

Briterne satser på konfrontation med Rusland i overensstemmelse med 'The Great Game' – det store spil; Det er modbydeligt og usikkert og kan give bagslag

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 27. marts, 2018 – For enhver, der ikke er en sinke, er den modbydelige natur af premierminister Theresa Mays og kohorters Skripal-forgiftnings- og anti-Ruslandsmobilisering en åbenlys »Great Game«-manøvre for at forhindre den potentielle realisering af en amerikansk-russisk hældning over mod »Nye Silkevejsrelationer«, for fred og for udvikling. Hele Mays anti-russiske, internationale mobilisering er blot en ny fase af det igangværende Trump-gate kupforsøg, med det formål at bringe det amerikanske præsidentskab til fald. Briterne er ligeledes i centrum for gennemførelsen af denne fase: MI6, Christopher Steele, Richard Dearlove, Sir Andrew Wood, Robert Mueller og andre håndlangere.

Der er ingen legale belæg for Theresa Mays kampagne for at anklage Rusland for forgiftningen i Salisbury den 4. marts – ingen beviser, ingen analyse, ingen juridiske standarder. May selv var politisk på vej ned og ud, inden for ganske få dage, indtil denne beskidte operation blev lanceret; og nu forventes

verden at hylde hende som en »anti-Ruslands-heltinde«.

»Det er modbydeligt; det er usikkert«, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag og bemærkede, at dette tydeligvis er briterne, der anstifter konfrontation. »Vi kan få det til at give bagslag«, sagde hun. Hold fast i sandheden og brug ethvert middel til at afsløre den onde hensigt og dens gerningsmænd.

Det er rent strategisk meget vigtigt, at den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov i dag gentog, at den forpligtelse stadig er aktiv, som fornylig blev indgået af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin og præsident Donald Trump, til en dialog om stabilitet og sikkerhed. Det forholder sig således, på trods af gårsdagens amerikanske, pro-britiske ordre til udvisning af 60 russiske diplomater og lukning af det russiske konsulat i Seattle. Ryabkov sagde i dag, rapportret i Sputnik, »Vi har brug for denne dialog, præsidenterne for vore lande talte om det i en telefonsamtale for et par dage siden. Vi opgiver ikke denne dialog, vi vil bevare den.« Herudover fordømte Ryabkov USA's udvisninger.

I løbet af de seneste 24 timer har ledere i andre lande udtalt sig imod denne briternes 'udsmidning af bumser'. Den østrigske kansler Sebastian Kurz sagde i dag, at hans nation ikke ville udvise russiske diplomater. Han sagde, at Østrig traditionelt er et neutralt land; det er en bro mellem Øst og Vest. Diplomater er velkomne og nødvendige i Østrig.

Der høres også udtalelser imod det britiske/EU-fremstød for konfrontation med Rusland internt i selv Tyskland, og ligeledes i Italien. Det rapporteres, at på EU-topmødet for statsoverhoveder i Bruxelles den 22.-23. marts, fremlagde May og den tyske kansler Angela Merkel krav om nye, skrappe sanktioner mod Rusland, men at dette blev blokeret som værende forkert af den italienske premierminister Paolo Gentiloni. Dernæst rejste han hjem, og på trods af, at han er afgangende leder, udviste han to russiske diplomater og demonstrerede således det intense pres, der lægges på de europæiske ledere

af briterne og deres kohorter internt i USA. Denne handling blev prompte fordømt af andre i Italien som værende forkert og som en »præmatur« dom.

Torsdag vil Trump besøge det nordøstlige Ohio for at tale om infrastruktur. Dette er i hjertet af Rustbæltet, som ville blive transformeret til et kraftcenter under betingelser, der afgøres af USA's samarbejde med USA og Rusland og Kina under Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og med **LaRouches Fire Love**.

Foto: Premierminister Theresa May mødtes med præsident Trump på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum, 25. jan., 2018.

Ruslands barske respons på udvisning af diplomater, men med håbet om at gennemføre de amerikansk-russiske »forhandlinger om stabilitet«

27. marts, 2018 – Udvisningen af russiske diplomater fra Europa er resultatet af en afpresningskampagne og et pres fra USA, sagde udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov i dag i respons til et spørgsmål fra TASS. »Den konklusion, der umiddelbart må drages, er, at vi havde helt ret, da vi mere end én gang sagde, at virkeligt uafhængige lande i den moderne verden og i det moderne Europa er meget få«, sagde han. »Når én eller to diplomater bliver bedt om at forlade landet, med undskyldninger, der hviskes i vore ører, så ved vi med

sikkerhed, at dette er et resultat af et kolossalt pres og en kolossal afpresning, som er Washingtons hovedværktøj på den internationale scene.« Disse handlinger er i realiteten ikke engang »demokratiske«. De er resultatet af, at eliteerne ignorerer befolkningen. Han rapporterede, at *Die Welt* i Tyskland har gennemført en opinionsundersøgelse, der sagde, at mere end 80 % af respondenterne var imod flere russiske sanktioner.

