

Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ 35 år i dag: Omsæt Lyndon LaRouches vise ord til handling for et Strategisk Forsvar af Jorden. LPAC Internationale Webcast, 23. marts. 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: Det er i dag den 23. marts, 2018, en meget gunstig dato: Det er nemlig 35 års dagen for en meget vigtig dato, som var 23. marts, 1983, hvor præsident Ronald Reagan annoncerede vedtagelsen af det [Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ](#) (SDI; Strategic Defense Initiative). I dag er det et meget passende tidspunkt for at bedømme den stadigt mere presserende nødvendige vedtagelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur for planeten, og den samtidige nye økonomiske arkitektur, som må ledsage den.

Vi befinder os i et meget dramatisk øjeblik i verdenshistorien, og jeg mener, at, hvis vi træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede, så står det klart, at verdensordenen, som vi har kendt den i de seneste 70 år, er i færd med at undergå en total transformation. Og udfaldet af de strategiske kampe, der raser netop nu, både på den nationale scene her i USA, men især på den globale scene; udfaldet af disse strategiske kampe vil afgøre menneskehedens historie i mange generationer fremover.

Med de begivenheder, der har fundet sted i løbet af de seneste tre uger, siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin den 1. marts annoncerede, at Rusland havde udviklet en helt ny generation af strategiske våben, baseret på avancerede fysiske [principper], og som er i stand til at gennemtrænge alle kendte forsvarssystemer, har vi set, hvor dramatisk nødvendigt det er, med det presserende i en sådan ny sikkerhedsarkitektur. Ikke én, der bygger på Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD; garanteret gensidig ødelæggelse), men derimod én, der bygger på win-win-overlevelse og økonomisk fremskridt *for alle nationer* på denne planet; nødvendigheden heraf bliver i stigende grad mere presserende. Jeg vil gerne fremhæve, hvad præsident Putin selv sagde i denne tale 1. marts til den føderale forsamling:

Han sagde:

» ... lad os sætte os ved forhandlingsbordet og sammen udtænke et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation. ... Dette er et vendepunkt for hele verden og for dem, der er villige til, og i stand til, at forandre sig; de, der handler og går fremad, vil tage føringen.«

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/56957>

Men, snarere end klart og nøgternt at vurdere denne ændrede, strategiske virkelighed, med denne game-changing tale af Ruslands præsident, og besvare dette tilbud for at forhandle, med hans ord, »et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation«, for endelig at bringe denne nihilistiske dødsspiral med stadigt mere dødbringende masseudslettelsesvåben til en afslutning; snarere end at gøre dette, har briterne og deres såkaldte »partnere« i Europa forsøgt at oppiske en generel støtte til en krigskonfrontation mod Rusland ved anvendelse af det, Labour-partiets leder, Jeremy Corbyn, meget korrekt karakteriserede som det, han kaldte »fejlbehæftet efterretning« og »uvederhæftige dossiers« af den type, som blev brugt til at retfærdiggøre invasionen af Irak. Og som Jeremy Corbyn advarede om, så bør vi ikke »affinde os med en ny Kold Krig ... og en intolerance over for dissens som under McCarthy-perioden«.

Som [Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går understregede i sin internationale webcast](#), så har briterne og Theresa May, i deres forsøg på at gennemtvinge en sådan krigsprovokation, overspillet deres hånd. Deres metoder og deres mål står nu afsløret for hele verden at se. På trods af Theresa Mays bestræbelser på at presse præsident Trump over i et hjørne, hvor han ikke ville vove at forsøge at tage skridt, der ville gøre det muligt for ham at honorere sin forpligtelse til at forbedre relationerne med Rusland; snarere end at lade sig blive bakket ind i et hjørne, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, så udmanøvrerede præsident Trump imidlertid hele operationen ved at tage telefonen og ringe til præsident Putin og lykønske ham med genvalget og hans næste periode som Ruslands præsident, og fortsatte med en meget sober diskussion mellem de to statsoverhoveder om nogle af de meget vigtige, fælles bestræbelser og fælles udfordringer, som disse to nationer, USA og Rusland, sammen konfronteres med; og som, hvis vi fik lov at gøre det, vi kunne arbejde sammen om at løse, såsom krisen i Syrien; såsom muligheden for et totalt gennembrud for fred på Koreahalvøen; såsom den igangværende situation i Ukraine; og meget signifikant, såsom at forhindre et nyt våbenkapløb.

Umiddelbart efter denne telefonsamtale, blev pressen, som I kan tænke jer, hysterisk, og Det Hvide Hus' pressesekretær Sarah Sanders holdt en

pressekonference i briefing-værelset i Det Hvide Hus, hvor hun ikke mindre end et halvt dusin gange understregede den absolutte betydning af at opretholde en dialog mellem USA og Rusland på lederskabsniveau, omkring fælles interesser og fælles udfordringer.

Jeg vil afspille nogle eksempler på nogle af disse gentagne udtalelser fra Sarah Sanders på denne pressebriefing i Det Hvide Hus.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

SARAH SANDERS: We want to continue to have a dialogue with Russia, and continue to talk about some of the shared interests we have, whether it's North Korea, Iran, and particularly as the President noted today, slowing the tensions when it comes to an arms race, something that is clearly important to both leaders....

We want to continue to have dialogue so that we can work on some of the issues that concern both countries, and we're going to continue to do that, while also continuing to be tough on a number of things....

The President once again has maintained that it's important for us to have a dialogue with Russia so that we can focus on some areas of shared interests...

These are conversations that sometimes take place, and certainly the President finds there to be an importance in having that dialogue with Russia so that we can talk about some of the big problems that face the world....

We disagree with the fact that we shouldn't have conversations with Russia. There are important topics that we should be able to discuss, and that is why the President's going to continue to have that dialogue.

Again the focus was to talk about areas of shared interests.

We know that we need to continue a dialogue. It's important for a lot of the safety and security of people across the globe. We would like to be able to work with them on things like North Korea, on Iran, and also both countries shared interest in

lowering the tensions when it comes to an arms race, recognizing that that's not the best thing for either country, and so we want to be able to have those conversations and that was the point of today's call.... [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's a very clear message, obviously. Now, on the same day, President Trump himself reiterated exactly the same points in a couple of tweets that he posted, and I would like to just read you those tweets. He said:

"I called President Putin of Russia to congratulate him on his election victory (in past, Obama called him also). The Fake News Media is crazed because they wanted me to excoriate him. They are wrong! Getting along with Russia (and others) is a good thing, not a bad thing."

"They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran, and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried to get along, but didn't have the 'smarts.' Obama and Clinton tried, but didn't have the energy or chemistry (remember RESET). PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!" he concludes.

Now of course that final phrase is a quotation directly from President Ronald Reagan. And this direct reference is a very timely one, and perhaps is not merely a coincidental one: As I said, today, March 23rd, is the 35th anniversary of one of the groundbreaking moments in modern history, and it's one which completely reshaped the global, strategic geometry at that time, and which remains immediately relevant all the way up to the present day.

That moment, March 23rd, 1983 was representative of a complete shock, a shock wave which was felt around the world. This was the surprise announcement by President Ronald Reagan at the conclusion of a live, national television broadcast which was an address to the nation, nominally on national security. But what President Reagan did at the conclusion of that broadcast, to the surprise of almost all of his leading advisors in the White House even, was to announce what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, what President Reagan called a "vision of the future, which offers hope."

In the speech, what President Reagan did was that he committed the United States to a crash program, a crash scientific program for the development of advanced technologies which would be based on new physical principles to (quote/unquote) "free the world from the threat of nuclear war."

And so, in so doing, President Reagan completely overthrew the ideology of retaliatory nuclear deterrence through the threat of instantaneous, total nuclear response in the event of the detection of a nuclear attack against the territory of the United States. This was what was so-called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).

President Reagan completely rejected the very premise of Mutually Assured Destruction and in so doing, Reagan shocked the world, and truly did change the course of world history. So, right now, why don't we wind the clock back 35 years, and listen to what the world heard on that night, March 23rd, 1983:

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century...

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and defend against aggression – to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable – quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and

artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age...

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisors, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides...

Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today. What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort...

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose – one all people share – is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war. My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you. [end video]

OGDEN: That was 35 years ago today.

Now, just as a side note, incidentally, President Trump is not ignorant of this history. In 1999, far before he ever was a candidate for President, in a an interview with none other than Wolf Blitzer on CNN, President Trump actually addressed what he thought of as the necessity for the Strategic Defense Initiative, but also the necessity for sitting down and having talks to work out the tensions between the United States and Russia. Here's just a quick quote from President Trump. He said:

"As far as nuclear is concerned, this country, us, we need a shield..."

Wolf Blitzer said, "A Strategic Defense Initiative?"

And Trump affirmed that, saying, "Because Russia is unstable. We need a missile defense shield. People used to criticize Reagan, but now it's very developable. We need a shield... We need a change. The ABM Treaty was 1972. Who knew what technology would develop? We have to sit down with the Russians and many others."

So, that was just a side note. That was Nov. 28, 1999. But as I think you can see, now-President Trump remains committed to that inclination to sit down with the Russians and many others – North Korea, for example; and to resolve these nuclear threats. If you just go back again to that date in 1983, this was 35 years ago. In President Reagan's own words, he said that what he announced that night would, indeed, change the course of world history; and it did. And, it took most of the world completely by surprise. But, it didn't come out of nowhere, and this history is very important for viewers to understand.

Let me just read you a portion of what Lyndon LaRouche had to say at that time. This is a statement that he issued the morning following that historic speech, so this is from March 24, 1983. What Mr. LaRouche had to say was the following:

"Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the Earth-shaking impact the President's television address last night will have throughout the world... [T]he words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy announcement. With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

"Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope for humanity's future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten."

So that was Lyndon LaRouche, March 24, 1983. Now, as LaRouche alluded to in that statement, he was no bystander or casual observer of the events of that night President Reagan announced the SDI. In fact, the grand idea behind what Reagan

announced that night, came directly from none other than Lyndon LaRouche himself. I would like to play for you a brief excerpt of Mr. LaRouche, in his own words, speaking about the background to what had shocked the world that night – March 23, 1983. This is taken from a video that LaRouche PAC published about ten years ago, back in 2008, on the 25th anniversary of the SDI speech. The video was titled “A Brief History of Lyndon LaRouche’s SDI.” So, let’s listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say in that video.

LYNDON LAROUCHE

: I had been organizing the SDI operation, including initially from 1977, long before it was called an SDI. I was the one who said, “We’re going to make a project of this thing.” So, I adopted this and stated this as my program in 1979, when I was running as a Presidential candidate. Then, I had this conversation with Reagan, and then as a follow-up after he was President, we had a follow-up with various people in the Reagan circle; including his National Security Council. I was working with the head of the National Security Council on this operation, and with people from the CIA and this and that. I was sworn to this and sworn to that, so I was doing the whole thing. The SDI was my work, which they liked. And there was a faction, including the President, who liked it. He liked it because he was against, he always hated Henry Kissinger; and he hated Henry Kissinger particularly because of the so-called “revenge weapons.” The idea that you build super weapons, and if somebody throws a bomb at you, you obliterate the planet. That is not considered a good defense, and he was against that. When he saw from experts that what I was saying was accepted experts – military and others – and this was French intelligence, the leadership of the Gaullist faction in France; this was the leadership of the German military; this was the leadership of the Italian military, and all over the world. So, I was the creator of the SDI. Reagan liked it, he adopted it. I was creating the thing in direct cooperation during the entire period, with the cooperation of the National Security Council and the heads of the CIA. People recognized that I was right; I had the scientific capability and knowledge to do it, and we were doing it.

OGDEN: So, that's the story in Lyndon LaRouche's own words. That is merely the tip of a very fascinating iceberg. We encourage you to watch that full video that I cited that that excerpt was taken from. But also, to visit the page on the LaRouche PAC website which gives you the full background of this story. As you can see there, the link is larouchepac.com/sdi. That gives you this full, historic background. But as you heard Mr. LaRouche say there in that video clip, this effort on his part to craft the idea of what then became adopted by the President of the United States in the form of the SDI, this effort went all the way back to the mid-1970s. Here's an image of a campaign pamphlet which was commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, titled "Sputnik of the '70s: The Science behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon." In this pamphlet, Lyndon LaRouche called for an international crash program to develop a space-based missile defense system based on new physical principles. A Manhattan project-style mission which would provide the economic driver to fuel global development. The pamphlet proposed "... Long-range economic and scientific collaboration with the Soviet Union, among other nations, which would eliminate the danger of world obliteration," and it emphasized "... Tremendous revolutionary industrial implications available to this nation and the world if the political will of the United States forces a recommitment to technological progress in the form of an International Development Bank and its national concomitant Third National Bank."

So, as you can see, Lyndon LaRouche's idea of this missile defense system, was always framed around the idea of not unilateral defense systems, but rather, a joint missile defense and joint scientific and economic collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union. To do so, would be to unleash the revolutionary industrial and economic implications of such technological breakthroughs as the basis for a new international, economic order; something which he had been involved in all the way back to at least 1971 when he first issued the proposal for a new International Development Bank – the so-called IDB. So you can see in LaRouche's idea, the kernel of what became the SDI, always had with it a new international security architecture, overthrowing this entire reign of terror of Mutually Assured Destruction and revenge weapons. But concomitantly, a new international economic order, which would be driven by the revolutionary, unprecedented economic boom that

would come out of the progress associated with such technological breakthroughs around these new physical principles in the collaboration of US and Soviet scientists to develop this joint missile defense to make International Ballistic Missile and nuclear war impotent and obsolete.

