

Mueller-dossieret revideret: Hvordan briterne og Obama plattede USA LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 23. feb., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: I takt med, at Muellers anklageskrift mod 13 såkaldte russiske 'trolde' fortsat dominerer overskrifterne hen over weekenden, er amerikanerne i stigende grad begyndt at fatte det iboende hykleri i hele denne Russiagate-narrativ. Fra tidligere CIA-direktør James Woolsey, der af Laura Ingraham på Fox News bliver spurgt, om USA nogen sinde har blandet sig i et andet lands valg – til hvilken han måtte rømme sig og hoste og sige, »Jamen, det har vi sandsynligvis, og vil sandsynligvis fortsætte med«; og til en række blogindlæg i denne uge på tidligere forsvarsefterretningsofficer Pat Langs webside, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. Man ser her [Fig. 1] titlen på et af de seneste indlæg: »Robert Muellers Amerika – En farce pakket ind i hykleri«. Dette blev postet den 20. feb., og her er et kort uddrag af hans blogindlæg, hvor han siger:

Under overskriften »Robert Muellers Amerika – En Farce pakket ind i hykleri«, fremfører Tacitus, at anklageskriftet er »intet mindre end en køreplan for despotiske regeringer, der ville ønske at behandle enhver, der vover at udlægge afvigende materiale på internettet, som en kriminel.« I virkeligheden »er det ikke andet end en gang harsk butterdej. Det prætenderer at have et bjerg af beviser på russernes misgerninger. Men, hvis man begynder simpelt hen at stille

kritiske spørgsmål om det underliggende bevis for disse misgerninger, opdager man hurtigt, at dette dokument er et stykke politisk teater snarere end en faktisk opremsning af kriminelle gerninger.«

»Der er ikke et eneste stykke solidt bevis i hele dokumentet, der underbygger« påstanden om Internet Research Agency (IRA), det russiske selskab, der angiveligt skulle have haft tilsyn med den beskidte propagandakrig mod intetanende amerikanske vælgere. »Det er blot en konstatering af en overbevisning. Det er ikke sådan, man skriver et anklageskrift, der beskylder en for kriminelle handlinger.«

»Denne sag er således meget langt fra at være en 'slam dunk' for Mueller-teamet. Skulle det nogen sinde komme for retten, er der signifikante huller og sårbarheder i anklageskriftet, som en kompetent forsvarsadvokat kunne splitte ad. Niks. Det her handler ikke om at straffe folk, der overtræder loven. Dette er et politisk teater, der er designet til at nære memet for at promovere antirussisk hysteri.« Tacitus understreger, at enhver objektiv efterforskning af angivelig »indblanding« fra IRA kun ville kunne konkludere, at »IRA's aktiviteter er på grænsen til irrelevante og uden indvirkning«. Ingen stor afsløring her: Rusland har gennemført efterretningsoperationer i USA i 80 år. Men USA har gennemført lignende operationer »i og imod Rusland / USSR og har været involveret i hemmelige indblandinger i valg i hele verden. Dét er det hykleriske. Vi har et hysterisk anfald over latterlige internet-narrestreger, udført af en lille gruppe russere, der var dårligt finansieret og genererede liden aktivitet samtidig med, at vi ignorerer vores egen historie, hvor vi rent faktisk har væltet andre lovligt valgte regeringer. Der har vi det. Farce og hykleri.«

Hør så dette næste indlæg, publiceret i dag, den 23. feb., med titlen »Amerika blander sig i Ukraine« [Fig. 2]. Han siger:

»Historikere vil bemærke den enorme ironi, der ligger i USA's engagement i undergravende virksomhed og indblanding i valget

i Ukraine, som overgår alt, Rusland har forsøgt.

De ideologiske spltninger, der vokser i USA, begynder at ligne de krigsførende lejre, der karakteriserer den politiske verden i Ukraine. Splittelsen i Ukraine sætter grupper, der beskrives som »højrefløj«, og mange er ideologiske efterkommere af ægte nazister og nazi-sympatisører, op imod grupper med et stærkt tilhørsforhold til Rusland.