Også viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov kom i dag med skrappe kommentarer til Sputnik, men han udtalte, at Rusland ikke ville opgive forhandlingerne med Washington om strategisk stabilitet. Han gav udtryk for det synspunkt, at »den aktuelle situation vil ikke vare ved«. Han sagde, »Vi har brug for denne dialog« og forklarede, »vore landes præsidenter sagde ... i en telefonsamtale for et par dage siden, vi opgiver ikke denne dialog, vi bevarer den«. Og Ryabkov udtrykte »håb« om en »sund start«, der »før eller senere vil få overhånd«.

Ryabkov angreb Theresa May for at fremlægge flere end 20 teorier, der angiveligt skulle være leveret af Moskva, med hensyn til Skripal-forgiftningen. UK-regeringsfolk, sagde han, »taler fortsat nonsens«. Han gav dem det råd, at de »holdt op med uophørligt at surfe på Internettet, læse aviser, se TV og læse alle udtalelser fra enhver person med et russisk pas, og så fremstille det, som om det repræsenterer Moskvas officielle teori«.

Foto: 14. marts sagde Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov til TASS: »Der har været en meget nervøs reaktion på Ruslands comeback som en ligeværdig partner, der ikke påtvinger andre noget som helst, men som ikke vil tolerere diktater eller ultimatummer. Vore vestlige partners reaktion på dette er meget smertefuld ... «.

Theresa Mays anti-russiske korstog er intet andet end UK's krig mod Trump

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 26. marts, 2018 – Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har hen over de seneste 35 år spillet en hovedrolle i udformningen af relationer mellem nationer til det bedre: gennem LaRouches idé til præsident Reagans Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) fra 1983, og gennem »LaRouche-doktrinen« for stormagtsrelationer, som ledsagede denne idé; og gennem deres kampagne fra 1989 for den »Eurasiske Landbro«, som sluttelig bidrog til Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, der nu udvikler mange nationer i hele verden. Hele vejen igennem var fjenderne af disse tiltag hen mod et nyt paradigme for udvikling, City of Londons finansimperium og britisk geopolitik.[1]

Denne tidligere, hyppigt skjulte virkelighed er pludselig, på dramatisk vis, blevet åbenlys. Den britiske premierminister Theresa May og udenrigsminister Boris »bondske« Johnson har tyranniseret USA og 14 europæiske nationer ind i en eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland, der tilsigter at ødelægge stormagtssamarbejde for fremskridt gennem projekterne i Bælte & Vej, og som meget hurtigt kan føre til verdenskrig.

I går understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at London har gjort dette som en reaktion på miskrediteringen af det af britisk efterretning styrede Russiagate-kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump. Hun sprængte den udokumenterede sag om »russisk nervegift« som værende intet andet end Russiagate fortsat,

genopfundet og genoplivet. Denne sags foreløbige succes, efter at Russiagate mod Trump var slået fejl, er ekstremt farlig, sagde hun. Både Kina og Rusland vil reagere på denne ændrede, transatlantiske dagsorden.

Kina har, gennem sin præsident Xi Jinping og sine partiorganer som *Global Times*, indset, at Kinas fredelige opkomst, konfronteret med et sandt stormløb af britisk geopolitisk og økonomisk krigsførelse, måske ikke vil få lov at blive let eller fredelig.

Men Kina har udløst en udviklingsdynamik og hæver produktivitet og levestandarder i mange nationer, såvel som i sin egen, og bruger et nyt koncept, som Lyndon LaRouche for 30 år siden kaldte »Verdenslandbro-udviklingen«. Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ tiltrækker nu også nationer fra selv Vesteuropa. Dets lederskab vil ikke lade sig standse af toldkrig eller investeringsembargo; i stedet anvender det dette nye paradigme for at stoppe dem.

Som Helga LaRouche udtrykte det, så er Kina omsider i færd med at feje Londons århundredelange Malthus-politik og nulsums-geopolitik til side; og Kina erstatter det med et Nyt Paradigme for gensidig fordel for nationer, for udryddelse af fattigdom, videnskabeligt fremskridt og for »et fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«. Lyndon LaRouche har i 50 år insisteret på nødvendigheden af denne udskiftning. Hans LaRouche-bevægelse har fremlagt ammunitionen til overvindelse af angrebene mod præsident Trump, som kommer fra britisk efterretning, og for de tiltag for en økonomisk politik, der kan virkeliggøre Amerikas fremtid på den »Nye Silkevej«.

[1] Se [Harley Schlangers præsentation af geopolitikken historie](#), fra serien, 'Hvad er det Nye Paradigme' (video; dansk pdf.)

