

# Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Motsætningernes sammenfald – Morgendagens verden. Schiller Instituttets Internationale konference, 30. juni, 2018, Tyskland

*Hvis alle europæiske nationer ville gå sammen med Kina, Indien, Japan og også USA og gøre alt dette sammen med de afrikanske stater, der ønsker at blive en del af et sådant forceret program, og annoncere det som en fælles forpligtelse, kunne vi vende flygtningekrisen omkring. Men denne fremgangsmåde kræver en passioneret kærlighed til menneskeheden; præcis, som premierminister Abiy Ahmed fra Etiopien for nylig sagde under et masse møde med en halv million mennesker, kort tid, før han blev udsat for et attentatforsøg; han sagde, »Den eneste måde at gå fremefter på, væk fra al denne historie, er tilgivelse og kærlighed. Hævn er for de svage. Og fordi etiopiere ikke er svage, har vi ikke bug for hævn. Vi vil vinde med kærlighed«.*

*Så lad os handle ligeså. Verden befinder sig i en utrolig oprørstilstand. Det er meget kompliceret, og jeg mener ikke, at problemerne vil blive løst ved at have en zillion delvise løsninger. Vi har brug for et højere fornuftsgrundlag, som vil forene hele menneskeheden. Jeg mener, vi har nået vejs ende for en epoke, enden på geopolitik. Og vi må nå frem til det Nye Paradigme, hvor vi tænker i banerne for coincidentia oppositorum; det, Xi Jinping har kaldt et »fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid«. Hvis Europa er villig til at*

*overleve, vil vi organisere de europæiske lande til at gå med i denne indsats.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Rusland lægger atomafrustning på bordet til diskussion med USA**

*29. juni, 2018 – I opløbet til det planlagte topmøde 16. juli mellem USA's præsident Donald Trump og Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin, lægger russiske toptalspersoner, inkl. Putin selv, atomafrustning på bordet og advarer imod, hvad der vil ske, hvis seriøse bestræbelser mod dette mål ikke imødekommes.*

*I Washington, D.C., sagde den russiske ambassadør til USA, Anatoly Antonov, til deltagere i en begivenhed i USA's Udenrigsministerium i anledning af 50-året for Traktaten om Ikkespredning af Atomvåben (NPT), at »Rusland vil forfølge et mål om universel atomafrustning. Dette har vi gentaget på højeste niveau. Vi er overbevist om, at det er muligt at sikre yderligere fremskridt i atomafrustning, under forudsætning af, at alle de berørte stater gør deres yderste for dette«, sagde Antonov, rapporterer TASS.*

*»Den eneste, realistiske mulighed her er en afbalanceret, skridt-for-skridt fremgangsmåde, baseret på konsensus. [Denne*

fremgangsmåde] fastsætter en gradvis skabelse af passende betingelser, som gør det muligt at gå fremefter med en atomafrustning«, fortsatte Antonov. »Det er afgørende, at disse skridt bør være med til at styrke international stabilitet og sikkerhed og bør hvile på et princip om større sikkerhed for alle.« Iflg. Antonov »er forsøg på at nå målet uden deltagelse fra lande med atomvåben og i modstrid med deres lovlige interesser forbundet med, at de nuværende FN-redskaber til afrustning slås ud af balance og NPT-regimet svækkes«. Dette er tilsyneladende en reference til traktaten om forbud mod atomvåben, som for nylig blev forhandlet igennem i FN's Generalforsamling, men uden deltagelse af atomvåbenstaterne og mange af deres allierede. Alle ikkespredningsspørgsmål må tackles på basis af ikkespredningstraktaten og i streng overholdelse af internationale love, erklærede Antonov.