The history is as fascinating as it is extensive. Here is not the time or the place to go through every single aspect of this history; but the full background, again as I said is available on that webpage – larouchepac.com/sdi. But if you fast forward from that pamphlet “Sputnik of the '70s” all the way to the lead-up into the 1980 Presidential campaign in which Lyndon LaRouche himself was a candidate for President of the United States. Let’s take a look at a picture here of Lyndon LaRouche meeting face-to-face with then-candidate Ronald Reagan at a candidates’ forum that took place in Concord, New Hampshire. During this face-to-face meeting and in several other opportunities to interface with the Reagan campaign team, Lyndon LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail. Following Reagan’s victory and his election, Lyndon LaRouche and representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with leading members of the National Security Council and Reagan’s intelligence community. They discussed LaRouche’s idea for this new strategic doctrine, and the related scientific and energy policies that would go along with it. So, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned numerous reports and campaign pamphlets promoting this idea. As you can see here, this is from {Fusion}; this is a special report titled “Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for Peace.” Here’s the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982. Again, before the March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI. This was titled “Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War.” Here’s another one; this is a pamphlet. “How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression.” So, all along, this was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche’s standpoint. As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of Reagan’s victory, 1980, '81, '82, the idea of this Beam Defense system which would be based on new physical principles, was associated – including in the popular mind – it was associated with Lyndon LaRouche. And it had been associated with Lyndon LaRouche for at least half a decade prior to Reagan’s historic,

groundbreaking speech.

The morning after Reagan's March 23rd address, the media was scrambling to try to find experts to interview to explain what it was that Reagan had presented the night before. Naturally, they had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization. Here's a photograph of Paul Gallagher, who was at that time Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, appearing on CBS' Evening News program on March 24, 1983 – the day following Reagan's address – to explain the science behind Reagan's policy that had been announced the evening before.

Immediately following Reagan's address to the nation, Lyndon LaRouche launched a mass educational campaign to educate the American people as to what their President had just presented. He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work. This image here is an array of different publications that were issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's announcement of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the scientific, the economic, and the military-strategic implications of the policy. There you can see one pamphlet – "Support the President's Strategic Defense Initiative; Kill Missiles, Not People."

As should be very clear, Lyndon LaRouche was in a leading position of authority following this groundbreaking announcement, and the influence that his ideas had come to wield put him in a position of real power inside the political structure of the Presidency of the United States. He used that influence to launch and to escalate on his campaign to completely reorganize the entire international economic and strategic architecture of the planet. Let's take a look at a document that Lyndon LaRouche released exactly one year following Reagan's March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI program. This was called "The LaRouche Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and the USSR." This was published March 30, 1984. Let me read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published under this title "The LaRouche Doctrine." He begins by saying: "The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and b) Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the benefits of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and all.

“The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary, economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and those relatively subordinated nations often classed as ‘developing nations.’ Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there can be no durable peace on this planet.

“Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both, the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers.

.. [T]he general advancement of the productive powers of labor in all sovereign states, most emphatically so-called developing nations, requires global emphasis on: a) increasing globally the percentiles of the labor force employed in scientific research and related functions of research and development ... b) increasing the absolute and relative scales of capital-goods production and also the rate of turnover in capital-goods production; and c) combining these two factors to accelerate technological progress in capital-goods outputs.

“Therefore, high rates of export of such capital-goods output to meet the needs of developing nations are indispensable for the general development of so-called developing nations: Our common goal, and our common interest, is promoting both the general welfare and promoting preconditions of durable peace between our two powers....

“By supplying increased amounts of high-technology capital goods to developing nations, the exporting economies foster increased rates of turnover in their own most advanced capital-goods sectors of production....

“The importer of such advanced capital goods increases the productive powers of labor in the economy of the importing nation. This enables the importing nation to produce its goods at a lower average social cost, and enables it to provide better-quality and cheaper goods as goods of payment to the nations exporting capital goods.

“Not only are the causes of simple humanity and general peace served by such policies of practice; the arrangement is

equally beneficial to exporting and importing nations...

.. [T]he general rate of advancement of the productive powers of labor is most efficiently promoted by no other policy of practice."

Then a little later in the report, he reviews the situation of strategic tensions between the USSR and the United States. He says:

"Since the rupture of the wartime alliance between the two powers, U.S. military policy toward the Soviet Union has passed through two phases. The first, from the close of the war until a point beyond the death of Joseph Stalin, was preparation for the contingency of what was sometimes named 'preventive nuclear war.' The second, emerging over the period from the death of Stalin into the early period of the administration of President John F. Kennedy, was based on the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response ...

"From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called 'détente,' between the two powers. This appearance was deceptive; during the period 1977-83, there was an accelerating deterioration in the military relationships between the two powers....

"Beginning shortly after the inauguration of President Jimmy Carter, the deterioration of the military situation accelerated....

"In response to this direction of developments, the U.S. public figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proposed that both powers develop, deploy, and agree to develop and deploy 'strategic' defensive, anti-ballistic-missile defense based on 'new physical principles.' This proposal was issued publicly by LaRouche beginning February 1982; he proposed to U.S.A., Western European, and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of such strategic defensive systems be adopted policy, as a means for escaping from the 'logic' of Nuclear Deterrence....

.. The true solution must be found in the domain of politics and economics, and the further shaping of military relations between the powers must produce military policies by each coherent with the direction of development of the needed political and economic solutions....

"On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred

endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of this planet. This shall become a community of principle coherent with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If any force should endeavor to destroy that community of principle, or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the United States will be prepared to defend that community and its members by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient. With respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United States offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might enter fully into participation within that community of principle...

"Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in development of the frontiers of scientific research, in laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations will be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems derived from application of 'new physical principles.'

"To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other nations in development of these new areas of scientific breakthrough for application to exploration of space.

"To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in scientific exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements protecting national and multinational programs for colonization of the Moon and Mars.

"At some early time, the powers shall enter into deliberations, selecting dates for initial manned colonization of the Moon and Mars, and the establishment of international space stations on the Moon and in the orbits of Moon and Mars, stations to be maintained by and in the common interest and use of space parties of all nations.

"The powers jointly agree upon the adoption of two tasks as the common interest of mankind, as well as the specific interest of each of the two powers: 1) The establishment of full economic equity respecting the conditions of individual life in all nations of this planet during a period of not more than 50 years; 2) Man's exploration and colonization of nearby space as the continuing common objective and interest of mankind during and beyond the completion of the first task. The adoption of these two working-goals as the common task and respective interest in

common of the two powers and other cooperating nations, constitutes the central point of reference for erosion of the potential political and economic causes of warfare between the powers.”

That was known as the “LaRouche Doctrine,” published March 30, 1984. As you can see, what Lyndon LaRouche outlined in that document was the basis for exactly what we’re calling now a new international economic and strategic architecture. In fact, the one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have the kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic development and the application of these groundbreaking new physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations – but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB.

As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called “developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny, I think that the echoes couldn’t be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the 1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa or Central and South America. Or, when President Putin offers to “sit down at the negotiating table and devise together a new and relevant system of international security and sustainable

development for human civilization," we should reflect on what was laid in that document. That LaRouche Doctrine now almost 35 years ago today, in the wake of that history-changing announcement by President Ronald Reagan, at which he called a spade a spade. The world could no longer survive under the dictatorship of Mutually Assured Destruction; that reign of terror that President Kennedy characterized as the Sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads over every man, woman, and child on this planet, threatening nuclear annihilation. What Lyndon LaRouche characterized at that moment as the "LaRouche Doctrine" is the principle behind the new economic and new security architecture which must be adopted on this planet today. Not as a recipe, not taking everything exactly as it was said, because clearly of course, the world has changed; and we must apply the principles that lay at the root of exactly what Lyndon LaRouche had in mind when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and when he proposed the subsequent LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit the specific conditions of today.

One thing that Lyndon LaRouche alluded to explicitly in that document, was the need for joint cooperation in the colonization and exploration of space. In fact, that is the form that the idea of a revived SDI has actually been taken. The proposal for not an SDI, but what's now called an SDE – the Strategic Defense of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India and other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech. What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr. Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading

science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other, and let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a "non-zero threat" – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is all the more timely and all the more relevant today.

So, what I'd like is to just play an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast that she delivered yesterday. She takes up exactly this idea, so here's an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling it "Star Wars," and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely is in this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and the Europeans.

This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among sovereign republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic today represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver in the economy to use the increased productivity of the real economy

for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector, in order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

And this is what we're seeing today, also, in the collaboration between China, Russia, and the countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think we should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of the Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another big asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth. So we need to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all countries should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future of humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of cooperation where we put all our forces together to solve those questions which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons, poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And I think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

OGDEN: So, that was Helga LaRouche's call to action, and I think that's a perfect concluding point for our webcast today, as we observe this very auspicious date – March 23rd – the 35th anniversary of President Reagan's groundbreaking speech announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative. Let's take that kind of sense of victory and the optimism that indeed, ideas can change the course of history, and consolidate this New Paradigm; this new security architecture and new economic architecture for the planet. The opportunity is greater than it ever has been before; but the need is ever more dire.

Thank you for joining me, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

USA understreger støtte til Saudi-Arabien i Yemen; Nye \$670 mio. i amerikanske våbensalg til saudierne

23. marts, 2018 – USA vil fortsat støtte saudiernes folkemordskrig i Yemen, er resultatet af den saudiske kronprins Mohammed bin Salmans besøg i Washington i denne uge. I går sagde forsvarsminister Mattis i Pentagon under sine åbningsbemærkninger, at USA og Saudi-Arabien »fortsat vil arbejde sammen for at bringe enhed, stabilitet og sikkerhed til området, for at bekæmpe terrororganisationer og afskrække Irans ondsksfulde aktiviteter«. En del af dette »samarbejde« består i en pakke militært udstyr til mellem \$670 mio. og \$1 mia., der sælges til Kongedømmet.

Mattis sagde, at han så udnævnelsen af en ny FN-udsending til Yemen, den britiske diplomat Martin Griffiths, som en mulighed for at fremskynde en politisk løsning på denne konflikt, »fordi det kan yde den regionale stabilitet, der er nødvendig for at beskytte jeres nation og nægte terrorister det sikre opholdssted, de søger, gennem stabile betingelser for alle yemenitiske borgeres menneskerettigheder«.

»Vi mener, at Saudi-Arabien er en del af denne løsning«, sagde Mattis. »De har været loyale mod den af FN anerkendte regering, og vi vil afslutte denne krig. Det er bundlinjen, og vi vil afslutte det på en positiv måde for Yemens befolkning, men som også yder sikkerhed for nationerne på halvøen.«

Saudierne har endnu en amerikansk handelsvare, de er interesseret i at købe – kernekraftværker. Selv om dette fremstilles som et køb til strengt civil anvendelse, har de insisteret på, at de får lov til – imod amerikansk lov – at udvikle uranberigelse og oparbejdning af brugt brændsel, som en garanti mod et muligt fremtidigt, iransk program for en bombe. Deres trussel er, at, hvis USA ikke giver adgang til dette krav, vil saudierne købe kraftværkerne fra Rusland eller Kina. USA's Kongres hælder imidlertid ikke mod at ændre loven under en sådan trussel.

Foto: De nådesløse luftangreb mod Yemen, udført af den saudiskledede koalition, fortsætter, her, februar, 2018.

Federal Reserve og infrastrukturprojekterne

23. marts, 2018 – Med Federal Reserves hævelse af Federal funds-renten til 1,75 % onsdag, og med yderligere to planlagte rentestigninger, har man regnet ud, at Fed vil udbetale \$37 mia. i 2018 i renter på overskydende reserver (IOER) til banker, der fortsat har overskydende reserver i Fed. Det drejer sig i overvældende grad om storbankerne på Wall Street og i City og London og andre europæiske storbanker, samt de store, amerikanske, regionale institutioner; og de har stadig næsten \$20 billion i overskydende reserver i Fed, i form af amerikanske statsobligationer.

Fed vil således udbetale dem \$37 mia. i år, for *ikke* at udlåne disse overskydende reserver, men til fortsat at bruge dem som instrumenter for sikkerhedsstillelse til spekulative handler.

\$37 mia. ville finansiere både hele Gateway Projektet og udskiftningen af Poe Locks, helt til deres færdiggørelse; eller, en ny jernbanetunnel i Baltimores havn og hele Texas kystbeskyttelse mod oversvømmelse og plan for vandmanagement, der har ventet på finansiering, siden 1968.

Federal Reserve anlagde første gang i historien IOER under finanskrakket i 2008. Selv de to Republikanske ledere af Husets Komite for finanstjenesteydelser, Jeb Hensarling og Patrick McHenry, truede gentagne gange Fed-formænd på komiteen med, at, hvis Fed ikke standser denne praksis, vil Kongressen tvinge dem til det. Men Fed ignorerer dem; Wall Street behøver stadig denne »støtte«; og de har ikke forsøgt at handle på disse trusler.

Den gennemsnitlige rente, der tilbydes sparere, som køber CD'er (Credit Default Swaps), er stadig ikke engang oppe på 1 % og ligger på 0,91 %, iflg. American Banker.

Foto: Houston, Texas, august 2017. Det er påkrævende nødvendigt at finde finansiering til at gå i gang med moderne infrastruktur til beskyttelse mod oversvømmelser, der jævnligt forekommer i området som følge af orkaner og koster menneskeliv og enorme ødelæggelser.

