

**POLITISK ORIENTERING 18.  
februar 2016:  
Rusland tager strategisk  
lederskab/  
Bail-in ikke holdbart/  
Gennembrud for Fusionskraft**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# Russisk forsvarsminister: NATO kommer stadig tættere på Rusland

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

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

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

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

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

---

## **IMF ændrer sine regler for at skade Rusland og BRIKS**

9. december, 2015 – IMF ændrede i tirsdags reglerne for sin (giftige) udlånsvirksomhed, for derved eksplicit at give Ukraine mulighed for ikke at tilbagebetale sin gæld til Rusland. IMF forsøger stadigvæk at komme på en formulering af "rationalet" bag ændringen, men det står klart, at London og Washington har indgået aftale om, at konfrontation med Rusland må være enhver "vestlig" institutions opgave.

IMF udsendte følgende: "IMF's bestyrelse mødtes i dag og

aftalte at ændre den nuværende politik vedrørende nul-tolerance over for restance til statens kreditorer. Vi vil i de kommende dage komme med de detaljerede forskrifter for rækkevidden af, og rationalet bag, denne ændring i vores politik".

For indeværende vil reglen alene berøre Ukraine og Rusland.

IMF har tidligere ændret sine regler for at gøre det muligt at udlåne "med restancer" til Ukraine – dvs., at låne dem yderligere penge, selvom de ikke tilbagebetalte gamle IMF-lån. Så begyndte IMF's direktør Christine Lagarde personligt at forhandle med Ukraines kreditorer om afskrivninger af landets udenlandsgæld – hvilket, som det er blevet bemærket, er det modsatte af IMF's politik i forhold til Grækenland, og sker til trods for, at Ukraines økonomi og valuta er kuldsejlet mere og mere. Ukraines præsident Poroshenko og premierministeren, Victoria Nulands "mand Yats", brugte åbenlyst de tidligere IMF låne-udbetalinger til at finansiere militærets krig med Rusland.

Erklæringen fra i dag betyder, at nationer, der misligholder gæld til andre lande, stadig vil kunne modtage nye IMF lån. Ukraine har – ikke tilfældigt – meddelt, at det ikke vil honorere sin gæld til Rusland på \$3 mia., der forfalder ved årets udgang, (og har nægtet at forhandle en gældssanering, som Rusland ellers har tilbudt).

*Wall Street Journal* nævner, at Rusland har afvist Ukraines forslag om at 'nedbarbere' gældsforpligtelsen på de \$3 mia., alt imens Ukraine afviste et russisk modtilbud med krav om, at Ukraine skal betale hele beløbet, men over en længere tidsramme. "Dette dødvande truede IMF's 'redningspakke' (bailout) til Ukraine, samt andre vestlige hjælpeindsatser for fondens finansiering, inklusiv fra USA og Europa," siger *Wall Street Journal*.

"Jeg vil gerne minde om, at kun Rusland har tilbudt at hjælpe

Ukraines økonomi og for to år siden gav et lån til landet, der ellers ikke havde adgang til eksterne markeder”, sagde den russiske finansminister Anton Siluanov til journalister i tirsdags. IMF’s beslutning om at ændre sin udlånspolitik er blevet truffet ”for at skade Rusland, og for at legalisere Kievs muligheder for ikke at tilbagebetale sine lån”, sagde han, idet han kaldte beslutningen ”fremtvunget og forudindtaget”.

En kommentator ved RT TV sagde, at dette træk repræsenterer en politik fra USA’s side for at opdele verdens valutaer i to blokke: en dollar-blok (japanske yen, euro, pund), og for hvilken det gælder, at gæld SKAL tilbagebetales, og alle andre, udtrykkeligt refereret til som lån i BRIKS-valutaer, for hvilke det gælder, at tilbagebetaling er valgfrit.

---

## **Willy Wimmer i Moskva: RT og Putin forhindrede en storkrig i Europa over Ukraine**

*10. december 2015* – I et interview på sidelinjen af RT’s 10. jubilæumskonference kaldte det tidligere tyske kristendemokratiske parlamentsmedlem og statssekretær i Forsvarsministeriet Willy Wimmer RT-konferencen for »en meget vigtig begivenhed på et meget vigtigt tidspunkt«, der var en hovedsammenkomst for styrkelse af den »intellektuelle dialog« mellem alle sider i Europa. Han gjorde det klart, at han også havde benyttet lejligheden til at se sine »gode venner« i Moskva, en by, han beskrev som en »hektisk by ligesom Beijing« og skarpt tilføjede, at man på hele kontinentet kun kan sammenligne disse to hektiske byer.

Forespurgt om RT's rolle i verden benyttede Wimmer lejligheden til ikke alene at give udtryk for sin taknemlighed for, at RT kom på det rette tidspunkt for at tjene som »ny haj i poolen«, hvis nyhedsrapportering tvang andre medier til at give en mere ligevægtig dækning. Midt i konflikten i Ukraine »forhindrede RT og den russiske præsident os i at få en storkrig i Europa ... som jeg ser det, så er RT en fredsbevarende kraft«, udtalte Wimmer.

---

## **Elektricitet begynder at strømme gennem første, russiske energi-bro til Krim**

*3. december 2015* – Drevet frem af Putin personligt blev der i går, forud for tidsplanen, tændt for den første »energibro«, der via Kerch-strædet forbinder Krim med det integrerede russiske el-net, og som kan levere 200 MW elektricitet. Den anden 200-MW ledning skulle efter planen blive operationel den 20. dec., men Putin presser på for at dette skal ske tidligere, den 15. dec. eller deromkring, hvis det overhovedet er muligt.

Ukraine forsynede Krim med al Krims elektricitet (ud over individuelle generatorer), 800 MW, indtil det fascistiske regimes bøller sprængte disse forbindelser i luften den 20. november. På det tidspunkt optrappede Putin-regeringen arbejdet med at få noget strøm igennem før den oprindelige startdato, som var den 20. dec. Der kommer yderligere to undervands-el-ledninger i kraft i maj 2016, og der skal bygges to nye kraftværker i 2017-2018.

Ved indvielsesceremonien udtrykte Krims leder Sergei Aksyonov

over for Putin Krim-folkets »enorme taknemlighed, respekt og kærlighed til Deres personlighed« i bevidstheden om, at De ikke ville »efterlade dem hjælpeløse«.

*Foto: Mørklagte gader i Simferopol, Krim.*

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

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

---

## **POLITISK ORIENTERING**

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

Lyd:

---

## Leder, 26. november 2015: Dump Obama, eller se en atomar udslettelseskrig i øjnene

Den britiske agent Barack Obama stod bag den tyrkiske nedskydning af det russiske Su-24 fly over syrisk luftrum tirsdag, den 24. november, og den russiske regering har gjort det klart, at det er fuldt ud klar over Obamas medskyldighed. I en telefonsamtale med den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry onsdag påpegede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at, under bestemmelserne i forståelsesmemorandaet om dekonfliktion, som USA og Rusland for nyligt underskrev, tog USA ansvaret for alle de såkaldte koalitionspartners handlinger. Mere præcist, så påpegede Lavrov, at angrebet på



det russiske fly blev udført af et amerikansk fremstillet F-16, og der foreligger en bindende forståelse, der går ud på, at offensive operationer med anvendelse af amerikansk fremstillede fly skal cleares forud.

I det umiddelbare kølvand på nedskydningen af den russiske jet var det vigtigt for præsident Obama at telefonere til den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan for at forsikre ham om, at USA fuldt ud støttede hans »suveræne« handlinger. I sin afskyelige pressekonference sammen med den franske præsident Hollande tirsdag aften kastede Obama sig i sit storhedsvanvid ud i et angreb på Putin og Rusland og kaldte dem »afvigerne« og »tilbød« Rusland en sidste chance for at slutte sig til den amerikansk ledede »koalition«, der udfører den rigtige bekæmpelse af ISIS.

Obama gjorde det, han gør bedst – han løj, patologisk, på vegne af sine britiske herrer. I umindelige tider har den britiske kronens strategi været den at fremprovokere krig mellem USA og Rusland og bære ved til bålet for en permanent befolkningskrig internt i den muslimske verden, mellem sunni og shia, ved at anvende deres (briternes) saudiske juniorpartnere som hovedprovokatører. Nu er Tyrkiet, under det korrupte Erdogan-regime, blevet bragt ind i blandingen for at oppiske betingelserne for en verdenskrig. Obama har været hovedaktivet for denne britiske krigsstrategi, lige siden han tiltrådte embedet, og indledte sin første embedsperiode med et besøg hos Dronning Elizabeth og Prins Philip i London, tre måneder efter sin indsættelse.

Et voksende antal politiske analytikere har tilsluttet sig Lyndon LaRouches afsløring af Obamas medskyldighed i tirsdagens tyrkiske handlinger. John Helmer i Moskva, Justin Raimondo, Daniel McAdams fra Ron Paul Institute og Pepe Escobar har inden for de seneste 24 timer alle offentligt udtalt, at Erdogan aldrig ville have lanceret et angreb mod det russiske fly uden forudgående godkendelse fra Obama.

I respons til det tyrkiske angreb har præsident Putin annonceret flere omgående militære modforholdsregler, inklusive deployeringen af de mest avancerede S-400 luftforsvarssystemer til den russiske luftbase i den syriske provins Latakia, udstationeringen af et overflade-til-luft (SAM) missilskib ud for Syriens kyst, samt en opgradering af ledsagefly, der kan afværge angreb, til alle fremtidige russiske bombetogter imod ISIS og mål i Syrien. Den russiske regering har gjort det klart, at de har beviser, inkl. varmesporet fra det nedskudte Su-24-fly, på, at flyet aldrig var inde over tyrkisk luftrum. En unavngiven amerikansk regeringsperson sagde til Reuters og andre nyhedsbureauer, at det russiske fly blev skudt ned over syrisk luftrum efter en meget kort passage gennem tyrkisk luftrum, der ikke kunne have varet mere end nogle få sekunder. Angrebet var planlagt på forhånd, med fuldt overlæg, og havde til hensigt at smadre klimaet efter angrebene i Paris, hvor en potentiel afgørelse af den fem år lange krig i Syrien og en koncentreret kampagne for at nedkæmpe ISIS og Nusra var ved at komme op at stå.

