

LAROCHE PAC UPDATE

The Stakes Are Very High Over the Coming Days

Matthew Ogden's weekly LaRouche PAC Monday Update webcast can be seen at <https://larouchepac.com/>. This Jan. 22 edition is on YouTube at <youtu.be/NO3CBVoinsQ>. The transcript has been edited.

Matthew Ogden: Good afternoon. It's January 22, 2018. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our Monday afternoon weekly strategic update here from larouchepac.com.

As you can see on our screen, we are now eight days from the official President Trump State of the Union address. We've been continuing this countdown, and this is scheduled, at least currently, for a week from tomorrow, Jan. 30, where President Trump will address a Joint Session of Congress in his first official State of the Union address. As you can see here by our graphic, our two agenda items continue to be LaRouche's Four Economic Laws and for the United States to join the New Silk Road. This is the subject of "[The Campaign to Win the Future.](#)"

This is LaRouche PAC's policy platform for the year 2018, and we are engaged in a national mobilization to gain endorsements for this platform. Those endorsements can come from everybody—from private citizens, labor organizations, farm organizations, elected officials, and most importantly, from candidates for Federal, state, and local office. This is our campaign to shape the terms of the debate for the 2018 elections, and the more that we do over the coming eight days, between now and January 30th, the more impact we will have on the policy of the U.S. Presidency.

During this period, I guarantee you the news is going to be filled with all of the details and the melodrama about the government shutdown, and other things which are really side-issues. You can get lost in all of the details, and you can come to think of this as just partisanship and a Republican versus Democrat kind of partisan battle. But the real war which is being

waged in Washington, is not what it seems. It's not this war between the Republicans and the Democrats over the so-called government shutdown. The real war in Washington, and which continues to escalate, is the war over the U.S. Presidency. Will it continue to exist at all, or will it be swept away in a coup involving fake charges of Russian collusion? Will President Trump be freed from the pressure of an illegal insurgency, so that he can move into full cooperation with Russia and China, and will he be supported to take the urgent steps outlined in "The Campaign to Win the Future"?

As Helga Zepp-LaRouche warned over this weekend, we are in very dangerous waters. We have not reached safe harbor yet as to what U.S. policy will be, especially U.S. policy on the world stage. As you know, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at the beginning of this year, on January 1st—New Year's Day—declared that 2018 must be the year that we end geopolitics and inaugurate a new era of great power collaboration, great power partnerships, which must be built on a new philosophy of "win-win" cooperation. The leading great powers on this planet right now obviously are the United States, Russia, and China. If those three countries can create a win-win collaboration, the entire 20th Century paradigm of geopolitics, which has brought us to the threshold of thermonuclear war—that can be ended. As we know, President Trump has shown his intention to achieve that, especially in terms of a constructive relationship with Russia and with China.

However, directly contrary to that intention, over the weekend, the official National Defense Strategy was released, and it is full of inflammatory attacks on both Russia and on China. This National Defense Strategy goes so far as to call for a new era of great power competition, as opposed to what Helga Zepp-LaRouche called for, an era of great power cooperation. Literally, a revival of Cold War geopolitics. U.S. Defense Secretary James Mattis stated in a speech on Friday, an-



DoD/Navy Mass
Communication Specialist
1st Class Kathryn E. Hold

U.S. Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis announces the National Defense Strategy at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C., Jan. 19, 2018.



nouncing the release of this National Defense Strategy, the following: “We will continue to prosecute the campaign against terrorists that we have engaged in today. But great power competition, not terrorism, is now the primary focus of U.S. national security. We face growing threats from revisionist powers as different as China and Russia. Nations that seek to create a world consistent with their authoritarian models, pursuing veto authority over other nations’ economic, diplomatic, and security decisions.”

Now, this is clearly inflammatory and is stuck in the paradigm of Cold War geopolitics. What Helga Zepp-LaRouche has warned is that this is not just Cold War, but this kind of rhetoric or this kind of policy could literally lead to a hot war. What she emphasized is that we have to understand that this is very dangerous language.