Perfide Albion: Det dødeligt sårede, britiske bestie slår fra sig; Forgiftningen af Skripal er desperat britisk forsøg på at genoplive deres amerikanske kup

Denne artikel vil udforske den strategiske betydning af betydningsfulde begivenheder i verden, med begyndelse i februar, 2018. Vores formål er præcist at placere Theresa Mays sindssyge bestræbelse den 12.-14. marts på at fabricere et nyt svindelnummer med »massetødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en efterretningsssvindler med hensyn til massetødelæggelsesvåben), som blev brugt til at trække USA ind i den katastrofale Irakkrig. Svindelnummeret med forgiftningen af Skripal involverer ligeledes direkte den britiske agent, Christopher Steele, den centrale person i det igangværende kup mod Donald Trump. Denne gang er den britiske operation for informationskrig direkte rettet mod at provokere Rusland samtidig med, at de fastholder den amerikanske befolkning og præsident Trump som mål for deres angreb.

Som den ophedede, krigstidslignende mediedækning og hysteriet omkring sagen gør det klart, så synes en vist lag i den britiske elite at være parat til at risikere alt på vegne af det døende imperiesystem. På trods af alt ståhejet, så synes økonomisk krigsførelse og sanktioner at være briternes foretrukne våben. Som vi vil få at se, så afslørede Putin for nylig Vestens atomare bluff. [1] Med Russiagate-kuppet mod Donald Trump, der er ved at ebbe ud og eksponerer den britiske agent Christopher Steele og et slæng af hans amerikanske venner til retsforfølgelse for kriminelle handlinger, var der et desperat behov for et nyt værktøj til at drive USA's præsident ind i det britiske, geopolitiske hjørne, som de har til fælles med det meste af det amerikanske establishment. Dette værktøj er et efterretnings-svindlernummer, et gennemprøvet og pålideligt britisk produkt.

Foto: Den britiske premierminister, Theresa May. (Photo: EU2017EE Estonian Presidency)

Regeringsfolk fra det Russiske Udenrigsministerium og Forsvarsministerium siger, London har trængt sig selv op i en 'blindgyde' i Skripal-affæren

21. marts, 2018 – I dag gav Vladimir Ermakov, chef for det Russiske Udenrigsministeriums departementet for ikkespredning og våbenkontrol, og major Igor Kirilov, øverstbefalende for Ruslands styrke til beskyttelse mod stråling, kemiske og biologiske agenter, en vidtgående og hårdtslående briefing i Udenrigsministeriet om Skripal-affæren, og om Londons grundløse beskyldninger mod Rusland, til alle udenlandske ambassadører i Moskva. Ifølge rapporter fra både Sputnik og TASS, var alle ambassadører fra den Europæiske Union, undtagen Storbritannien, til stede ved briefing. Maria Olson, talsperson for den amerikanske ambassade, sagde til TASS, at ambassadør Jon Huntsman ikke ville være til stede ved briefing, men at en »deltager på arbejdsgruppeniveau« i stedet ville være til stede.

Sammenfaldende med denne briefing kommer rapporten fra Moskvas ambassadør i London, Alexander Yakovenko, om, at, som resultat af det britiske hysteri mod Rusland, bliver russiske borgere, der bor og arbejder i UK, chikaneret og angrebet og frygter for deres og deres børns sikkerhed.

I deres bemærkninger rejste Ermakov og Kirilov skarpe spørgsmål om Londons irrationelle opførsel og om, at det fremfører beskyldninger, men ikke leverer noget bevis, samt ignorerer de klart definerede bestemmelser, der er fastlagt af Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW), om bilaterale konsultationer i sådanne sager. Rusland, sagde Ermakov, skylder ikke nogen noget og kan bestemt ikke gøres ansvarlig for »de britiske myndigheders sløse handlinger på deres eget territorium«, rapporterede TASS. Han sagde, at London i realiteten nu er ved at blive mere og mere nervøs, fordi de har »trængt sig selv op i en

blindgyde; men de vil sluttelig blive nødt til at besvare det voksende antal spørgsmål« om hele denne affære.

Ermakov bekræftede, at »enten er de britiske myndigheder ikke i stand til at beskytte mod terrorangreb på deres eget territorium, eller også iscenesatte de selv angrebet ... Hvis den efterforskede sag ikke bestemmes med sikkerhed«, sagde Ermakov, »og man bevidst mørklægger alle fakta, alt imens de reelle beviser måske allerede er forsvundet, eftersom dette er sket mere en én gang i UK, så er det uklart, hvad det drejer sig om fra UK's side.«

Alt imens han mindede om, at OPCW den 27. september, 2017, bekræftede, at Rusland totalt havde fuldført ødelæggelsen af dets lager af kemiske våben, påpegede general Kirilov, at USA endnu ikke har destrueret sit eget arsenal af kemiske våben. General Kirilov bemærkede ligeledes, at UK ikke har fremlagt nogen beviser for, at gassen, der angiveligt blev brugt til at forgifte Skripal, var fremstillet i Rusland og tilføjede, at UK i 1962 tog patent på fremstilling af et organophosphor-VX-nervestof, og at Porton Down-laboratoriet i London, blot få kilometer fra Salisbury, hvor Skripal og hans datter blev angrebet, var et af de britiske hovedcentre, der udførte research af stoffer til kemisk krigsførelse.

Foto: Vladimir Ermakov under briefing i det Russiske Udenrigsministerium.

[Perfide Albion delenda est](#)

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 21. marts, 2018 – Det britiske Imperium har, med truslen om sin endelige død, udløst et desperat kneb i denne måned og uden nogen beviser hævdet, at Rusland havde brugt nervegas til at angribe Sergei og Yulia Skripal på britisk jord. London opfordrede sine betroede allierede – og først og fremmest, USA – til at støtte op omkring dets onde, geopolitiske planer for krig mod Rusland, og sandsynligvis også Kina, og hvis formål er at bevare deres imperieopdeling af verden i Øst og Vest. Dette kneb har trods alt virket så ofte i fortiden. Som the Lord's elsker at sige: Britisk hjerne og amerikansk råstyrke kan bevare Imperiet, selv om den tid, hvor Britannia herskede over bølgerne, for længst er forbi.

Men, verden har ændret sig. Snarere end pligtskyldigt at følge den »særlige relation« med Moderlandet, ringede præsident Donald Trump i stedet tirsdag, 20.

marts, til præsident Vladimir Putin. Lederne af USA og Rusland holdt en værdig, langvarig diskussion om nødvendigheden af, at disse to store nationer, sammen med Kina under Xi Jinpings kompetente lederskab, kan og må gå i gang med at løse de mange eksistentielle kriser, som menneskeheden står overfor. Voksne mennesker, der diskuterer den virkelige verden og præsterer reelt lederskab for en verden, der er bragt ud på randen af et atomart holocaust og globalt, økonomisk kaos af det fejltagte lederskab, der præsteres af Londons Lord's og deres satraper i Europa og Amerika.

Sammen har præsidenterne Trump, Putin og Xi allerede demonstreret, at terrorisme kan besejres, og at verdensøkonomien, gennem økonomisksamarbejde i den Nye Silkevejsånd, kan bringe alle folkeslag ind i et fremgangsrigt og harmonisk paradigme for menneskelig udvikling.

For en gangs skyld må Perfide Albion stå alene, og det bliver i stigende grad åbenlyst for hele verden, at de intet ståsted har. I halvtreds år har Lyndon LaRouche advaret amerikanerne om, at britisk geopolitik og britiske monetære politikker var i færd med at drive USA og verden mod økonomisk ødelæggelse, alt imens USA fører kolonikrige på vegne af Imperiet. Den kendsgerning, at præsident Trump har helliget sig genindførelsen af det Amerikanske System, som Lyndon LaRouche (stort set alene) har været fortaler for i det forgangne halve århundrede samtidig med, at han erklærer, at stormagterne Rusland, Kina og USA må være venner, betyder, at Det britiske Imperium står over for den endelige død.

Dette er selvfølgelig grunden til, at britisk efterretning lancerede Russiagate-kupforsøget mod præsident Trump. Denne kampagne kolliderer nu, og dens gerningsmænd afsløres som forrædere, sammen med de korrupte medieselskaber, der har fået et apoplektisk anfald over Trumps opringning til Putin. Med et stærkt svækket Russiagate har præsident Trump vundet styrken til at gennemføre sine oprindelige, diplomatiske planer, som verden så det tirsdag, 20. marts, en dag, som vil gå over i historien. Gennemførelsen af det Amerikanske Systems økonomiske politikker, som fremlægges i [LaRouches Fire Love](#), haster ligeledes, med det forestående kollaps af finansboblen, som kan underminere det nye paradigme.

Tiden er inde til at handle. Verden ser nu Det britiske Imperium for det, det er, og ligeledes alternativet til det, i form af den Nye Silkevej, som skaber en fælles bestemmelse for fremskridt og samarbejde for alle nationer. Fokusér alle bestræbelser på dette strategiske mål. Tillad ingen afledninger. Sejren er for hånden.

Foto: US Marines øver dekontamineringsprocedurer, april 2013. (arkivfoto, US DoD)

De britiske imperie-eliters desperation tvinger dem til at begå en kæmpe brøler!

Helga-Zepp LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast. Video og eng. udskrift

Schlanger: Lad os begynde med betydningen af samtalen mellem Trump og Putin, Helga.

Zepp-LaRouche: Dette var en fremragende udmanøvrering af denne britiske operation, for netop, som Russiagate var forsvundet i USA eller næsten kollapsede og faktisk vendte sig mod britisk efterretnings rolle i hele denne affære, lancerede den britiske Theresa May denne absolut utrolige provokation mod Rusland. Det var et klart forsøg på at tvinge præsident Trump hen i et hjørne, hvor han ikke ville vove at forsøge at opfylde sit løfte om at forbedre relationerne med Rusland. Så, ved at lykønske Putin med genvalget til endnu seks år, og så have meget vigtige diskussioner om de virkelige udfordringer i verden, nemlig strategisk stabilitet, at forhindre et våbenkapløb; Syrien, Ukraine, Koreakrisen, etablerede de to præsidenter absolut en direkte forbindelse og fik den britiske bestræbelse til at se ud som det, den er, nemlig en absolut sindssyg provokation.

Engelsk udskrift:

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, March 22 2018

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Desperation of British Imperial Elites Forces Them To Make a Big Blunder

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger: Welcome to this week's Schiller Institute international webcast, featuring our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

In the last days the British have been in an open assault against Russia and Russian President Putin, using the Skripal case as the basis for that, with Theresa May going completely wild in trying to build a unified front against Russia, and implicitly, against President Trump's efforts to establish cooperative relationships between the United States and Russia. In the last days, this was completely outflanked by a call made between President Trump and Vladimir Putin. So we have lots to cover today, but I'd like to start there, with the significance of the Trump-Putin discussion, Helga.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this was a brilliant outflanking of this British operation, because, just as Russiagate had vanished in the United States, or almost collapsed, and actually turned against the role of the British intelligence in this whole thing, this is the moment when Theresa May launched this absolutely incredible provocation against Russia. And this was a clear effort to basically push President Trump into a corner, where he would not dare to try to make good on his promise to improve relations with Russia.

So by congratulating Putin for his reelection for another six years, and then having very, very important discussions about the issues which are the real challenges in the world, namely, strategic stability, prevention of the arms race, Syria, Ukraine, the Korea crisis, I think the two Presidents established absolutely a direct connection and it makes the British effort really look rather what it is, namely, an absolutely insane provocation.

Now, I think it's very important that in that same phone call, President Trump not only congratulated Putin for his reelection, but he also was very positive on the fact that President Xi Jinping, that the limit to his terms was eliminated, so he can stay on in these crucial years ahead. And he said this is a very good thing, because President Xi Jinping has provided

very, very good leadership.

I think the geopolitical faction is absolutely going bananas, and that is reflected in really hysterical media coverage about this, but I think it's a good thing. And the fact that there is a relationship and a dialogue among the Presidents of the three most important countries on the planet – the United States, Russia, and China – everybody who loves peace and who is not a moron should be happy about it. But if you contrast that with rather unbelievable warmongering of Stoltenberg, the head of NATO, for example – I mean, this guy, can you imagine he said, because there was this poison attack on Skripal, a former double agent, that means the likelihood that Russia is dropping nuclear bombs – this is {really} crazy.

The war faction, they have gone beyond all reason, and Merkel, the German Chancellor, when she went to Poland, even went so far as to say that Russia has to prove that they didn't do it! Can you imagine this? I mean, there is such a thing in international law as {in dubio pro reo}, which means "in doubt for the accused," and that the accuser has to provide the evidence and not the accused, and that's exactly what the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov said. And he used that occasion to say that Merkel's behavior, unfortunately, points in the direction that the European leaders are not coming back to reason. So I think, nothing can be expected from the Europeans at this point. The British are on a rampage; Merkel and Macron, for their own reasons, backed this up completely, and therefore I think it's very, very good that President Trump cut through all of this and established direct contact with Putin. {And} they announced that they will have a summit fairly soon between the two of them, Putin and Trump. And Serbia already offered Belgrade as a neutral place for the two to meet. So I think this is a very, very good sign.

SCHLANGER: And while this discussion has been going on, there have been a number of other discussions that I think are quite significant between the U.S. and Russian military, political leaders, a briefing at the Russian Foreign Ministry; it does appear as though the Trump administration and the Putin administration see this as an opportunity for outflanking it. Is that your assessment?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes. Because, as you said, there were all

kinds of other diplomatic initiatives. The two military chiefs of staff communicated, then there was a meeting between the Russian Ambassador Anatoly Antonov and Senator Rand Paul, which is very important, because in the midst of all of this demonization, almost nobody dared to speak with the Russian Ambassador, like what happened to Sessions. So, the two of them, Antonov and Rand Paul also agreed to reestablish U.S.-Russian inter-parliamentarian dialogue.