Hvem støtter USA's regering og medierne? *Nazisterne*. Du tror, jeg laver grin!«

Han fortsætter dernæst med at fremlægge OUN's historie [Organisationen af Ukrainske Nationalister] og Stephan banderas støtte til Hitler og fortsættelsen af denne arv med Sektor Højre i dag. Dernæst fortsætter han:

»Regn mig med blandt de mennesker, der er oprørt over det hykleri og den stupiditet, der nu kommer frem i USA.

Der foregår helt tydeligt indblanding i det det amerikanske politiske landskab. Men det er altså ikke den russiske regering. Nej. Der er fremmede og hjemlige kræfter i alliance, som er ivrige efter at portrættere Rusland som en trussel mod verdensordenen, og som må modgås med højere forsvarsudgifter og hårdere sanktioner. Det er den propaganda, der dominerer medierne i USA i disse dage. Og det er i sandhed farligt for vores nations sikkerhed og frihed.«

Det står klart, som Pat Lang pointerer her i dette blogindlæg, og ligeledes, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointerede i sin internationale webcast i går, at hele denne Russiagate-historie, og desuden hele Kina-hysteriet, der i stigende grad nu oppiskes; at dette forkyndes med det formål at portrættere disse lande som en dødbringende trussel mod den herskende verdensorden, og som må tilintetgøres. Som Helga LaRouche sagde i dette klip, vi nu skal se, så man se dette som intet mindre end førkrigs-propaganda. Her er, hvad Helga havde at sige:

(her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.)

(Hele Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra 22. feb. kan læses på dansk, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23890>)

Henvisninger i den engelske tekst:

Nyt Paradigme undervisningsserie, Indtegning, program:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23703>

Helga Zepp-LaRouches introduktion 10. feb. (dansk):
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23855>

Harley Schlanger, lektion 2 17. feb., video, (engelsk):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xy87_gzTTTU

“The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”,
<https://larouchepac.com/20180220/mueller-dossier-revisited-how-british-and-obama-diddled-united-states>

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE

: This is a case which will never go to trial, because these are people living in Russia. It's an old case, it was already discussed in 2014, and since there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Russia, the trial will never take place; and therefore Mueller does not have to provide any evidence for any of his accusations. So it's a very convenient way to keep beating the drums in an anti-Russian hysteria and it's a big, big "nothing-burger" as people have been pointing out. But it is actually a fraud against the population, because if you keep building this kind of enemy image, such as against Russia and China – and people should understand, this

has nothing to do with Russian hacking, or Russian collusion;
as
a matter of fact, there were several people, but one of them
was
a leading member of the Russian Duma who said that there are
102
very well documented cases for the United States meddling in
the
internal affairs of other countries, and it's fairly well
known
how many coups and regime-change operations. So obviously, at
minimum, you could say is that both sides are doing it, but
the
United States has a very long record of having tried to
intervene
in the internal affairs of other countries in multiple ways.
So, this should be understood as pre-war propaganda, and
people easily fall for things which are in the mainstream
media,
and rather, they should think twice. What Russia is doing and
what China is doing, is they are building a completely
different
model of international relationships, explicitly modeled on
noninterference, and respect for the social system of the
other
country. And therefore, this propaganda is just a terribly
dangerous scenario of lies which actually is serving as a
preparation for war, and that is what people really must get
straight.

OGDEN: So the stakes are very high, and in the same
broadcast yesterday, Helga LaRouche made the point that there
are
ongoing investigations coming out of the House Intelligence
Committee under Devin Nunes, and also the Senate Intelligence
Committee under Chuck Grassley, into the role of Christopher
Steele as a central figure in this entire Russiagate

narrative.