I Moskva advarede Sergei Rogov, »videnskabs-dekanen« fra det Russiske Videnskabsakademis Institut for Amerikanske og Canadiske Studier, imod farerne for et sammenbrud af de eksisterende regler for våbenkontrol. Han sagde i går, under en rundborddiskussion i det Russiske Føderationsråd om at bevare Traktaten om Mellemdistance-atomstyrkerne (INF), at en amerikansk tilbagetrækning fra traktaten ville udgøre en fare for forlængelsen af New START-traktaten og et sammenbrud af NPT. »Situationen er meget alvorlig. Der er stor fare for, at INF-traktaten lider samme skæbne som ABM-traktaten. Dette kunne ske så tidligt som til næste år«, sagde Rogov. »I en situation som denne er det højst usandsynligt, at New START vil kunne opretholdes og fortsætte med at eksistere i et vakuum. Dens forhaling vil vise sig at blive totalt utrolig«, sagde han til Føderationsrådet, det russiske tokammerparlaments overhus, rapporterede TASS.

Rogov advarede om, at dette ville være ensbetydende med et sammenbrud af arkitekturen for atomvåbenkontrol, som Rusland og USA skabte under store anstrengelser. »Men NPT-traktaten

ville også gå i vasken. I en multipolær verden vil frit spil for alles rivalisering begynde, og dette vil være ekstremt farligt«, sluttede han.

I Kreml i går mindede Putin selv, under en tale på en reception for afgangselever fra militær- og sikkerhedsakademierne, sit publikum uden for Kreml om, at Rusland har ændret det globale, strategiske paradigme ved at udvikle nye klasser af militære kapaciteter, i respons til, at USA har nedlagt arkitekturen for våbenkontrol, som går tilbage til USA's tilbagetrækning i 2002 fra ABM-traktaten. Putin annoncerede første gang denne nye realitet i sin dramatiske, landsdækkende, fjernsynstransmitterede tale 1. marts, 2018, til den Føderale Forsamling, Ruslands parlaments tokammersystem. I går erklærede han: »Flere russiske våbensystemer er år, hvis ikke årtier, foran lignende udenlandske produkter. For eksempel er et eksperiment for at deployere de seneste Kinzhal luftaffyrede missiler i gang i det Sydlige Føderale Distrikt. Avantgarde interkontinentale missilsystemer vil blive leveret til hæren i den nærmeste fremtid, og Sarmat ICBM'er vil følge efter inden for et år. Dette er blot en del af de moderne våbensystemer, som forventes at forbedre Ruslands potentiale adskillige gange.«

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin (venstre) og den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu (højre) under en reception i Kremls store palads til ære for afgangselever fra militærakademier. 28. juni, 2018.*

---

## **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](http://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](http://larouchepac.com/sdi). But if you fast forward from that pamphlet “Sputnik of the ’70s” all the way

to the lead-up into the 1980 Presidential campaign in which Lyndon LaRouche himself was a candidate for President of the United States. Let’s take a look at a picture here of Lyndon LaRouche meeting face-to-face with then-candidate Ronald Reagan

at a candidates’ forum that took place in Concord, New Hampshire.

During this face-to-face meeting and in several other opportunities to interface with the Reagan campaign team, Lyndon

LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail.

Following Reagan’s victory and his election, Lyndon LaRouche and

representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings

with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with

leading members of the National Security Council and Reagan’s intelligence community. They discussed LaRouche’s idea for this

new strategic doctrine, and the related scientific and energy policies that would go along with it. So, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned numerous reports and campaign pamphlets promoting this idea. As you can see here, this is from {Fusion}; this is a

special report titled “Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for Peace.” Here’s the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982.

Again, before the March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI. This

was titled “Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War.” Here’s another one; this is a pamphlet. “How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression.” So, all along, this

was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche's standpoint. As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of

Reagan's victory, 1980, '81, '82, the idea of this Beam Defense

system which would be based on new physical principles, was associated – including in the popular mind – it was associated with Lyndon LaRouche. And it had been associated with Lyndon LaRouche for at least half a decade prior to Reagan's historic,

groundbreaking speech.

The morning after Reagan's March 23rd address, the media was scrambling to try to find experts to interview to explain what it

was that Reagan had presented the night before. Naturally, they

had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization.