So every effort to reestablish dialogue and trust building, confidence building, is extremely welcome, because, as it has been developing – in the '60s and '70s you had the idea of an East policy, of rapprochement through cooperation, détente, trying to have a good-neighbor relationship in Europe, and all of that with, really, starting with PNAC, the Project for a New American Century, with the neo-cons when the Soviet Union collapsed, that basically led to a complete build-up of a Cold War mentality, NATO expansion, regime change, interventionist wars, and this has poisoned the atmosphere so much that you can really ask yourself, what was the purpose – or what {is} the purpose of that? What is the purpose, when the British are trying to build such a war-like enemy image of Russia? I mean, there are some few, very lonely voices who share our view, that once you build up such an enemy image, and you poison the atmosphere, you completely make wild accusations, I mean, this is the kind of atmosphere in which things can go very quickly very wrong. And that would be devastating.

Now, in this context, it's also noteworthy that there was a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, where the commander of the Strategic Command of the United States, General Hyten, was asked: Does the United States at this point have any defense against the kind of weapons systems which were announced by President Putin on March 1? And he said, no. Then his answer was to say, therefore, the use of low-yield nuclear weapons should be considered more strongly, which is in the new nuclear doctrine of the United States. And he was immediately refuted by a Democratic Senator who said, nobody should think that such so-called "low-yield nuclear weapons" use cannot immediately lead to an all-out nuclear war.

So people should not be blind in repeating this Cold War demonization against Russia, and in a certain sense against [China], because this is {really} dangerous. It's very dangerous. And you have the distinct feeling that with the

exception as such people as President Trump and a few others, that the present crop of politicians in leading positions have been so self-brainwashed and so incapable of strategic thinking, or even thinking of the consequences of what they're saying and doing, that they are not capable to see the cause and effect of their warmongering. And I think we need a real discussion that what is needed is cooperation, confidence-building, dialogue, cooperation on economic projects, cooperation in space, which was also mentioned in this context, as a positive step. But we have to have a debate that this kind of confrontation should stop, and we should support President Trump when he is trying to mend fences with Russia and China, and not attack him.

SCHLANGER: And there is a counterattack against May from within the United Kingdom, from Jeremy Corbyn, even from some of the people in the chemical weapons section of British intelligence. Will this backfire, this whole effort to turn this against Russia?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think it shows like never before, the role of the British, and I think that's a useful thing. Because those among our audience who know the LaRouche movement for a longer time, will remember that we were, and especially my husband, was always attacked for his having pointed to the role of the British. And it was the British Empire – which still exists, not in the old form, but it exists in the form of the leading financial institutions, and their whole system of private security firms, and the whole central bank/insurance company system. The trans-Atlantic financial structure, is the present form of the British Empire, and my husband always pointed to the fact that it is that which is corrupting the United States, and running much of the dope traffic. And he always was accused that said, the British monarchy is behind all of this. Now, anybody who looks at the present manipulation of the situation, can see very clearly the role of the British, the role of Boris Johnson, the role of Theresa May who are just the instruments of this. But I think this is very useful, because the real United States after all made an American Revolution and War of Independence against this British Empire, and if you look at the history, that same British Empire never gave up the idea of reconquering the United States, and finally they succeeded to establish the “special relationship” between the United States

and Great Britain to run the world as a unipolar world. And if President Trump breaks out of that, – and that was the real reason for the attacks on him – and establishes a direct communication with Russia and China, then that's the end of this kind of geopolitical manipulation, of divide and conquer of the world. And that is a very good thing. And I think that should happen, right now.

SCHLANGER: Well, when we talk about backfiring, this calls to mind something you often bring up, Schiller's idea of the "Ibykus principle." We see it also with Russiagate, in the firing of [FBI Deputy Director Andrew] McCabe in the last days; the focus now on [former CIA Director] John Brennan, – there are a whole series of articles attacking John Brennan, who's coming out openly saying, Trump is crazy, he has to be removed. And then, there's a whole story that the attempt to ensnare Trump in this Cambridge Analytica, and there's a whole different story that's now coming out on this. This is the Ibykus principle, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes. And it's also very useful, because we always warned against the addiction of young people to the so-called "social media," where real life, real friendships, real studying, real studying, were replaced by this almost autistic dependency on the so-called social media, which is a virtual reality. So-called "friends" are not friends – and now it turns out that this whole thing was just a commercial operation to collect private data, sell them for commercial and other interests. And I think it's a very useful think.

Interesting in this context is also a comment by Edward Snowden, who said: A firm which collects and sells private data should be rightly called a surveillance institution. And to call that social media is the most successful fraud since the story that the Department of War is really a Department of Defense was sold officially to the public.

So I think this whole affair should lead to a re-thinking, what do you do with this surveillance apparatus, and how do you trust this, and how do you demand, especially, the reestablishment of privacy control, control of private data, and forcing government and legislators to go back to a protection of the privacy of its citizens. I think the idea that everything is transparent and everything is allowed for everybody to be

manipulated, it's really part of giving up your individual freedom, and being completely controlled, profiled, shaped, nudged, – nudged into any direction – I think people should reflect on all of this, and not be so absolutely naïve. And I think this Cambridge Analytics story and the role of Facebook is a very useful reminder to think about these matters in a different way.

SCHLANGER: Well, then you have the whole other irony, of the efforts to pin Press Secretary Sanders down on why didn't Trump talk about the fraud in the Russian elections? And she made the comment that "we're not in the business of telling other countries how to run their elections," but it does seem as though we completely – by "we" I mean the United States government – constantly talk about Russian interference in private lives, when, what Snowden showed, and Clapper tried to lie to cover it up, is that the biggest violator of that is the National Security Agency!

Now, on the Ibykus principle, Helga, I don't know if we have enough on this, yet for you to say much, but it should be noted that former French President Nicolas Sarkozy was arrested yesterday, one day after the seventh anniversary of his role in working together with then British Prime Minister David Cameron, and also with Obama and Hillary Clinton, to destroy Libya and kill Qaddafi. Do you have anything on that story?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have to see what our French colleagues are actually saying about that. But I can tell you that much, that the story is breaking big time in Italy, where many former politicians are now commenting on it, saying it was a big mistake for Italy to be drawn into this war, basically by the British, by Hillary Clinton; who then convinced NATO, and then drew in Italy to join in this attack. And that they should have talked more to Germany at the time.

Germany at the time, the foreign minister was Guido Westerwelle, who fortunately refused to be part of this. But what these Italian politicians are pointing to, is – if the story is what the accusations are right now, which obviously needs to be determined – that Sarkozy did receive large money from Qaddafi. Qaddafi's son and former advisor have now testified that Sarkozy would have demanded \$50 million for his election campaign; Qaddafi only gave him \$20 million, but then

that Sarkozy later – that’s what the Italian media and some politicians are saying right now – carried out person warfare against Qaddafi, to eliminate a witness. If that is true, it would be a really incredible story! And these Italian politicians, former deputy secretary of defense, for example, say that this war has led to a complete destruction of Libya, terrible economic, social and humanitarian catastrophes erupting out of that. The whole Libyan state is still completely torn apart, and part of the refugee crisis, and naturally, the impact of that on Italy, in terms of the refugees, in terms of energy supplies and so forth, was quite devastating.

But this is just one more symptom among many. Because if you look at what has come out in terms of the political class, the managers, academia, – there has never been such an open disgrace of so many representatives of this so-called “elite” and establishment, that I think it is a very serious problem we have in the West! And the reason why, in Europe, for example, some of these right-wing populist parties are coming up, is because of that. And you have right now, a completely collapse and disappearance of the so-called people’s parties, and they’re being replaced by populist movements or extreme right-wing movements, and I think it’s a reflection of a real moral crisis of the West.

And that’s why we need a change, we need a New Paradigm, and we need to call on you, you the audience, you our viewers, to help us and enter with us into a discourse: Where should our future be and why we need a New Paradigm.

SCHLANGER: And let’s move now from this discussion of the corruption of the establishment in the West, and we should just remind listeners that Hillary Clinton played a big role in the Libya operation, and this was one of the points that President Trump focussed on, when he said that this administration would stop regime-change policies.

But let’s move to something much more positive. You brought up the New Paradigm: President Xi Jinping just gave a closing speech at the “two sessions” conferences in China, in which he reiterated the long-term goals for China in his Presidency, and I’d like your thoughts on what he had to say.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, first of all, he emphasized both humility and pride. He said the purpose of leadership is to

serve the people, and he repeated that many times, and thanked the Chinese population for having the confidence in him to continue his leadership. And naturally, the Western media were completely freaked out about Xi Jinping being now in the leadership position in the next period indefinitely. But from a Chinese standpoint, Xi Jinping has proven to be an exceptional leader. And he said, this is going to be a very difficult period for China, because it takes place in a very complex world situation; and he, indeed, called for a new "Long March." And this is quite an amazing historic reference to this history of China.

So I think he is clearly somebody who is devoted to the common good of the Chinese people, and the contrast to what China is actually doing, and how the Chinese people are happy to have such a leader – as the Russian people are happy to have Putin; after all, 76% vote for Putin is more than the West for sure expected. And there is a very funny little joke: Saying that, oh, Putin won the election – and the Russians did it! (Anyway, I find this amusing with all of this Russia-bashing, that the Russians are behind everything.)

So I think we have a situation where Russia is clearly responding to Putin's leadership. China is clearly devoted to continuing on the course of the New Silk Road, the Belt and Road initiative; many more countries are joining, and even Morgan Stanley, one of the Wall Street banks, put out a report saying this is the largest infrastructure project in history and it will continue, it will make China a very strong, modern economy, with wealthy inhabitants and all the countries that join will have the same; and they say that the AIIB is estimating that there is an infrastructure financing gap of something like \$21 trillion. And this is obviously a gigantic task to accomplish, because the previous leading financial institutions of the West, the IMF and World Bank, they did not give that kind of development credit, and therefore China is doing something for the uplifting of the developing countries, which is actually priceless, because, for the first time, these countries have the chance to overcome their situation which has been really terrible.

And I think it's very good, because the New Silk Road Spirit is something which, once people understand it, that it's based on the idea of a harmonious development of all, working together for the mutual benefit; naturally, China is pursuing its interests, but all the other countries are happy, that for the first time,

somebody is taking care of their interests as well.

So I think the whole propaganda about China is really – that's what it is: It's propaganda, coming from geopolitical warmongering people in the West, and we should build a mass movement of people who say "no": We should take up the offer of Xi Jinping and have a win-win cooperation, join the New Silk Road projects, and there are plenty of tasks where we can have a common destiny of mankind. And Xi Jinping, in this speech, he used the very beautiful idea, "let the Sun shine on the shared community for the one future of humanity," and basically, make it innumerable.

SCHLANGER: In contrast to the positive report from Morgan Stanley on China, we saw one of the chief market economists for Goldman Sachs, a man named Himmelberg, warning of the financial fragility in the West, especially if liquidity flows are cut, and of course, yesterday the Federal Reserve Board met, and said they're going to cut liquidity flows by raising interest rates another three to five times over the next 12 months! So I think we can see the contrast very clearly.

Now one of the other areas where a contrast comes in, that in spite of the threats from the anti-China lobby in the United States about the "danger" of China becoming a hegemonic power, we see developments that continue to be positive on the Korean Peninsula, which include collaboration between President Trump and Xi Jinping. There's a couple of summits that were announced, and Helga, it looks as though this is just going to continue to build toward the possibility of an outbreak of peace: how horrible, huh?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yeah. The possibility that it comes to a trilateral summit in May, between Trump, Kim Jong-un, and President Moon Jae-in from South Korea, is right now very likely. Also, there will be other summits, involving Japan, Russia; so I think there is a strategic realignment.

And I really think that the countries that are stubbornly insisting on the geopolitical confrontation, they will be sidelined. I'm not underestimating the danger as we can see by the British behavior, but I think the overwhelming tendency is really development and cooperation, and this is a very good thing.

Let me just mention one last point on this contrast: While

China is cooperating with many African nations, building railways, we talked about the beautiful Transaqua project which is now on the table, and this is bringing the Silk Road Spirit into Africa. Now, what is the EU doing? They just had an African Union/EU summit in Kigali, in Rwanda, where only 25 Africa countries participated, and notably absent was President Muhammadu Buhari of Nigeria, who refused to go, and does not want to have Nigeria sign the proposed free trade agreement between the AU and the EU. Why? Because naturally, many of the industries of African nations are still in their infancy, very backward and not developed, and fragile; and if you have a free trade agreement, then all the European products would just flood the African markets even more than they do already, and that way, absolutely prevent and strangle the young, emerging industries in the African nations. And therefore, some of the Africans are just refusing to go along with it.

But the reason why I'm mentioning it, is because it just shows you that the neoliberal/neo-con geopolitical system is really not out for win-win. They want to exploit their advantages, and that the EU is doing that is really one more reason to say that they represent a system which is not in the interest of anybody they cooperate with, nor their own members. And if you want to know the proof of that, just look at the southern European countries, which have been completely smashed by the austerity policies of the Troika, and I think that what we need instead is exactly what Italy is now doing: working with China and the African nations in building up real economic development like the Transaqua project.

So I think we have a real, very crystal clear picture, where you see the intention of the two paradigms. The old paradigm of neoliberal control of the world, and the New Paradigm of harmonious development of all nations. And I think people should really help to make sure that the second one becomes the victorious one, and join with us!

SCHLANGER: And Helga, when you talk about being stuck in the old paradigm, do you have anything to say about the new appointments to the new German government?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yeah. That is a very sad story. As for Mrs. Merkel who had nothing better to do than to be the puppy dog of the British, really, this is a disgrace, and it should be noted

and understood by everybody.