Let me read some quotes from the National Security Directive, published as James Mattis announced its release during the speech that I just quoted from. Here’s what is in this National Defense Strategy:

The central challenge to U.S. prosperity and se-

curity is the re-emergence of long-term, strategic competition by what the National Security Strategy classifies as revisionist powers. It is increasingly clear that China and Russia want to shape a world consistent with their authoritarian model—gaining veto authority over other nations’ economic, diplomatic, and security decisions.

Concurrently, Russia seeks veto authority over nations on its periphery in terms of their governmental, economic, and diplomatic decisions, to shatter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and change European and Middle East security and economic structures to its favor.

Another change to the strategic environment is a resilient, but weakening, post-World War II international order. China and Russia are now undermining the international order from within the system. For decades the United States has enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain.

[We must] remain the pre-eminent military power in the world,

[and] ensure the balances of power remain in our favor

Long-term strategic competitions with China and Russia are the principal priorities for the Department [of Defense].

Defense objectives include:

Maintaining favorable regional balances of power in the Indo-Pacific, Europe, the Middle East, and the Western Hemisphere.

So, this directly calls for great power competition, and asserts that the objective of U.S. policy will be to maintain military and strategic and economic hegemony over the entire world. Literally the opposite of what Zepp-LaRouche has called for, namely, the end of geopolitics, and the opposite of what President Xi Jinping has offered in terms of win-win great power collaborations in which you have not a winner take all, but mutual benefit for all powers involved, economic, strategic, and military.

Zepp-LaRouche issued a tweet over the weekend di-

rectly in response to this National Defense Strategy. This is what she said: “President Trump should revoke the new national security strategy document immediately, fire Mattis, and appoint Tulsi Gabbard as Defense Secretary. Signed, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.” So, that tweet came directly from her, and she calls for President Trump to revoke the National Security document, fire Mattis, and instead, install Tulsi Gabbard in his place as Defense Secretary.



a wake-up call for the United States to immediately abandon the Cold War regime-change policies that led to this situation, and to “end the dark shadow of potential nuclear war.” Here are a few examples of what she has been saying on Twitter in the past few days:

“Over a million of Hawaii’s people were faced with the immediate reality of having 15 minutes to find a place to take shelter, wondering ‘Where do I go? What shelter is going to protect me and family from

Nuclear War or Common Destiny?

As many of our viewers and supporters probably know, Tulsi Gabbard has been very vocal about the utter failure of the Cold War regime change policy of the United States. Gabbard, of course, is the Democratic Congresswoman from the state of Hawaii. Her warnings have only become more urgent in the wake of the false alarm—so-called—of an incoming ballistic missile in Hawaii.

This “false alarm,” as you can see here on the screen, told people that they were about to be incinerated in a nuclear attack on Hawaii, and that they should immediately find shelter and take cover. It said, “Ballistic missile threat inbound to Hawaii. Seek immediate shelter. This is not a drill.” And this is what was received by all Hawaii cell phones and everybody in that state, and was not revoked for 38 minutes. You can imagine the kind of environment of terror that reigned in the state of Hawaii for those 38 minutes.

Now Gabbard found out about this and immediately tweeted out, once she discovered that it was indeed false, that “There is no incoming missile threat. This is a false alarm. This has been confirmed that there is no danger.” But again, this was a false warning that was received by every single person who was in Hawaii at that moment.

Gabbard has been emphasizing that this should not be written off as some sort of “false alarm,” but must be

a nuclear bomb?’ But there’s nowhere to go. Nowhere to hide.” She said, “The people of Hawaii experienced that in 15 minutes, they and their families are going to be dead; gone. That’s what they just went through.” She said, “We have seen this nuclear threat during the Cold War, when the Soviet Union and the United States were seconds away from such an attack. Peace with North Korea requires immediate and direct talks without preconditions. Regime-change war policy is the reason

why North Korea sees nuclear weapons as their only deterrent from a U.S.-led attack. Kim Jong-un sees what the United States has done to Qaddafi in Libya, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and the effort underway to decertify the nuclear deal with Iran.”

She said, “It was a mistake for the United States to take out Qaddafi and Hussein.

Libya and Iraq are still reeling from the effects of our attacks. We need to learn from our mistakes; end our policy of regime change; and implement a policy of de-escalation and peace.”