As she said, this leads directly to the role of British intelligence. So, here's a second clip from yesterday's broadcast.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Yes, it is directly British intelligence. It's not "former" MI6 agent, but it is an MI6 operation, and it involves the Foreign Office of Great Britain itself, as we saw in a case which was launched by one of the Russians who were accused of hacking, who took the Steele case to court, and then the Foreign Office intervened directly to block any revelations coming from the Steele operative of theirs. Now, that it is an incredible story: It means the British have intervened, not only in the coup against the Yanukovich government, but also in the case of the coup against President Trump. That whole Russiagate as some people funnily say is a big "regurgitated nothing-burger" – there is absolutely no substance to it. And we should just note the fact that the continuous investigations coming from the two Houses of Congress, under the leadership of Nunes and Grassley, they are still pointing absolutely to the coup-plotters who were involved with the British in this coup. In the recent developments, [House Intelligence Chair] Congressman Nunes has sent out 10 or 11 other letters to officials of the existing or former government, where they have to answer very pointed question – when did you know first about the Steele dossier? Did you discuss it with anybody else? Did Obama know it? When did he know it? And these individuals

have

to answers these questions by March 2nd, so it's not a long-term

investigation, but it's something extremely hot. And it's not yet decided how this coup will go: If the Congress has the courage to go after those Obama intelligence officials who colluded with Great Britain, but if they do, a lot of people could not only lose their position, but actually end up in jail,

as some judges are now already demanding.

OGDEN: So, as Helga said, this investigation continues and it continues to escalate. This is the question of the role of the British and their fellow-travellers in the American intelligence community in actually meddling in the US electoral

process. Chairman Devin Nunes is scheduled to appear at the CPAC

[Conservative Political Action Conference] conference today; he's

scheduled to be the closing speaker. We'll see what he has to say there, but as Helga mentioned, Nunes has continued to march

forward with Phase Two of his investigation into this entire Christopher Steele matter. He issued a series of questions; this

is letter that was just published yesterday which was sent to the

FBI and officials within the State Department. The letter is asking for questions regarding information contained in the Steele dossier, which was funded by the DNC [Democratic National

Committee] and the Clinton campaign, and used in a FISA [Foreign

Intelligence Surveillance Act] application targetting Carter Page. He notified them, as Helga mentioned, that if their responses are not received by March 2nd, which is a week from

today, then subpoenas will be issued. He said, "If you do not provide timely answers on a voluntary basis, the Committee will initiate compulsory process."

So, included in these questions is one which directly asks what did Obama know and when did he know it? So, here are a few of the questions that are asked by Chairman Nunes [Fig. 3]:

"1. When and how did you first become aware of any of the information contained in the Steele dossier?

"2. In what form(s) was the information in the Steele dossier presented to you? By whom? ...

"3. Who did you share this information with? When? ...

"6. When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by a Democrat-aligned entity?

"9. Was President Obama briefed on any information contained in the dossier prior to January 5, 2017?

"10. Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media?

If so, who and when?"

So clearly it is very significant that this investigation is going all the way to the top, with Obama himself being implicated. Now recall that Chairman Grassley of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has also been asking questions about what

Obama knew and when did he know it. Take the example of the very

bizarre email that was sent by Susan Rice to herself on Inauguration Day at 12:15pm on the day that President Trump was

inaugurated; literally right before she walked out of the doors

of the White House for the last time to attend this inauguration.

The email describes a January 5, 2017 Oval Office meeting between President Obama, former FBI James Comey, former Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, as well as Vice President Joe Biden and Rice herself. The email that Susan Rice sent to herself obviously has been publicized by Chairman Grassley, and in this letter [Fig. 4] that you're looking at, he published the relevant excerpt from this email. Again, this is Susan Rice, addressed to Susan Rice;

12:15pm, January 20, 2017. This is what she says:
"On January 5, following a briefing by IC leadership on Russian hacking during the 2016 Presidential election, President Obama had a brief follow-on conversation with FBI Director Jim Comey and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates in the Oval Office.
[She mentions that Biden and herself were also present.]
"President Obama began the conversation by stressing his continued commitment to ensuring that every aspect of this issue is handled by the Intelligence and law enforcement communities 'by the book'. The President stressed that he is not asking about, initiating or instructing anything from a law enforcement perspective. He reiterated that our law enforcement team needs to proceed as it normally would by the book.
"From a national security perspective, however, President Obama said he wants to be sure that, as we engage with the incoming team, we are mindful to ascertain if there is any reason that we cannot share information fully as it relates to Russia".