But also the SPD, which is in a deep crisis, they have been falling in the polls to less than 15%; the new Finance Minister Olaf Scholz, what did he do? He appointed a banker from Goldman Sachs, Jörg Kukies, to be the deputy finance minister, and that has caused a revolt in the German population. There was a poll whereby 64.9% of the people thought this was disgusting. And then he also appointed another guy, called Gatzert, who is known to be the architect of the "black zero" policy of Schäuble. And then Scholz said oh, he's so happy that he was able to put together a good team.

Now, that forebodes not good things for Germany, because as everybody knows, we are on the verge of a new financial crash, and this was again mentioned by Sheila Bair, the former head of the FDIC in the United States, who warned that the absolute continuation of the derivatives trade, the speculative excesses, the non-correction of the reasons that led to the 2008 crisis, means we are in absolute danger of a new, even bigger crash. And she contrasted that, by the way, with what China has been doing, by trying to completely forbid speculative investments, by stabilizing the banking sector by increasing the reserves of the banks to 15%.

But if you have such a pro-bubble government in Germany this is not good. And also despite the fact that there are many Italian politicians from the Lega and Five Star Party who are calling for Glass-Steagall, the EU is trying to get a Five Star/Democratic Party coalition government, which would be from their standpoint, the optimal option to preserve this speculative system.

So I'm saying this because the Damocles Sword of a new financial crash is absolutely still hanging over the world. All I can say is, given the fact that China has tried to move it's financial into safe waters, they are probably better protected against the effects of such a crisis, coming than anybody else. And I would ask our viewership, join with us, join with the Schiller Institute to try to help mobilize for the Four Laws proposed by my husband: Glass-Steagall, a return to Hamiltonian banking; a credit system and National Bank; a crash program for thermonuclear fusion research and power, cooperation in space exploration. And join with the New Silk Road countries, and we could have a New Paradigm in the world very, very quickly. But it requires you. And it requires people to become active and no

leave events and history of mankind in the hands of an obviously corrupt establishment.

SCHLANGER: Helga, I think we can conclude by coming to the commemoration of an event which proved that cynics are not right, that people who say you can't change the world with big ideas – 35 years ago from tomorrow, March 23rd, 1983, there was a shock effect around the world, when Ronald Reagan gave a primetime speech, and at the end of that speech, he endorsed the policy that your husband first introduced with his pamphlet "Sputnik of the '80s" in the late 1970s – that is, the Strategic Defense Initiative. And it's especially relevant today, given what we're seeing from Russia and President Putin. So I'd like your reflections on the importance of the anniversary of this event from 35 years ago.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling it "Star Wars," and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. ["The LaRouche Doctrine: A Draft Memorandum for an Agreement between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.," {EIR}, April 17,1984] This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely is in this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and the Europeans.

This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among sovereign republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic today represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver in the economy to use the increased productivity of the real economy for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector, in order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

And this is what we're seeing today, also, in the collaboration between China, Russia and the countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think we should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of the Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another big asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth: So we need to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all countries should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future of humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of cooperation where we put all our forces together to solve those questions which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons, poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And I think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need more active citizens: So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

SCHLANGER: I think that's a very good place to end. People should now realize that giving up your pessimism is one of the keys to bringing online this new paradigm.

So, Helga thank you very much for joining us today, and we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, see you next week.

NYHEDSORIENTERING MARTS 2018: **Rusland: Ven eller fjende?**

Forgiftningen af den russiske/britiske eks-spion: Britisk informationskrig forsøger at provokere Rusland og genoplive deres amerikanske kup.

Vores formål er præcist at placere Theresa Mays sindssyge bestræbelse den 12.-14. marts på at fabrikere et nyt svindelnummer med »masseødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en efterretningssvindel med hensyn til masseødelæggelsesvåben), som blev brugt til at trække USA ind i den katastrofale Irakkrig. Svindelnummeret med forgiftningen af Skripal involverer ligeledes direkte den britiske agent, Christopher Steele, den centrale person i det igangværende kup mod Donald Trump.

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

Hvad mener Aarhus Universitet egentlig?

af Hans Schultz fhv. kandidat til Folketings- og Kommunal-valg for Schiller Instituttets Venner, marts 2018 – Lektor emeritus i bioscience fra Aarhus Universitet Per Nørnberg skriver i en kronik i Jyllands-Posten bragt d. 28. februar 2018, at vi grundlæggende set mangler en pest i ny og næ til at reducere verdensbefolkningen med – sikkert lidt ligesom den mørke tidsalder i det 14. århundrede da byldepesten hærgede i Europa. 2,5 mia. mennesker på jorden er, hvad Per Nørnberg stiler efter, hvor andre af lignende overbevisning kan nævne en eller en halv mia. mennesker som deres 'drømmescenarie'.

Med det menneskesyn, der ligger bag denne tankegang, må man jo konkludere, at Adolf Hitler var en våbenfælde for denne 'bæredygtige' verdensorden. Måske med den undtagelse, at Hitler også forårsagede død blandt de forkerte mennesker, såsom europæere og jøder. Per Nørnberg peger nemlig direkte på Afrika som det sted, hvor befolkningen først og fremmest skal reduceres, ud fra hvilket man nødvendigvis må konkludere, at det er udviklingslandene, der er det første mål for reduktion. Altså må disse befolkninger bestå af mennesker af mindre værd end kaukasiske hvide. Dette er en grundtanke bag nazismen, som Per Nørnberg altså fremturer med.

Per Nørnbergs argumenter er et sammensurium af forskellige emner, som klimaforandring, flygtningeproblemer, biodiversitet – ingen overraskelser her –

og meget andet mellem himmel og jord. Fælles for det hele er, at Per Nørnberg ikke viser den mindste indsigt i de dybere detaljer for hver enkelt af de sager, han nævner, men agerer som en elefant, der forsøger sig med broderi.

At ressourcer ikke er begrænsede, og at der findes løsninger på verdens fattigdomsproblemer, optræder ikke i Per Nørnbergs optik. For eksempel har Lake Chad-myndigheden netop holdt en succesrig konference om megaprojektet Transaqua, der handler om at omlede en del af vandet fra tilløbsfloderne til Kongofloden op til Chad-søen beliggende mellem Niger, Nigeria, Cameroun og Chad. Dette viser en vej til, hvordan man faktisk kan forbedre levebetingelserne for nogle af de fattigste mennesker på jorden, fremfor at stigmatisere dem, ved at erklære dem som problemet.

Afrika er ikke overbefolket, men mangler derimod udvikling. Og fattigdom er ikke en naturlig konsekvens af demografi eller lignende, men er politisk kunstigt iscenesat. Netop nu er en historisk udvikling i gang, båret af Kinas Bælte og Vej Initiativ (BRI) også kaldt 'Den Nye Silkevej', som gør det muligt for verdens fattigste befolkninger en gang for alle at gøre op med fortidens åg fra kolonimagterne og befri sig fra århundreders fattigdom.

Men Per Nørnbergs verdensopfattelse kommer af hans grundlæggende menneskesyn. Et menneskesyn han deler med bl.a. prins Philip Mountbatten, medstifter af Verdensnaturfonden, Adolf Hitler, der vidst ikke behøver yderligere introduktion, samt Winston Churchill, der bl.a. stod for den forcerede udsultning af 4 millioner Bengalere i året 1943 alene. Spørgsmålet er så, om Aarhus Universitet som institution også deler Per Nørnbergs syn. Står Connie Hedegaard, formand for AU's bestyrelse, på linje med dette syn? Og hvad med de andre universiteter her i Danmark?

Link til artikel på Jyllandsposten:

<https://jyllands-posten.dk/debat/kronik/ECE10357910/det-egentlige-problem-er-befolkningsudviklingen/>

[Trump til Putin – Lad os mødes snart](#)

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 20. marts, 2018 – Præsident Trump har netop trukket tæppet væk under den skøre lady, Theresa May, og den endnu mere skøre udenrigsminister Boris Johnson. Alt imens disse afdankede forsvarere af det

døende, britiske imperium beskylder Rusland for krigshandlinger, beskyldninger, der typisk ikke er baseret på nogen beviser, ringede Trump i dag og talte med den netop genvalgte præsident Vladimir Putin. Trump ikke alene lykønskede Putin for hans valgsejr, men annoncerede til den amerikanske presse, at han og Putin »sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke så fjern fremtid« for at diskutere forholdsregler for at forhindre et våbenkapløb og finde fredelige løsninger på kriserne i Ukraine, Syrien og Nordkorea. Kremls udskrift af samtalen lød, at de to ledere »talte for at udvikle praktisk samarbejde inden for forskellige felter, inkl. bestræbelser for at sikre strategisk stabilitet og bekæmpe international terrorisme, med særlig vægt på betydningen af koordinerede bestræbelser på at begrænse et våbenkapløb.« Kreml tilføjede: »Samtalen om økonomisk samarbejde afslørede en interesse i at styrke det. Energi blev diskuteret særskilt.«

Her til aften vil briterne bide i gulvtæppet. Ikke alene har Trump ødelagt deres kneb med at beskyldte Rusland for et kemisk krigsangreb på britisk jord; men også svindelnummeret med »Russiagate« i USA, som køres direkte af MI6-agenten Christopher Steele og hans agenter internt i USA, er kollapsede. Nu står aktørerne i dette kupforsøg mod den amerikanske regering – inkl. John Brennan, James Clapper, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton og flere nyligt fyrede FBI-operatører – over for mulige anklager om kriminelle handlinger for det mest åbenlyse forræderi i moderne amerikansk historie, alt sammen på vegne af Det britiske Imperium.

For at gøre det hele værre for den ynkelige, håbefulde »M« og hendes kohorte, har »BoJo«-Labour-leder Jeremy Corbyn, der efter al sandsynlighed ville vinde et valg mod May, hvis det blev afholdt nu, krævet, at May fremlægger beviser (hvis der eksisterer nogen) for den nervegift, der blev brugt i Skripal-angrebet, over for russerne og (ligesom præsident Trump) insisteret på, at forhandlinger med russerne er absolut nødvendigt. I et BBC-interview her til morgen mindede han også landet om de katastrofale resultater af Tony Blairs tidligere forfalskede efterretninger om Iraks masseødelæggelsesvåben.

Og, for lige at banke sømmet dybere ind, så bekræftede talsperson for Det Hvide Hus Sarah Sanders, at nervegiftangrebet i UK slet ikke blev nævnt i telefonsamtalen mellem Trump og Putin!

Det nye paradigme er ved at komme i fokus på globalt plan: ikke alene lykønskede Trump Putin med at vinde seks år mere på posten, men sagde også, at det var godt, at Kina har ophævet begrænsninger af embedsperioder – for, sagde han, Xi Jinping er en storslået leder.

I dag talte Xi Jinping for den afsluttende forsamling i den 13. Nationale Folkekongres og udtrykte tillid til, at den kinesiske foryngelse vil fortsætte og ekspandere, med Kina, der bidrager endnu mere til global regeringsførelse og global udvikling gennem den Nye Silkevej. »Lad solskinet fra et fællesskab for en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden oplyse verden«, sluttede han.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i dag, at præsidenterne Trump, Putin og Xi viser sandt lederskab for verden, alt imens Det britiske Imperiums desperate handlinger er begyndt at give bagslag. Tidligere har britiske imperieintriger været støttet af svage, amerikanske ledere, der endda stillede sig i spidsen for håndhævelse af britisk politik, som i krigen i Indokina, Irakkrigen og krigen i Libyen, samt i de radikale politikker for det 'frie marked', som holdt de tidligere kolonisationer økonomisk tilbagestående samtidig med at ødelægge de industrialiserede nationer i Europa og Nordamerika.

Men Trump har nægtet at lade sig udnytte af den »særlige relation« og har i stedet fremført, at imperieopdelingen i Øst og Vest skal være forbi. I sin besejring af kupmagerne kan han også gennemføre sit løfte om at vende USA tilbage til det Amerikanske System for fysisk økonomi og opgive den fejlslagne, britiske »frie markedsmode« til fordel for en dirigeret kreditpolitik i Hamiltons tradition til genopbygning af Amerikas industrielle infrastruktur. Situationen er stadig ekstremt farlig, men aldrig har vi været så tæt på at afslutte selve eksistensen af Imperium, én gang for alle.

Foto: Trump og Putin hilser på hinanden på APEC-topmødets første dag. 10. nov., 2017, De Nang, Vietnam.

[Præsident Trump ringer til Putin for at diskutere strategisk samarbejde og muligt møde](#)

20. marts, 2018 – I samtale med reportere under sit møde i dag i det ovale kontor med den saudiske prins Mohammad bin Salman, annoncerede præsident Donald Trump rask, at han havde ringet til den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tidligere på dagen for at lykønske ham med hans valgsejr og foreslå, at de to

skulle mødes »i en ikke for fjern fremtid« for at diskutere, hvordan de i fællesskab kunne forhindre et våbenkapløb, blandt andre afgørende spørgsmål.

Som præsidenten forklarede: »telefonsamtalen havde også at gøre med det faktum, at vi sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke for fjern fremtid, så vi kan diskutere våben, diskutere våbenkapløbet. Som I ved, så har han erklæret, at det, at være i et våbenkapløb, ikke er så godt. Det var lige efter valget – en af de første udtalelser, han kom med.

Vi vil bruge \$700 mia. i år på vores militær, og meget af det er, at vi fortsat vil være langt stærkere end nogen anden nation i verden.

Vi havde en meget god samtale, og jeg regner med, at vi sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke så fjern fremtid for at diskutere våbenkapløbet, der er ved at komme ud af kontrol, men vi vil aldrig tillade nogen at have noget, der blot nærmer sig det, vi har. Og ligeledes for at diskutere Ukraine og Syrien og Nordkorea og forskellige andre ting«, sluttede han.

De amerikanske medier, både i »anti-Trump« CNN og »pro-Trump« Fox News versionen, viste deres britiske stamtavle ved at gå bersærk mod Trump, for at tale med Putin.