So, that’s very explicit and very direct. As Gabbard says, we must end regime change; we need a new strategy of de-escalation and peace. You can see why Helga Zepp-LaRouche would call for her to be appointed Defense Secretary to replace James Mattis in the wake of the release of this so-called National Defense Strategy. It’s completely contrary to what he is saying; this bellicose, geopolitical, neo-con line that’s being taken by





DoD/Glenn Fawcett

Former Secretary of Defense Dr. William Perry (1994-1997), on March 6, 2015.

Mattis and others in his faction within the Trump administration.

Also in direct contradiction to Secretary Mattis, Zepp-LaRouche emphasized the statements of former Defense Secretary William Perry, and his response to the so-called false alarm in Hawaii. Here's a tweet that he posted *before* the "false alarm" in Hawaii. This was on January 3. He said, "We are at greater risk of nuclear catastrophe now than we were during the Cold War. We have ignored the existential threat of nuclear weapons for too long. The risk has always been there, and it will continue unless we take action." So that was prior to this incident in Hawaii. Following the incident, Perry published an article titled, "The Terrifying Lessons of Hawaii's Botched Missile Alert." Here's what he said in the article:

"This is not a drill," announced the emergency alert, and for 37 minutes, hundreds of thousands of Hawaiians and tourists were left to contemplate the possibility that an incoming missile might soon end their lives.

The consequences in Hawaii were that people were terrified. They were terrified not only because they thought that they and their families were going to die, but because they had no idea of "what to do."

That they didn't know what to do is fundamental to a nuclear attack, especially if the missile is carrying a hydrogen bomb. One hydrogen

bomb could kill essentially everyone in a city like Honolulu or Hilo, even if the residents took cover. So the "what to do" has to happen *before* the missile is fired. The way to save yourself and your family from being killed in a nuclear war is to keep such a war from happening. Once the missiles are launched, it is too late. And that is one important lesson we could learn from the Hawaii false alert.

But there is also a second lesson. If the attack alert came from our military warning system, the president would be faced immediately with an existential decision. He would have 5 to 10 minutes to decide whether to launch our ICBMs before they were destroyed in their silos.

If he decides to launch them, and it is a false alert, there will be no way to call them back or abort them in flight. He will have mistakenly started World War III, a war likely to destroy our civilization.

[T]he consequence of a mistaken launch order is no less than the end of our civilization as we know it. That is the problem we face, and no "duck-and-cover" drills can solve it, or even mitigate it. Instead, we need to get serious about re-engaging the Russians on ways of reducing nuclear dangers to both of us; we need to give up our "launch on warning" policy. All of these actions will be hard to execute, but the possible consequences of failure are so great that we have a responsibility to give them our highest priority.

What William Perry is warning about, is exactly what Lyndon LaRouche was involved in trying to prevent when he worked with President Ronald Reagan in the early 1980s to draft what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. This was not just missile defense in some sort of simplistic unilateral way; it was a joint program of space-based missile defense based on cutting-edge plasma and laser beam technology. Lyndon LaRouche was actively involved in working with leading layers inside the diplomatic community in Russia, to say, "Let us adopt this as a joint program. The United States and Russia must jointly adopt this Strategic Defense Initiative in order to end the threat of thermonuclear war once and for all." That was President Reagan's intention when he announced the Strategic Defense Initiative on March 23, 1983. But it was not adopted by both sides, and if it had been, we wouldn't be living under this nu-

clear sword of Damocles as we are today.

Tulsi Gabbard and William Perry are warning today that the threat of thermonuclear war is all too real, and that we must urgently change our policies. What Gabbard said is that we have to declare an end to the policy of regime change. Perry said we “need to get serious about re-engaging the Russians on ways of reducing nuclear dangers to both of us before the nuclear war starts.” He said, “The way to save yourself and your family from being killed in a nuclear war is to keep such a war from happening. Once the missiles are launched, it is too late.”

Those are obviously words of sanity and words of wisdom which must be taken to heart. However, the tone that’s being taken by this new National Defense Strategy is completely contrary to that tone of sanity. And it is risking the escalation of just such a threat of thermonuclear war breaking out, either intentionally, or even accidentally.