Putin vil svare tilbage med et flankeangreb, på linje med sin deployering af russiske styrker i Syrien, der fundamentalt ændrede konfliktens kurs, i september måned.

Skulle der herske nogen tvivl om, at dette er et globalt, britisk/Obama-ledet krigsfremstød mod Rusland, så se blot på Ukraine, hvor Sektor Højre har bombet elektricitetsledninger til Krim, og hvor Victoria Nulands (USA's viceudenrigsminister for eurasiske og europæiske anliggender, -red.) kæledægge, 'Jats' Jatsenjuk, netop har meddelt, at han har forbudt russiske fly enhver adgang til det ukrainske luftrum. Det svarer til en trussel om at nedskyde et russisk fly, hvornår det skal være.

Briternes største sårbarhed i dette fremstød for krig er Barack Obama. Han har begået forbrydelser imod menneskeheden, og så mange kriminelle handlinger, der berettiger til, at han stilles for en rigsret, at han udelukkende kun stadig er i

embedet takket være fejheden og opportunismen hos de fleste af Kongressens medlemmer og det amerikanske folk, der tolererer hans eksistens, med deres eget liv som indsats.

## **Dokumentation:**

### **Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Godkendte USA på forhånd Tyrkiets handling?**

*25. november 2015* – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry kondolerede på USA's vegne over for den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov over telefon i dag, iflg. en erklæring udgivet af USA's Udenrigsministerium. Forud for telefonopringningen sagde Lavrov til reportere i Moskva, at Rusland ved, at USA altid af sine koalitions partnere i Syrien kræver, at brug af amerikanske kampfly koordineres med USA. Han påpegede således, iflg. TASS, den mulighed, at de tyrkiske myndigheder havde diskuteret deres beslutning om at beordre deres krigsfly i luften til at nedskyde det russiske fly med USA.

»Nogle medlemmer af koalitionen, inklusive dem, der leverer deres kampfly til angreb mod Irak og Syrien, har betroet os, at de involverede fly var af amerikansk fabrikat, og amerikanerne kræver normalt en tilladelse fra USA til sådanne operationer«, sagde Lavrov. »Så vidt jeg forstår, blev vores fly skudt ned af et amerikansk fremstillet F-16-fly. Vi ved endnu ikke, om USA's krav gælder for Tyrkiet, og hvis det gør, ville jeg gerne vide, om Tyrkiet har spurgt USA om lov til at sende sine fly af sted på en kampmission og nedskyde et fly, selv om dette sandsynligvis er identificeret, over syrisk territorium.«

Lavrov mindede Kerry om, at, under bestemmelserne i

Forståelsesmemorandaet (MOU) om dekonflikktion tager USA direkte ansvaret for de såkaldte koalitionspartners handlinger, og det omfatter Tyrkiet. Lavrov bemærkede ligeledes, at Tyrkiet og Rusland, uafhængigt af MOU'et, etablerede en 'hot line' telefonforbindelse, men at der ikke var nogen indsats fra nogen tyrkisk regeringsperson for at bruge denne linje til at afværge nedskydningen.

Lavrov talte også med sin tyrkiske modpart, Ahmet Cavusoglu, tidligere på dagen. Lavrov sagde, at Rusland ikke har nogen planer om at gå i krig med Tyrkiet, men at de planlagte russiske, diplomatiske besøg til Tyrkiet, og vice versa, heller ikke vil blive gennemført. Lavrov sagde, at hans tyrkiske modpart gav udtryk for beklagelse over Sukhoi-24M-hændelsen, men forsøgte samtidig at fremlægge undskyldninger for de handlinger, som det tyrkiske luftvåben begik.

»Hvad bør Tyrkiet gøre for at normalisere situationen?«, spurgte Lavrov. »Vi må nødvendigvis drage den konklusion, at angreb som det i går til syvende og sidst er absolut uacceptable. Jeg har hørt kondolencer fra [den tyrkiske udenrigs]minister Cavusoglu, men alle de andre erklæringer havde til hensigt at retfærdiggøre den tyrkiske holdning.«

Lavrov bemærkede også, at angrebet på Ruslands Su-24M-fly ligner en planlagt provokation. »Vi betvivler alvorligt, at det var uagtsomt; det ligner en planlagt provokation«, sagde Lavrov og tilføjede, at nogle russiske partnere kalder nedskydningen for »et åbenlyst bagholdsangreb«.

**»Ville Tyrkiet handle uden USA's tilladelse?« spørger politiske kommentatorer McAdams og Escobar; Andre**

## advarer om atomkrig

25. november 2015 – »Et spørgsmål lyder, ville [den tyrkiske præsident] Erdogan gøre dette uden USA's tilladelse, uden USA's støtte?«, sagde Daniel McAdams, adm. dir. for Ron Paul Instituttet for Fred og Fremgang i et interview i dag med Sputnik International. McAdams, en mangeårig støtte til Ron Paul i Kongressen, anklagede Tyrkiet for kriminel aktivitet med at hjælpe ISIS: »Dette er meget alvorligt«, sagde han, » ... Tyrkiet har gjort det muligt for sig selv at blive til et super-arnested for ISIS og andre jihadister, der kan bevæge sig frem og tilbage fra Syrien til Tyrkiet ... hvis man vil have kriminel aktivitet, er Tyrkiet mindst en medskyldig i forbrydelsen.«

McAdams inkluderede Obama i forbrydelsen: »Netop i denne uge overvejede USA at invitere al-Qaedas affilierede Ahrar ash-Sham til også at deltage i drøftelserne [om Syrien]. Så, 14 år efter, at al-Qaeda angreb USA den 11. september, taler USA om at bringe en organisation, der er tilknyttet al-Qaeda, ind, som en moderat opposition til Syrien.«

Obamas rolle rejses også af Pepe Escobar: »Lad os gå lige ind til benet. Den idé, at Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk Su-24-fly af et 'made-in-USA' F-16 blev gennemført uden enten grønt lys eller i det mindste en på forhånd arrangeret 'støtte' fra Washington«, er næsten umuligt at tro på. Dernæst fremlægger Escobar en synopsis over Tyrkiets beskidte rolle under 'Sultan Erdogan' med at hjælpe ISIS og smugling af olie, stjålet af ISIS, fra Syrien og Irak. Han dokumenterer også, at »Bilal Erdogan, sultanens søn, er en betydelig spekulant« inden for denne handel, og som Putin, bemærker han, afslørede under G20-topmødet i Antalya, Tyrkiet, i sidste uge.

Der er også alvorlige advarsler om faren for en atomkrig. Den republikanske præsidentkandidat Rand Paul sagde i går, iflg. *The Hill*: »Nedskydningen af et russisk kampfly illustrerer præcist, hvorfor vi må have en åben linje« til Rusland. Han

knuste også andre kandidaters krav om en flyveforbudszone og sagde, »nedskydning af de andre landes kampfly vil blive resultatet, og en krig mellem atomare stormagter en mulighed«. Redaktøren af antiwar.com, Justin Raimondo, siger, at »amerikanerne vil have en ny Cubansk missilkriser ... Er I parate til Tredje Verdenskrig?«

---

# Global krigsførelse ved Det britiske Imperiums terrorister

24. november 2015 – Lyndon LaRouches advarsel om, at der »bliver ingen fred, før det britiske monarki er afsat, og den britiske marionet og foragtelige person Obama fjernes fra embedet«, understreges af mønstret med global terrorisme og andre provokationer, som de har udløst, ud over Tyrkiets nedskydning af det russiske Su-24 kampfly.

\* Ukraine: Krim-provokationen er i gang, med Victoria Nulands nazister, der afskærer al tilførsel af strøm til Krim og sprænger transmissionstårne i luften, som omdrejningspunkt. Russiske myndigheder er overbevist om, at de kan håndtere nødsituationen med de 35 % af strøm i Krim, der produceres af lokale generatorer, indtil Rusland kan færdiggøre konstruktionen af undervandsforbindelsen fra Rusland under Kerch-strædet inden årets udgang. I mellemtiden er den ny fase af det amerikanske militære uddannelsesprogram for Ukraine begyndt, med USA's uddannelse af fem bataljoner af aktive,

tjenestegørende tropper og en bataljon styrker til specialoperationer.

\* Belgien: Landet er forsat i højeste alarmberedskab, med Bruxelles, der har lukket alt ned. Regeringen har arresteret 21 mistænkte personer, men løsladt de 17, og de indrømmer, at de ikke har nogen ledetråd til, hvad der er det næste, der vil ske, bortset fra, at de stadig forventer flere angreb på forskellige lokaliteter.

\* ISIS: Storbritannien har udgivet sin årlige sikkerhedsrapport, der hævder, at ISIS forsøger at få fat i atomvåben og kemiske våben.

\* Egypten: En selvmordsbombe eksploderede i det egyptiske Sinai og dræbte mindst tre personer og sårede et dusin andre.

\* Grækenland: En bombe eksploderede sent i går aftes i nærheden af parlamentet på Syntagma-pladsen. Ingen kom til skade.

\* USA's udenrigsministerium har udstedt en rejseadvarsel, der vil være i kraft til 24. februar, uden et specifikt sted eller hændelse i tankerne, men som blot bemærker, at IS, Boko Haram og andre grupper »fortsat planlægger terrorangreb i mange regioner«.

*Foto: Krim henligger i mørke, mens Krims myndigheder desperat kæmper for at genoprette vital strømforsyning til f.eks. hospitaler, ved hjælp af de 35 % strøm, der produceres af lokale generatorer.*

---

# USA: Den foragtelige Victoria Nuland og Ukraines fascistiske vender sig mod Rusland

23. november 2015 – Præsident Obamas nazistiske viceudenrigsminister for europæiske og eurasiske anliggender, Victoria Nuland, sluttede sig til NATO's vicegeneralsekretær Alexander Vershbow den 17. nov., hvor hun holdt en ekstremt fjendtlig, antirussisk tale ved *Behörden Spiegel* Sikkerhedskonference i Berlin. Nuland, der er berygtet for at installere Arsenij »Jats« Jatsenjuk som premierminister i Ukraine, krævede der, at sanktionerne mod Rusland opretholdes, indtil Minskaftalens våbenhvile er fuldt ud implementeret, og Krim er kommet tilbage til Ukraine!