Kremls udskrift af samtalen var i overensstemmelse med ånden i præsident Trumps rapport om de to ledes diskussioner, inkl. at omtale interessen i at øge det økonomiske samarbejde.

»Donald Trump lykønskede Vladimir Putin med hans valgsejr i præsidentvalget. Lederne talte til fordel for at udvikle praktisk samarbejde inden for forskellige områder, inkl. bestræbelser på at sikre strategisk stabilitet og bekæmpe international terrorisme, med særlig vægt på betydningen af koordinerede bestræbelser for at forhindre et våbenkapløb«, rapporterede Kreml.

»Ordvekslingen om økonomisk samarbejde afslørede en interesse i at styrke det. Energi blev særskilt diskuteret.

Problemet med Syrien blev diskuteret, såvel som også den interne krise i Ukraine. Der var en erkendelse fra begge sider af nødvendigheden af at gøre hurtige fremskridt mod opnåelse af afgørelser.

Der blev udtrykt tilfredshed med den begrænsede reduktion af spændinger omkring Koreahalvøen. Det hensigtsmæssige i at fortsætte med konstante bestræbelser for at løse situationen ved fredelige, diplomatiske midler blev understreget.

Det aftaltes at udvikle yderligere bilaterale kontakter i lyset af ændringerne i det Amerikanske Udenrigsministeriums lederskab. Muligheden for at arrangere et møde på topniveau fik særlig opmærksomhed.

Generelt var samtalen konstruktiv og forretningsmæssig, med fokus på at overvinde de akkumulerede problemer i de russisk-amerikanske relationer», sluttede det.

Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump ringede i dag til præsident Vladimir Putin for at lykønske ham med valgsejren i søndags. Her ses de to ledere under G20-topmødet i Hamborg, 7. juli, 2017.

[Den italienske økonom Alberto Bagnai, nyvalgt senator, promoverer Glass-Steagall for Italien](#)

15. marts, 2018 – Den velkendte økonom Alberto Bagnai er blevet valgt til det italienske senat for Lega. I et langt videointerview med videoblog Byoblu understreger han Glass-Steagall som en del af forklaringen på, at han, en venstreorienteret intellektuel, tilsluttede sig et »højrefløjsparti« som Lega. Venstrefløjen er opdelt i to lejre, siger Bagnai: de beredvillige bødler, der sidder i regeringen, og de nyttige idioter for finanskapitalen såsom dem, der kræver magt til folket.

»Jeg er ikke fordomsfuld over for finanssektoren. Vi er blevet stalket af folk, der insisterer på, at penge er djævelens afføring – et sted mellem St. Bernadine af Sienna og et psykiatrisk hospital. Men siden venstrefløjen gik med i regering ... er denne funktion svulmet op. Finans er blevet en kræftudvækst, og det må vi tackle. I Legas program er der nogle korrigerende forholdsregler; for eksempel bankopdeling mellem kommercielle banker og investeringsbanker«, den klassiske beskrivelse af FDR's Glass/Steagall-lov fra 1933.

Foto: Den italienske økonom Alberto Bagnai, nyvalgt senator for Lega, går ind for bankopdeling.

Meddelelse: Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast,
torsdag 22. marts 2018 kl. 18 dansk tid:
De britiske imperie-eliters desperation
tvinger dem til at begå en kæmpebrøler!

<http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com/>

Facaden, der har dækket for de århundredlange metoder, som de britiske imperieeliter har brugt for at opretholde deres kontrol, er i færd med at blive revet i stumper og stykker, og deres desperation er blevet særdeles synlig nu, hvor de agerer åbenlyst, i deres eget navn! Dette er en kæmpebrøler, idet selv de, der fornægter eksistensen af Det britiske Imperium, nu kan se, at London åbenlyst står i spidsen for et fremstød for krig. I de seneste par dage er de irrationelle tirader mod Rusland fra Theresa May og Boris Johnson blevet mere og mere skingre og demonstrerer klart deres frygt for, at de er ved at miste kontrollen.

Konsolideringen af lederskabet i Rusland og Kina omkring præsidenterne Putin og Xi står i grel kontrast til sammenbruddet af de regerende partier i det transatlantiske område, med begyndelse i Brexit. De fortsatte indikationer på, at præsident Trump går ind for samarbejde med Rusland og Kina snarere end geopolitisk konfrontation, forhøjer hysteriet i London. Alt imens en krig fortsat er en reel mulighed pga. britiske provokationer, så er det også højst tænkeligt, at det, vi hører, er et kollapsende imperiums dødsrallen.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentagent har understreget, så er det Nye Paradigmes »win-win«-fremgangsmåde, centreret omkring Kinas Nye Silkevejspolitik, ustoppelig. Hør med på torsdag, når Helga fremlægger sin enestående analyse af, hvad der nu må til, stedt over for Londons optrappede fremstød for krig, for at høste fordelene for menneskeheden af et Nyt Paradigme, baseret på økonomisk

samarbejde på den største skala i menneskets historie.

Putin vinder sin fjerde periode; Krim stemmer for første gang til præsidentvalg

19. marts, 2018 – Ifølge Ruslands Centrale Valgkommission har den siddende statsleder Vladimir Putin høstet 76,65 % af stemmerne i valget 18. marts, med 99,84 % af stemmerne, der er optalt. Stemmeprocenten var 67 %. Direktør for Lenin Statsfarmen Pavel Grudinin, nomineret af Ruslands Kommunistiske Parti, kom på andenpladsen med 11,82 % af stemmerne, alt imens lederen af Ruslands Liberal-Demokratiske Parti (LDPR) Vladimir Zhirinovskiy er på en tredjeplads med 5,68 %.

»Hovedområder, som vi vil fokusere på, er emner på den hjemlige dagsorden: først og fremmest forholdsregler til stimulering af Ruslands økonomiske vækst med en impuls fra innovation; udvikling af sundhedssektoren, uddannelse, industriproduktion, infrastruktur og andre områder, der er af vital betydning for yderligere fremskridt i landet og for at hæve levestandarden«, sagde Putin ved et møde med folk, der sammen med ham præsiderede hans valghovedkvarter, rapporterer TASS. »Dette vil vi give stor opmærksomhed.«

»Der er spørgsmål i forbindelse med at sikre landets sikkerhed og nationale forsvarsevne«, udtalte han. »Dette er også afgørende spørgsmål, men det vigtigste for os er den hjemlige dagsorden.«

Da kampagnemedarbejderne sang, »Pu-tin, Pu-tin«, ændrede Putin det kraftfuldt til »Rus-land, Rus-land«.

Putin vandt også stort på Krim, med 92,15 % af stemmerne i det, der var Krims første deltagelse i et russisk præsidentvalg, sagde formand for den regionale valgkommission, Mikhail Malyshev, til reportere. Ifølge de foreløbige data, høstede den siddende præsident Vladimir Putin 92,15 % af stemmerne; 985.117 vælgere stemte på ham.

Foto: Folk vifter med russiske flag, mens de venter på valgresultaterne på Manezhnaya-pladsen, nær Kreml, i Moskva, søndag, 18. marts, 2018.

Londons scenarie for krig, eller Kinas scenarie for fremskridt? Hvad vælger Amerika?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 19. marts, 2018 – Den britiske regerings nu dagligt eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland er drevet af de mest korrupte motiver og tilsigter frem for alt at trække USA ind i – det, der kunne blive krig, endda en »krig uden overlevende«.

I løbet af de seneste 48 timer er tre nye »narrativer« om angivelige russiske angreb mod Storbritannien blevet sendt ud af London, som konstant optrapper og forandrer den oprindelige, udokumenterede anklage om, at Rusland – og dernæst, russere efter præsident Putins personlige ordre – forsøgte at myrde en MI6-dobbeltagent i England. Og de britiske medier har gjort en dristig »militær udfordring af Rusland« ud af en øvelse med britiske ubåde, læsset med amerikanske atommissiler, sammen med amerikanske atomubåde under polarisen.

Hvilke motiver har den britiske udenrigsminister Boris Johnson, der ser ud, og agerer, som »Col. Blimp« fra tegneserien fra Første Verdenskrig, og Theresa May, der blev premierminister ved et tilfælde, og som har den stilling, Johnson troede, ville blive hans? De er imperialister af en finansiell og geopolitisk London-orden, som, forventer de, vil blive håndhævet militært af USA.

De ser denne geopolitiske orden blive erstattet af Kinas nye paradigme for samarbejde mellem stormagter for alle nationers fremskridt og deres befolkningers produktivitet: Bælte & Vej Initiativet med nye infrastrukturprojekter og udryddelse af fattigdom. De ønsker Kina holdt tilbage, Bælte & Vej sat under City of Londons regler; men de kan ikke få det til at ske. De ønsker Kinas allierede Rusland konfronteret og endda udfordret til kamp.

De konfronteres selv med utilfredse britiske befolkninger og en determineret og bredt støttet leder i Labours Jeremy Corbyn, som bekæmper deres geopolitiske politikker og City of Londons finansielle, imperiale bankcentrums finansielle forbrydelser. De ønsker Corbyn tjæret som en »håndlanger for Kreml« af tabloidpressen, og drevet ud.

De ser fortsat stærk modstand mod Londons geopolitik fra præsident Donald Trump. Efter 18 måneders nonstop angreb på Trump, der har deres udspring i britiske

efterretningstjenester, som sigter på at knække ham eller fjerne ham, går han stadig ind for samarbejde mellem stormagterne og vinder støtte i den amerikanske befolkning.

De står meget snart over for endnu et krak i London-Wall Street-kabalen, værre end i 2007-08. Det britiske Imperiums svar på denne trussel har altid været krig.

På trods af hysterisk støtte i de store medier, så har de »nye Churchills« fra London ikke det momentum, de forestiller sig, for krigskonfrontation. Ikke engang i UK – men, for dem er det, at køre USA, altid det, der tæller mest.

Det, der nu er afgørende, er, at præsident Trump og USA vælger tilbuddet fra Kina, Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og lader dets paradigme for produktiv, økonomisk fremskridt dryppe lidt på os.

Skattelettelser og afregulering af Wall Street har ikke genoplivet, og vil ikke genoplive, amerikansk vækst fra dens lange stagnation, og heller ikke udfylde USA's enorme infrastrukturunderskud. Det vil derimod de tiltag, som stifter af EIR, Lyndon LaRouche, har foreslået, med begyndelse i Glass/Steagall-loven til at bryde Wall Street op. Disse tiltag, som omfatter den første, statslige kreditinstitution, USA har haft siden Franklin Roosevelts Reconstruction Finance Corp., har til formål at slutte USA til et globalt samarbejde mellem suveræne nationer for »menneskehedens fælles mål«.

Det betyder at vælge Kinas fremskridt til, og Storbritanniens krig fra.

Foto: Vladimir Putin og Theresa May diskuterede spørgsmål af fælles interesse for Rusland og Storbritannien. Hangzhou, Kina, 4. september, 2016 (Kreml).

[Det britiske Imperiums lange historie med nazistiske ABC-eksperimenter på](#)

menesker

17. marts, 2018 – I dagene efter, at den britiske premierminister Theresa May udløste hysteri over den angivelige forgiftning af den britiske dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal, sættes der fornyet fokus på Det britiske Imperiums egen historie for arbejde med kemiske og biologiske krigsvåben. Dette omfatter at trække artikler frem fra arkiverne om disse emner.

Den første af disse artikler fra arkiverne, som vi er blevet opmærksomme på, blev udgivet i avisen *Guardian* den 6. maj, 2004, og som rapporterer om daværende ny research af eksperimenter, udført på britiske soldater, med reel nervegift i 1950'erne og 1960'erne. »Ud fra et rent videnskabeligt synspunkt, producerede de en enorm mængde data om virkningerne af nervegas på den menneskelige krop«, skrev Rob Evans, forfatter af *Gassed: British Chemical Warfare Experiments on Humans at Porton Down*. (Porton Down er Storbritanniens hemmelighedsfulde videnskabelige og teknologiske forsvarslaboratorie, som angiveligt identificerede Novichok-nervegiften i Skripal-sagen.) »Disse data har igen gjort det muligt for Porton at udvikle nogle af de mest sofistikerede forsvar i verden for at beskytte Storbritanniens bevæbnede styrker mod kemiske angreb«. Evans rapporterede yderligere, at disse nazistisk-lignende eksperimenter (vores betegnelse, ikke hans) på mennesker har været en integreret del af arbejdet på Porton Down, siden det blev oprettet i 1916.

Endnu en sådan rapport fremkom i *Independent* den 8. juli, 2015, og som afslørede ny research af britiske regeringseksperimenter med både kemiske og biologiske gifte på den almindelige befolkning, uden dennes vidende. »I flere end 70 hemmelige operationer, blev hundrede tusinder af almindelige briter udsat for 'fingerede' biologiske og kemiske krigsangreb, lanceret fra fly, skibe og automobiler«, rapporterede *Independent*. Research udført af Ulf Schmidt, professor i moderne historie ved Universitetet i Kent, afslørede, at britiske militærfly kastede tusindvis af kilo af et kemikalie af 'stort set ukendt giftigt potentiale' på britiske, civile befolkninger i og omkring Salisbury i Wiltshire, Cardington i Bedfordshire og Norwich i Norfolk. Det anvendte kemikalie, zink cadmiumsulfid, mentes at være harmløst, men er siden blevet anset for at være kræftfremkaldende.

I maj 1964 gennemførte forskere fra Porton Down også et eksperiment i Londons undergrundsbanesystem, hvor de spredte en bakterie ved navn *Bacillus globigii*. På det tidspunkt, rapporterede *Independent*, »mente regeringen, at *Bacillus globigii* var harmløse – men i dag anses de for at være en årsag til fødevareforgiftning, øjeninfektioner og endda blodforgiftning«.