Here's a photograph of Paul Gallagher, who was at that time Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, appearing on

CBS' Evening News program on March 24, 1983 – the day following

Reagan's address – to explain the science behind Reagan's policy

that had been announced the evening before.

Immediately following Reagan's address to the nation, Lyndon LaRouche launched a mass educational campaign to educate the American people as to what their President had just presented.

He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work.

This image here is an array of different publications that were

issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's announcement

of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the

scientific,  
the economic, and the military-strategic implications of the policy. There you can see one pamphlet – “Support the President’s Strategic Defense Initiative; Kill Missiles, Not People.”

As should be very clear, Lyndon LaRouche was in a leading position of authority following this groundbreaking announcement,

and the influence that his ideas had come to wield put him in a

position of real power inside the political structure of the Presidency of the United States. He used that influence to launch and to escalate on his campaign to completely reorganize

the entire international economic and strategic architecture of

the planet. Let’s take a look at a document that Lyndon LaRouche

released exactly one year following Reagan’s March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI program. This was called “The LaRouche

Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and the USSR.” This was published March 30, 1984. Let me

read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published under

this title “The LaRouche Doctrine.” He begins by saying:

“The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and b)

Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the benefits

of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and all.

“The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the

monetary,  
economic, and political relations between the dominant powers  
and  
those relatively subordinated nations often classed as  
'developing nations.' Unless the inequities lingering in the  
aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied,  
there  
can be no durable peace on this planet.

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

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

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

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

“The importer of such advanced capital goods increases the productive powers of labor in the economy of the importing nation. This enables the importing nation to produce its goods at

a lower average social cost, and enables it to provide better-quality and cheaper goods as goods of payment to the nations exporting capital goods.

“Not only are the causes of simple humanity and general peace served by such policies of practice; the arrangement is equally beneficial to exporting and importing nations....

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

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

He

says:

“Since the rupture of the wartime alliance between the two powers, U.S. military policy toward the Soviet Union has passed

through two phases. The first, from the close of the war until a

point beyond the death of Joseph Stalin, was preparation for the

contingency of what was sometimes named ‘preventive nuclear war.’

The second, emerging over the period from the death of Stalin into the early period of the administration of President John F.

Kennedy, was based on the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response ...

“From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might



have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called 'détente,'

between the two powers. This appearance was deceptive; during the

period 1977-83, there was an accelerating deterioration in the military relationships between the two powers....

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

"In response to this direction of developments, the U.S. public figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proposed that both powers

develop, deploy, and agree to develop and deploy 'strategic' defensive, anti-ballistic-missile defense based on 'new physical

principles.' This proposal was issued publicly by LaRouche beginning February 1982; he proposed to U.S.A., Western European,

and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of

such strategic defensive systems be adopted policy, as a means for escaping from the 'logic' of Nuclear Deterrence....

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

"On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing

community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of this planet. This shall become a community of principle coherent

with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If

any force should endeavor to destroy that community of principle,  
or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the United States will be prepared to defend that community and its members by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient. With respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United States offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might enter fully into participation within that community of principle... "Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in development of the frontiers of scientific research, in laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations will be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems derived from application of 'new physical principles.' "To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other nations in development of these new areas of scientific breakthrough for application to exploration of space. "To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in scientific exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements protecting national and multinational programs for colonization of the Moon and Mars. "At some early time, the powers shall enter into deliberations, selecting dates for initial manned colonization of the Moon and Mars, and the establishment of international space

stations on the Moon and in the orbits of Moon and Mars, stations to be maintained by and in the common interest and use of space parties of all nations.

“The powers jointly agree upon the adoption of two tasks as the common interest of mankind, as well as the specific interest

of each of the two powers: 1) The establishment of full economic

equity respecting the conditions of individual life in all nations of this planet during a period of not more than 50 years;

2) Man’s exploration and colonization of nearby space as the continuing common objective and interest of mankind during and beyond the completion of the first task. The adoption of these two working-goals as the common task and respective interest in

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

That was known as the “LaRouche Doctrine,” published March 30, 1984. As you can see, what Lyndon LaRouche outlined in that

document was the basis for exactly what we’re calling now a new

international economic and strategic architecture. In fact, the

one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized

as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the

persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have the

kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic

development and the application of these groundbreaking new physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic

order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations

– but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB.