Tre dage senere sprængte fascistiske sabotører to højspændingsledninger, der ledte elektricitet til Krim fra Ukraine, i luften. Det var en fredag aften, den 20. november; søndag morgen, den 22. nov., sprængte de yderligere to i luften uden, at den ukrainske regering greb ind. Med »demonstranter«, der forhindrede reparationer, er Krim og dets 2 mio. mennesker nu blevet efterladt uden strøm, med undtagelse af den strøm, der leveres af lokale generatorer, omkring 30 % af totalen, iflg. russiske myndigheder. Det nazistiske Sektor Højre, med tilslutning fra tatarer »i eksil«, er begyndt at blokere lastbiler med varer ind til Krim og forsøger således at afskære mad og vand.

Regeringen responderede ved den ukrainske præsident Poroshenko, der sammenkaldte et regeringsmøde denne mandag, som sluttede med gennemtvingelsen af en »midlertidig suspension af alle vareudvekslinger mellem Ukraine og Krim. Nulands »Jats« krævede, at regeringen »omgående oprettede en



arbejdsgruppe« for at standse »levering af varer og al handel« med Krim.

Disse forholdsregler er morderiske i betragtning af, at Krim indtil videre stadig er beroende af Ukraine for sit vand og sin strøm. Rusland er i gang med at bygge en undervandsstrømforbindelse til Krim, som forventes at komme i drift ved årets slutning.

---

## De fem brændpunkter for Tredje Verdenskrig

22. november 2015 – Robert Farley, en seniorlektor ved Patterson School for Diplomati og International Handel ved Kentucky Universitet, advarer om, at der er fem mulige måder, hvorpå Tredje Verdenskrig (eller efter hans mening snarere Femte Verdenskrig, idet han tæller Syvårskrigen og Napoleonskrigene med som verdenskrige) kunne begynde.

Brændpunkterne omfatter de følgende:

\* **Syrien** – Enten kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly i luften over Syrien eskalere ud af kontrol, eller også bliver ISIS besejret, men USA, Frankrig og Rusland bliver rivaler over, hvordan Syrien efter ISIS skal se ud.

\* **Indien og Pakistan** – Indien og Pakistan kunne komme i krig igen af flere grunde. USA har generelt været tæt på Pakistan, men har været i færd med at dyrke tættere relationer med Indien. Kina har længe miltært været tæt på Pakistan. Farley nævner ikke Rusland, der rent historisk har haft tætte

relationer til Indien, inklusive militært.

\* **Det Østkinesiske Hav** – Kina og Japan er modstandere mht. Senkaku/Daioyu-øerne. USA er traktatmæssigt forpligtet til at forsvare Japan, hvilket gør det næsten sikkert, at, skulle der udbryde kampe, ville USA gå ind på Japans side.

\* **Det Sydkinesiske Hav** – En krig mellem USA og Kina kunne trække Japan og Indien med og kunne resultere i en udveksling af atomvåben.

\* **Ukraine** – En konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland kunne forårsage, at Rusland tyer til taktiske atomvåben, hvis det mener, det ikke kan overleve.

Farley konkluderer, at vi mangler den Kolde Krigs »rædselsvækkende« klarhed. »Der kunne udbryde krig flere steder, som kunne trække krigsførende parter med ind på uforudsigelige måder«, skriver han. »Krigsførende parter begynder meget sjældent en krig med overlæg; lederne af verdens mest magtfulde nationer må være på vagt over for truslen om en optrapning af kriser.«

*Foto: Russiske jets under en "aerobatic" flyveopvisning i Rusland. Kunne en konfrontation mellem amerikanske og russiske fly over Syrien komme ud af kontrol og eskalere?*

---

**NATO i færd med at implementere overtagelse af**

# Ukraine

11. november 2015 – I dag udgav Sputnik News en analyse af Victoria Legranova, en russisk forsvarsanalytiker, i hvilken hun dokumenterer, at NATO er i færd med at forberede overtagelsen af kontrollen over hele det militære og paramilitære apparat i Ukraine, selv om Ukraine ikke får formelt NATO-medlemskab. I stedet satser NATO på total udstyrs-kompatibilitet og kommandokontrol. »Som resultat vil NATO blive i stand til at etablere et netværk af taktiske operationscentre i hele Ukraine for at kontrollere landets bevæbnede styrker og også de paramilitære grupper, som er aktive i landet. Hvis regeringen af en eller anden grund skulle komme uden for vestlig kontrol, eller en ny præsident kommer til magten, kunne disse paramilitære grupper bruges til at genoprette status quo«, advarede hun. Ukraines militære stabschef, general Viktor Muzhenko, bekræftede, at NATO i øjeblikket er i færd med at udarbejde planer for moderniseringen af Ukraines militær frem til 2020, hvor det vil være fuldt ud kompatibelt med NATO-standarder.

Lyndon LaRouche gjorde i dag imidlertid nar ad den idé, at NATO skulle kunne være i stand til at gennemføre en sådan operation. »Vesteuropa er ved at kollapse økonomisk og finansielt. Disse planer, under disse betingelser, er rent bedrag. De kan ikke gøre det. Tyskland er under økonomisk kollaps, Frankrig er værre stedt, og briterne er mest udtrykkeligt under kollaps. De er ikke alene ude af stand til at gennemføre en så ambitiøs intrige; de er endda ude af stand til at vurdere, at hele ideen er absurd«, konkluderede LaRouche.

---

# Udenrigsministrene i Normandiet 4-formatet mødes om Ukraine

7. november, 2015 – Udenrigsministrene fra Normandiet 4-landene Frankrig, Tyskland, Rusland og Ukraine mødtes i går i Berlin for at diskutere situationen i det sydøstlige Ukraine. Mødet kom efter ti ugers relativ ro siden iværksættelsen af våbenhvile-aftalen af 1. september, som for nyligt har været præget af tegn på fornyet vold mellem styrker for uafhængighed og Kiev-regimets styrker. "Der er en vis optrapning af situationen i sikkerheds-sfæren."

Organisationen for sikkerhed og samarbejde i Europa, OSCE's Særlige Overvågnings Mission (SMM) har rapporteret om "beskydning fra begge sider, brud på forpligtelserne til våben-tilbagetrækning, også fra begge sider. Jeg håber meget, at optrapningen vil blive stoppet", sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov. Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier var meget mere optimistisk og pegede på fremskridt i tilbagetrækning af tunge våben fra kontaktlinjen mellem de to sider. "Vi er blevet enige om ... at takle tilbagetrækningen af de tunge våben nu," sagde Steinmeier.

---

**Rusland er »kategorisk uenig«**

# i den hollandske havarirapport om MH17

14. oktober 2015 – Moskva er »kategorisk uenig« i den hollandske havarirapport om MH17, sagde Oleg Storchevoy, vicechef for Rosaviatsiya, Ruslands nationale tilsyn for civil lufttrafik, i går, og karakteriserede kommissionens konklusioner som »fundamentalt forkerte«. DSB, den officielle hollandske organisation, der fik ordre til at undersøge flyulykken den 17. juli 2014, udsendte sin slutrapport i går.

For det første sagde Rosaviatsiya, at det »støtter den hollandske havarikommissions konklusion om, at den ukrainske side har det fulde ansvar for ikke at lukke luftrummet midt i militæraktiviteterne, der kunne udgøre en potentiel fare for den civile flytrafik«. DSB, den hollandske organisation, der fik opgaven at undersøge ulykken, rapporterede, at flyet syntes at være blevet ramt af et jord-til-luft-missil og erklærede, at mindst 16 militærfly og -helikoptere var blevet skudt ned i det østlige Ukraine i månederne forud for MH17-ulykken.

For det andet rapporterede Rosaviatsiya-tilsynsmyndigheden, at »ukrainske myndigheder ikke sikrede koordinering mellem militære myndigheder og myndigheden for flytrafik for at sikre sikker flyvning.

For det tredje anklagede Rosaviatsiya, at, ved det første møde hævdedes det, uden beviser, at MH17 var blevet ramt af en BUK-1 missiltype, der var affyret fra byen Snizhne. Beviset var angiveligt et bueformet element, der skulle være blevet fundet. Dette var en forud aftalt version af begivenhederne, sagde Storchevoy. Det pågældende element var sandsynligvis plantet, anklagede Rosaviatsiya og bemærkede, at de virkelige kemiske stoffer, som en eksplosion af et BUK-missil efterlader, slet ikke stemmer overens med de data, som den

hollandske rapport fremlægger.

Iflg. den hollandske havarikommissions rapport styrtede MH17 ned som følge af et 9N314M-model sprænghoved, båret af et missil i serien 9M38, der blev affyret et sted inden for et areal på 320 km<sup>2</sup> i Østukraine; rapporten specificerede ikke, hvem, der var ansvarlig for affyringen.

Den russiske producent af forsvarssystemer Almaz-Antey fremlagde også sine egne undersøgelsesresultater, der fandt, at det missil, der nedskød MH17, kun kunne have været en model af missilerne i 9M38-serien, der blev taget ud af tjeneste i den russiske hær i 2011; de konkluderede også, at missilet blev lanceret fra regionen Zaroshchenske, der dengang var under Kijevs kontrol.

Rusland vil bruge sin ret til at indlede en fornyet undersøgelse af MH17-ulykken, sagde Storchevoy i dag til reportere. Rusland inviterede alle andre lande, 'der ikke finder det ligegyldigt at finde den sande årsag til tragedien', til at vurdere Ruslands undersøgelsesresultater.

---

## **Hollandsk rapport: Det var et BUK-missil, der skød MH17 ned**

*13. oktober 2015* – Den hollandske havarikommission udgav sin rapport i dag om nedskydningen af det malajiske fly MH17 over Ukraine den 17. juli 2014, hvor 298 mennesker, mange af dem hollandske, mistede livet.

Kommissionen konkluderede, at flyet blev skudt ned af et

russiskfremstillet BUK-missil. Som *Washington Post* skrev: »BUK-jord-til-luft-missilet, der først udvikledes i begyndelsen af 1970'erne af Sovjetunionen, er en del af det russiske arsenal og er et kompliceret luftforsvarsvåben, der er beregnet til at lokalisere og engagere mål over radar. Alt imens ældre versioner ikke længere er i brug i Rusland, så anvendes diverse typer BUK-systemer af Ukraine og nogle andre forhenværende Sovjetrepublikker.« Det er det samme Ukraine, hvis regering nu er i hænderne på amerikansk støttede nazister, som det også var i juli 2014.