“The President asked Comey to inform him if anything changes in the next few weeks that should affect how we share classified

information with the incoming team. Comey said he would.”

Now, what Senator Grassley asks in his open letter to Susan Rice is the following:

“It strikes us as odd that, among your activities in the final moments on the final day of the Obama administration, you

would feel the need to send yourself such an unusual email purporting to document a conversation involving President Obama

and his interactions with the FBI regarding the Trump/Russia investigation. In addition, despite your claim that President Obama repeatedly told Mr. Comey to proceed ‘by the book,’ substantial questions have arisen about whether officials at the

FBI, as well as at the Justice Department and the State Department, actually did proceed ‘by the book.’...

“4. Did anyone instruct, request, suggest, or imply that you should send yourself the aforementioned Inauguration Day email memorializing President Obama’s meeting with Mr. Comey about the

Trump/Russia investigation? If so, who and why?

“12. Did President Obama have any other meetings with Mr. Comey, Ms. Yates, or other government officials about the FBI’s

investigation of allegations of collusion between Trump associates and Russia? If so, when did these occur, who participated, and what was discussed?”

So, these questions and these investigations are beginning to hit very close to home. Remember, Susan Rice was also caught

and has admitted to requesting the unmasking of several individuals associated with the Trump campaign; Americans

whose

communications were collected under NSA wiretaps and surveillance. Susan Rice and other officials have now been caught on repeated occasions requesting the unmasking of these American officials; raising many questions as to what the motives

were.

Now Chairman Nunes has been appearing on several talk shows and media interviews over the last several weeks. Obviously, since the publication of his memo. But he appeared last weekend

on "The Full Measure" show with host Sharyl Atkinson. In that interview, he continued to keep a laser focus. Let me just read

you a few excerpts of what Chairman Nunes had to say in that interview.

"We have a Russian Investigation going on whether or not there was collusion between any campaign and the Russians. That's

coming to a close. We've never had any evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians. There's nothing there".

"[I]n that investigation, we've unearthed things that are very concerning. We know that there are un-maskings that occurred

and probably were leaked to the media". [W]hat we found was happening is, in the last administration, they were unmasking hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of American's names. They were unmasking people for what I would say, for lack of a better

definition, were for political purposes". [N]ames were unmasked.

And those names ended up in the newspaper.

"[I]t's like political dirt to create a narrative and a spin with the mainstream media". [T]here were unmaskings that we unearthed, then there are the FISA abuse that we've discovered.

[T]his is where the FBI and the Justice Department – because they're involved in this FISA Abuse, because they're the ones who

“ go before the secret court to get the warrants, they're all involved, they're all implicated in this”|.

“It really boils down to this. You had a campaign. The Hillary Campaign and the Democratic Party went out and paid for

dirt”|. Then they used that dirt and funneled it into the FBI. The FBI then used that dirt to get a warrant on a US citizen who

was part of the other campaign”|. [T]o do that, it's wrong.

“|... As it relates to Department of Justice and the FBI, if they need to be put on trial, we will put them on trial. The reason that Congress exists is to oversee these agencies that we

created. DOJ and FBI are not above the law. Congress created them, we oversee them, and we fund them. And if they're committing abuse for a secret court, getting warrants on American

citizens, you're darn right that we're going to put them on trial.

“I think people are just starting to learn now what really happened. Because as we peel more and more of this back, I think

more and more Americans get educated. And I think that they're gonna demand that changes are made.”

Remember that this entire line of investigation is exactly what was suggested in the original LaRouche PAC special report.