In response to the Pentagon’s new National Defense Strategy document and other recent developments, there have been protests from foreign ministry spokesmen in both Russia and China. The Chinese have released a statement, as you can see here on the screen, which is titled “China Blasts New U.S. Defense Strategy.” This is what they had to say:

If someone is always wearing dark glasses, they will never see a bright world. Peace and development are the themes of this era, and are also the shared aspirations of mankind. However, if some people look at the world through a Cold War, zero-sum game mindset, then they are destined to see only conflict and confrontation.

We hope that the U.S. can align itself with the trend of the world and the will of the people, and put the world and China-U.S. relations into the perspective of cooperation.

So, that’s a beautiful statement of exactly what we’ve been emphasizing. The year 2018 should be the end of geopolitics, and as the Chinese Foreign Ministry said, peace and development must be the themes of this new era—the shared aspirations of mankind. However,



White House/Shealah Craighead
President Trump (right) speaking with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in the Oval Office, May 10, 2017.

they said, as you can see, there are some people who continue to be involved in policymaking in the United States Administration, who “look at the world through a Cold War, zero-sum game mindset”; as opposed to what President Xi Jinping has proposed as a win-win paradigm of international relations.

The Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, also came out and denounced what he called the United States’ “regrettable strategic policy towards Russia and China,” which he said is one of “confrontational concepts and strategies.” Here you can see on the screen the meeting between Secretary Lavrov and President Donald Trump. Helga Zepp-LaRouche said that what Sergey Lavrov has emphasized is that Russia does see that there is a division. President Trump himself is in favor of peaceful cooperation between the United States and Russia, and also between the United States and China; and he had repeatedly said that. “That it would be a good thing, not a bad thing,” he says. But he notes that there is an insurgency against him from within the United States, directed from the British empire, which is preventing him from blocking these anti-Russia actions. Here’s a quote from Foreign Minister Lavrov:

When U.S. President Donald Trump received me in the White House, when he spoke with Russian President Vladimir Putin in Hamburg, and later they held telephone conversations, I did not see U.S. President Trump’s charge [i.e.,

directive] for any sort of actions which could undermine his election campaign slogans that he wanted good relations with Russia.

Then he goes on to say that he sees that Trump's intentions are towards this good relationship with Russia, but that he's being forced into permitting anti-Russia decisions. He said, "However, we are comforted that recently, some members of the Congress, political circles in the United States, and some diplomats, acknowledge quietly in their confidential talks, the absolute abnormality of such a situation and the need to improve it."

So, there's a very clear recognition that there's a war going on inside this administration, inside the White House, and that President Trump is being backed into a corner against his intentions, to allow these sorts of anti-Russian and anti-Chinese positions.

This goes directly to the point, and it shows you that this persisting conflict within U.S. policymaking continues, and we are in an all-out battle for the existence of the Presidency.

Coup and Counter-Coup

I want to cite an article which was published by Stephen Cohen. He's a well-known Russian scholar, a professor at Princeton University. He stated this reality very directly in an article published in the *Nation* this weekend, titled—and I think this is very much to the point—"Democrats Are Repudiating FDR's Precedent of Détente with Russia"; and then the subtitle is "By criminalizing alleged contacts with the Kremlin and by demonizing Russia itself, today's Democrats are becoming a party of the new and more perilous Cold War." So, here are some quotes from what Stephen Cohen had to say:

The first of several détente policies [between the United States and Russia] was initiated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933, when he formally extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union, then ruled by Stalin. That is, FDR was the father of détente, a circumstance forgotten or disregarded by many Democrats, especially today.

[T]oday, post Soviet Russia and the United States are in a new and even more dangerous Cold War, one provoked in no small measure by the Democratic Party and the still shadowy role of Obama's intelligence chiefs, not only those at

the FBI, in instigating Russiagate allegations against Donald Trump early in 2016.

Russiagate allegations have been leveled by leading Democrats and their mainstream media against Trump every time he has tried to develop necessary cooperative agreements with Russian President Putin, characterizing those initiatives as disloyal to America, even "treasonous." Still more, the same Democratic actors have increasingly suggested that normal "contacts" with Russia at various levels—a practice traditionally encouraged by pro-détente U.S. leaders—are evidence of "collusion with the Kremlin."

