 conference – despite the efforts of the papal encyclical and John Schellnhüber and other outright proponents

of
genocide – that conference is likely to fail. There's too
much

resistance from developing sector countries that realize that
what they're looking at is a recipe for genocide. So, what we
have before us then, are other means by which the world is
careening towards the kind of events that can lead to the mass
population reduction policies that are being demanded
principally

out of the British monarchy; and are being carried out
principally through agents of that monarchy such as Barack
Obama.

So, what have we seen just in the recent days? The
administration has continued with the drone kill policy; and
as

we saw in the rally out in front of the {New York Times}, it's
quite clear that the White House has put enormous pressure on
the

major US media outlets to suppress the story. Because if the
story were to get national media attention through the {New
York

Times}, through the {Washington Post}, through CNN or one of
the

major cable news outlets, there would be a groundswell of
demand

for President Obama's removal from office. These policies are
policies of outright genocide. And we've been continuing our
own

investigation into the drone kill policy of Obama; looking
beyond

the "Drone Papers" that were released by {The Intercept} about
three or four weeks ago. And when you dig deeper into this
policy, what you find is that there have been repeated and
consistent studies carried out by the military, carried out by
major thinktanks whose job it is to do analysis of the actions
of

the military. You have the Stimson Center producing a series

of

two reports in 2012 and in 2014; the Naval Post-Graduate School

out in Monterey, California, produced a major study; the Rand Corporation produced a major study. In every instance, they can

to the identical conclusion: the drone policy is a failed policy;

it can never work; it will never work. The idea of targetting priority terrorist agents for elimination, does nothing to reduce

the spread of these kinds of jihadists. If anything, it becomes a

major means of further recruitment, of expansion of operations.

These are not things that are unknown at the levels of the National Security Council, the Obama White House, and similar locations. It is {willfully known} that these polices do not curb

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

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

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

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

carried out. So, we have a period that we've been living through, that constitutes more than a Thirty Years War, a period of perpetual war, and these last two Presidencies have been major instrumentalities to make sure that that policy happens. Now, in the past days, in addition to the continuing cover-up of the Obama drone kill programs which go directly and personally to Obamas desk in the Oval Office, every single one of these kill orders has Barack Obamas personal signature on it. Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, when he was asked to comment about the drone program, simply said, Its the only game in town. So, this has been the {signature policy} – an indiscriminate mass murder policy, of this President and of this administration. The idea of toleration for that, for one moment more, is something that now clearly threatens us all. If these kinds of actions can happen in the streets of Paris, France, then they can happen anywhere, including here in the United States. Now, not only is Obama continuing to pursue and defend this policy of drone kill, but, in the past week, we've seen an escalation on the strategic scale, as well. Defense Secretary Ash Carter spent last week in Asia, attending the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting. He tried to turn that event, unsuccessfully, fortunately, into a gang-up against China. The host government, Malaysia, refused to include a reference to the South China Sea situation in the draft communiqué for that conference. Carter showed up – and by the way, the United States is not a member of

ASEAN. Carter was there as an invited guest of the ASEAN countries, the ten nations of Southeast Asia. But, he basically intervened to try to hijack the entire direction of that conference. Fortunately, many of those countries of the region simply refused to do it. As the result, the conference ended in a shambles; there was no final communiqué.

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

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

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

in response to the United States deployment of ABM systems right

along the southern borders of Russia, the expansion of NATO throughout eastern Europe, in violation of the agreements that were reached at the time of German reunification. In response to

all of those provocations, the Russians have moved to establish

new levels of defense against what President Putin this week described as a clear attempt by the U.S. and its allies, to break

up the strategic balance that had existed throughout the period

of the Cold War and the post-Cold War period, up until this time,

and that the United States, by refusing to collaborate with Russia on some kind of global missile defense program, as President Reagan had proposed back in 1983, when he was in close

collaboration with Lyndon LaRouche on that project. The United States policy, is to create a thermonuclear war-winning

option.

That poses not just an existential threat to Russia, but a grave threat to all of mankind.

Now, middle of this past week, President Putin convened the annual meeting with top Russian defense officials and leaders of the defense-industrial sector of Russia, at Sochi, on the Black

Sea. In opening remarks to that event, which were widely televised throughout Russia, Putin made very clear: the United States has been targeting Russia with the ABM deployment. The fact is clearly demonstrated, because even after the P5+1 deal was reached with Iran, the United States announced it was continuing to move full steam ahead with the ABM deployment, not

in partnership with Russia, but unilaterally, with U.S. allies.