As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis

for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called

“developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny,

I think that the echoes couldn't be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the

1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa

or Central and South America. Or, when President Putin offers to

“sit down at the negotiating table and devise together a new and

relevant system of international security and sustainable development for human civilization,” we should reflect on what was laid in that document. That LaRouche Doctrine now almost 35

years ago today, in the wake of that history-changing announcement by President Ronald Reagan, at which he called a spade a spade. The world could no longer survive under the dictatorship of Mutually Assured Destruction; that reign of terror that President Kennedy characterized as the Sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads over every man, woman, and child on this planet, threatening nuclear annihilation. What Lyndon LaRouche characterized at that moment

as the “LaRouche Doctrine” is the principle behind the new economic and new security architecture which must be adopted on

this planet today. Not as a recipe, not taking everything exactly as it was said, because clearly of course, the world has

changed; and we must apply the principles that lay at the root of

exactly what Lyndon LaRouche had in mind when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and when he proposed the subsequent

LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit

the specific conditions of today.

One thing that Lyndon LaRouche alluded to explicitly in that document, was the need for joint cooperation in the colonization

and exploration of space. In fact, that is the form that the idea of a revived SDI has actually been taken. The proposal for

not an SDI, but what’s now called an SDE – the Strategic Defense

of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the

United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India and other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech. What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr. Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other, and let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a "non-zero threat" – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is

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

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

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

today

represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver  
in

the economy to use the increased productivity of the real  
economy

for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector,  
in

order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

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

participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace  
breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition  
and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we  
should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think  
we

should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of  
the

Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another  
big

asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth. So we  
need

to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all  
countries

should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future  
of

humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I  
mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to  
overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of  
cooperation

where we put all our forces together to solve those questions  
which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons,  
poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could  
fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And

I



think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

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

---

## **Trump til Putin – Lad os mødes snart**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 20. marts, 2018* – Præsident Trump har netop trukket tæppet væk under den skøre lady, Theresa May, og den endnu mere skøre udenrigsminister Boris Johnson. Alt imens disse afdankede forsvarere af det døende, britiske imperium beskylder Rusland for krigshandlinger, beskyldninger, der typisk ikke er baseret på nogen beviser, ringede Trump i dag og talte med den netop genvalgte præsident Vladimir Putin.

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

Her til aften vil briterne bide i gulvtæppet. Ikke alene har Trump ødelagt deres kneb med at 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 kollapsede. Nu står aktørerne i dette kupforsøg mod den amerikanske regering – inkl. John Brennan, James Clapper, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton og flere nyligt fyrede FBI-operatører – over for mulige anklager om kriminelle handlinger for det mest åbenlyse forræderi i moderne amerikansk historie, alt sammen på vegne af Det britiske Imperium.

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

Og, for lige at banke sømmet dybere ind, så bekræftede

talsperson for Det Hvide Hus Sarah Sanders, at nervegiftangrebet i UK slet ikke blev nævnt i telefonsamtalen mellem Trump og Putin!

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

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

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

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

selve eksistensen af Imperium, én gang for alle.

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

---

# **Præsident Trump ringer til Putin for at diskutere strategisk samarbejde og muligt møde**

20. marts, 2018 – I samtale med reportere under sit møde i dag i det ovale kontor med den saudiske prins Mohammad bin Salman, annoncerede præsident Donald Trump rask, at han havde ringet til den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tidligere på dagen for at lykønske ham med hans valgsejr og foreslå, at de to skulle mødes »i en ikke for fjern fremtid« for at diskutere, hvordan de i fællesskab kunne forhindre et våbenkapløb, blandt andre afgørende spørgsmål.

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

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

Vi havde en meget god samtale, og jeg regner med, at vi

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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