[These allegations] are being codified into a Democratic Party program for escalated and indefinite Cold War against Russia, presumably to be a major plank in the party's appeal to voters in 2018 and 2020.

Consider instead the supremely existential and real danger of nuclear war, which as Reagan wisely concluded, "cannot be won and therefore must never be fought." And consider the false alarms of incoming nuclear missiles recently experienced in Hawaii and Japan. These episodes alone should compel any Democratic Party worthy of the name to support President Trump's pro-détente instincts and urge him to pursue with Putin agreements that would take all nuclear weapons off high alert. But for that to happen, the Democratic Party would need to give American national security a higher priority than its obsession with Russiagate.

So, Stephen Cohen's citation of Franklin Roosevelt as the precedent for what the Democratic Party should be, and what the Democratic Party has lost in terms of the soul of the Democratic Party is, I think, very apropos. And obviously, Franklin Roosevelt's recognition that after World War II, we—out of necessity—needed to work together with Russia or the Soviet Union at that time, and China. Not only in defeating fascism, as we did accomplish in that great power relationship during World War II, but also in seeking to end the British Empire, and the kind of colonial policies that the British Empire had stood for, for over a century. And to bring peace through development to the entire world.

It's precisely for that reason that the LaRouche Political Action Committee has released its 2018 Party Platform. It's because the Democratic Party has been

completely overtaken by these Russiagate fanatics, this neo-McCarthyism, who are intent on derailing any potential for U.S.A.-Russia-China cooperation. Here's what we said in the 2018 Policy Platform:

We must end the coup against the President, and break the control over both parties, which adhere to the post-World War II geopolitical system which has produced decades of perpetual war and now threatens World War III by attacking China and Russia.

The Way Forward

That is a major aspect of this 2018 policy, this 2018 platform from LaRouche PAC. That's one of the aspects that we must absolutely escalate on and gain a flood of endorsements for this. It has to be seen as not politics, but as an existential threat to the United States if we are not be in collaboration and in dialogue with these two leading world powers—Russia and China. Those terrible experiences that the residents of Hawaii just went through, not to mention what the Japanese are now going through—those experiences should solidify in our minds and vividly bring to life that threat; that thermonuclear war is a very real danger and that this is a possibility which must be taken off the table if civilization is to survive.

Now, there is a very dramatic development on the front of breaking this “Russiagate” coup against President Trump. We don't have time to cover all of the aspects of this in detail, but let me quickly cite the actions by Congressman Devin Nunes. What he has done over the weekend could very well quickly bring this entire Robert Mueller Russiagate coup to its knees, and fully confirm the charges that were documented in the [original LaRouche PAC pamphlet](#) on the Robert Mueller operation. At the end of last week—and let me just go through a few details on this—while the rest of the country was being distracted by this melodrama over the government shutdown and the continuing resolution and so forth, Congressman Nunes wrote a four-page classified memo which documented—from sources at the FBI and the DoJ exactly what occurred around the original Steele report. Reports have been circulated that this discredited dossier, this so-called Steele dossier, was the basis for the FISA Court ruling allowing the FBI to spy on the Trump Presidential campaign. So this is not just a U.S. citizen under Section 702, but this is a



Representative Matt Gaetz.

leading candidate for the United States Presidency, intelligence services under Obama's control spying on his enemies list. This is obviously in the league of what happened around Nixon and Watergate. Then, they continued this spying after the President took office.

On Thursday, the House Intelligence Committee voted along strict party lines—Republican versus Democrat; all the Republicans voted in favor of allowing every member of Congress to read the classified four-page memo from Devin Nunes. On Thursday night after that vote, a large number of Republican Congressmen took that liberty and went in to read that classified memo. They were shocked by what they saw, and they came out and went on national television and demanded that that memo be released to the public immediately. So, here are a few statements from some of the Congressmen who have read the memo.