I 1950'erne tilbragte britiske forskere 15 måneder i Nigeria – som dengang stadig var en britisk koloni – med at udføre nervegaseksperimenter, selv om omfanget af virkningen på den lokale befolkning tilsyneladende ikke kendes.

Billede: Studie af kunstneren John Singer Sargent til hans oliemaleri, 'Gassed', fra 1918-1919. Maleriet, der måler 231 cm x 611 cm, hænger på Imperial War Museum og blev kommissioneret af British War Memorials Committee for at dokumentere krigen. Maleriet blev i 1919 vedtaget som 'årets billede' af Royal Academy of Arts.

[Kina fornyer tilbud til Europa om samarbejde om Bælte & Vej, 'et globalt offentligt gode'](#)

17. marts, 2018 – I en artikel, der torsdag blev udgivet på websiden Euractiv, skrev den kinesiske ambassadør til den Europæiske Union, Zhang Ming, at »Regeringer i 11 EU-medlemsstater har underskrevet dokumenter om samarbejde med Bælte & Vej Initiativet sammen med den kinesiske regering«, og at »EU's udenrigshandel vil stige med 6 % pga. Initiativet, iflg. den økonomiske tænketank Bruegel, der har hjemsted i Bruxelles. Ekspresgodstogene mellem Kina og Europa har travlt med at krydse det eurasiske kontinent. I 2017 var der totalt set 3.673 ture, en stigning på 116 % (!) i forhold til 2016, og som overstiger det samlede antal ture i de forgangne seks år. Togforbindelserne når 36 europæiske byer i 13 lande og gør europæiske varers adgang til det kinesiske marked meget lettere«.

»Desuden er et stort antal projekter godt i gang, såsom infrastruktur, logistik, havne, e-handel og finans. For eksempel købte et kinesiske foretagende i Serbien et stålvalseværk, der havde vanskeligheder, og vendte det på under et år. I Grækenland genvandt havnen i Piræus sin position som en af de største havne i Europa. I Det forenede Kongerige er Kina gået i partnerskab med Frankrig om at bygge et kernekraftværk, et stjerneeksempel på samarbejde mellem tre parter under Initiativet«, skrev ambassadøren.

Men iflg. Zhang vil Bælte & Vej Initiativets potentiale imidlertid først nå sin

fuldstændige udfoldelse, når alle spillere indser dets betydning og tager del i det på en upartisk måde. Til dette formål gentog han tre basale faktorer:

Det er ikke en ensidig strategi, eller Kinas »Marshallplan«, som nogle har kaldt det, men det »har til hensigt at fremme økonomisk samarbejde gennem infrastruktur-konnektivitet og frembringe fælles udvikling ved at bruge alle deltagernes sammenlignelige styrker til maksimal fordel. Som et globalt, offentligt gode, følger Initiativet den gyldne regel om udstrakt rådslagning, fælles bidrag og fælles fordele«.

Det er ikke en ensrettet vej, som kun giver Kina mulighed for at eksportere dets teknologier og manpower. Det er snarere baseret på udstrakt rådslagning og kommunikation. »Alle projekter under Bælte & Vej må gennemgå velinformerede forundersøgelser, som udføres af de interesserede parter, og må følge markedsprincipper og internationale regler. Alle projekter må være resultatorienteret, af høj standard og bæredygtige. Vores mål er ikke blot at styrke infrastrukturens fysiske konnektivitet, men også at forbedre den institutionelle konnektivitet mht. regler og standarder.«

Bælte & Vej Initiativet »er så stort et foretagende, at det må involvere mange deltagere, inkl. dem fra Europa. Alt imens hver enkelt deltager kommer fra forskellige baggrunde og har forskellige behov, så respekterer vi denne diversitet og anser fleksibilitet i vores samarbejde for vigtigt, i stedet for at insistere på ensartethed«, sagde Zhang.

Selv om det blev formuleret høfligt, så er budskabet til EU og dets besættelse af ensartethed klart. »Vi er fortsat forpligtet over for at gå i partnerskab med vore europæiske venner i en ånd af åbenhed. Lad os rådslå med hinanden, bidrage og dele sammen for at gøre Bælte & Vej Initiativet til en succes«, konkluderede han.

Foto: Ambassadør Zhang Ming, chef for den kinesiske mission til EU.

[Russisk militær anklager, at USA støtter provokation med kemiske våben i det sydlige Syrien](#)

17. marts, 2018 – Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium fremførte i dag den anklage, at det amerikanske militær, som opererer ud fra sin illegale base i Al Tanf, Syrien, i nærheden af det sted, hvor den irakiske og jordanske grænse møder den syriske grænse, er i færd med at forberede en provokation med kemiske våben i

det sydlige Syrien, og som skal bruges som påskud for amerikanske luftangreb mod syriske regeringsstyrker. Chefen for den russiske generalstabs Operationelle Hoveddirektorat, oberst general Sergei Rudskoy, sagde i Forsvarsministeriet i dag, at »det russiske parti har beviser for, at amerikanske instruktører har uddannet flere oprørsgrupper nær al-Tanf med det formål at udføre provokationer med kemiske våben i det sydlige Syrien«. Disse oprørs-sabotagegrupper blev dernæst deployeret til deeskaleringszonen i Daraa, i det sydlige Syrien. »De er i færd med at forberede provokationer med anvendelse af eksplosive mekanismer, der har monteret giftstoffer«, sagde Rudskoy. »Dette faktum vil i fremtiden blive brugt til at anklage regeringstropperne for at bruge kemiske våben.«

En lignende provokation er ligeledes i færd med at blive forberedt for Idlib, fremførte den russiske militærmand. »De bevæbnede grupperinger Jabhat al-Nusra, med støtte fra de såkaldte 'Hvide Hjelme', er i færd med at forberede iscenesatte kemiske angreb nær bebyggelserne al-Habid og Qalb Luza, der ligger 25 km nordvest for Idlib. Derfor er 20 containere med kloringas blevet leveret dér«, sagde Rudskoy. »Sådanne provokationer vil give USA og dets koalition belæg for et angreb imod militære faciliteter og regeringsfaciliteter i Syrien.«

»Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium understregede, at der er klare beviser for forberedelser til de mulige angreb«, sagde Rudskoy. »Der er grupper af skibe med missiler, som er deployeret i den østlige del af Middelhavet, den Persiske Golf og det Røde Hav. Det stiller spørgsmålet – hvem er det, USA vil støtte med disse angreb? Vil det være Jabhat al-Nusra og dets søsterafdelinger, som begår uhyrligheder i landet? Den russiske generalstab overvåger fortsat situationen i den Syriske Arabiske Republik.«

Hangarskibet *USS Theodore Roosevelt* og dets angrebsgruppe, bestående af tre destroyere med styrede missiler og en krydser, opererer aktuelt i den Persiske Golf. U.S. Naval Institute News' seneste Naval Tracker, opdateret 27. feb., rapporterer, at USA's Femte Flåde har 20 krigsskibe, som aktuelt opererer under flåden, og hvor den Sjette Flåde, der har hovedkvarter i Napoli, Italien, har 16. En stor del af disse fartøjer vil være i stand til at medføre Tomahawk-krydsermissiler.

Foto: Talsmand for den russiske generalstab, Sergey Rudskoy. (Photo Sputnik News)

Talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium advarer om »Giftige Londons« Atomare Lege

17. marts, 2018 – I et interview den 13. marts til Rossiya-1 Tv's »60 Minutes«-program, dagen efter den britiske premierminister Theresa Mays absurde ultimatum til den russiske regering i sagen om den »forgiftede eks-spion«, sagde talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, til sine værter, at hun *ikke* ville tale om London og gift, men snarere »om et giftigt London«.

Zakharova kaldte den britiske PM's »cirkusnummer« i parlamentet for »et klassisk eksempel på den britiske propagandamaskine ... som insinuerer, at 'det kunne have været Rusland, var måske Rusland'«. Men, dette er et meget farligt »cirkus«, gjorde Zakharova det klart. May fremlagde ingen beviser, ingen kendsgerninger, og beordrede dog den russiske regering til at komme med svar inden for 24 timer, sagde hun. »Sådanne udtalelser kommer fra en premierminister, der er et medlem af et land med atomvåben og permanent medlem af FN's Sikkerhedsråd.«

Zakharova mindede alle seerne om præsident Putins afsløringer den 1. marts af de defensive, strategiske våbensystemer, Rusland har udviklet. »Står det klart for alle, hvorfor vi har brug for disse våben? Efter dette show i Det forenede Kongeriges parlament, må alle forstå, at, efter det, præsidenten har talt om, kan ingen person i parlamentet bare sige, 'jeg giver Rusland 24 timer'.

Jeg gentager. Vi taler om London, hovedstad i et atomvåbenland. Hvem gav de 24 timer? For hvad gav de 24 timer? ...

Lad os kalde det, hvad det er. Kald det ikke en hændelse. Det er en storslået, international provokation«, advarede hun.

Hun nævnte Tony Blairs såkaldte undskyldning for de falske efterretninger, der blev brugt til at starte Irakkrigen, og spurgte: »Hvordan skal vi kunne tro på folk, som allerede har undskyldt for hundrede millioner af ødelagte liv?« En »overfladisk undskyldning«, bemærkede Zakharova, som kun blev givet til »dem selv, fordi det hele handler om britiske skatteydere og tab af britiske liv. De har stadig ikke undskyldt over for ét eneste land, hvor deres soldater satte fødderne, hvor civile døde, hvor almindelige liv forvandlede til ruiner pga.

deres sammensværgelser og intriger ... Ikke én eneste historie af samme art er resulteret i nogen som helst form for sandhed.«

Det samme gælder for tidligere anklager om, at den russiske stat havde dræbt andre russere, der boede i UK (Litvinenko, Berezovskij osv.), bemærkede hun. »Først lancerer de en sindssyg propagandakampagne, og så forsegler de data. Så afsiger domstolene en afgørelse, men der er ingen, der ved, hvad de er, for alting er klassificeret. Hvorfor er de så klassificeret, at vi ikke engang kan diskutere dem?«

Zakharova gjorde det ligeledes klart, at den russiske regering fortsætter med indtrængende at opfordre USA til ikke at bøje sig for »giftige London«. Til en af værternes klage over, at USA, med hvem Rusland har en mekanisme for at dele efterretninger, ikke engang spurgte Rusland, om den nervegift, der angiveligt skulle have været brugt, var Ruslands, svarede hun:

»Hør her, der er terroristangreb i Syrien, så de to sider, Moskva og USA, er kokke i samme køkken. Terrorisme er et fælles problem; det er overalt. Så de forsøger at bringe den form for tillid, vi plejede at have i vore dialoger, tilbage.« Hun nævnte russisk efterretnings tidligere indsats med at advare deres amerikanske kolleger om Boston Maraton-bombemanden, hvor USA desværre »ikke tog denne information alvorligt. Lad os se på de nylige begivenheder ... Disse data blev korrekt behandlet, og et terrorangreb blev forhindret. Disse forsøg kritiseres omgående i Washington. Hvorfor? Til hvilket formål? Almindelige mennesker, der intet har med politik at gøre, som går på indkøb, går i skole, går i teatret; de blev reddet. Det er godt!«

Foto: Talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova.

[Fr. »M« trækker vestlige allierede ind i farlig konfrontation med Rusland](#)

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. marts, 2018 – I sin artikel den 17. marts, skrevet til den tyske avis [Neue Solidarität](#), der udkommer ugentligt, advarede Schiller Instituttets stifter og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche om, at vestlige ledere

kapitulation til Det britiske Imperiums sindssyge provokationer mod Rusland har forværret den strategiske krise og forhøjet faren for krig. Vi citerer uddrag af hendes artikel her:

»Blot en enkelt dag efter, at kansler Merkel i sit embedsløfte svor at 'beskytte det tyske folk mod ondt', støttede hun fuldt og helt den britiske regerings uansvarlige provokation mod Rusland i en fælles erklæring fra den franske, amerikanske, britiske og tyske regering. Macron, Trump, May og Merkel enedes om, at der 'ikke var nogen troværdig, alternativ forklaring' på giftangrebet mod den tidligere dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal og hans datter Yulia ud over, at Rusland var ansvarligt for det. Men denne operation er så åbenlys, at der kun er én troværdig forklaring på den: Det britiske Imperium ønsker at trække hele Vesten ind i en optrapning af en ny Kold Krig, og muligvis mere. Og fr. Merkel er med til at støtte det, uden tøven.

I mellemtiden har en række kendte eksperter påpeget, at ultimatummet på blot én dag, som Theresa May gav den russiske regering til at forklare, hvordan nervegiften 'Novichok' kom fra Rusland til Storbritannien, er et klart brud på reglerne i OPCW [Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben], som også UK er medlem af. Det ville have været nødvendigt, bemærker de, at udlevere en prøve på giften til OPCW for en uafhængig efterforskning, og den anklagede part, i dette tilfælde Rusland, skulle have fået ti dage til at svare på anklagerne. Den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Usbekistan, [Craig Murray, karakteriserede 'Novichok'-historien](#), for hvilken den britiske regering ikke har præsenteret den mindste smule bevis, som et svindelnummer i samme tradition som anklagerne om Iraks angivelige masseødelæggelsesvåben.

(Man vil huske, at et memo fra den britiske efterretningstjeneste MI6 fremlagde dette forslag).