Since the original argument had been made that this ABM system was strictly directed against Iran, now that Iran has come into

compliance with the nuclear deal, with the P5+1, it just shows the lie to everything that Obama has been saying on this. Putin

made very clear, that Russia is moving forward to develop new weapon systems that can defeat any kind of ABM program that the

U.S. puts in place, which {will} be directed against Russia.

At the same time, as reported this week in the {Guardian} – we've mentioned it here on these Friday night webcasts for some time – the United States is going ahead with the deployment of what is, in effect, a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons

that will be forward-based in central and eastern and western Europe, which will be a new generation. They're called the B61-12,

with highly accurate tail-guidance systems, that will

penetrate

deeper into Russian territory, with much more precision accuracy,

and therefore these nuclear weapons will have greatly-reduced thermonuclear payloads, which means that the gap between strategic nuclear war and tactical-theater conventional nuclear

war, is greatly reduced. In other words, were moving towards a policy of having a deployable force of thermonuclear weapons, directed at close range, against targets in Russia.

Now, we learned this past week, through excerpts from a forthcoming authorized biography of George Herbert Walter Bush [Destiny and Power}, by Jon Meacham], that at the time of the 1991 Operation Desert Storm, and again during 2003, during the period of the invasion and overthrow of Saddam Hussein in Iraq,

[Vice President] Dick Cheney was persistently pushing for the use

of nuclear weapons. In the case of the first war in the Gulf, Cheney was promoting the idea that the U.S. should use 17 tactical nuclear weapons against targets in Iraq. So now we've got a continuation of that policy under President Obama.

So, here we are, more than 25 years after the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the collapse of the

Warsaw Pact – we're facing the gravest threat of thermonuclear war not because of any actions on the part of Russia, but because

of the character of the President of the United States, a Satanic

character who has no sense whatsoever of the consequences of pursuing this kind of policy of genocide.

So, whether it's preparing the groundwork for thermonuclear confrontation with Russia, and similarly with China – we've had

B-52 bombers, which are bombers that are capable of carrying thermonuclear warheads, flying over territory that China

claims

in the South China Sea, as China's sovereign territory, as part

of the Spratly Islands. That happened just in the last several days, and it's only now been first acknowledged by the Pentagon.

There was an earlier incident involving naval ships, incursions, into those same waters.

So we've got the targetting of Russia, the beginnings of a similar outright targetting of China. We have the drone policy,

and the cover-up of that policy. So here we are, literally looking at somebody whose track record, documented proven track

record, is that of mass murder. And yet there is toleration for

his remaining in office.

Now in our discussion this afternoon with Mr. LaRouche, he very much placed the emphasis on the situation in Manhattan.

You've got a unique characteristic of the population of Manhattan, the population of New York City and the great metropolitan area – but particularly the population of Manhattan. They still have a greater sense of reality, at least

large segments of the population do. They have a greater sense of

the morality that goes with recognizing the great danger that we're facing in the world today. And so, if you look back historically, Manhattan was the place where the core concepts around which our Constitutional republic was organized were formulated. They were formulated in Manhattan in particular by our First Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. There is a Hamiltonian tradition that prevails, and that tradition is the organizing principle for our nation, for our republic.

So Manhattan holds a special place for the nation as a whole. Mr. LaRouche pointed out that if you do a survey,

region

by region around the United States, you will find that region by

region the economy has been destroyed. The social fabric has been

gutted. We have drug addiction, suicide, all kinds of social dislocation because region by region, the economies of these areas of the United States have been gutted, particularly during

the period first of the Bush-Cheney administration, and at a greater and greater accelerating rate, under President Obama. Never mind that since 9/11, \$44 {billion} in your taxpayers' money has gone into the establishment of this drone kill program

that is one of the critical factors that keeps expanding the size

and brutality of the terrorist apparatus that we've now seen playing out on the streets of Paris just in the last few hours.

So we're dealing with an assault against the American people, an

assault that has weakened the social fabrics of many parts of our

country. So again, Manhattan represents a certain kind of glue, a

potential critical point of inspiration for saving this nation,

and this event that you've just seen a brief excerpt of in front

of the {New York Times} headquarters today, is indicative of the

kind of thing that we will be doing at an accelerating and continuing rate of expansion in Manhattan.