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump i samtale med britiske PM Theresa May under et bilateralt møde i det ovale kontor, 27. januar,

2017. Premierminister May var det første statsoverhoved, der aflagde statsbesøg i Det Hvide Hus. (Official White House Photo)

Russisk ambassade i UK: London 'har bekræftet', at Porton Down udviklede giftige kemikalier

25. marts, 2018 – En talsmand for den russiske ambassade i London fremførte i dag, at en udtalelse fra chefen for Storbritanniens Porton Down, Gary Aitkenhead, faktisk bekræfter, at de er engageret i udvikling af giftige kemikalier til militærbrug. Aitkenhead, der for to dage siden blev spurgt af BBC, om der var nogen mulighed for, at nervegiften Novichok kunne være blevet taget fra Porton Down, svarede: »Vi ville ikke få lov at operere, hvis vi manglede kontrol, som kunne resultere i, at der var noget, der forlod vore faciliteters fire mure her.« Til hvilket den russiske diplomat responderede: »Den britiske side har faktisk bekræftet, at udvikling og forskning af nye, giftige substanser til militærbrug er i gang i denne hemmelige facilitet. Desuden benægtede Aitkenhead ikke, at der var et lager af kemiske våben, som angiveligt skulle omfatte nervegiften A-234, der, i overensstemmelse med de officielle forsikringer fra den britiske side, var blevet brugt til at forgifte Skripal og hans datter ... «

Ifølge TASS mindede den russiske ambassades pressesekretær om, at den britiske udenrigsminister Boris Johnson antydede, at UK

havde sådanne prøver, i respons til et spørgsmål fra 19. marts om, hvorvidt Porton Down havde »nogen prøver på Novichok, med hvilke man kunne sammenligne beviserne. Johnson svarede, »Det har de«.

»Disse udtalelser efterlader os intet andet valg end at forstærke vore krav om, at vi får udleveret fuld information om undersøgelsen, og at programmet for at fremstille kemiske stoffer i Porton Down, til militærbrug, offentliggøres«, sagde diplomaten fra den russiske ambassade.

Foto: Giftgas, 1. Verdenskrig.

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 stadig 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 menneskeheds 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 larouhepac.com.

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 fabrikere et nyt svindelnummer med »masseødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en efterretningssvindler 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. 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-svindelnnummer, et gennemprøvet og pålideligt britisk produkt.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 fejlagtige lederskab, der præsteres af Londons Lord's og deres satrapper 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUICHE: 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

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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUICHE: 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 Gatzler, 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-LAROUICHE: 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 »massetødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en efterretningssvindel 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.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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. Kremles 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 beskyldt 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 kollapset. 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.

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 finansiel 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 mennesker

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.

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 lederes 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 ødelæge 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: Genvælgte 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)

**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 Kremls 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.

Det britiske Imperium er nu totalt afsløret; det må knuses!

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. marts, 2018 – I sin ugentlige webcast i dag advarede Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche rammende om, at den britiske operation imod Rusland, der i denne uge eskalerede med Londons anklager om, at Moskva er ansvarlig for forgiftningen med nervegas af den russiske MI6-dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal og hans datter,

»lugter langt væk«. Dette er en »utrolig provokation« mod Rusland, sagde hun, men det er direkte relateret til det faktum, at Det britiske Imperium og dets efterretningstjenester er blevet totalt afsløret og svækket. »Tidligere« MI6-agent Christopher Steele er ikke alene blevet afsløret som den centrale person i forsøget på at bringe Trumps præsidentskab til fald i USA, men hans poteaftryk er også over det hele i Skripal-affæren – han var med til at gøre ham til en britisk dobbeltagent – såvel som også i tidligere, lignende sager, der involverede den russiske agent Alexander Litvinenkos død. Gennem sit Orbis Business efterretningsfirma har han tilbragt årtiet, siden han »forlod« MI6, på at fabricere »beviser« for, at Rusland blandede sig i valgene i flere europæiske lande med det formål at ødelægge den Europæiske Union, og alle mulige andre angivelige »forbrydelser«.

Storbritanniens tidligere ambassadør til Usbekistan, Craig Murray, har påpeget svagheden i premierminister Theresa Mays anklager om, at Rusland havde forgiftet Skripal med den såkaldte nervegas Novichok. Som det rapporteres nedenfor, så påpeger Murray, at Novichok er et stof, ingen nogensinde har set, og hvis eksistens endda betvivles. Den britiske regerings laboratorie for kemiske våben i Porton Down har i publikationer erkendt, at det aldrig har set noget russisk Novichok. Hverken Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW) eller laboratoriet i Porton Down er overbevist om, at Novichok overhovedet eksisterer. Er det grunden til, at den britiske regering nægter at give OPCW en prøve af Novichok eller at følge den strenge protokol, som OPCW har etableret for efterforskning af sådanne sager?