Murray udtalte, at chefen for UK's eneste facilitet for kemiske våben, dr. Robin Black, i et prestigøst videnskabeligt magasin i 2016 havde understreget, at beviserne for eksistensen af denne gift var sparsomme, og at dets kemiske sammensætning var ukendt. Ikke desto mindre påstod Theresa May, selv om Storbritannien selvsagt ikke havde nogen prøver, dvs., at de ikke havde noget, med hvilket de kunne have sammenlignet den giftige substans, som blev brugt i angrebet på Skripal, at Rusland alene bar ansvaret for det. Storbritanniens facilitet for kemiske våben ligger tilfældigvis i Porton Down, som interessant nok blot er 12 km fra Salisbury, hvor angrebet fandt sted. I betragtning af den tvivlsomme karakter af Novichoks eksistens, besluttede OPCW ikke at føje det til listen over kemiske våben.

Tingene bliver endnu mere interessante, når det kommer til Christopher Steeles rolle i denne affære. Sergei Skripal, der dengang arbejdede for den russiske militære efterretningstjeneste, blev angiveligt 'vendt' i 1995 af en MI6-agent ved navn Pablo Miller i en operation, som blev koordineret af Steele, der dengang arbejdede i Moskva under diplomatisk dække. Da Steele 'forlod' MI6 i 2009, stiftede han det private sikkerhedsfirma Orbis Business International, hvis varemærke er at markedsføre anklager imod Rusland i PR-stil. Et af firmaets operationer var 'Operation Charlemagne', om den såkaldte russiske indblanding i valgene i Frankrig, Italien, Storbritannien og Tyskland, såvel som også den angivelige finansiering af Marine Le Pen, Silvio Berlusconi og partiet Alternativ for Tyskland (AfD) og en russisk kampagne for at ødelægge EU.

Men hans absolutte mesterværk som spion er kupforsøget mod Donald Trump via det aftalte spil mellem Obama-administrationens efterretningschefer, DNC [Democratic National Committee], Hillary Clintons kampagne og de britiske efterretningstjenester, og som udelukkende var baseret på det 'slibrige dossier' om Trump, som Steele et Orbis havde fremstillet. USA's Repræsentanternes Hus' efterretningskomite har netop udgivet resultaterne af sin ét år lange efterforskning, som fandt, at der ikke fandt noget 'aftalt spil' sted mellem den russiske regering og Trump-teamet.«

Senere i sin artikel nævner Zepp-LaRouche, at en anden aktør i Orbis-operationen var Andrew Wood, den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Moskva på netop det tidspunkt, hvor Skripal blev rekrutteret af Miller i en operation, der blev koordineret af Steele. Desuden var Steele selv den ansvarlige MI6-officer for anklagerne mod Rusland i sagen om den tidligere KGB-, FSB-agent Alexander Litvinenko, der døde i London i 2006.

Med andre ord, den samme kreds af 'tidligere' MI6-agenter, der står for propagandaoperationen om angiveligt 'aftalt spil' mellem Trump og Rusland, som nu er blevet miskrediteret som 'fake news', var og er i centrum for Skripal-angrebet. Hvis det går som en and, rapper som en and og ser ud som en and, så er det efter al sandsynlighed at dømme, en and; dvs., en operation på vegne af britisk efterretning.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer indtrængende Tyskland til at nægte at gå med på den hysteriske kampagne mod Rusland, og ligeledes mod Kina, og til i stedet at slutte sig til det Nye Paradigme. Hun konkluderer, at, hvis premierminister Theresa nu forestiller sig, at hun må imitere den britiske skuespillerinde Judi Dench, der spillede rollen som 'M' i James Bond-film – den chef, som Bond rapporterede til – så er det et tilfælde af ekstremt dårlig smag. »At tillade sig selv at blive trukket ind i en konfrontation med Rusland af en sådan

rollemodel, er uansvarligt.«

Foto: Genvalgte kansler Angela Merkel (højre) og britiske PM Theresa May (midten) enedes tirsdag 13. marts om, at allierede burde handle samstemmigt for at imødegå »Ruslands aggressive adfærdsmønster« efter giftangrebet på UK's territorium af en tidligere russisk dobbeltagent, Sergei Skripal. Frankrigs præsident Emmanuel Macron (venstre), såvel som også USA's præsident Donald Trump, har ligeledes givet deres støtte til briternes udlægning af sagen; at Rusland er den ansvarlige. (Arkivfoto).

Mere end nogensinde før er det presserende nødvendigt at afslutte geopolitik.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast,
16. marts, 2018.

Fuldt dansk udskrift

Vi befinder os nu i en situation, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche tidligere i dag beskrev som »ildevarslende«; det var det ord, hun brugte. Hun sagde, »Dette kan kun forstås som et miljø med førkrigs-propaganda«. Hun sagde, at den respons, vi har set fra Vesten, fra flere lande i Europa og inkl. her i USA, til den bizarre sag med forgiftningen i Salisbury, Storbritannien, af en russisk eksspion, der blev britisk spion, ved anvendelse af en angivelig nervegift; hun sagde, at dette nu har skabt det, der kun kan betegnes som en ekstremt farlig situation, som meget let kunne eskalere hurtigt og føre til krig. Hun sagde, »Man må stille sig selv det indlysende spørgsmål: Hvor fører alt dette hen?«

Nøglefaktoren her, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har understreget, er timing. Denne begivenhed, og alt det, der efterfølgende har udviklet sig med den, kom direkte i hælene på: 1) præsident Putins annoncering i sin tale for den føderale forsamling den 1. marts af denne nye generation strategiske våben, der totalt har ændret den internationale, geopolitiske struktur; og 2) annonceringen fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der præsideres af kongresmedlem Devin Nunes, nogle få dage senere af, at de havde afsluttet deres efterforskning og konkluderet, at

der absolut ikke fandt noget 'aftalt spil' sted mellem Trump-kampagnen og russerne. Dette var absolut hele grundlaget for Christopher Steeles Russiagate-narrativ.

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

[Xi Jinping genvalgt til præsident for Kina, aflægger sit embedsløfte](#)

17. marts, 2018 – Folkets Nationalkongres valgte her til morgen Xi Jinping til Kinas præsident for endnu en periode, og til formand for den Kinesiske Militærkommission. I en hidtil fuldstændig uset ceremoni bragte et militært kontingent, efter valget, den reviderede forfatning frem, og Xi og de andre valgte regeringsfolk aflagde et embedsløfte på forfatningen.

Forfatningen indeholdt naturligvis mange af de formuleringer, som Xi har udtrykt i sin nye vision for Kinas foryngelse, og nogle af disse var også reflekteret i formuleringen af løftet. Tidligere var der ikke noget løfte over for forfatningen (selv om partimedlemmer aflægger et løfte som medlemmer af Kinas Kommunistiske Parti). Men, eftersom dette nu er indført af Kinas præsident, vil det nu blive en vedtaget praksis.

I Kinas historie har præsident- og vicepræsidentembedet snarere været af formel end reel karakter. Deng Xiaoping besad ingen af disse poster, men han var formand for Kinas Militærkommission og næsten altid den, der bestemte. Det har nu ændret sig. Og posten som partiets generalsekretær, formand for kommunistpartiet og præsident besiddes nu, og vil måske også i fremtiden blive besiddet, af én person. Præsidentskabets, såvel som vicepræsidentskabets, magt

er nu blevet styrket.

Hvad der er vigtigere, så ses løftet over for forfatningen som en styrkelse af retsstatsprincippet, idet denne grundlæggende lov begrænser alle arbitrære handlinger ud over forfatningens omfang, af de mennesker, der har aflagt dette løfte over for forfatningen. Wang Qishan, en nær samarbejdspartner til præsident Xi, og som under de gamle regler havde nået pensionsalderen, blev valgt til vicepræsident (med en enkelt nejstemme). Wang har været instrumental i anti-korruptionskampagnen, som Xi lancerede, men, hvad der måske er vigtigere, så har han et godt kendskab til USA og vil utvivlsomt fungere som en højtplaceret samtalepartner til USA og vil være en vigtig rådgiver til Xi i amerikanske anliggender.

Valget af præsident Xi blev modtaget med stående akklamation fra de flere end 2.000 delegerede i Folkets Nationalkongres.

Foto: Den genvalgte præsident Xi Jinping aflægger løfte, med hånden på den reviderede forfatning, med de indledende ord, »Jeg sværger, at jeg vil være tro mod forfatningen og mod den Kinesiske Folkerepublik, forsvare dens myndighed, udføre lovpligtige forpligtelser og ansvar, være loyal over for landet og folket ...« (Se f.eks. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iE9rUKH8Qsw>)

Det britiske Imperium er nu totalt afsløret; **Det må knuses! Helga Zepp-LaRouche** **i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 15. marts** **2018**

Der er mange spørgsmål, vi bør diskutere, og mange ting, vi bør gøre, for det image, folk har af Vesten, er virkelig noget, folk bør tænke over. Hvordan kan det være, at det kommunistiske Kina, som er et socialistisk land, baseret på socialisme med kinesiske karaktertræk, som de siger – hvorfor klarer dette land sig så meget bedre end Vesten? Det bør give stof til eftertanke. Hvad er der i vejen med den neoliberale metode, et system, der forårsager svælget mellem rig og fattig at blive større hele tiden? I alle europæiske lande, og dette

reflekteredes også i valget af Trump, væmmes mange mennesker fuldstændig ved den politiske klasse, med klassen af direktører, med bankfolk, med akademikere, og føler sig ikke længere repræsenteret af disse institutioner, hvilket er meget farligt, for i Europas tilfælde giver det grund til, at der vokser nogle virkelig meget farlige, eller i det mindste problematiske, partier og organisationer frem.

Så, manglen på fornuft afføder monstre, som Goya så klart påpegede i sine tegninger.

Folk bør begynde at blive aktive, for man kan ikke sidde passivt i et paradigmeskifte som det, vi oplever på dette tidspunkt.

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

Storbritanniens udenrigsminister Boris Johnson beviser, han er den mest imperiale og den mest sindssyge

16. marts, 2018 – Storbritanniens udenrigsminister Boris Johnson har den 16. marts givet en »eksklusiv« kronik til den store Pariseravis, *Le Parisien*, om mordforsøget på Skripal. Han skriver: »Jeg fortolker denne hændelse som en yderligere demonstration af præsident Vladimir Putins farlige opførsel. Den røde tråd, der forbinder [Skripal] forgiftningen i Salisbury med annekteringen af Krim, cyber-angrebene mod Ukraine, udspioneringen af Bundestag, russernes indblanding i flere europæiske valg; det er Kremles foragt for grundlæggende, internationale regler.« Han fortsætter, at Ruslands opbakning af Syriens

præsident Bashar Assads angivelige brug af kemiske våben viser, at Rusland er ansvarligt for Skripal-angrebet.

Til BBC himlede Johnson op om, at det var »overvældende sandsynligt«, at Putin personligt havde beordret Skripal-angrebet; så gik han over gevind, selv for ham: »Vi har intet imod selve russerne. Der er ingen russofobi som resultat af det, der finder sted. (!) Vi har et skænderi med Putins Kreml og med hans beslutning – og vi mener, det er overvældende sandsynligt, at det var hans beslutning – at beordre brugen af en nervegift i Det forenede Kongeriges gader.«

Og hvorfor så efterlade et »fingeraftryk« som Novichok, blev han spurgt? »Der er en grund til at vælge Novichok«, sagde han. »I sin åbenlyse væren russisk sender denne nervegift et signal til alle, der overvejer dissidens i den intensiverende undertrykkelse i Putins Rusland«, svarede han BBC. »Budskabet er klart: Vi vil finde jer, vi vil fange jer, vi vil dræbe jer – og selv om vi vil benægte det med et hånligt smil på læberne, så vil verden uden for enhver tvivl vide, at Rusland gjorde det.«

Foto: Storbritanniens udenrigsminister Boris Johnson (venstre): »Overvejende sandsynligt«, at Putin personligt beordrede Skripal-angrebet.

Russisk repræsentant til OPCW sønderriver UK's løgne

16. marts, 2018 – Alexander Vasilievich Shulgin, permanent russisk repræsentant til Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW), rev de britiske løgne om Skripal-sagen i stumper og stykker. »Der er mange muligheder, og de er alle forklaret i konventionen. Vi håber, vi kan komme til en forståelse, få en dialog med vore partnere og klarlægge denne situation«, sagde han høfligt. Han afslørede dernæst, at Rusland aldrig har udført nogen research af den såkaldte Novichok-gift, alt imens både USA og briterne har. »Det er helt igennem muligt, at dette stof kunne have været brugt fra deres arsenaler, fra deres lagre«, sagde Shulgin.

»Mit gæt er det følgende: Storbritannien kan ikke give os de reelle beviser på og bekræftelse af de påstande, som de fremfører over for os. Vi er parat til en meningsfuld dialog; vi har brug for klar viden om, hvad det er, vi beskyldes for, og hvad det er baseret på, og for at få adgang til de prøver, der blev

taget fra scenen i Salisbury.«

Dernæst gik han i kødet på briternes historie for dødbringende løgne. »Vore britiske partnere mener, vi skal tage deres ord for det. Som om alt allerede er blevet defineret af de største eksperter, så bare acceptér vores ord. Men jeg spørger, hvorfor skulle vi stole på briterne? Har vi ikke eksempler på, at højtplacerede, britiske repræsentanter har omgåedes sandheden lemfældigt, for at sige det mildt?« sagde Shulgin.

Han tilføjede, at Moskva gentagent har anmodet London om at give dem beviserne, men kun har modtaget uforpligtende svar. »Lad os håbe, vore britiske partnere får nogle nøgterne øjeblikke og kommer til en forståelse af, at det er nødvendigt at bevare roen uden gensidige beskyldninger og med gensidig respekt«, sagde han.

Foto: Alexander Shulgin har været permanent russisk repræsentant til OPCW siden oktober, 2009.