Kommissionens rapport fastlagde ikke, hvem, der var ansvarlig for nedskydningen af flyet, selv om den kraftigt lagde skylden på den ukrainske regering for at tillade et civilt fly at overflyve en grundlæggende set krigszone.

---

## **Rusland advarer om, at Obama kan flippe ud og forsøge at starte nye krigsprovokationer via 'farvede revolutioner'**

7. oktober 2015 – Rostislav Ishchenko, en ukrainsk, strategisk analytiker, der nu er i Moskva, skrev en advarsel i den russiske publikation *MIA Rossiya Segodnya*, om, at den russiske præsident Putins nylige diplomatiske gennembrud kunne drive Obama til at forsøge nye provokationer mod Rusland. Ishchenko nævnte tre nylige, diplomatiske kup udført af Putin: Hans tale til FN's Generalforsamling, hans flankemanøvre i Syrien og

hans topmøder efter Normandiet-formatet, hvor han opnåede tysk og fransk støtte til Minsk-aftalerne.

Ishchenko skrev, at »hvis Minsk-aftalerne krænkes under betingelser, hvor Paris og Berlin har nægtet at skyde skylden på Rusland, så kan Kiev hurtigt besejres i det sydlige Ukraine; hvis våbenstilstanden er væk, genoptages krigen, men Kiev er i øjeblikket ikke i stand til at føre krig. Desuden står Kiev over for betalingsstandsning (statsbankerot), hvilket fører til yderligere, dyb forarmelse af befolkningen, såvel som også en manglende mulighed for at få yderligere kredit fra Vesten.«

Forfatteren fortsatte med at sætte fokus på fire brændpunkter, ud over det østlige Ukraine, som kunne detoneres af Obama imod Rusland, begyndende med situationerne i Moldova og Transnistrien, hvor der er en trussel om en Maidan-revolte, og hvor Sektor Højre truer med en blokade af forsyninger til de russiske fredsbevarende styrker i Transnistrien. »Det eneste, USA behøver gøre, er at udløse de moldoviske og ukrainske radikale elementer, og så vil der være en ny konfliktzone, der ikke dækkes af Minsk-aftalerne, og som Rusland ubønhørligt vil blive trukket ind i.« Ishchenko konkluderede, at »Moskva sandsynligvis ville arrangere en luftbro til Transnistrien, og dette ville samtidig sætte scenen for, at Ukraine forsøger at lukke sit luftrum, nedskyder russiske fly osv.«

I Kaukasus-regionen advarede Ishchenko om en genoplussen af Karabak-konflikten, indebyrden af hundreder af tjetjenske kæmpere i ISIS og muligheden af ustabilitet i Armenien, hvor der allerede er protester over elektricitet.

Centralasien er et andet brændpunkt, efter at Taliban har taget initiativ til at kontrollere områder af Afghanistan på grænsen mod Tadsjikistan, hvor Rusland har militære kontingenter. Der er lignende trusler imod Kasakhstan fra jihadister, der passerer igennem Afghanistan ind i Centralasien.



Ishchenko nævnte også valgene den 11. oktober i Belarus, som kunne udgøre en udløsermekanisme for endnu et forsøg på at gennemføre en 'farvet revolution', på trods af præsident Lukasjenkos tilsyneladende stærke position.

Artiklen sluttede med en advarsel: »Efter at Obama har opgjort Putins sejre på alle fronter i oktober, må vi således forvente et snarligt forsøg fra Obamas side på at genvinde det tabte land ... Jeg forventer en optrapning af IS' brutalitet i Syrien, aggressive handlinger fra Kiev-regimets side og aktivering af amerikanske agenter omkring alle følsomme punkter for Rusland i det postsovjetiske område.«

---

## **Obama/Putin-mødet i NY: Vred Obama tvunget til at befatte sig med Ruslands Putin**

*29. september 2015* – Det 90 minutter lange møde mellem præsidenterne Obama og Putin, der endelig blev afholdt i går (mandag), var ikke et møde på tomandshånd, men en formel affære med fem eller seks regeringsfolk fra hver nation – her iblandt udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry – der flankerede deres præsident, som sad i hver sin ende af et langt bord.

Obama sagde intet om mødet bagefter og overlod det til en unavngiven »højtplaceret regeringsperson« at give en kort rapport senere samme aften om, at mødet havde været »produktivt« og »fokuseret« og mest omhandlede Ukraine og Syrien. Den unavngivne regeringsperson rapporterede

imidlertid, at den amerikansk-russiske koordinering vedr. operationer i Syrien, som Obamas Hvide Hus tidligere havde skudt ned, vil blive etableret. Som nationale, statslige radiokanaler opsummerede regeringspersonens rapport, så »aftalte de to præsidenter, at deres militær skulle bevare kommunikation med henblik på 'de-konfliktion'« af operationer i Syrien.

Ulig Det Hvide Hus udlagde Kreml billeder af mødet, og præsident Putin afholdt en pressekonference med russiske journalister ved De forenede Nationer bagefter. Også Putin karakteriserede mødet som »meget konstruktivt, forretningsmæssigt og overraskende nok meget åbenhjertigt«, og han gav udtryk for sit synspunkt om, at det var meget nyttigt, men han var ligefrem om den fortsat farlige tilstand af de russisk-amerikanske relationer, og om hvem, der er ansvarlig for denne tilstand:

»Desværre befinder relationerne mellem Rusland og USA sig på et temmelig lavt punkt; dette er indlysende uden mine kommentarer. Men, det var ikke vores initiativ, der forårsagede en sådan lavkonjunktur i relationerne mellem Rusland og USA. Det er vore amerikanske partners holdning. Er det godt eller dårligt? Jeg mener, det er dårligt, både for bilaterale relationer og globale anliggender. Men det er det valg, USA har truffet.

Vi er altid parat til at udvikle kontakter og genoprette relationer i fuld skala«, tilføjede han. »Med hensyn til mødet i dag, så var det meget nyttigt, og, hvilket især er glædeligt, så var det meget oprigtigt. Jeg mener, at vore amerikanske partnere forklarede deres holdning ganske klart i mange spørgsmål, inklusive afgørelsen af situationen i Ukraine og Syrien, så vel som i Mellemosten generelt. Vi har, selv om det kan synes overraskende, mange sammenfaldende punkter og meninger i alle disse spørgsmål. Vi er også uenige om nogle ting, som vi har aftalt at arbejde på i fællesskab. Jeg håber, at dette arbejde vil blive konstruktivt ... «

Putin understregede betydningen af Minsk-processen i Ukraine-spørgsmålet; med hensyn til Syrien gjorde han det klart, at Obamas politik for regimeskifte og hans insistensen på, at Bashar al-Assad må fjernes fra embedet før alt andet, fortsat udgør et centralt punkt i deres uenighed.

Putin gentog til de russiske journalister, at Rusland ikke vil bøje sig mht. princippet om national suverænitet. Han rapporterede, at han med Obama havde drøftet den kendsgerning, at amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, da der hverken foreligger en resolution fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd, og heller ikke en invitation fra den legitime regering, der bakker disse handlinger op. Med hensyn til Assad: »Jeg har stor respekt for mine kolleger – både den amerikanske præsident og den franske præsident – men de er imidlertid, så vidt jeg ved, ikke borgere i Den syriske Republik, og bør derfor ikke tage del i at beslutte en anden stats fremtidige lederskab. Dette er syrernes anliggende.«

Rusland »vil ikke udelukke noget, men hvis vi handler, så bliver det i streng overensstemmelse med normerne for international lov«, sagde Putin.

---

## **Obamas tale i FN afslører ham – rapport og video**

I dag, den 28. sept., udspejede Obama sit krigsgale snavs over de samlede repræsentanter for verden på FN's Generalforsamling. Blot få minutter senere fastslog Putins

fremlæggelse med syvtommersøm den usminkede sandhed: at Obama er færdig.

Mens han på hyklerisk vis nævnte »regering ved international lov« og ondskaben i »magt er ret«, gjorde Obama Putin og Syriens Bashar al-Assad til direkte målskive for anklager om, at de var roden til alt ondt i verden i dag og hævdede endda, at Assad er årsagen til ISIS-rædslen i Irak og Syrien. »Lad os huske på, hvordan det begyndte«, fantaserede han.

*»Assad reagerede på fredelige protester ved at optrappe undertrykkelse og drab, som igen skabte vilkårene for den aktuelle strid. Og Assad og hans allierede kan således ikke simpelt hen pacificere det store befolkningsflertal, der er blevet brutaliseret af kemiske våben og hensynsløse bombardementer.«*

Han sagde, at »visse stormagter hævder sig på måder, der er i modstrid med international lov«, hvilket må have fået tilhørerne til at gispe efter vejret; dernæst klagede han over, at disse samme magter fremfører, at, for at bekæmpe terrorisme,

*»må vi støtte tyranner som Bashar al-Assad, der kaster tøndebomber for at massakrere uskyldige børn, fordi alternativet sikkert er værre«.*

Han skød dernæst brystet frem:

*»Jeg er leder for det stærkeste militær, verden nogen sinde har kendt, og jeg vil aldrig tøve med at beskytte mit land eller vore allierede, ensidigt og ved hjælp af magt, om nødvendigt.«*

(Senere fremdrog Putin ødelæggelsen af Libyen og Irak, lande, der bestemt ikke truede nogen, samt Obamas ensidige tilsidesættelse af FN's charter og international lov.)

Obamas diskussion blev mere direkte med hensyn til Ukraine:

*»Se på Ruslands annektering af Krim og yderligere aggression i Ukraine ... Vi kan ikke passivt se til, når en nations suverænitet og territoriale integritet åbenlyst krænkes.«(!)*

Idet han tydeligvis følte presset, sagde han klagende:

*»Det er ikke en sammensværgelse af amerikansk-støttede NGO'er, der afslører korrupsion og sætter befolkningens forventninger op i hele verden; dens teknologi, sociale medier og ønsket, der ikke kan indskrænkes, hos folk overalt om at træffe deres egne valg om, hvordan de ønsker at blive regeret.«*

Rusland har, sagde han hysterisk, startet en ny kold krig, og er nu ved at kollapse.