Zepp-LaRouche forklarede, at dette seneste angreb mod Rusland, som meget hurtigt er eskaleret netop i løbet af denne uge, såvel som også truslerne fra USA's ambassadør til FN, Nikki Haleys side om, at USA måske vil bombe Syrien, alt sammen har med det faktum at gøre, at »det Nye Paradigme er ved at vinde,

og det gamle paradigme er splintret. Jeg mener, der nu kommer en ny, strategisk virkelighed, som kommer fra den Nye Silkevej, der konstant ekspanderer og går progressivt fremefter, og som omfatter flere end 140 lande, som [den kinesiske udenrigsminister] Wang Yi sagde for nylig på en pressekonference i Beijing«. Det ville være en alvorlig fejltagelse at undervurdere virkningen af præsident Vladimir Putins tale den 1. marts og hans annoncering af nye, avancerede våbensystemer, som gør Vestens ABM-systemer forældede, understregede Zepp-LaRouche. »Dette har skabt en ny, strategisk virkelighed, og jeg mener, at denne britiske operation og eskaleringen i Syrien virkelig er de sidste, på forhånd tabte kampe fra et systems side, der tydeligvis er ved at gå ned.« Det gør dem imidlertid ikke mindre farlige.

I det samme spor kommenterede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov indsigtfuldt, at det, der nu finder sted, er, at USA og dets vestlige allierede ser, at »den 500 år lange periode med vestlig dominans i globale anliggender er ved at nå vejs ende«. Overgangen til en ny, multipolær, demokratisk og retfærdig verdensorden vil tage nogen tid, sagde han til en forsamling i Moskva, »men allerede nu er denne overgang smertelig for dem, der i århundreder har vænnet sig til at regere verden«. Og de er »nervøse« over, at Rusland nu fremstår som en »ligeværdig partner, der ikke påtvinger andre noget, men som ikke tolererer diktater eller ultimatummer«. Han påpegede også, at Theresa May er »desperat« og svag og ude af stand til at holde løfter, hun har afgivet til befolkningen med Storbritannien, der gør klar til at forlade den Europæiske Union.

Fr. LaRouche påpegede, at Theresa May måske har set en James Bond-film for meget og tror, hun er den berygtede »M«, der var Bonds boss. Men, tilføjede hun, »dette er ikke nogen leg«. Dette antikverede persongalleri er farligt, men jeg tror virkelig, det er sådan noget James Bond-halløj. Hvis I nogensinde igen ser en James Bond-film, jeg mener, hvad er

det, de gør? De er terrorister! De bryder loven! ... og det er selvfølgelig hele britisk efterretnings fantasiverden. Folk bør virkelig kaste et ekstra blik på det og indlede en efterforskning af britisk 'aftalt spil', både i tilfældet Trump og nu, i tilfældet Skripal«.

Zepp-LaRouche bemærkede, at hun ved årets begyndelse sagde, »vi må overvinde geopolitik«, for i en æra med atomvåben kan intet løses ved militære midler. »Det, der nu kommer fra briterne, kan kun bruges til én ting: det gør det absolut klart, hvilken rolle, de spiller. Det har de hele tiden gjort, men nu er det mere ude i det åbne end nogensinde før.« Det er derfor afgørende, »at vi virkelig sætter ind for at afslutte Det britiske Imperium og erstatter det med det Nye Paradigme, med et nyt sæt internationale relationer, baseret på suveræniteten, baseret på respekt for den andens samfundssystem og for menneskehedens fælles mål, og jeg mener, at denne debat er absolut presserende påkrævet«.

Se hele Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra fredag, 15. marts:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ecoYSyypvB4>

Dokumentation:

Tidligere britiske diplomat Craig Murray afviser beskyldninger om russisk nervegift

15. marts, 2018 – Den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Usbekistan Craig Murray har på sin webside afvist beskyldningerne om en russisk nervegift med hjælp fra kilder, som han siger, han ikke kan afsløre på nuværende tidspunkt. Han fremfører imidlertid, at »Novichok-historien er endnu et irakisk masseødelæggelsesvåben-fupnummer«, som titlen på hans blog lyder.

Storbritanniens regering hæver grundlæggende set, at den tidligere russiske agent i GRU (øverste efterretningsafdeling)

Sergei Skripal, der blev en MI6-dobbeltagent, blev dræbt [sic] af »Novichok«, et stof, ingen nogensinde har set, og hvis eksistens endda betvivles, så hvis det virkelig blev brugt, ville det være første gang, og britiske eksperter ville ikke være i stand til at identificere det. Desuden burde de have afleveret en prøve til Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW), som UK er medlem af.