And we've got a situation in Washington, where there are a precious handful of elected officials, people in other positions

within the Federal government, within the military, within the

diplomatic corps, within the intelligence services – a handful of people – who remain truly committed to the survival of this nation and the planet, and we call on you, the American people,

to put maximum pressure on them to step outside the bounds of what's required to "go along to get along" and for a handful of

these people to step forward and speak the absolute truth about

what has gone on in this country, particularly during the seven

years of this Obama presidency.

One or two leading members of the U.S. Senate, in particular, taking their oath of office seriously, can bring this

President down and start the process of reversal of this destructive, literally Satanic takedown of the United States and

everything it has historically stood for. We need that step, but

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

States Senate, or U.S. House.

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

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

what is our advice to European leaders?"

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

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

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

could ultimately lead to the eruption of an outright civil war in Europe. In fact, I greatly fear that in the wake of these Paris attacks, that you're going to see an enormous backlash. German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who is increasingly becoming a captive of the revolt by people like Schäuble in her own party, actually took the surprising, but courageous stance, of saying that these refugees must be assisted; they must be protected, and they must be given an opportunity to be integrated into European society. And so, there's a deep split over this issue. The Russians, through President Putin, have intervened forcefully into the Syria situation to bring the Syria war to an end. The Russian military intervention on behalf of the Assad government, is beginning to show significant success. Remember, the Russian involvement only began directly on September 30; so we're talking about a period of six weeks. And in that six week period, there have been a number of significant setbacks delivered to the Islamic State and some of the other jihadist elements of the Syrian rebel opposition. The area around the city of Aleppo, which is the industrial capital of Syria, is now in the process of being retaken by the government forces. 60% to 80% of the population of Syria has now moved, or has already been located in areas under government protection. So, the idea

that
the Syrian people are fleeing to Europe through Turkey and
other
routes to get away from Assad is not the reality of the
situation. They're fleeing to get away from the Islamic
State,
the Nusra front, and the jihadists who've been the instruments
for the war to overthrow the Assad government.
Remember, in August of 2009, President Obama simply
declared, "Assad must go"; and with that declaration, the US
began facilitating the efforts of the Saudis, the Turks and
others to provide weapons to an army of jihadists who have
come
in from around the world. So, defeat the Islamic State; push
back against the tyranny of the Anglo-Saudi apparatus; dump
the
likes of Wolfgang Schäuble and others of his ilk, who are
trying
to stir up literally a Hitlerian backlash in Europe against
these
refugees, who are caught in a trap between the brutality of
ISIS
back in the Middle East and Iraq and Syria, and the emergence
of
a nativist right wing, literally a Hitlerian backlash inside
western Europe. If Europe is to survive, if Syria is to be
rebuilt, then you've got to take certain decisive actions; and
the United States should be collaborating with Russia in a
coordinated effort to defeat ISIS. Because every effort that
the
US and this so-called coalition of 60 nations has taken
against
ISIS has been a completely transparent fraud.
So, who's responsible for the flood of refugees streaming
into Europe? Start with President Obama, British Prime
Minister
Cameron, former French President Sarkozy, current French

President Hollande. These are the criminals who, along with the Saudis, the Turks, the Qataris and the others, have been providing all of the logistical and other support to the spread of jihadism. Because ultimately what they're out to accomplish is a population war. We've said this previously. The British policy towards the entire Islamic world, is to foment a new religious Hundred Years War between Sunni and Shi'a on a global scale; because ultimately their objective is population reduction. If they can launch such a Hundred Years War, then how many of the 1.8 or so billion Muslims on this planet will survive at the end of the day? And again, we have a President of the United States who, by personality and by ownership by the British, is a fully witting instrument in this process. So, on the one hand, as Mr. LaRouche said, Schäuble and people of his ilk have got to be dumped. They're the menace; they're the danger. Schäuble wants to go ahead with murderous austerity against the population of Europe; and has even less interest in doing anything for these refugees. And Obama, in his own right, has carried out the same kinds of policies. The destruction of the United States on his watch and on the watch of the previous President, is a crime beyond imagination. And so, it's time for the American people and even a handful of leading elected officials in Washington to wake up to exactly where the clock stands and to act before midnight.

OGDEN: Well, with that said, I think is the point where we

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

Mere fordømmelse af Obamas dronemassemord

10. november 2015 – Siden *The Intercepts* udgivelse i sidste måned af »Drone-papirerne«, er kravene om kontrol fra Kongressens side, kongresundersøgelse og direkte forbud mod Obamas selektive program for dronemord blevet stærkere.

Næste mandag vil Kirkernes Nationalråd i USA fokusere på dette spørgsmål på Capitol Hill, når rådet er ko-sponsor af en høring om Obamas dronedræberprogram i Rayburn-bygningen. En af talerne er den pensionerede oberstløjtnant i den amerikanske hær, Daniel L. Davis, en udtalt kritiker af krigen i Afghanistan.

I går udgav Countercurrents.org en kommenteret artikel af Doug Noble, der er medlem af Koalitionen for Droneaktion i staten New York, med titlen »Reaper Madness: Counterproductive Drone Wars« ('Manden med Leens galskab: Kontraproduktive dronekrige'). I artiklen citerer han etableringsens tænketaanke fra Rand og Brookings, en researcher ved Afdelingen for National Sikkerhed ved Flådens Skole for Akademikere, et medlem af staben ved U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, en professor ved Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, samt endnu flere. I variende grader af ligefremhed advarer de imod eller fordømmer politikken og programmet med dronedrab.

Blandt disse personer citeres James A. Russell ved Naval Postgraduate School fra dennes artikel, 'False Promise of Aerial Policing' (tilnærmelsesvis: 'Ordens-magthåndhævelse fra luften giver falske løfter'), at »ideen om ordensmagt-håndhævelse fra luften er farlig og dybt fejlbeskrevet, og er dog på mystisk vis blevet et universalmiddel for stater, der søger at anvende magt i den moderne æra ... Magthåndhævelse ved luftpatruljering er et intellektuelt og strategisk korthus, der bygger på et skrøbeligt fundament ... [det] repræsenterer taktikkens triumf over strategi og vender fundamentale sandheder om krigens natur på hovedet.«

Noble skriver, »Det måske mest lumske i alt dette er den kendsgerning, at mange undersøgelser, der længe har været tilgængelige for militære planlæggere, på afgørende vis har vist, at anvendelsen af bevæbnede droner i indsats til imødegåelse af oprør og terrorisme både er ineffektivt og kontraproduktivt. Ydermere har historien og nylig research klart vist, at strategien bag sådanne anvendelser af droner, med at 'afhugge hovederne' – mord på højtrangerende personer – i sig selv har været både fejlslagen og kontraproduktiv mht. at besejre oprørs- eller terrororganisationer.

Så drone-krigerne har hele tiden vidst, at det ikke ville virke: at dræber-droner og drabslister ville slagte tusinder

af civile, men aldrig besejre terrorister. De har haft afgørende viden om dette fra årtiers militærerfaring og mange bind med undersøgelser.«

Og i »'How Airstrikes Fail and Why Washington Never Notices' ('Hvordan luftangreb slår fejl, og hvorfor Washington aldrig bemærker det'), skriver Tom Englehardt i sin artikel, der blev bragt i Huffington Post (9. nov.): »I sin post-moderne 'menneskejagt'-form med det grumme navn Predator og Reaper, (Rovdyr og Manden med Leen) er det lykkedes droner at dræbe tusindvis af ledere, officerer, underofficerer og menige militante personer i forskellige terroristorganisationer, så vel som også et betydeligt antal civile, inklusive børn. Nyligt lækede dokumenter om Washingtons dronedrabskampagner indikerer, at, i mindst én periode i Afghanistan, var kun 10 % af dem, der blev dræbt, rent faktisk udset som mål for drab. Og alligevel synes præsidentens dronedrabskampagne i flere lande (delvist baseret på en drabsliste fra Det Hvide Hus og tirsdags-terror møder for at beslutte, hvem der skal være mål) blot at have været med til at nære den eksponentielle vækst af terrororganisationer i hele Sydvestasien og Afrika.«

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

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

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

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

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

Senator i Den amerikanske

Kongres Mike Gravel fordømmer Obamas dronekrige

20. oktober 2015 – Senator til Den amerikanske Kongres, Mike Gravel fra delstaten Alaska (1969-1981), har fordømt Obamaregeringens politik med at dræbe civile og tilfældige tilskuere gennem »Dronekrige, der er planlagt under møder, der har en meget præcis og omhyggeligt detaljeret kommandostruktur«, som involverer CIA-chef John Brennan og andre, men som sluttelig falder tilbage på præsident Obama personligt.



I juni 1971 var senator Gravel den eneste, der var modig nok til at oplæse »Pentagon-papirerne«, Daniel Ellsbergs afsløring af de løgne, som man fortalte den amerikanske offentlighed for at skjule Vietnamkrigens fiasko, i Kongressen, hvorved papirerne indgik i Kongressens protokol. På det tidspunkt, hvor senator Gravel afslørede løgnene om Vietnamkrigen, var både **New York Times** og **Washington Post** gennem en retskendelse blevet forbudt at offentliggøre dokumenterne, og Ellsberg var blevet truet med retsforfølgelse og fængsling. I dag eksisterer der intet retsligt forbud mod offentliggørelse af »Drone-papirerne«, men de store aviser har nægtet at dække historien.

Følgende pressemeddelelse blev overgivet til LaRouchePAC af senator til USA's Kongres Mike Gravel (1969-1981):

Websiden *The Intercepts* »[The Drone Papers](#)« giver detaljerede oplysninger om, hvordan det amerikanske, militære mordprogram fungerer i Afghanistan, Yemen og Somalia, i morderiske detaljer. »Dronepapirerne«, der er afsløret af endnu en

'Edward Snowden', vinder nu opmærksomhed internt i USA, på trods af de store mediers mørklægning, med dækning, der fremkommer i *Mother Jones*, *WIRED* magazine, *Small Wars Journal* og *Lawfare*, samt med britisk dækning i *The Guardian* og med dækning i irske aviser.

Dækningen i *Mother Jones* havde overskriften »A Massive National Security Leak Just Blew the Lid off Obamas Drone War« (Et massivt sikkerhedslæk har netop blæst låget af Obamas Dronekrige). Den citerer *The Intercepts* unavngivne whistleblower, »Denne oprørende eksplosion af overvågningslister – af at overvåge personer og inddele dem på hylde og i bunker på lister, at tildele dem numre, tildele dem 'baseball cards' ('røde kort'?), tildele dem dødsdomme uden varsel, på en verdensomspændende slagmark – dette var, fra allerførste færd, forkert.«

Historien bemærker, at Amnesty International har krævet en omgående Kongresundersøgelse af hele droneprogrammet med det argument, at de netop lækede papirer »rejser alvorlige bekymringer om, hvorvidt USA systematisk har krænket International Lov, inklusive gennem at klassificere ikke-identificerede personer som 'soldater' for at retfærdiggøre deres drab«. Der eksisterer nu officielle, amerikanske, militære dokumenter, siger artiklen, der i detaljer beskriver omfanget af massedrabsprogrammet (mellem januar 2012 og februar 2013 blev f.eks. 200 mennesker dræbt under droneangreb i det nordøstlige Afghanistan, alt imens der kun var opført 35 navne på drabslisten). *Mother Jones*-historien satte også fokus på den kendsgerning, at, i nogle tilfælde, har præsident Obama underskrevet drabsordre, der ikke engang identificerede specifikke mål, men som bemyndigede droneangreb baseret på iagttagede adfærdsmønstre hos grupper af personer.

The Guardian satte fokus på den kendsgerning, at præsident Obama har løjet med sine påstande om, at hans droneprogram kræver »nær-vished« for, at der ikke vil forekomme civile ofre. Ifølge Bureau of Investigative Journalism er næsten

1.000 civile blevet dræbt under 421 droneangreb i Pakistan siden 2004, herunder skønsmæssigt 200 børn. Og dog opregner droneprogrammets lister alle uidentificerede civile, der er dræbt i kamp, som terrorister for at mørklægge den kendsgerning, at, i mange områder, hvor droneprogrammet opererer, er 90 % af de dræbte personer ikke de godkendte mål.

Under mit første møde med Barack Obama, under den første debat mellem demokratiske kandidater til præsidentnomineringen i 2008 i South Carolina i 2007, satte jeg spørgsmålstegn ved Obamas helligelse til anvendelsen af dødbringende magt for at eliminere terrorister, efter at Barack Obama havde erklæret, at »Der er ingen modsætning mellem, at vi anvender vores militær, og i visse tilfælde i dødbringende form, for at eliminere terrorister, og opbygning af alliancer i hele verden ... », hvormed han refererede til Iran og den mulige støtte til Israel, hvis landet blev truet. Obama var noget forlegen over at have skabt denne forbindelse. Idet han passerede forbi mig efter debattens afslutning, talte han vredt til mig, 'Hvem er du, Gravel, at du stiller spørgsmålstegn ved min moralitet i brugen af atommissiler i et Førsteangreb?' Så satte jeg virkelig spørgsmålstegn ved hans moralitet. I dag peger jeg på Obamas åbenlyse immoralitet i anvendelsen af Droneangreb mod uskyldige tilskuere til angreb med dronemissiler.