Obama vendte gentagne gange tilbage til situationen i Syrien, men omtalte aldrig russernes flanke-initiativ, hvorved de intervenserer militært og skaber en ægte, international koalition for at knuse ISIS, hvilket er årsagen til Obamas forstillelse foran hele FN.

Se hele Obamas tale i FN her:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e3V9I2Dx7vk>

---

# LPAC Fredags-Webcast, 25. september 2015: Hvad er Lyndon LaRouches råd til præsidenterne Obama og Putin forud for deres møde på tomandshånd i New York?

Mandag i denne uge markerede den officielle begyndelse af FN's Generalforsamlings sammentræde i New York City, hvor en stor del af verdens ledere vil være samlet for de næste to uger, midt i en meget usikker, og også meget farlig og omskiftelig, global strategisk situation. Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i en erklæring, hun udstedte for et par uger siden »**En hasteappel til FN's Generalforsamling**«, så kunne dette være menneskeheden sidste chance for at droppe systemet med geopolitik og indvarsle et nyt paradigme, der bygger på menneskeheden fælles mål. I erklæringen siger hun: »Kun på denne måde vil vi overleve som art. Og efter denne standard vil statsoverhovederne på Manhattan blive målt.«

Af denne grund vil der være meget fokus på de første dage i næste uge, hvor statsoverhovederne vil samles på Manhattan for at holde taler og mødes; disse statsoverhoveder inkluderer Kinas Xi Jinping, Ruslands Vladimir Putin og USA's Barack Obama.

Engelsk udskrift.

We're coming to you LIVE tonight! We have plenty to update you on, so tune in LIVE at 8pm Eastern.

**Transcript**

## MEGAN BEETS:

It's Friday evening September 25, and I'd like to welcome you all to our regular weekly webcast. My name is Megan Beets, and I'm joined tonight in the studio by Jeffrey Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*, and Jason Ross and Ben Deniston of the LaRouche PAC science team.

Monday of this week marked the official start of the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York City, where much of the leadership of the world has convened for the next two, in the midst of a very precarious, and also a very dangerous and rapidly transforming global strategic situation. As was said by Helga Zepp-LaRouche in a statement that she released a couple of weeks ago, "An Urgent Appeal to the United Nations General Assembly," this could be mankind's last chance to dump the system of geopolitics, and to usher in a new paradigm built around the common aims of mankind. She says in the statement: "Only in that way will we survive as a species. And by that standard will the heads of state in Manhattan be measured."

Now for that reason, much attention is focused on the early days of next week, when the heads of state will be gathering in Manhattan to speak, and to meet, heads of state including Xi Jinping of China, Vladimir Putin of Russia, and Barack Obama. Now, this brings us to the subject of tonight's institutional question which reads as follows: Mr. LaRouche, President Obama is set to have a one-on-one meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin next week at the United Nations General Assembly in New York. According to a senior administration official: "Given the situation in Ukraine and Syria, despite our profound differences with Moscow, the President believes that it would be irresponsible not to test whether we can make progress through high-level engagement with the Russians. In particular, our European partners have underscored the importance of a unified message about the necessity of fully implementing the Minsk agreements.

President Obama will take advantage of this meeting to discuss Ukraine, and he will be focused on ensuring Moscow lives up to the Minsk commitments. This will be the core message of this bilateral engagement." What is your advice to presidents Obama and Putin?

So with that, I'd like to invite Jeffrey Steinberg to the podium to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response to that question, and also his views on the more general strategic situation.

**JEFF STEINBERG:** Thanks, Megan.

We had a lengthy discussion this afternoon with Mr. LaRouche, and we discussed this; and for the sake of precision, I want to briefly read you the pretty much exact comments that Mr. LaRouche made, and then I'll give some elaboration and set some context for what he had to say.

He said: Putin will handle the meeting with Obama fine. Let Obama get stuck. After nearly two terms, it is clear you cannot deal with him. You can only denounce him. He is no good, and never was. Only half-wits support him. Look at what he is. His step-father was the prototype. In essence, he is a nasty. Putin is fine. Obama is dangerous, after his step-father.

Now, I think it's important to realize that the statement, that was included in the institutional question from a White House senior spokesperson, is typical of what you get from Washington, D.C. today. This is true from the first day of the Obama presidency, and it was true throughout the presidency of George W. Bush, with Dick Cheney looking over his shoulder. There's nothing that is said in Washington that can be presumed to be truthful. There's nothing that is said in Washington that can be relied on as an accurate account of what's actually going on.



The fact of the matter is that the only reason that President Obama, at the very last moment, agreed to this meeting with President Putin, is that he was boxed in to an absolute corner, and in fact, the proposal from Moscow for there to be just such a face-to-face meeting, was made over a month ago, and it took the White House just until the last 24 hours, to make the decision that they could not weasel their way out of this face-to-face meeting. So, when you get this high-falutin' language about, it would be irresponsible not to sit down with Russia, despite these tremendous differences, and the attempt on the part of Obama to turn the entire issue of the discussion around the situation in Ukraine, and to completely ignore what the Russians have done in Syria – and the opportunity that represents for actually defeating the Islamic State and these other Salafist jihadis – is sheer folly.

Mr. LaRouche's view is that if President Obama attempts to turn the discussion in that private meeting around Ukraine, his simple advice to Mr. Putin is to just say to Obama, "Mr. President, you made the decision, beginning in November of 2013, to support an outright neo-Nazi coup against a legitimately elected government because that government refused to sign on to a rotten deal that would have wrecked Ukraine, and would have led to the kind of crisis between Ukraine and Russia that we're seeing right now." And in fact, that's the simple truth of the matter. President Obama is committed to the idea of war with Russia. That commitment has been there from literally the very beginning of the Obama presidency, and in November [I think it's October–ed.] of 2011, when there was a decision made between President Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and then-French President Sarkozy to summarily execute Libyan leader Qaddafi, rather than capture him and put him on trial, and go through the prolonged process with all that would have come out during the course of that trial, Mr. LaRouche said, this is vectored against Russia and China.

Now in the last days, just preceding the events now beginning to take place in New York City, the German national television network, ZDF, aired a news magazine – kind of their equivalent of 60 Minutes – which went through a detailed exposé of the danger behind the fact that the United States is in the process of deploying a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons into Western Europe, and in fact, the B61-12, this new generation, is in fact an intermediate-range weapon which is a clear violation of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force INF Treaty that was signed in 1988. These weapons, in fact, blur the lines of distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons. They are no longer simply deterrence against the old Cold War fears that the Soviet Army would come rushing through the Fulda Gap and would basically occupy half of Western Europe before anybody could do anything about it. The situation right now is that these new generation weapons are far more accurate, will carry a much-reduced payload, and can be fired from combat stealth fighters that will reach deep into Russian territory. The fact that the German national television network, a week before all these UN events, chose to put a very prominent documentary exposé of the danger behind this Obama decision, is indicative of the fact that it's not that there's unity between the US and our European allies over the situation in Ukraine.

There's been a decisive break led by Germany, now also including France; because they have come to the realization that Obama is a dangerous lunatic when it comes to Russia, and is jeopardizing the real possibility of a nuclear war on European soil. So, the Europeans have broken with Obama in a very demonstrable way. Germany, then France, then other European countries, have also come out fully supportive of the Russian military deployments into Syria; and have called for a much broader diplomatic initiative that does not exclude Russia, that does not exclude Assad in Syria, and does not exclude Iran. So the idea that there's unity within the

western nations is an absolute fraud. Obama has created the conditions where Europe, in many critical areas of security, is breaking with the United States and is moving – at least by natural impulse – towards seeking cooperation and an alliance with Russia.

So remember, when Russian President Putin a month ago began the deployment of significant military equipment into Syria, this was a strategic game-changer. The United States was in the advanced stages of reaching a rotten deal with Turkey and Saudi Arabia and Qatar and Kuwait, to establish a no-fly zone in the northern part of Syria that was to ostensibly be a safe haven against ISIS; but was in fact to be a zone where the jihadists could operate freely, because the Syrian air force was completely denied access to that. Now, you've got two squadrons of Russian advanced MiG fighter planes at a base just south of Latakia in northern Syria on the Mediterranean coast. This week, several thousand Russian engineers arrived in the port of Tartus to expand and modernize that port to be able to receive larger Russian battleships and supply ships. So the game has been dramatically changed in the Middle East, and it was not on the basis of President Putin seeking out a compromise with President Obama. It was based on taking a very clear political military calculation that by hitting Obama on this strategic flank in Syria, it would completely destabilize the White House; and it would create the conditions where Obama would make a series of significant political mistakes. If he mishandles the summit meeting next week on Monday with President Putin, this will be another indication of Obama walking into the kind of trap that has been set for him; first by his own behavior, and by his commitment on behalf of London and Wall Street to fomenting war against Russia.

And we've seen the same things in the case of China. President Xi Jinping arrived in Seattle, Washington earlier this week; and had three days of meetings out there. And now, has been

here in Washington last night and today for a summit meeting with President Obama. Preceding that summitry in Washington, the President sent Penny Pritzker, part of the Chicago mafia apparatus that put Obama in office; that created his political career. She's now Secretary of Commerce, and she was the finance chair of Obama's two Presidential campaigns. She was sent out to Seattle as a kind of a minder to sit in on all of the meetings that took place between top American business leaders and President Xi Jinping; to make sure that they toed the White House line of making accusations about China unfair business practices in dealing with American companies. So that kind of crazy behavior on the eve of a heads of state summit is another typical indication of how this President has tended to do business. So, again as Mr. LaRouche said, "Putin will handle the meeting with Obama fine; let Obama get stuck. After nearly two terms, it's clear you cannot deal with him; you can only denounce him." So that is, in all likelihood, the kind of approach with velvet gloves, that President Putin will take; and that certainly is Mr. LaRouche's recommendation of what he should expect out of this meeting with President Obama.

Now, I should say that there are elements within the US military – high-level people – who favor the idea of US-Russian military cooperation to genuinely go after and crush the Islamic State and the Nusra front. Their view is that: 1) there must be negotiations on what's called "de-confliction"; the US and Russia are going to be operating in the same theatres of activity over Syria, and it's very important that there be a level of coordination to avoid an accidental incident that could get out of control. There are those in the Pentagon and in the US intelligence community who wish to see direct intelligence sharing and ultimately coordinated operations against the Islamic State, involving the United States and Russia. There is a line of communication between President Putin through Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, into Secretary of State Kerry; and it's very clear that there is

both a diplomatic and a military initiative coming out of President Putin. And he's expected to present that in considerable detail Monday morning when he addresses the UN General Assembly. That'll be just several hours before his Monday afternoon meeting with President Obama.