Obviously, this special report on Mueller was published now over

six months ago. But this continues to be very timely and very relevant. An update to that report will be forthcoming, but we

have a preview now available on the website of what will be contained in that updated dossier. That preview is available

under the title “The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”. There you can see a screen

shot [Fig. 5] from that updated preview. This is obviously available in full on the LaRouche PAC website, and we would encourage you to read it in its fullest extent. It’s a fairly long update. But what I’d like to do is just read you from the

beginning of how this report is set up, a little bit of a retrospective on the effect that this Mueller dossier has had over its six-month circulation; but also the context in which you

have to understand always the big strategic picture behind the events that are now unfolding on a day-to-day basis. So, this is

what this updated report has to say:

“On September 29, 2017, LaRouchePAC published the original version of the dossier ‘Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will do His Job If You Let Him’. To date, that dossier, now being circulated nation-wide by LaRouchePAC, represents the most thorough and the most accurate assessment as

to the character of Robert Mueller, as well as the utterly fraudulent nature of the ongoing treasonous effort to bring down

the Trump Presidency.

“This present report is an update to that dossier, with the emphasis on the dramatic significance of two documents which were

released in the first days of February. The first is the House Intelligence document known as the ‘Nunes Memo’, and the second

is the – by far more substantive – un-redacted document authored by Senators Grassley and Graham.

“We shall examine the importance of these two documents in depth, as well as significant other developments which flow

from
the impact of their release. Before doing so, however, it is
of
critical importance that a matter of primary overriding
concern
be re-stated here, at the beginning of this update.

“The British Origin of the Coup

“Nothing of any truth about the current assault on President
Trump can be understood, unless one addresses the question of
why all of this is occurring, along with the subsumed question
of “*cui bono?*” This requires transcending the world of
partisan
politics and inside-the-beltway gossip, and the necessity for
examining the *strategic* setting and implications surrounding
the coup plot.

“Everything that is now transpiring must be viewed within
that truthful strategic context. During the eight years of the
Obama Presidency, and the prior Administration of George W.
Bush,
a profound shift in U.S. strategic policy took place. Obama,
working closely with – and often under the direction of – the
British, committed the United States to enforcing a global
policy
of Anglo-American hegemonism, what is sometimes referred to as
a
'uni-polar world'. This took the form of escalating
provocations
against Russia, and more recently the targeting of China.
Currently, this imperial Anglo-American faction is determined
to
thwart China's gigantic Belt and Road Initiative
infrastructure
development of Eurasia, Africa, Southwest Asia (the Middle
East),
and nations in Central and South America. This largest

infrastructure development project in human history now involves more than 68 countries.

“For the British, such geo-political designs are nothing new. British strategic policy since before World War I has been based on geopolitics. Under the theories of Lord Halford Mackinder, completely embraced by today’s Anglo-American foreign policy establishment, control of Eurasia dictates strategic mastery of the world. China is now establishing vast transportation and other infrastructure throughout Eurasia, a region which Anglo-American policy up until now had reserved as a primitive looting ground.

“Unable to break from imperial axioms and join China’s offer of win-win cooperation, let alone offer a viable alternative model which promotes the general welfare, Barack Obama and the British adopted a strategy of geopolitical containment and provocation, a New Cold War policy. It began with the Anglo-American coup in Ukraine in 2014, pushing NATO right up to Russia’s borders, and involves hostile encirclement strategies against both Russia and China, employing color revolutions, economic sanctions, overt economic, cyber, and information warfare, provocative military maneuvers, development of new nuclear and other warfare capacities, and military support of insurgents and terrorists in states friendly and/or trading with Russia or China, such as Iran and Syria. All of this, of course, threatens the extinction of the human race.”

Now, the final aspect of that memo which is now available goes through the fact that with Trump’s election, this entire agenda was derailed. As it says:

“In November 2016, it was the intention of Obama and the British that Hillary Clinton would continue this dangerous