The most extensive statement came from Congressman Matt Gaetz, who's a Republican from Florida. People might recognize Matt Gaetz as the Congressman who took to the floor, declaring that this operation against President was a “coup.” So this is what Matt Gaetz said after having read the Nunes memo:

The House must immediately make public the memo prepared by the Intelligence Committee regarding the FBI and the Department of Justice. The facts contained in this memo are jaw-dropping, and demand full transparency. There is no higher priority than the release of this information to preserve our democracy. I think that this will not end just with firings. I believe there are people who will go to jail. I was very persuaded by the evidence. You don't get to try to under-

mine our country, undermine our elections, and then simply get fired. So, I think that there will be criminal implications here. Why don't they want the American people to know the truth about what was going on with the government? How that impacted the President, his transition, his campaign. It just seems interesting to me that Democrats don't want us to know what the entire basis was in the first place for the Mueller probe. They want to drag this out through the mid-term elections to try to embarrass this President and distract this Congress from the crucial work we have to do to save this great country. Let's release the documents. The entire Mueller investigation is a lie built on a foundation of corruption. This will vindicate claims by many of us. It is a real attempt to undermine the President from the scariest of places. It would be ludicrous if we allow the Mueller probe to go ahead.

Then a number of other Congressmen who went in and read that Nunes memo, also came out and had some statements that were fairly short, but just as much to the point. Representative Jim Jordan from Ohio said, "What I read is as bad as I thought. Every American must see it to know what the FBI is up to." Congressman Scott Perry said, "You think about, 'Is this happening in America? Or is this the KGB?' That's how alarming it is." And Congressman Mark Meadows from North Carolina said, "It's troubling. It is shocking. Part of me wishes that I didn't read it, because I don't want to believe that those kinds of things could be happening in this country that I call home and love so much."

So, it makes you curious. What is in that memo, and will the Congress release that memo to the American people? Now the *Wall Street Journal* editorial board also came out and echoed exactly those same statements. It has a signed editorial under the title, "Transparency for Fusion and the FBI," and it calls for the release to the public of the House Intelligence Committee memo. It said the following: "The chance that Americans will learn what really happened between the FBI and Fusion GPS is growing, with Thursday's vote by the House Intelligence Committee to give every House member access to key information. Soon, the House should move to declassify all documents in the case that don't jeopardize intelligence sources and methods, so the public can get the complete story. The FBI played an extraordinary and trou-

bling role in the 2016 election, and access to the facts of what happened shouldn't be limited to FBI leakers, their media protectors, and partisans in Congress."

So, this is a very dramatic fight, and it goes directly along the lines of this fight over the existence of the U.S. Presidency. These seditious activities are intended to overthrow the duly elected President and, while he remains in office, to annihilate the potential for an end to geopolitics and a mutually beneficial relationship between the United States, Russia, and China. We see that there are high-level elements within his own administration who are going against that very intention, and are reinforcing this great-powers confrontation policy, this geopolitical agenda which led us into the Cold War and now could lead us to a hot war, World War III, which would be thermonuclear. We must take to heart what Helga Zepp-LaRouche has said: 2018 must be the end of geopolitics, or human civilization on this Earth very well might not survive.

So let me put our countdown on the screen one more time. There are eight days until President Trump's State of the Union address. It is coming up one week from tomorrow. Our campaign must be to put Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws on the agenda. That is, Glass-Steagall to erect a firewall between commercial banking and gambling on Wall Street; that entire bubble could blow out at any moment. We must instead return to national banking; what Alexander Hamilton originally instituted for this country. We must use that national banking capability to issue trillions of dollars in direct Federal credit for infrastructure and to uplift the skills and the technological level of the United States workforce, and to increase the productive powers of labor. And finally, that must all be included under a crash program for fusion power in the near term, and the expansion of manned space exploration. Secondly, this must all come within an end to geopolitics and a declaration that the United States is ending its policy of regime change, perpetual war, and competing economic blocs in a winner take all, zero-sum game strategy—and must instead join the New Silk Road and the paradigm of win-win cooperation that that represents.

So, we have eight days. We have a lot of work to do, and I hope that you will take the initiative to continue to escalate on this campaign and help us secure a victory.

Thank you very much for tuning in to larouchepac.com, and please stay tuned over the course of the coming week in what I'm sure will be a very dramatic eight days.