So, the Russians have taken a number of bold and critical initiatives. They've created a series of strategic *faites accomplis*; that's why President Obama authorized Defense Secretary Ash Carter to engage in phone discussion with Russian Defense Minister Shoigu last Friday. There will be a working group at the Pentagon chaired by Carter, but with representation from the Joint Chiefs and CENTCOM [Central Command—ed.] that will be negotiating and talking on an ongoing basis with Russian counterparts. This didn't come from negotiating and compromising with Obama; it came from forcing his hand and creating a series of unavoidable options. So, Obama is shaken; he's furious at what's happened around the Syria situation. He's furious that the efforts to create a blockade of Russian air links into Syria failed miserably; they couldn't even get Iraq to go along with banning Russian over flights over Iraqi airspace. So, the corridor from Russia through Iran and Iraq into Syria has been wide open; and that's the basis on which the Russians have carried out a very rapid and very significant military build-up inside Syria.

So, that's the backdrop to what's going to be happening in New York beginning this weekend and extending into next week.

Now, I think that there's an over-arching message that my colleagues will be addressing throughout the duration of this webcast, but I just want to put it clearly on the table right now, which is that there has been so much compromise, so much "practical decisions" that have been made over such a long time. This long pre-dates Obama, long pre-dates Bush-Cheney, really goes back *decades*, that the kinds of compromises on core principle have an erosive effect that is a grave danger.

In fact, it's the single gravest danger to the survival of mankind, that there is a willingness to make compromises on fundamental issues of scientific truth. We've seen that with the Pope's compromise in the encyclical, that gave ground to outright British genocidalists on this concept of global warming and climate change. So these kinds of compromises, which are considered to be in good taste, or to be expected of honorable gentlemen and -women, is a flaw, a deep pragmatic flaw that right now has created the conditions for the crisis that the world is facing. So, in the case of the Putin-Obama meeting coming up on Monday: no compromise. Truth. And on that basis we can get through this crisis, and avoid the kind of thermonuclear war that President Obama is toying around with.

**BEETS:** Thank you, Jeff.

Now, as Jeff just referred to, leading into the heads-of-state meeting that is to begin Monday in New York, events at the U.N. this weekend have been co-opted by the attempt to shape the ongoing discussion in a major way around the rotten agenda, the fraud, of so-called sustainable development. Now, a major part of that was kicked off this morning by the speech of Pope Francis in front of the plenary session, where he again, very unfortunately, pushed the doctrine coming from the British, that man is destroying the Earth, and must shift to a mode of stewardship and living harmoniously with Mother Earth, and to face the threat of climate change. So this began a weekend full of meetings of the U.N. Sustainability Summit around their 2030 agenda for sustainable development, which was, as Jeff said, in terms of a real tragic concession, voted up unanimously by the session shortly after the Pope's speech.

Now, as we've documented thoroughly in these webcasts, and also as is covered in great detail in the newly-released EIR Special Report, "Global Warming Scare Is Population Reduction,

Not Science", the entire program of so-called sustainability is nothing new, and it's a fraud which has been pushed time and again throughout the twentieth and now the twenty-first centuries by the leading factions of the British Empire. So what I'd like to do now is invite first Ben Deniston, followed by Jason Ross, to come to the podium to address, number one, what is the fraud of the policy of sustainable development, and number two, what would a *real* policy for human progress look like?

**BEN DENISTON:** Thanks, Megan.

I think I just want to start by referring to Mr. LaRouche's very clear and concise assessment of the situation around the Pope. You know, he's, I think, put this question in some terms that have important precision. The question we have, is, what convinced this Pope of all people to go along with this policy which is a genocide program. We may not know every aspect of *why* he's going along with this, for his personal motivations. Mr. LaRouche has made that clear a number of times, including in a discussion last night, his so-called Fireside Chat discussion, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website, but he's made that point a number of times. We may not know all of the motivation behind the Pope *himself*, but the facts are what they are, and we know that he's going along with the policy, which is a genocide policy, and we know *exactly* what forces have moved in on this Pope, and what they're characteristics are.

First and foremost, what we've identified and we've discussed on these shows, and we've discussed on the LaRouche PAC website, and one of the key individuals is this guy John Schellhuber, who has been for many years a leading operative and collaborator of the British Royal Family, very specifically in their genocidal population-reduction program. He shares the view of Prince Philip, of the Queen, of this

degenerate oligarchical faction, that the world is well beyond its carrying-capacity and needs – and world population must be reduced to around a few billion people. This is the view of Philip, and the other British Royals. This is the view of Schellnhuber. He's the one who's become a key advisor to the Pope on these environmental issues, on the so-called climate issue, including playing a leading role in this encyclical that the Pope released a couple of months back.

Now, you know, just to make this clear and put this on the table, just look at the guy's profile. In 2004, Schellnhuber was deployed along with Tony Blair's top science advisor at the time, Sir David King, together to go over to the United States to try and strong-arm the Bush Administration into going along with this climate change fraud policy. And apparently they were so egregious in their attempt to strong-arm the Bush Administration, that the Bush Administration issued a formal complaint to Tony Blair, complaining about the trip of Schellnhuber and the way he acted on it. It was later that same year, that Schellnhuber was named an official Honorary Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, by Queen Elizabeth, and it's been said that he very much is offended if you do not call him by his official title given by the British Royals. In 2005, he worked with Tony Blair to organize a conference for the G-8 Summit in Scotland at the time, on the issue of this climate change fraud. Schellnhuber edited the proceedings of that conference, and the introduction to the whole thing was written by Tony Blair. Since then, he became the key advisor to Angela Merkel in Germany, presiding over the, really, dismantling of the German economy, with their nuclear-exit program, their insane carbon-reduction policy, and their suicidal green energy program. 2009, in the buildup to the Copenhagen Climate Summit, Schellnhuber worked closely with Prince Charles to try and build support for this summit, including making another trip to the United States to meet with then Obama as the President, to make sure the Obama Administration was in line



with this whole program. So, you know, he's got a clear, very high-level track record of trying to recruit and strong-arm leading officials to go along with this population-reduction program of the British. Now, he is the guy who has moved in on the Pope, bringing this entire program into the Vatican. As Megan referenced, just earlier today in his address to the United Nations, the Pope clearly asked for support from the world population, from the leaders represented there at the U.N. Summit, to support the upcoming Climate Summit in Paris this December, where they're trying to get nations to agree to really a suicidal commitment to reduce carbon emissions in the name of this fraud of a so-called climate-change scare. This is a killer policy, but the point is, that's the *intention*. This is being pushed by these radical de-population fanatics. They don't care about the facts, they don't care about the climate, they don't care about the reality of the science between CO2 and the climate – their objective is this population-reduction program. You know, what are that facts we actually know on CO2 and climate? Well, number one: there's been no warming of the Earth's temperature on average, for the past nearly 20 years, now, despite the fact we've been putting CO2 in the atmosphere at a faster rate than ever. So there's no evidence that the climate is highly sensitive, or highly responsive, to CO2, and there's no evidence to show that mankind is going to have some catastrophic effect. It's just getting ridiculous.

There's been no increase in extreme weather, despite what you hear. There's no evidence that CO2 can be tied to any increase in sea level rise, according to the most accurate measurements we have available. And, as an added irony to the whole thing, we know that the planet is actually getting greener, because CO2 is a plant food; it's not a pollutant, despite the insane proclamation of the EPA. It's a vital component to the biosphere, and the higher levels of CO2 have actually led to a greener planet overall.

But, the point is, these guys don't care about these facts. They don't care about the scientific arguments, because they're starting from their program of a Malthusian population reduction policy, not any scientific argument. And Schellnhüber is a leading example of this.

Now, Mr. LaRouche has also emphasized the importance of highlighting the role of another figure, another situation, expressing this exact same fight, which is Jerry Brown, over in California, the governor of California. Where yes, he's also pushing this insane idea for a murderous reduction in CO2 emissions, but that agenda is really no different than his water policy, or maybe better said, his no water policy. The facts are clear; the reality is clear. There's plenty of water for California. Jerry Brown doesn't want new water for California. He doesn't *want* to develop new resources. He wants to kill off sections of the population; he wants to reduce the population of California.

There's no shortage of water supplies for the state. They're being denied to the population by the policies of that governor. As we've covered on these shows, on this site, we can get all the water we need for California, and we can actually get it in new ways. We can get it more quickly. We can get it more efficiently than ever before, if we decide to actually act human, and move to higher levels, by understanding how our galactic system operates.

You can ask the question: How do specifically the atmospheric components of our Earth's water system operate? How does the atmospheric aspect of the Earth's water cycle operate? Well, you can't actually understand that unless you understand how the Solar System as a whole is actually subsumed by the higher order system of the Galaxy as a whole. If you understand that, if we understand that, and we act on that; if we act on a galactic level, on a Galactic principle, then we can manage the world's water supplies in a completely new way. We can bring water to where it's needed, by managing the atmospheric

characteristics of the water system, in a way we haven't been able to do before.

But people like Jerry Brown – they don't want that. It's not that that's not an option; it's not that we don't have that available. They don't want that policy. The British Royal Family does not want that policy, because it's contrary to their Zeusian view of mankind. Because this shows us that mankind can go to qualitatively higher levels. We can create new resources. We're not limited by any finite amount of resources. We're limited by the boundaries of our knowledge at any given state, but what we can do as mankind is transcend to a higher state; go to a higher level of discovery, fundamentally transforming what the nature of the human species is in the Universe. Just like this galactic perspective is a clear demonstration of that, and that's what these people hate.

They want their Green program. They want a program of so-called sustainability. Not progress, not creation, not really truly human action, but sustainability, sustaining some prior earlier state of mankind as a fixed animal-like species.

So, this is the fundamental fight going on right now. And this is what's happening at the United States, with the so-called move to adopt some idea of a "sustainable" policy.