geo-political gambit. Donald Trump's victory in that election stopped this mad drive to war just as it was turning very hot. "As we detailed in our original Mueller dossier, 'Russiagate,' – which has roiled our nation since Summer 2016, has driven most members of Congress into a McCarthyite insanity so severe that you can literally picture them braying at the Moon at night, and has critically undermined Donald Trump's Presidency – has absolutely nothing to do with any hostile action by Russia against the United States. Its origins are to be found in the desperation of the British and American establishments, among individuals and interests who are frantic to re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama Administration." I would strongly encourage you to read the entirety of this report, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website now. It's crucial, but let me just pick up on that picture, which was just laid out in that prefatory section. As is very apparent from developments in the recent week and a half, these frantic attempts to impose the re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama administration, which the Hillary Clinton administration clearly would have continued full-bore; this attempt to re-impose that track is now in full swing. One only has to look at the escalations that have occurred in Ukraine, the escalations which have occurred in Syria, the calls for a response to that, and absolutely the very heated rhetoric and hysterical speeches which were delivered at the so-called Munich Security Conference which just occurred this week. We saw just raid anti-Russia, anti-China speeches, one after another after another,

attacking
the One Belt, One Road policy as an imperialistic scheme;
trying
to identify a full spectrum intelligence operation that's
being
allegedly run by the Chinese against every nation in the West,
and so forth and so on.

In contrast to that, the spokesperson from China at the
Munich Security Conference, very calmly and very undefensively
laid out the picture of what the New Paradigm of win-win
relations that China is offering to the world really entails.
That was originally elaborated by Xi Jinping at his speech at
the
United Nations General Assembly several years ago, but it
involves non-confrontation, non-meddling in foreign countries'
affairs, an understanding of differences in approach and
differences in political and cultural systems. But overall,
not
an attempt to impose one nation or one system's view of the
world
on other nations in a sort of unipolar or hegemonic way; but a
way to say, "Let's take our differences and use them to our
collective advantage. Let's put together a system of shared,
mutual benefit under a vision of common destiny for mankind."
Which is the way the Chinese have put it. But this is
characterized as a win-win approach, as opposed to the Cold
War
mentality of winner take all, zero-sum game type of
geopolitics.

So, Helga LaRouche in her broadcast yesterday strongly
encouraged people to actually read the text of the speeches
from
the Munich Security Conference, both the anti-China, anti-
Russia
war-mongering speeches so you can see for yourself just how
rabid
and hysterical this prewar propaganda actually is. But also,

go

and read that speech from the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and you can see how the Chinese are responding.

This is the time where we desperately need a New Paradigm of international relations; and it comes under the form of that win-win relationship. The way that you can see that playing out

on the ground, not from 300,000 feet with rhetoric; but really look at the reality on the ground, in places such as Africa, Central and South America, countries in Eurasia. These countries

are already benefitting from the infrastructure, the modern technology and the infrastructure which is being brought to those

countries by China and the One Belt, One Road initiative.

It's

high time that the United States and other countries in Western

Europe come to the table and say what China is doing is very good. This is for the benefit of these countries, and instead of

trying to shut this down and beat the drums of war, we should finally reciprocate what China is doing. We should come to the

table with intentions of good will, and we should join together

and as a community of nations, build this future which will be for the common benefit of all.

So, the LaRouche PAC class series, which we've been promoting now for several weeks, and is already ongoing, could not be more timely and more urgent. This is titled, "The End of

Geopolitics; What Is the New Paradigm?" You can register, if you

haven't already, at discover.larouchepac.com or at the link that

you see here on the screen – <http://lpac.co/np2018>. Again, there are public classes which have been available on YouTube; two so far. The first inaugural speech by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and then the second follow-up by Harley Schlanger last Saturday; which was “What Is Geopolitics? Part I, the History”. That was very informative and very in-depth. But there are also aspects of this class series that you cannot access unless you are a registered participant; such as the discussion period which will occur tomorrow, which will only be open to those who are registered for this class series. So, we strongly encourage you, if you haven’t yet, to register. Also, to encourage other people that you know to register for this class series at that link that’s on the screen and to become active participants in this entire series.

The time has come. We must take very seriously what’s at stake here in this current unfolding battle over the soul of the United States and the soul of the US Presidency. The ugly nature of this operation and this apparatus continues to come to light, but we have to continue – as the LaRouche PAC dossier does very well – to put it into its proper strategic context and to understand *cui bono?* and what is the strategic context for this unprecedented assault on the US democratic system and the US Presidency that we now see ongoing.

So, thank you very much for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do.