Han opsummerer sine konklusioner som følger:

»1) Porton Down [den britiske regerings laboratorie, der arbejder med kemiske våben] har i publikationer erkendt, at det aldrig har set noget russisk 'Novichok'. Den britiske regering har absolut ingen 'fingeraftryks-information', såsom urenheder, hvorved en prøve på stoffet med sikkerhed kunne tilskrives Rusland.

2) Frem til i dag har hverken Porton Down eller de globale eksperter i OPCW været overbevist om, at 'Novichok' overhovedet eksisterer.

3) UK nægter at afgive en prøve til OPCW.

4) 'Novichoks' blev specifikt designet til at kunne blive fremstillet fra almindeligt forekommende ingredienser på alle forskningssteder. Amerikanerne afmonterede og undersøgte den facilitet, der angiveligt skulle have udviklet dem. Det er fuldstændig usandt, at kun russere kunne fremstille dem, hvis nogen overhovedet kan.

5) Novichok-programmet lå i Usbekistan, ikke Rusland. Arven efter det blev arvet af amerikanerne under deres alliance med [usbekiske præsident Islam] Karimov, ikke af russerne.«

Foto: Storbritanniens PM, Theresa May.

Dokumentation: Tidligere britiske diplomat Craig Murray afviser beskyldninger om russisk nervegift

15. marts, 2018 – Den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Usbekistan Craig Murray har på sin webside afvist beskyldningerne om en russisk nervegift med hjælp fra kilder, som han siger, han ikke kan afsløre på nuværende tidspunkt. Han fremfører imidlertid, at »Novichok-historien er endnu et irakisk masseødelæggelsesvåben-fupnummer«, som titlen på hans blog lyder.

Storbritanniens regering hæver grundlæggende set, at den tidligere russiske agent i GRU (øverste efterretningsafdeling) Sergei Skripal, der blev en MI6-dobbeltagent, blev dræbt [sic] af »Novichok«, et stof, ingen nogensinde har set, og hvis eksistens endda betvivles, så hvis det virkelig blev brugt, ville det være første gang, og britiske eksperter ville ikke være i stand til at identificere det. Desuden burde de have afleveret en prøve til Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW), som UK er medlem af.

Han opsummerer sine konklusioner som følger:

»1) Porton Down [den britiske regerings laboratorie, der arbejder med kemiske våben] har i publikationer erkendt, at det aldrig har set noget russisk 'Novichok'. Den britiske regering har absolut ingen 'fingeraftryks-information', såsom urenheder, hvorved en prøve på stoffet med sikkerhed kunne tilskrives Rusland.

2) Frem til i dag har hverken Porton Down eller de globale

eksperter i OPCW været overbevist om, at 'Novichok' overhovedet eksisterer.

3) UK nægter at afgive en prøve til OPCW.

4) 'Novichoks' blev specifikt designet til at kunne blive fremstillet fra almindeligt forekommende ingredienser på alle forskningssteder. Amerikanerne afmonterede og undersøgte den facilitet, der angiveligt skulle have udviklet dem. Det er fuldstændig usandt, at kun russere kunne fremstille dem, hvis nogen overhovedet kan.

5) Novichok-programmet lå i Usbekistan, ikke Rusland. Arven efter det blev arvet af amerikanerne under deres alliance med [usbekiske præsident Islam] Karimov, ikke af russerne.«

Foto: Tidligere britiske ambassadør til Usbekistan (2002-2004) Craig Murray, foto fra 2016.

Sergei Lavrov: Vesten er bange for at miste sin dominans og for en ny, retfærdig, multipolær verdensorden

15. marts, 2018 – I en tale i går i Moskva på forummet, »Rusland: Mulighedernes land«, kommenterede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov indsigtfuldt den »nervøse« respons fra USA og dets vestlige allierede på »Ruslands comeback som en ligeværdig partner, som ikke påtvinger andre

noget, men som ikke tolererer diktater eller ultimatummer. Vore vestlige partnere reagerer meget smertefuldt på dette«, sagde han, rapporterer TASS.

Lavrov forklarede, at »vi søger ikke konfrontation med nogen. Vi ønsker at samarbejde med alle på lige vilkår, på basis af gensidig respekt, og at søge en interessebalance og gensidigt acceptable fremgangsmåder«. Han fortsatte, »det, vi imidlertid ser nu, er, at USA og dets vestlige allierede er enige om, at den 500 år lange periode med vestlig dominans i globale anliggender er ved at nå vejs ende«. Overgangen til en ny, multipolær, demokratisk og retfærdig verdensorden vil vare meget længe, »men allerede nu er denne overgang smertefuld for dem, der i århundreder har været vant til at regere verden. De er vant til at sidde ved roret«, sagde Lavrov.

Han rapporterede, at Moskva snart vil annoncere forholdsregler som respons til Londons udvisning af russiske diplomater i går og erklærede, at Theresa Mays regering er »desperat«, fordi den bl.a. ikke kan opfylde de løfter, den har afgivet til den britiske befolkning i forbindelse med Storbritanniens udtræden af EU, sagde han til Sputnik. De britiske påstande mod Rusland er uhyrlige, sagde han. Rusland er »parat til at genoprette partnerskabet med den Europæiske Union, når vore europæiske naboer ikke længere ønsker« at efterligne USA's russofobi, inkl. sanktioner og provokationer, »og når de ikke længere er interesseret i at tolerere de uhyrlige handlinger, som vi har set fra den britiske regerings side, og som går langt ud over grænserne for elementær anstændighed«.

Foto: Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov sagde, at Theresa Mays regering er »desperat«, fordi den bl.a. ikke kan opfylde de løfter, den har afgivet til den britiske befolkning i forbindelse med Storbritanniens udtræden af EU.

Briterne lyver igen igen for at skabe konfrontation med Rusland. Politisk Orientering 15. marts, 2018.

v/ Tom Gillesberg:

»Velkommen til disse dramatiske tider, hvor man ligesom føler, det er sådan lidt dejà vu, at vi igen har en britisk leder, Theresa May, som er i gang med at mobilisere nationen og verden til krig, fordi, igen igen, så er der en trussel fra masseødelæggelsesvåben, som man er sten sikker på, at man ved, hvor truslen kommer fra, og derfor må verden nu følge det britiske lederskab og gå i krig. Ligesom vi så det, da Tony Blair annoncerede, at man nu havde sikre beviser på, at Saddam Hussein havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, som inden for 45 minutter ville kunne nå os alle sammen og at vi derfor præventivt, hvis vi ikke havde lyst til at blive udraderet, så var vi jo nødt til at gå i krig i Irak, ikke sandt? Og senere viste det sig så selvfølgelig, at de der beviser, man havde, som man ikke kunne fremvise, for så ville man jo kompromittere sine kilder og alt det der, det var rent fup og fidus; der var nul og niks, det var rent fabrikerede beviser til lejligheden.

Det var ikke den eneste gang; der var nogen, der også kunne huske, at, da man fik hele det danske folketing inkl. Enhedslisten, til at stemme for, at vi skulle sende danske F16-fly ned til Libyen for at gå i krig, så var det, fordi man havde beviser fra Storbritannien på, at Gaddafi var i gang med

at ville udrydde hele befolkningen i Benghazi, og for at beskytte dem, så var vi jo tvunget til i humanitetens navn at sende F16-flyene af sted. Det viste sig så senere selvfølgelig, at det var rent fup, det var bare noget, man havde fundet på. Der var ingen, der stillede spørgsmålstegn ved det; alle sagde, når briterne siger det, så må det jo være rigtigt, og som sagt, selv Enhedslistens medlemmer af folketinget stemte for, at vi skulle sende F16-fly til Libyen, og det har jo så lige siden ... ligesom den første krig, der lagde Irak i ruiner, så fik man også lagt Libyen i ruiner. På lignende vis skal man huske på, at det jo ikke er mere end i marts sidste år, at, lige pludselig ud af det blå kom der fra britiske kilder dokumentation for, at Assad stod bag et giftgasangreb i Syrien, som man præsenterede som stensikre beviser og dermed fik Donald Trump til at affyre en masse Tomahawk-missiler mod en syrisk luftbase for at statuere et eksempel; noget, som kunne have sprængt alt potentielt samarbejde mellem, ikke bare Rusland og USA i stumper og stykker, men også mellem USA og Kina, og det var selvfølgelig formålet.

Man har dette engelske, eller amerikanske, ordsprog: 'Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me' ...«

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/briterne-lyver-igen-igen-for-at-skabe-konfrontation-med-rusland

Det britiske Imperiums rolle har aldrig været klarere

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 14. marts, 2018 – Først var det Tony Blairs »uvederhæftige dossier« om Saddam Husseins masseødelæggelsesvåben, som udløste, at den ynkelige George W. Bush forvandlede hele Mellemøsten (med Obamas hjælp) til et helvedeshul af terrorister. Dernæst kom påstande om Bashar Assads brug af kemiske våben, som narrede Trump til at gennemføre et missilangreb mod en syrisk flyvebase. Så kom britisk efterretningsagent Christopher Steeles eget »uvederhæftige dossier«, der lancerede et forsøg på regimeskifte mod USA's regering, baseret på eventyrfortællinger om Trump og Rusland. Nu erklærer Theresa May, typisk uden beviser, at der »ikke er nogen alternativ konklusion«, men at den »russiske stat« er ansvarlig for angrebet med nervegift i London-området Salisbury, »en ulovlig magtanvendelse mod Det forenede Kongerige«. Vi må alle forenes mod de onde russere, hylér May og hendes kontrollers.

Det er alt sammen selvindlysende nonsens, men der er desperation i Det britiske Imperium. I 50 år har Lyndon LaRouche dokumenteret Det britiske Imperiums historiske had mod De forenede Stater og den systemiske overtagelse af den amerikanske regerings politik gennem Wall Street og andre aktiver, i kølvandet på FDR's død og mordet på JFK. Få lyttede. »Det britiske Imperium er dødt«, lod man os ofte vide, efterfulgt af en påstand om, at det eneste imperium i dag er Det russiske Imperium, eller Det amerikanske Imperium, afhængigt af, hvilket af Det britiske Imperiums kontrollerede miljøer, man valgte at bo i.

Men det fungerer ikke så nemt denne gang. Londonavisen *Guardian* viste i dag graden af panik i Imperiet. Lederartiklen lyder: »UK arbejdede hårdt hele dagen i Washington for at overtale Trump til at skubbe sit ønske om et forhold til Putin

til side og indse, at Rusland var det eneste land, der havde midlerne og motivet til at søge at dræbe Skripal«, den russiske dobbeltagent for MI6, som sammen med sin datter i sidste uge blev ramt af et angreb med nervegift. Men, klynker de, »Trump tilbød kun en modstræbende accept af det britiske tilfælde, men tilskrev ikke direkte Rusland ansvaret ... Det ville være et slag mod de angloamerikanske relationer, hvis Trump nægtede at acceptere den britiske efterretningsvurdering, men siden sit valg har han følt sig under belejring pga. beskyldninger om, at han havde indgået et aftalt spil med Rusland for at vinde præsidentskabet, og han mener, at tidligere, britiske efterretningsofficerer har næret disse beskyldninger.«

Det gør han så sandelig, og denne bestræbelse på at bruge løgne, brygget sammen af MI6, for at bringe hans præsidentskab til fald, er nu blevet godt og grundigt miskrediteret. De tidligere efterretningsfolk fra Obamas tid, som bragte disse britiske løgne til torvs, er blevet taget på fersk gerning i at køre et forræderisk angreb mod den amerikanske regering, og de kunne (og burde) snart havne i fængsel.

Premierminister May har heller ikke bare frit løb internt i UK. Det bliver i stigende grad sandsynligt, at leder af Labour-partiet Jeremy Corbyn ville vinde et valg, hvis det kommer dertil, som det kunne, og Torierne sakker bagud i meningsmålingerne over de forestående lokalvalg. I dag udfordrede Corbyn direkte Mays handlinger mod Rusland i parlamentet og spurgte, om hun ville følge reglerne i Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben, OPCW, og give Rusland prøver på den nervegift og vente de krævede ti dage. May råbte op om, at hun havde givet russerne tid nok, og at der var konsensus fra alle menige i parlamentet om, at Corbyn trådte ved siden af, og at hun ville udvise 23 russiske diplomater. Med en manøvre, der nok skal jage russerne en skræk i livet, annoncerede hun ligeledes, at kongefamilien ikke ville deltage i World Cup i Rusland.

Men de britiske oligarkers frygt er legitim. Imperiet vil ikke overleve, at USA, Rusland, Kina, Afrika, Latinamerika – og endda befolkningerne i Europa og UK – kommer sammen i det nye paradigme, repræsenteret af den Nye Silkevejsånd. Disse oligarker er villige til at løbe risikoen for en atomkrig for at forhindre dette nye paradigme, men deres tid er ved at være forbi. Dette er et øjeblik med et stort potentiale, hvis den menneskelige race lever op til lejligheden.

Foto: George W. Bush og Tony Blair udveksler håndtryk efter at have modtaget besked om, at Coalition Provisional Authority havde genetableret fuld suverænitet i Irak og overført kontrol over nationen til den midlertidige irakiske regering, 28. juni, 2004.

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov angriber voldsomt Londons sindssyge svindel med kemiske våben

14. marts, 2018 – Ruslands Udenrigsministerium har udgivet en officiel respons til de forholdsregler, der i dag blev annonceret af den britiske premierminister Theresa May i hendes hysteriske, Goebbels-lignende tale for Underhuset, og som omfatter udvisning af 23 russiske diplomater. Udenrigsministeriet advarer om, at »vores respons ikke vil lade vente på sig«.

Mays handlinger udgør en »uhørt, åbenlys provokation, der underminerer fundamentet for en normal dialog mellem vore lande«, lød ministeriets erklæring. Med sine handlinger

forfølger den britiske regering tydeligvis »usømmelige politiske formål«, fortsætter erklæringen, og »i stedet for at gennemføre sin egen efterforskning og bruge etablerede, internationale protokoller inden for rammerne af Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben (OPCW), har London valgt konfrontation med Rusland«, anklagede Udenrigsministeriet.

»Ved at efterforske denne hændelse på en ensidig, ikkegennemskelig måde søger den britiske regering tydeligvis at lancere en ubegrundet antirussisk kampagne.

De forholdsregler, vi vil træffe som respons, vil selvsagt ikke lade vente på sig«, sluttede ministeriets erklæring.

Iflg. TASS uddybedes dette yderligere af udenrigsminister Lavrov, hvor han sagde, at, alt imens Rusland ikke har noget motiv for at forgifte tidligere oberst i GRU (øverste efterretningsdirektorat), Sergei Skripal og hans datter, »så kunne sådanne motiver helt bestemt eksistere i hovedet på dem, der ville ønske at fremme den russofobiske kampagne inden for alle sfærer af menneskelig aktivitet, uden undtagelse«. Han påpegede, at, iflg. konventionen om kemiske våben (CWC) var UK forpligtet til at sende Rusland en officiel anmodning om information, »men en sådan anmodning er ikke blevet sendt«.

Topmålet af Londons arrogance, som Lavrov forklarede det, var det faktum, at den britiske repræsentant til OPCW udsurgte den russiske ambassadør til OPCW Alexander Shulgin om, »hvorfor Rusland forsøgte at referere til CWC, for, med hans ord, det var tilstrækkeligt, at den britiske udenrigsminister havde indkaldt den russiske ambassadør [til London] og fortalt ham det hele«. Minister Lavrov sluttede, »I ved, denne form for indbildskhed viser sig i næsten alle skridt, London har taget – og ikke kun i dette særlige tilfælde.«

Foto: Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov erklærede, at Mays beskyldninger mod Rusland i sagen om Skripal, var

'nonsens'.

Den britiske Labour-leder Corbyn sætter spørgsmålstegn ved Theresa Mays påstande

14. marts, 2018 – I kølvandet på den britiske premierminister Theresa Mays hysteriske anklager mod Rusland i dag i Underhuset, antydede leder af Labour-partiet Jeremy Corbyn og hans talsperson, at der kunne være en alternativ forklaring og rejste spørgsmålet om efterretningstjenesternes rolle.

Business Insiders webside citerer Corbyns talsperson for at sige, at Labour-lederen ikke mente, der var tilstrækkelige beviser til at konkludere, at Rusland forgiftede Sergei og Yulia Skripal og foreslog, at britisk efterretning tager fejl. Der er trods alt, sagde talspersonen, »en historie mellem masseødelæggelsesvåben og efterretning, der er problematisk, for at sige det mildt«. Talspersonen kom med en hypotese om, at en »mafia« eller en anden tidligere sovjetstat, ikke Kreml, kunne have været involveret.

Guardian citerer Corbyn for at sige, at forgiftningen af Skripal var »en oprørende voldshandling. Nervegifte er modbydelige, brugt i enhver krig ... det er totalt uansvarligt at bruge dem i det civile miljø«. Men det er ikke utænkeligt, at nervegiften kunne have været brugt af en anden end Rusland, sagde han. Han mindede om, at May i sin tale 12. marts havde sagt, at dette enten var en direkte handling af den russiske stat, eller også havde den russiske regering mistet kontrollen

over sin »katastrofalt ødelæggende nervegift og ladet den falde i andres hænder«.

Han konkluderede, at enhver respons således må baseres på klare beviser. »Hvis regeringen mener, at det stadig er en mulighed, at Rusland forsømmeligt har mistet kontrollen af en nervegift til militærbrug, hvilke handlinger træffes der så gennem OPCW med vore allierede?« Og, »hvilken respons kom den britiske regering med over for Ruslands anmodning om en prøve af nervegiften, for at teste den?«

May pointerede, at russerne allerede havde fået en chance for at forklare, hvor nervegiften kom fra, og pralede dernæst med, at hendes regering havde opnået »konsensus« blandt MP'erne. At dømme ud fra de bemærkninger, der kom fra de menige parlamentsmedlemmer »i hele huset« sidste mandag, proklamerede hun, er der en klar konsensus »fra alle husets menige medlemmer«. Hun beklagede, at denne konsensus beklageligvis ikke strækker sig til Corbyn, »der kunne have brugt anledningen, som den britiske regering har gjort, til at fordømme den russiske stats skyldighed.«

Mays Torier er langt bag efter Corbyns Labour-parti i meningsmålingerne over de forestående lokalvalg.

Foto: Labour-partiets leder Jeremy Corbyn var ikke enig i PM Mays udlægning af, at der var tilstrækkelige med beviser for, at den russiske stat skulle være ansvarlig angrebet med nervegift af Skripal og hans datter og spurgte i parlamentet bl.a., hvilken respons, den britiske regering kom med over for Ruslands anmodning om en prøve af nervegiften, for at teste den.