If you go to the fundamental principle of the matter, and Mr. LaRouche was very emphatic on this earlier today when we were meeting with him, sustainability is a Satanic policy. This is a scientifically defined Satanic outlook. Because this goes to a deeper issue, something quite frankly that the Pope should understand, but apparently he either doesn't understand it, or refuses to discuss. But the issue of what is the true nature of mankind. And Mr. LaRouche said this very clearly earlier today. He said: Sustainability is death. There is no such thing as sustainability. Without progress, mankind will cease to exist. Because the issue is that mankind as a unique

species on this planet, is uniquely characterized by a type of creative action, which does not exist in the domain of the animal world. Something that distinguishes our species as fundamentally unique. That *this* is what should be discussed at the United Nations right now. *This* should be the fundamental principle on which we discuss a new era of relations among nations, a truthful scientific insight and understanding of what mankind is as a creative species. Not a green program, not a sustainability program.

If you're starting from a green program, you're starting from a Satanic conception of mankind. Despite what the Pope said earlier today, despite what these crazy fanatics say, mankind is not a product of the natural biosphere, so to speak. We're not a product of animal life. We do not exist in any steady balance with nature that we have to maintain. It's not true.

Mankind, the existence of society today, is purely a product of mankind. We exist at the present state we're at right now, because of the creative contributions of prior generations that have created the current state of existence of our species. And that is what we need to focus on. That is what we need to understand.

We have to ask these questions: how is it that mankind uniquely creates his own future? And it's not just something that happened once, and then we've achieved that state and that's it. This is the substance of what makes us human: continual and unending progress. And I think the issue is that we have to treat – if we're going to treat individuals as truly human, we must recognize every individual's fundamental inherent right to participate in this process.

It's not just about biological life. It's not just about a lifespan per se. Sure, we need better living conditions. Much of the world needs better living conditions. We need longer lifespans, we need better health care, we need better infrastructure. That's all true. But, for what purpose? Do

those lives actually get a chance to mean anything? They can live out their live, you can live and you can die, without even having the chance to make a fundamental human contribution to the progress of society, without having the chance to really be truly human, and actually participate in a creative process to move society forward.

So, that's the principal issue. That is why a green program, a program focussed on sustainability, sustaining some magical, fanatical idea of balance with nature, some inherent balance that we should just maintain, is a Satanic conception. There's nothing truly human in it. There's no actual creation. And so this whole green program – it's not just evil because it kills people. That is evil; it's evil to kill people. But it's evil because it denies people access to their real nature as mankind as a unique species. It denies people access the right and the ability to contribute something unique and something meaningful to the progress of society. So, this is the issue that Mr. LaRouche was emphatic that needs to be put on the table; the actual principle of what mankind is. What is the basis on which we need to move the world forward on a positive conception of true human nature? But even this Green program that we're talking about here today, Mr. LaRouche emphasized, is only a recent expression of a longer standing fight; a longer standing issue. Today's Green policy is not really unique; it may have new clothes, it may have a more recent expression. But it's a much longer standing policy, longer standing fight. And I think Jason has some more to elaborate here on the deeper roots of this issue.

**JASON ROSS:** I do.

One of the other things that the Pope had brought up at the United Nations was, that in this speech he says that as human beings, we have to follow certain laws of physics and chemistry and biology, because we have bodies. We need to

talk about what it is that makes us human. And I'm going to do that tonight in two aspects. One is from the standpoint of the scientist Vernadsky; and the other is from the standpoint of Zeus or Bertrand Russell against the Promethean outlook of man, and talk about what a real human identity must be and what we need to hold on to today.

So, is it true what the Pope said, that we have to follow the laws of nature and biology and chemistry and physics because we have physical bodies? Well, ask yourself this: Are there any unique things about us as a species? Do we apply laws of morality to animals? Do we say that a lion is being immoral when it's catching, hunting down some animal and then only eating half of it; wasting the leftovers? Are there any rosebushes or orange trees that are going to be attending the Pope's mass on Sunday? I doubt it. The difference between human beings and animals is an obvious thing to everybody in the sense that it's not hard to tell if you see something in front of you; is this a human being, or is this an animal? It's not hard to figure that out. Just as in the study of biology or physics, it's not difficult to know whether something that you're seeing is part of a living process or not. Some people might say, "Well, viruses are an unusual case."

So, what does Vernadsky have to do with this? Vernadsky, the Russian-Ukrainian biogeochemist who regular viewers of our website will have heard about I think a fair amount, he looked at life as a phenomenon. He looked at human life as a phenomenon; and rather than focussing on the actions of individual organisms the way a biologist would, his focus was more on life as a whole. The impact of life, the inter-relationship between life and the non-living material around it, and the reshaping of the originally non-living material around life by the process of the biosphere over billions of years. As a result of this process, we're going to compare life with non-life, and then look at the human. Because

imagine if someone had said, "Well, life has to follow the laws of physics and chemistry." Imagine if you had gone back to the dawning of life on Earth, and said, "Wait a minute! Life, you're going to destroy the planet; you're going to alter everything. You're going to reshape the soils; you're going to change the atmosphere. Look at all that pollution you're making." This happened in life; the initial life on this planet lived off of chemical energy, such as deep sea vents, things in the crust, that sort of thing – chemical energy. The breakthrough invention in life of photosynthesis, where the light of the Sun became the fuel and power source for life; that was tremendous transformation [that] totally changed life's relationship to the rest of the planet. It also led to the production of a very dangerous chemical. Unlike carbon dioxide, which isn't going to hurt anything, oxygen is actually is toxic; you might have said life was polluting the planet. And indeed, the kind of life had to change to be able to live in an environment that had oxygen. New kinds of metabolic pathways were developed that used oxygen as part of metabolism; like we do, as animals.

So, there's been a dramatic change in life's presence on this planet. This is seen in the biogenic migration of atoms; of the flow of material from living organisms to the non-living – but almost undoubtedly shaped by life – surroundings. The flow back and forth between life and non-life. The development and growth of an increasing amount of biogeochemical energy. Vernadsky says that life increases its free energy; it colonizes the non-living. At this point, the whole crust of the Earth down to a certain depth, the atmosphere; it's all been shaped by life. Vernadsky points to other differences. Take, for example, evolution. Now, evolution has a direction to it. I'd mentioned earlier the transition from chemical energy only to having photosynthesis, to developing higher forms of life – animals, warm-blooded animals. The process of cephalization, meaning moving towards the head, where in animal life, more and more of the senses,

the neural systems developed into the head. That's a process that took place over time; making it possible for there to be human beings. Life doesn't respond the way chemical elements do in other respects. Life treats isotopes differently than can be explained by chemical or physical processes. It treats left- and right-handed isomers differently in a way that purely chemical processes don't.

So, there's plenty that distinguishes life from non-life. In a similar way, there's plenty that distinguishes human beings from life. Despite what you may have heard about lawsuits about chimpanzees or other such animals having human rights; they're not human. And this used to be an obvious thing. Let me read a section now from Vernadsky. This is from his paper "Problems of Biogeochemistry Two", and it's available in a Vernadsky anthology that we put together. (Anthology Book I Here) Vernadsky says:

*"From the standpoint of the biosphere, the individual living organism is usually lost from view; in first place comes the aggregate of organisms – living matter. In biogeochemistry, however – in some strictly defined cases – at times it is necessary to pay attention to the discrete organism, to its individuality. It is indispensable to do this in those cases, where the activity of Man appears as a geological factor, as we see happening now, and the individual personality sometimes becomes vividly apparent and is reflected in large-scale phenomena of a planetary character. The human personality changes, accelerates, and causes geological processes of enormous significance, through its presence in the biosphere."*

With human beings, individuals actually matter on a planetary scale; no individual animal matters on a planetary scale, no individual plant matters on a planetary scale, no fungus. With human beings, it's different; how is that? He said:

*"We are living in a brand new, bright geological epoch. Man, through his labor – and his conscious relationship to life –*



*is transforming the envelope of the Earth – the geological region of life, the biosphere. Man is shifting it into a new geological state: Through his labor and his consciousness, the biosphere is in a process of transition to the noosphere. [From the root noesis, or thinking.] Man is creating new biogeochemical processes, which never existed before. The biogeochemical history of the chemical elements – a planetary phenomenon – is drastically changing. Enormous masses of new, free metals and their alloys are being created on Earth, for example, ones which never existed here before, such as aluminum, magnesium, and calcium.”*

*“Plant and animal life are being changed and disturbed in the most drastic manner. New species and races are being created. The face of the Earth is changing profoundly. The stage of the noosphere is being created. Within the Earth’s biosphere, an intense blossoming is in process, the further history of which will be grandiose, it seems....”*

Human beings aren’t animals. Bio-behavior, by looking at human existence over time as a phenomenon; just looking at it a scientist, looking at it as something that occurred. We do things that animals have never done and never will. We transform biogeochemical processes; we create new states of existence in the universe on the Earth. We make new things happen that would not have happened by any means that was purely biological, physical, or chemical; we create.

Now this is a way of understanding the idea of human beings as being made in the image of God, for example. The distinction between human beings and animals used to be, this wasn’t really much of a question. Religions that look to Genesis and the notion that human beings are made in the image of God; that’s a clear distinction. Squirrels are not said to be so made. We see it in the indications that Vernadsky gives of the kinds of transformations we’ve made; so let’s talk about how that happens. And what that means about our identity, and what it means about how we have to approach the future. I

want to read a response that Lyndon LaRouche gave last night on a call of activists that we have every Thursday evening. I'll read the question, too. The question was:

"How do you deal with strengthening the spiritual ability for mankind, or the person to deal with the problem of the world? You mentioned people are becoming disheartened of the fact that the crisis is becoming unbearable for some. But how do you strengthen the quality in defending mankind?"

LaRouche in his answer, said:

*"We have the means, mankind has the means to understand mankind. And what I said in an earlier remark this evening, that at a certain point, we are able to understand mankind, how? We understand that, because we are all human, and we all know that we are going to die, sooner or later. And we know that the question is, what's the meaning of our life? And many people have a big problem, because they have never been able to resolve what has been and what will be, 'the meaning of my life.'*

*"So you start with what has been the meaning of your life; then you go to the really tougher question, and you say, what is the meaning of your future of your life? And that means you have think, now, of what you are, and shape what you are going to be, in such a way that you do not feel shame about having lived. That means that you devote your life to making contributions which lead mankind to improve mankind! That is to improve people, living people. And rather than simply taking care of your own greed, and so forth, you've got to think about what you can do to influence people, to make the next generation, a better generation than the one you're living in."*

He says, "That is a short way of saying it; but I think it's an adequately effective one."

Now, on this subject, LaRouche – when we spoke to him this

afternoon – was very emphatic about drawing the contrast between that outlook that he expressed and the outlook of mankind expressed by Zeus, or by Bertrand Russell, or by John Schellnhuber – sorry, I forgot your title there, John. You do it by not being practical. Now the story of Zeus and Prometheus is one of tyranny. Zeus the tyrant said that human beings were of a lower class than he; he was a god, human beings were these mere mortals. And that the power of fire was something reserved for him alone; it wasn't for human beings to have. If Zeus had his way, he'd exterminate the human race, as a matter of fact. Prometheus enters the story as the fire-bringer; as defying Zeus and bringing the power of fire to mankind, and in fact, creating mankind. Listen to this; you can understand the creation of the human species as a non-biological, non-animal – we're not animals. Here's Prometheus. He says: "Listen to the miseries that beset mankind. How they were witless before I made them have sense, and endowed them with Reason. First of all, although they had eyes to see, they saw to no avail. They had ears; but they did not understand." Your cat, as much as you love it, probably doesn't understand a whole lot. "But just as shapes and dreams throughout their length of days, without purpose, they wrought all things in confusion." He says, human beings didn't know how to build houses; didn't know how to use wood; didn't understand the seasons; didn't know when to plant crops; didn't know how to navigate using the stars; didn't have numbers; didn't have poetry; didn't have writing; didn't use animals to do their chores for them; and didn't have sailing. And didn't have metallurgy; he goes on. Prometheus, yes; the fire-bringer. The power of fire which no animal species uses; and creativity itself as a whole, defining the human race.

Now, against that idea of the human race, stood Zeus then and, in our time over the past century, has loomed very large – Bertrand Russell. I'm not going to say a lot about Bertrand Russell; we've got a lot of material, we've gone through this

a good deal in the past. But to give a short reminder, I suppose you could call it, in 1900, Bertrand Russell took up a task that was put down by David Hilbert about, in effect, killing science. The specific idea was about turning mathematics into a branch of logic; but what the whole pursuit meant to Russell was eliminating creativity. To turn science – instead of being something creative where new things could occur, where new discoveries happen; Russell sought to destroy it, and say, “We’ve really got it all figured out; and everything in the future can be derived from the past. We can take the model of Euclid; you derive from what you’ve already got, and that’s all that we’re going to have in the future.” And that really has taken over science; modelling, curve-fitting, throwing in more parameters to explain anomalies in the way that Ptolemy or Copernicus did by adding in extra epicycles. Approaching things mathematically, rather than as a scientist in the tradition of Mendeleev, Kepler, Cusa, Fermat, Leibniz, or a great musician.

So, I’d like to actually at this point get to a short idea about this from Percy Shelley. Now, Percy Shelley wrote a poem, *Prometheus Unbound*. Aeschylus’ play *Prometheus Bound* is only the first of a trilogy, and the other two plays have been lost; we don’t have them. But let me read an epilogue to Shelley’s poem, *Prometheus Unbound*. He’s writing this to Prometheus. He says that

*“To suffer woes which hope thinks infinite; to forgive wrongs darker than death or night; to defy power which seems omnipotent; to love and bear; to hope ’til hope creates from its own wreck a thing it contemplates. Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent. This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be good, great, and joyous; beautiful and free. This is alone life, joy, empire, and victory.”*

That the greatest power that we have lies in our minds; lies in the power to do new things; lies in the power to – as we understand it today through LaRouche’s economics – to live our

lives in such a way that not only can we feel good about ourselves, but that we can have access to a necessity. In other words, it's possible to live a life in such a way that you will have been necessary to the future.

And as Ben said, just as we must prevent people from being killed – murder is wrong; we can't have a SPCA approach to human beings. To develop the Third World like adopting a poor puppy from the pound, or something like that. That's not a human approach to our fellow human beings. The development that we need is one in which people are elevated to being able to play a role in that development process itself; and to be truly human. To know what means, to have an idea of what future must be; and as in that quote from LaRouche, to shape yourself, and live your life in shaping yourself to be able to bring that about. That is the highest form of freedom for an individual. And by bringing that to society as a whole, we can achieve the true highest sort of freedom; which is not only a freedom from want, oppression, tyranny; but it's freedom to express intelligence, a freedom to know. It's a very developed sense of freedom; the highest sense of freedom. And to make that something that people are able to participate in, is truly the highest work for us today.

**BEETS:** Thank you very much, Jason.

With that, I'm going to bring a close to tonight's broadcast. I'd like to thank Ben, Jason, and Jeff for joining me tonight; and I would like to thank all of you for watching.

Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

# Ruslands NATO-udsending: Det er op til NATO at genetablere en militær dialog med Rusland

17. september 2015 – Ruslands permanente repræsentant til NATO, Alexander Grushko, rapporterer, at hans regering på det seneste har modtaget »gentagne« indikationer fra NATO om, at det ville være en god idé at genetablere en NATO-Rusland-dialog på det militære niveau og med begyndelse i etablering af en direkte hotline for at udveksle informationer, med det formål at forhindre farlige militære hændelser«. 'Rusland bag Hovedoverskrifterne' og Sputnik News rapporterede begge om Grushkos bemærkninger i dag og påpegede hans udtalelse om, at »Den russiske side har ingen fordomme imod en sådan form for kontakt«.

Grushko understregede, at »det ikke var os, der skar kommunikationslinjerne over, så hvis NATO seriøst mener, at en militær dialog er en seriøst stabiliserende faktor, så bør NATO tage det første skridt i genopretningen af den normale dialog, der har eksisteret mellem os som en del af Ruslands/NATO-rådet nu i mange år«.

Med Moskvas angivelige involvering i Ukraine-konflikten som påskud, afskar NATO den 1. april sidste år ethvert civilt og militært samarbejde med Rusland.

*Foto: Alexander Grushko*

---

# NYHEDSORIENGERING    SEPTEMBER 2015:

## Kaos på Jorden, harmoni i rummet

*De flygtningestrømme, der nu oversvømmer Danmark og Europa, er kun et lille forvarsel om, hvad der vil ske, hvis ikke Islamisk Stat knuses, og der skabes fred i Syrien. Vi bør derfor samarbejde med Rusland og Syriens regering om det og hurtigt få området genopbygget. Kinas præsident Xi Jinping tager på seks dages statsbesøg i USA, men der er kredse, der vil iværksætte økonomiske sanktioner imod Kina. Finansverdenen venter nervøst på, hvornår renten hæves og finansboblerne kollapser. Andreas Mogensens 10 dages tur til Den internationale Rumstation ISS er starten på Danmarks rolle som rumnation. Vi bør omgående etablere et dansk rumagentur til at følge op på succesen. Dette er en redigeret udgave af en nyhedsorientering, Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, gav den 7. september 2015.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Lavrov leverer forpremiere på Putins tale; angriber Obamas forbrydelser

14. september 2015 – Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov leverede en forpremiere på præsident Putins tale i FN under et interview med Ruslands TV Kanal 1 i søndags.

Han sagde, at dette »ikke er et rutinemøde« i FN, fordi det er »en jubilæumssamling«. Putin vil tale om Ruslands synspunkter i hovedspørgsmål.

Først på listen er USA's indsats for at forhindre fremkomsten af BRIKS-nationerne (formuleret diplomatisk):

*»først og fremmest er der de systematiske problemer, der fremkommer i forbindelse med forsøgene på at tilbageholde den objektive proces med at skabe en ny, multipolær verdensorden, der kan reflektere den objektive skabelse af nye centre for økonomisk, finansiel magt og for politisk indflydelse«,*

sagde Lavrov, oversat (til engelsk) af TASS.

For det andet, USA's samarbejde med terrorister:

*»Herfra kommer de emner, vi alle kender: bekæmpelse af terrorisme, der bør være fri af dobbelte standarder, terrorister kan ikke opdeles i gode og dårlige, det er nytteløst at antage, at det kunne være muligt at samarbejde med nogle af disse 'dårlige' ekstremister med det formål at opnå nogle snævre, geopolitiske mål.«*

Dernæst, USA's ensidige, imperialistiske politik:

*»Desuden er der problemet med ensidige midler for tvang, og ikke kun imod den Russiske Føderation ... de vestlige modparter, først og fremmest under indflydelse af den amerikanske*



*psykologi, er i færd med at miste kulturen med dialog og diplomatiske afgørelser.«*

*»Det iranske atomprogram var en fremragende og ekstremt sjældnen undtagelse«, sagde Lavrov, alt imens de i de fleste tilfælde, der fortsætter med at fremkomme i Mellemøsten og det nordlige Afrika,*

*»forsøger at bruge magtmidler, direkte indgriben, ligesom det var i Irak og Libyen, og således krænker beslutninger taget i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, eller anvendelsen af sanktioner«.*

De gennemtvinger nogle politiske processer, sagde han, over indenrigspolitiske situationer, »det være sig i Yemen eller i Sydsudan«, og de forsøger at kontrollere det udefra. Lavrov konkluderede:

*»Denne fremgangsmåde kunne, hvis den var mere solidt baseret på aftaler mellem parterne, og ikke kun på råd udefra, være mere farbar. Så snart et sådant system begynder at 'skride', hvilket er uundgåeligt i tilfælde med påtvungne løsninger, trækker de omgående deres 'sanktionsknipler' frem med ønsket om at straffe dem, der ikke ville overholde deres fremgangsmåde«,*

*»Dette vil præsident Putin tale om, og om problemet med at knuse det verdensøkonomiske rum, som nu, med rammerne for WTO, vi har ikke effektivt fremskridt i forhandlinger om universelle fremgangsmåder over for nye sfærer af økonomiske og teknologiske relationer mellem lande ... Han vil også berøre visse detaljerede aspekter, som Syrien eller den ukrainske krise. Alle kriserne af denne art udvikler sig ud fra systemiske problemer i forsøgene på at fryse processen med at skabe den poly-centrerede verden.«*

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER: Sidste chance ved FN's jubilæumsmøde**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER: Sort mandag på børserne, den 24. august 2015**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg