

Fjern krigenes tåger: Løgne, forbandede løgne; forbandede britiske løgne

Lederartikel; Flyveblad, fra LaRouchePAC, 16. april, 2018 –
Mandag, den 16. april, portrætterer *Washington Post* præsident Donald Trump som værende omgivet af et forræderisk udenrigspolitisk team, der konstant og konsekvent lyver for ham om Rusland og om skridt, dette team har taget i præsidentens, og i jeres, navn, imod Rusland og Kina. **WP forsøger at hævde, at Trumps nationale sikkerhedsstab iscenesatte et paladskup imod ham med hensyn til Rusland og Syrien, og at Trump tabte denne kamp.**

Men præsidenten handlede omgående imod forræderne omkring ham. Han forkastede udnævnelsen af Nikki Haleys assistent, aldrig-Trumperen Jon Lemer, til en national sikkerhedspost, for Mike Pence. Det Hvide Hus annoncerede, at nye sanktioner mod Rusland, baseret på Ruslands støtte til Syrien, og som Nikki Haley promoverede blot i går, blev kaldt tilbage. Det blev offentligt meddelt, at præsident Trump stadig ønsker at mødes med Vladimir Putin, men en dato er endnu ikke fastlagt.

Samtidig pralede den franske præsident over for hele verden med, at det var ham, der narrede præsident Trump til at udføre et missilangreb mod Syrien, som herved genoplivede selve Hillary Clinton/Obama-doktrinerne for regimeskifte, som det amerikanske folk, helt rigtigt, afviste i valgene i 2016. Dette sætter blot scenen for et voldsomt, politisk bagslag for Frankrigs præsident.

Med tågen fra sidste uges handlinger, der nu letter, bliver flere aspekter af vores nuværende situation meget, meget klarere. Alt imens angloamerikanerne er ved at falde over deres egne fødder for på tåbelig vis at erklære, at de har

fået Trump manøvreret ind i et bur, så står det meget klart, at deres proklamerede sejr er en Pyrrhussejr, som udgør arrogante vrangforestillinger og kun er midlertidige. De opførte sig ansvarsløst, og muligheden for et bagslag er enormt og revolutionerende for verden, hvis det amerikanske folk nu går sammen med Lyndon LaRouches krav om at »annullere Det britiske Imperium«. På intet tidspunkt, siden Franklin Roosevelt erklærede sin plan om at gøre en ende på britisk kolonialisme, har det anglo-hollandske imperium været så sårbart og eksponeret. Her er de relevante træk af vores nuværende situation:

1. Svindelnummeret med det kemiske angreb i Syrien; svindelnummeret med Skripal-forgiftningen i Storbritannien, samt det britiskinspirerede kup mod vores præsident, er alle en del af én og samme, britiske, strategiske pakke. Storbritannien er nu, sammen med sin mangeårige puddel Frankrig, ude efter at anføre den vestlige verden i at udfordre Rusland og Kina, der påstås at praktisere noget, der skulle hedde »totalitær kapitalisme«. Her er, hvordan den britiske imperieskriverkarl Allister Heath beskrev det britiske motiv for forgiftnings-svindelnemrene i Salisbury og i Syrien, i londonavisen Sunday Telegraph den 14. marts:

»Vi har brug for en ny verdensorden, der kan gå op imod totalitære kapitalister i Rusland og Kina ... En sådan alliance ... ville på dramatisk vis ændre den globale magtbalance og gøre det muligt for de liberale demokratier, endelig at kæmpe tilbage. Det ville give verden den form for robuste institutioner, der kræves for at holde Rusland og Kina tilbage ... Storbritannien må have en ny rolle i verden: at opbygge et sådant netværk ville være vores perfekte mission.«

På den anden side af vandpytten, som de siger, udkom der, nøjagtig samtidigt, en tilsvarende, stiftende erklæring fra 68 tidligere embedsmænd i Obama-administrationen, der har dannet en gruppe ved navn **National Security Action**, og som tilsigter

at sikre Donald Trumps afsættelse og angreb mod Rusland og Kina.

2. Russerne siger nu, at de har uigendrivelige beviser for, at de Hvide Hjelme, en hjælpeorganisation, der er associeret til al-Qaeda og modtager finansiel støtte i millionklassen af den britiske regering og U.S. AID, iscenesatte det kemiske angreb i Douma, Syrien, på direkte tilskyndelse fra London. Beviserne omfatter fotografier og aflytninger. Samtidig har et uafhængigt, schweizisk laboratorium, der samarbejder med OPCW, fastslået, at den gift, der blev brugt på Skripal og datter, var noget, der hedder BZ, et stof, der aldrig blev udviklet i Rusland, men som i stedet har hjemme i både USA's og UK's programmer for kemiske våben. Disse påstande er helt i overensstemmelse med uafhængige analyser, som LaRouchePAC har fremskaffet i løbet af de seneste 10 dage. (Se: '[Der var intet kemisk angreb i Syrien](#)' og '[Assads kemiske våben: Endnu et britisk eventyr for børn](#)').
3. Der er allerede i Storbritannien en enorm, folkelig reaktion, som kommer fra Labour-partiet og Brexit-bevægelsen, mod disse løgne. De sammenligner meget passende de »klassificerede« beviser for forgiftningssvindelumrene med de løgne, der førte til den katastrofale Irakkrig. På samme måde gik de glemte amerikanere her i USA, der valgte Trump til at afslutte dette nonsens, sammen med LaRouchePAC og protesterede højlydt imod det syriske angreb hele sidste uge. Denne protest trak efter alt at dømme verden væk fra en balanceren og poseren på kanten af atomkrig, anstiftet af Storbritannien, Frankrig og deres kolleger i det Demokratiske Parti og blandt de neokonservative i USA.
4. En hoveddrivkraft bag denne situation er det forestående finanskollaps af finanscentrene på Wall Street og i City of London. Langt fra at praktisere 'totalitær kapitalisme' er Kina, sammen med Rusland, midt i et

projekt for massivt byggeri af infrastruktur og økonomisk udvikling, der har vundet tilslutning fra over 100 andre nationer i verden. Det udgør det største infrastrukturbyggeprojekt, menneskeheden nogensinde har påtaget sig, og det har det udtrykkelige formål at gøre en ende på fattigdom og hæve levestandarden på hele planeten. Kina og Rusland afsætter også betydelige andele af deres budget til rumforskning og fundamentale, videnskabelige opdagelser. Dette er den form for »at tænke stort«, som vi i USA plejede at praktisere. Det giver genlyd af det Amerikanske System for Politisk Økonomi. »Totalitær kapitalisme« er det ikke. Hvis præsident Trump accepterer Kinas invitation til at slutte USA til Bælte & Vej Initiativet, vil det snarere blive det Anglo-hollandske Imperium, og ikke Donald Trump, der henvises til historiens skraldespand.

5. Situationen er fortsat fuld af farer. Nikki Haley og John Bolton har forpligtet USA over for en militær respons, når som helst, en terrorist i Syrien kan iscenesætte endnu et falsk kemisk angreb. Ukraine er et andet muligt trigger point, der kunne bruges af dem, der er involveret i forræderi mod vort land og vor præsident. Det står nu ligeledes klart, at en desperat Robert Mueller er ude på at gøre Donald Trumps advokat til statens bevis imod hans egen klient, en taktik, den beskidte Mueller gentagne gange har anvendt. Muellers taktik har måske denne gang fjernet det Sjette Tillæg til den Amerikanske Forfatning. Mueller er desperat, fordi Russiagate er sprængt i stykker, Comey er en fiasko og hele afdelinger af Obamas Justitsministerium nu konkurrerer om at afsløre hinandens forbrydelser.

Så med tågen, der letter, finder vi faktisk os selv på randen af en sejr. Spørgsmålet vil blive afgjort af den amerikanske befolknings mod til at kræve, og handle for, en afslutning af dette kup, en afsløring af de perfide, britiske løgne og en insisteren på at komme videre med genopbygningen af landet, og

af planeten. Lyndon LaRouche har gentagne gange advaret imod pragmatisme i netop denne situation. Med et citat af apostlen Paulus, minder LaRouche os om, at »Thi for os står kampen ikke mod kød og blod, men mod myndigheder og magter, mod verdensherskerne i dette mørke, mod ondskabens åndemagter i himmelrummet.«[1] (Paulus' brev til efeserne, kap. 6, v. 12.) Vær en kraft for retfærdigheden og det gode.

(Det engelske Flyveblad kan [downloades her](#))

Foto: Den syriske præsident Assad og den russiske præsident Putin i Syrien, december, 2017. Photo: Kremlin.ru

[1] Den danske oversættelse iflg. Bibelselskabet.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Missilerne blev lanceret af britiske løgne; London må afkræves svar

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. april, 2018 – I et nationalt tv-interview søndag pralede Frankrigs præsident på tåbelig vis med, at han, sammen med den britiske premierminister Theresa May, overbeviste præsident Trump om at *trække sig fra sin egen politik* og bevare de amerikanske styrker i Syrien »for en længerevarende periode«. Denne uhyrlige udtalelse betyder, at UK og Frankrig kræver, ikke alene endnu en endeløs krig i Mellemøsten fra USA's side, men også en støt eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland, og med Kina.

Som en af Storbritanniens egne, tidligere diplomater i går sagde i London, »Det er vejen til galskab«. Hamlet talte med foragt om nationer, der fører krig over et stykke land, der er for lille til at rumme ét af deres slag. Her trækkes nationer mod global atomkrig *over begivenheder, der ikke fandt sted.*

Beviset: Skylden for forgiftningen, eller påvirkningen af kemikalier, i marts måned af den tidligere russiske dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal i Salisbury, England, blev rasende lagt på Rusland af Mays regering; men de britiske fabrikationer om denne hændelse er nu ved at kollapse.

I en enorm konfrontation krævede og fik »fr. Mayhem« udvisning af hundreder af russiske diplomater fra USA og EU-lande.

Men Spiez Laboratoriet, det statslige, schweiziske institut for beskyttelse mod NBC (nuclear, biological, chemical), fandt, at Skripal far og datter blev forgiftet af et ikke-dødeligt stof, der blev udviklet i UK og USA til NATO-militærstyrker for 50 år siden. Det forklarer, hvorfor de kom sig! Men det forklarer ikke, hvorfor prøver, som den britiske regering gav OPCW, også indeholdt en dødbringende nervegift af en type, der blev udviklet i det gamle Sovjetunionen – i en koncentration, der ville have dræbt de to Skripals meget hurtigt.

London må forklare dette; og det må svare på, om det presser OPCW til ikke at offentliggøre resultaterne fra et af dets fem mest betroede laboratorier.

Et kemisk angreb i Douma fra den syriske regerings side fandt ikke sted, som kampveteran fra Marinen og senere advokat i Army Judge Advocate General, senator fra staten Virginia, **Richard Black, forklarede i et interview til LaRouchePAC den 11. april**, som er udbredt via Internettet (nu 98.000 views!).

Barzeh-forskningslaboratoriet, der netop er blevet ødelagt af amerikansk/britisk/franske missiler, var to gange sidste år – og så sent som i november 2017 – blevet fundet totalt frit for

aktivitet omkring kemiske våben iflg. OPCW-rapporter for en måned siden, og igen for to uger siden!

Britisk efterretning, premierminister Theresa May og udenrigsminister Boris Johnson må forklare dette.

I dag sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at USA's Kongres og parlamenter i Europa må kræve svar; det er en potentiel verdenskrig, der står på spil. Briterne giver nu med det samme jihadisterne og terroristgrupperne i Syrien overtaget, som de kan bruge til at beordre nye angreb med krydsermissiler mod Syrien ved at iscenesætte disse »kemiske angreb«.

»Steele-dossieret«, fremstillet af senioragenter fra det britiske MI6, også kendt som den Hemmelige Efterretningstjeneste, har udgjort det svindelagtige grundlag for et intenst fremstød for at tvinge præsident Trump til at acceptere **britisk, geopolitisk politik** og konfrontere Putin og Kina – og dernæst afsætte ham ved en rigsretssag (impeachment).

Dette er alt sammen svindelnumre, den form for løgnagtig efterretning, gennem hvilken Tony Blairs britiske regering puffede USA ind i Irakkrigen, og ved hjælp af hvilken britisk efterretning for et århundrede siden banede vejen for Første Verdenskrig.

May og Macron har overeksponeret sig selv. USA behøver ikke være en evig tåbe, der går i krig på vegne af britiske løgne. De fleste veteraner fra Golfkrigene, f.eks., ved eller har stærk mistanke om, at Trump bliver narret af angreb under »falsk flag«. Han er ved at blive narret ind i krig af de samme kredse, der ønsker ham afsat.

Det var Trumps plan at trække de amerikanske styrker ud af Syrien; Amerikas nationaløkonomi har et presserende behov for udvikling, ny infrastruktur, nye teknologier. Og USA har brug for en forbindelse til projekterne i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, og en forbindelse til Kinas kapital.

Krigen er her!

Hvordan bekæmper vi den?

Hvad er vort våben?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. april, 2018 – Hvor kom dette raketangreb mod Syrien fra? Gå tilbage til Allister Heath, redaktør af londonavisen Sunday Telegraph. Husk hans artikel i Daily Telegraph fra 14. marts, kort tid efter nyheden om Skripal-sagen, med overskriften, »Glem NATO. Vi må have en ny, global alliance til at bekæmpe totalitære kapitalister i Rusland og Kina«. Han sluttede:

»En sådan alliance ville være det største skift i geopolitik, siden skabelsen af FN. Det ville på dramatisk vis ændre den globale magtbalance og gøre det muligt for de liberale demokratier, endelig at kæmpe tilbage. Det ville give verden den form for robuste institutioner, der kræves for at holde Rusland og Kina tilbage ... Storbritannien må have en ny rolle i verden: at opbygge et sådant netværk ville være vores perfekte mission.«

Husk, at han bogstavelig talt skrev dette den selv samme dag, hvor 68 tidligere embedsmænd i Obama-administrationen offentliggjorde deres aktionskomite, ved navn National Security Action, der har to formål – at sikre Trumps impeachment, og at angribe Rusland og Kina.

Vi må konstant sætte i perspektiv, hvor dette kommer fra. På dette punkt – hvor det kommer fra – står det faktisk meget svagt. For, det er ikke alment accepteret blandt befolkningen, på trods af mediernes hjernevask, 24 timer i døgnet – hvilket virkelig er bemærkelsesværdigt. En dyb splittelse har vist sig

i den såkaldte Trump-koalition omkring opgivelse af ideen om, at vi ikke længere skal gennemføre krige for regimeskifte. Og beviserne, med hensyn til det, man har fremlagt som grundlaget for disse angreb, er rene, britiske svindelnumre. Vi har et job at udføre, for i dybden at oplyse den brede befolkning om, at briterne har gjort dette før, som med Irakkrigen – som virkelig giver resonans hos præsidenten. Vi må sørge for, at den opposition, der er opstået internt i kredsen omkring Trump, bliver større. Vi fører ikke et juridisk angreb mod den forfatningsmæssige ret til at føre krig, men derimod et angreb mod briternes mål her og mod det faktum, at dette er et angreb mod det, som Rusland og Kina sluttelig repræsenterer med hensyn til en ny måde at have relationer i verden på – og mod ikkeeksistensen af beviser. De synes midlertidigt at have indfanget præsidenten – selv om: hvordan kan han være vidende om, at kuppet imod ham er britisk, og alligevel ikke se, at den udenrigspolitiske ende af dette ligeledes er britiskkontrolleret og ligeledes tilsigter at drive ham ind i en fælde? – For, målet er præcis det, som Allister Heath forklarede: at genetablere Det britiske Imperium imod Rusland og Kina og samtidig smide Donald Trump på historiens askebunke.

Vi må benytte alle midler for at forklare dette til folk, så de forstår det, samtidig med, at vi identificerer, hvor koalitionen, som støtter denne ondskab, ikke holder sammen. I mellemtiden må vi bruge situationen til at virkeliggøre 2018-kampagnen for at sikre fremtiden for **LaRouches Fire Love**, fordi der ikke findes nogen på den aktuelle, amerikanske scene, der har den fjerneste idé om, hvad man skal gøre for fremtiden. De to partier, som sådan, står for krig og FBI. Vi må gå tilbage til **LaRouches erklæring på hans 90-års fødselsdag**, hvor han viser, at vi er de mennesker, som kan samle folk omkring det, der virkelig behøves, uden at referere til disse forældede, politiske partier.

Krigen er nu her i USA, såvel som i Frankrig og

Storbritannien. Vi må intervenere i denne polariserede situation for at styrke de folk, der har en fornemmelse af aspekterne i dette. Vi ønsker at få en intelligent debat om de britiske løgne og andre vigtige aspekter af dette. Der foregår en kamp omkring fortolkningen af, hvad der foregår. Jo mere, vi taler med folk, der allerede er vidende, og får dem oplyst og får dem til højt at udtale, hvad det er, der er nødvendigt, desto bedre – dette er ekstremt vigtigt.

En **ny erklæring fra LaRouchePAC** vil blive udgivet i løbet af mandagen, den 16. april.

Foto: Himlen over Damaskus tidligt lørdag, 14. april, med affyring af jord-til-luft missiler som svar på USA's lancering af et angreb mod Syrien med forskellige mål i den syriske hovedstad.

Russerne smider endnu en bombe med hensyn til briternes rolle i at iscenesætte svindelnummeret med det kemiske angreb i det østlige Ghouta

14. april, 2018 – Kun få timer før angrebet med krydsermissiler den 13. april mod Syrien, gav talsmand for det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, gen. Igor Konashenkov, en briefing i Moskva, hvor han, for anden gang i lige så mange dage, naglede briternes rolle i den totale fabrikering af den

angivelige hændelse med kemiske våben i det østlige Ghouta, der blev brugt, som en fabrikeret *casus belli*, til at retfærdiggøre angrebet fra USA's, UK's og Frankrigs side. »I dag råder det russiske militærdepartement over flere beviser, der er vidnesbyrd om Storbritanniens direkte deltagelse i at organisere denne provokation i det østlige Ghouta«, sagde gen. Konashenkov. »Det russiske parti ved med sikkerhed, at, fra 3. til 6. april, blev repræsentanter for de såkaldte Hvide Hjelme influeret af London til den omgående gennemførelse af provokationen, der var forberedt på forhånd. De Hvide Hjelme fik informationer om, at militante kæmpere fra Jaish al-Islam skulle udføre en række voldsomme artilleribombardementer af Damaskus, 3. – 6. april. Bombardementet fra Jaish al-Islam havde til hensigt at fremprovokere en respons fra de syriske regeringsstyrker, rapporterede talsmanden, og således sætte scenen for provokationen. En dag tidligere havde Konashenkov beskrevet, hvordan jihadisternes havde iscenesat videoerne af de angivelige ofre for et kemisk angreb, iflg. øjenvidneberetninger, givet til det russiske militær. Et par dage tidligere havde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov advaret om, at »efterretningstjenester fra en stat, der nu stræber efter at være spydspids for en russofobisk kampagne, var involveret i denne fabrikation ... [Moskva har] uigendrivelige informationer om, at det var endnu en fabrikation«. På det tidspunkt tilbageholdt Lavrov de mere detaljerede efterretninger, som Konashenkov efterfølgende oplyste om. De russiske afsløringer, samt en voksende trommehvirvel af relaterede spørgsmål i hele verden, har tvunget briterne og deres allierede til at komme frem fra skyggerne og ihærdigt benægte de russiske anklager. På et temmelig voldsomt møde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd den 13. april, før luftangrebene blev lanceret, var Storbritanniens ambassadør Karen Pierce nødsaget til at fordømme Ruslands påstande, der blev fremlagt af general Konashenkov og her gentaget af Ruslands FN-ambassadør, Vassily Nebenzia, som »groteske, bizarre og direkte løgn. Jeg vil gerne kategorisk erklære, at Storbritannien ikke har, og aldrig ville have, nogen som helst

involvering i anvendelsen af kemiske våben«. Pierce blev forudsigeligt nok sekunderet af USA's FN-ambassadør, Nikki Haley, der foregav at være »i ærefrygt« over, at Nebenzia kunne komme med sådanne påstande »og holde masken«. Heksen Haley fløj atter i aktion på mødet den 14. april i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, der var indkaldt af Rusland for at fordømme aggressionen mod Syrien, og hun insisterede på, at disse videoer ikke var 'fake', og at en totalt optrappet, russisk misinformationskampagne nu var i gang. På lignende måde fremførte en lang artikel i den britiske avis *Guardian*, som blev udgivet sent om aftenen den 13. april, også benægtelser af Ruslands anklager i artiklens allerførste sætning, der citerede talskvinde fra Det Hvide Hus Sarah Sanders, der afviste den russiske påstand, og Heather Nauert fra Udenrigsministeriet, der gjorde det samme.

Foto: UK's FN-ambassadør Karen Pierce, UNSC 14. april.

Assads kemiske våben: Endnu et britisk eventyr for børn – hvad var det, der skete i Syrien?

14. april, 2018: Will Wertz: Vi befinder os netop nu på et punkt, som den tyske skuespilforfatter Friedrich Schiller kaldte for et 'punctum saliens', dvs. et punkt, hvor en tragedie potentielt kunne ske, hvor der, hvis der ikke træffes afgørende beslutninger, kommer en tragisk afsløring af

handlingsforløbet. Der står vi lige nu. Som folk ved, så annoncerede præsident Trump i går aftes bombningen af Syrien, som blev gennemført i løbet af aftenen eller rettere om morgenen, syrisk tid. Dette truer med at abortere hele fredsproceselementet i Syrien. Det er en overtrædelse af FN's charter, af folkeretten og truer med at komme fuldstændig ud af kontrol under visse omstændigheder ...

Stop briternes krigsfremstød! LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 13. april 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: Det er 13. april. Som seere af vores webside vil vide, og som LaRouchePAC-aktivister vil vide, så gik verden i mandags ind i et alarmberedskab, svarende til Rød Alarm. LaRouchePAC og LaRouche-organisationen gik ind i en generel mobilisering for at stoppe det, det ville være en katastrofal, ødelæggende og meget farlig beslutning om at lancere et angreb mod Syrien. Et angreb, der meget vel omgående kunne kaste os ud i begyndelsen til Tredje Verdenskrig. Denne mobilisering har haft en enorm effekt. LaRouchePAC gik omgående i offensiven og udgav et flyveblad, som I ser her på skærmen. Flyvebladet kan downloades via linket, I ser her. (Dansk: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=24629>)

Dette flyveblad omdeles nu overalt og er også blevet omdelt til hvert eneste kontor i Repræsentanternes Hus og USA's Senat.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af webcastet:

Let me just read you a little bit from this leaflet. This is not all of it, but these are some relevant excerpts. It begins by saying the following:

“We, the United States, are about to launch an attack on Syria and, possibly, the Russian troops therein, based on perfidious British lies; based on what may turn out to be history’s final and blackest intelligence hoax, the one that eliminated the human race. At the same time, President Trump’s personal lawyer’s office was raided today, April 9, 2018, based

on a referral from Special Counsel Robert Mueller. These two outrageous events are completely related. Unless you rise up with

us right now to stop it, this country is in grave, graver peril.

The outright attempt to blackmail this President into the war he

was elected to stop has been escalated beyond anyone’s imagination.

“In 2016, millions of Americans voted for Donald Trump because he said he would end useless, perpetual wars on behalf of

an intellectually dead and financially bankrupt Anglo-American system, the imperium which dates to the immediate aftermath of World War II. Donald Trump sought better relations with China, now emerging as the world’s most powerful economy, and Putin’s Russia. Trump’s determination to establish decent relations with

Russia and China and that determination alone, set into motion the hellish coup against the President, led by the British and those many useful idiots in our elites who are in their

thrall.

“That coup, whose manifesto was the fake “dirty dossier” on Donald Trump authored by MI6’s Christopher Steele and paid for by

Hillary Clinton, was on its last legs when Britain began its present offensive. Senators Charles Grassley and Lindsay Graham

had referred Christopher Steele to the United States Department

of Justice for criminal prosecution and patriots in Congress were

pursuing a genuine effort to identify and prosecute those responsible for the coup against our President. Then, on March 4,

2018, a Russian who spied for Britain, Sergei Skripal, and his daughter were allegedly poisoned in Salisbury, England. Skripal

runs in the same British espionage circles associated with Christopher Steele. Prime Minister Teresa May immediately pronounced to the world that Russia was behind the attack but has

never ever produced any proof for any of her bellicose statements. President Trump was bum rushed by his traitorous advisors, including H.R. McMaster, who throughout his military career was a captive of Britain’s International Institute of Strategic Affairs, into supporting Britain’s completely unfounded

claims. The message to the President from our traitors is clear,

join us in the march to war and maybe, maybe, we will let up with

the coup.

“Ultimately, Britain’s own chemical weapons experts at Porton Downs refused to say that the agent used on the Skripals

was manufactured in Russia, despite the evidence-free claims of

Teresa May and her insane Foreign Minister, Boris Johnson". "Despite voicing support for Teresa May, Donald Trump still sought to make good on his promise to the American people. He congratulated Putin on his election and invited him to the White House for early talks, citing the escalating and dangerous arms race between the United States and Russia. The British and their American friends completely lost it in response. A hammer needed to be dropped on this President who now was even talking of pulling American troops out of Syria and rebuilding the United States.

"Enter a second British authored poisoning hoax, this one in Syria. The Russians, Iranians, and Syrians not only assisted in the defeat of ISIS, but were mopping up the last remnants of remaining jihadis, such as Jayish Al Islam, a rebranded Salafist Jihadi group controlled by the Saudis, and the Al Nusra front or Al-Qaeda. The final military operations consolidating victory were concluded in the last days in Gouta, a suburb of Damascus.

Having achieved victory, under the narrative our war mongering media would have us believe, Assad launched a chemical weapons attack to celebrate that victory, knowing he would bring down holy hell upon himself from the West.

"The pictures of dying children which President Trump reacted to so emotionally a year ago, when he launched missile strikes on Syria, have been presented to him again. There is every reason to believe they are fake. Russia and Syria had been warning about just such a false flag attack involving chlorine gas for over a month as they closed in on victory in Gouta. The

only information claiming such an attack occurred is coming from the White Helmets, an aid organization founded by the British, implicated as being militarily involved with Al-Qaeda, and deeply implicated in past hoaxes concerning Assad's alleged use of chemical weapons.

"The White Helmets are jointly funded by British and American intelligence components dedicated to regime change in Syria. They have received millions upon millions of dollars for this purpose. They are critical components of the interventionist and regime change foreign policy Donald Trump was elected to eradicate.

"In 2013, when Obama threatened war with Russia over Syria, the American people intervened, raised the roof of Congress, and stopped it. This is what is needed now. Russia sees

an unrelenting information warfare offensive coming from the British and their dupes in the U.S. They correctly see this as

the first steps toward war. We need to reverse this starting right

now. Call your Congressional Representative or Senator, tell them

to stop the drive to War and Shut Down Robert Mueller, Now.

"[The] Capitol Switchboard is (202)224- 3121. Raise the roof! Call the White House and tell the President not to step in

a British trap. [And the White House switchboard number is] (202)456-1111."

Now, that leaflet is available in the description of this video. As we've received reports, calls have been inundating Congress, and we've received word that the White House switchboard has also been overwhelmed with calls over the last several days from American citizens responding to this call.

The call, that LaRouche PAC issued to immediately go into an all-out mobilization to stop this war. As I mentioned, this leaflet is being circulated around the country. Rallies are being held in cities around the country by members and activists with the LaRouche Political Action Committee. Here, I'm going to show you a couple of pictures. This is a picture from the streets of Manhattan, and that graphic there – “No Strike on Syria” – which had listed the White House phone number and the Congressional phone number. The next there, you see “Chemical Weapons Hoax Is another British Lie”. There is somebody signing up, leaving their information to become a volunteer and an activist with LaRouche PAC. The next one here, you see a banner “Fire Mueller, Not Missiles! Poison Gas, My Ass! Stop World War III! larouchepac.com”. Here you can see a similar banner which was being deployed in the streets of Houston, Texas. This one, you can see, was accompanied by Kesha Rogers, who is an independent candidate for US Congress there in Texas. This one: “Syrian Chemical Weapons Hoax! British False-Flag for Nuclear War!” And then one more, here you can see Kesha Rogers herself, “Poison Gas My Ass! It's All British Lies!” This is being similarly alluded to by experts here in the United States and abroad who are very clear that there have been previous instances of false-flag types of attacks being staged in Syria to try to provoke US involvement and to try to provoke

these US strikes against the Syrian government. In fact, spokesmen for the Russian Foreign Ministry are tracing this directly back to the British, and are naming the British by name.

So, as we said on Monday, the mask is now falling away, and the

British have over-extended themselves and are now being identified as the perfidious actors that they are. Including in

an interview that Will Wertz of *Executive Intelligence Review* conducted on behalf of LaRouche PAC on Wednesday of this week, with Senator Richard Black. Richard Black is a very vocal Senator here in the Virginia State Senate. This video has already gained over 23,000 views as of just a few minutes ago, last time I checked. In that interview, what Senator Black does

is, he spares no words in warning that any strike on Syria with

Russian troops present on the ground, could lead directly to a thermonuclear war which would threaten the existence of human civilization itself. Let me play you a clip from that video, and

I should just note that the full video is available. The link is

available in the description below this video in YouTube [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kTtAm00HW24>].

So, here's a clip from this interview with Senator Richard Black.

SEN. RICHARD BLACK

: we have maneuvered ourselves to a point, where the degree of risk I think is as high as it was when the Archduke of Austria was assassinated, causing an explosion into the First World War – enormous bloodshed, suffering, destruction. And the First World War, of course, was

sort of just a prelude and laid the groundwork for the Second World War, and the vast destruction that took place.

Now: what makes this worse than the First World War situation, is that while Russia – you know, we outspend Russia 11:1; our defense budget is so big, that it equals the combined

total of the next 14 largest nations in terms of defense spending: Russia, China, Germany, Korea, France; it just goes on

and on. We have a {gargantuan} defense budget, and so we are more than a match for the Russians. The Russians, while they have a fine army, and fine military, it's much smaller. It just can't compare.

However, where we do have equality is with nuclear power.

Both sides apparently have roughly 1,500 nuclear weapons that are

set to go, like that. There are roughly 7,000 on either side, which are capable of being used in short order. That is enough

probably to destroys two-thirds of humanity. And certainly the Western world as we know it, would be practically annihilated: All of our major cities. Right here in Virginia, Norfolk, the biggest naval base on Earth, would simply be gone. This Loudoun

County which has huge internet traffic would be gone. The Pentagon would be gone. New York City totally gone! It would totally be erased from the Earth!

And we have people like John Bolton, who are sufficiently reckless, to where, for their self-interest, they are willing to

risk the death of perhaps 2 billion people, to just simply purging them from the face of the Earth. And it is incumbent on

the President to recognize the extraordinary danger that we face.

We have been building up to this, and many of us elected

Donald Trump on a promise that he was going to sort of normalize our relations with Russia; he was going to stop trying to overthrow President Assad, and work with the Syrians; he was going to downgrade the importance of NATO, and he was going to give up regime change. Now, Trump has done a lot of the things he promised to do, but he has not done *one* thing that he promised to do in foreign affairs – well, you could take the exception – he was always very hostile towards the Iranian deal and so he was honest about that. That's probably the one thing that he's focused on most. But you know, when Gen. Michael Flynn was planned to be the National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn would have been a godsend for this nation. He knew where the skeletons buried, he understood what was going on, and I think he recognized the importance of drawing back from nuclear war. And so, we have come to a point, probably more dangerous than any time in my lifetime – and I'm counting the time, when as kids we used to have air raid drills, and we'd get under desks, and they tell you, you cover your eyes, so you won't be blinded by the blast, and the back of your neck, so something won't hit you and break your neck. And people understood nuclear war, because we had dropped the atomic bombs on Japan, and they understood what it could do. Today, it's sort of vague, it's very distant. But the nuclear weapons that we have today, make the ones we used on Japan look like firecrackers. They're nothing! So we are at a fantastically perilous juncture in our history, and someone needs to take control of it, and say, let's pull back from the precipice.

OGDEN: So, a very clear call. Somebody needs to take control of this situation and say, "We're pulling back from the precipice." And as Senator Richard Black said there, he sees that we're in a more perilous and more dangerous time than at any point in his lifetime; including at the height of the Cold War during the so-called "duck and cover" drills. Now, Senator Black immediately after delivering this interview to LaRouche PAC, travelled to Richmond, to the State House in Virginia, and used his privilege as a leading State Senator to stand up, claim the floor, and deliver an extraordinary speech to the entire General Assembly, which followed very heavily along the same lines as what he went through in this interview that you just saw an excerpt from. This speech had such an impact that even the *Washington Post* was compelled to give it thorough coverage. Here's some of the coverage that was included in the *Washington Post*. Let me just read you the beginning of their article. They said:

"A state legislator who once flew to Damascus for a two-hour sit-down with Bashar al-Assad took to the floor of the Virginia Senate this week to say the Syrian president might have been framed with a suspected chemical attack – if the attack happened at all.

"|'It is not entirely clear that there was an attack,' Sen. Richard H. Black (R-Loudoun) said in a 20-minute speech on the floor of Virginia Senate on Wednesday. 'There was a doctor, from the hospital â from the main hospital in Douma â who has said, "We haven't received any casualties. Nobody has been sent

in.”|’

“The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons [the OCPW], a global watchdog, has sent inspectors to Syria to try to confirm whether it was a chemical attack that killed dozens in Damascus on Saturday.”

Then it went on to say, “As nearly two hours of strictly perfunctory, procedural business wrapped up, Black asked to address the body.

“He expressed concern that President Trump – whom Black largely supports – will launch a military strike against Assad ‘regardless of whether there was an actual attack and without regard to who may have staged it.’

“He went on to say the United States has been at war in the Middle East for 17 years with no end in sight. That former Rep.

Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) had been right when he said that without a military draft, Americans are more careless about sending troops into battle. That national leaders who make the call, such as former Vice President and Defense Secretary Richard

B. Cheney, never went to war themselves.”

Now, the article went on to report that, while there were several Democrats who were quite flabbergasted that Senator Black

would have the gall and the guts to stand up and say what he said

there on the floor of the Virginia State Senate, there were several of his colleagues who stood behind him 100%. And knowing

his background as a military veteran with medals of valor that he

has received from going into combat, receiving wounds, and also

his history as a JAG [Judge Advocate General] and very high-level

prosecutor associated with the US Army, they know that these words from Senator Richard Black are not words that he

delivers

lightly.

Another elected official who, like Senator Black has travelled to Syria in order to see what actually the conditions

are on the ground, and to get the truth of the matter and to get

the facts for herself, is US Representative Tulsi Gabbard, Congresswoman from Hawaii – a Democrat. This week, Tulsi Gabbard, like many other members of the US Congress – Democrats

and Republicans included – went into an all-out mobilization. Several of her colleagues have been calling on President Trump to

at least come to Congress and follow the US Constitution and the

War Powers Act. But Tulsi Gabbard went much further, and she issued a very strong series of tweets, which I would just like to

go through for you here. She said: “Our unfortunate and brutal

history of waging regime-change wars has failed.

Interventions

in Iraq and Libya caused death, destruction, and human suffering.

We have neglected our own communities. Military action should be

the last resort, not our first. The people of Syria want peace

more than anything in the world. Dropping bombs on Syria will not bring their war-torn country any closer to peace. It will escalate and prolong the war, resulting in more senseless death,

destruction, suffering, and refugees.” She says, “By launching a

US military attack against Syria, terrorist groups like al-Qaeda,

ISIS, Jayish al-Islam, etc. will be reinvigorated and resurrected in their quest to topple the government and establish a caliphate. This creates a greater threat to America and Hell for the Syrian people.” She says, “Bottom line: If our desire is for peace and stability in Syria so that refugees can return home and they can begin to rebuild their homes and lives, then we should work for peace rather than expanding and escalating the war through a US military attack against Syria. #peace for Syria. As a soldier, I know that the most basic requirement before taking military action is that you must have a clear achievable objective, and a strategy to achieve it. You must analyze the situation, know what the risks are, and what the cost and consequences of your actions will be. Our actions in Syria must be based on strategy which is based on what our mission actually is. What are we trying to achieve? The neo-cons and neo-liberals calling on Trump to attack Syria either don’t know what the mission is, or are pursuing a mission that is contrary to US interests. Actions that weaken or cripple the Syrian military result in greater instability, more suffering of the Syrian people, and strengthen terrorist groups like al-Qaeda and ISIS, Army of Islam, etc. who are trying to topple the government. Is that our mission? Does this help Syrian or American people?” Then, she concludes, “US military action in Syria could escalate into a war with Russia and Iran. Russia has

already stated that they will respond to any US military attack against Syria. Is this our mission? How does going to war with Russia over Syria serve the interests of the American people?" That final tweet goes directly to the point. Any attack on Syria would risk wounding or killing a Russian service member or Russian military assets which are deployed heavily in that region. Any attack on a Russian military asset or a Russian soldier, would result in a direct response from Russia, which means World War III. So, those warnings are very clear. Now, Tulsi Gabbard also confronted US Defense Secretary James Mattis during a hearing that was held in the US House of Representatives just yesterday. She begins by bringing up the War Powers Act and the Constitutional right of Congress to declare war, not the President; but then she pursued a similar line of questioning as what she covered in that series of tweets. You'll hear Jim Mattis say, "We haven't yet actually decided whether there will be a military strike against Syria," although President Trump in the beginning of the week has set himself a 24-48-hour time line on that. There are questions surrounding what is actually the discussion and the push-back inside the White House, and what is Jim Mattis' role on this, and an acknowledgement that, at least if a military attack were launched, what is the strategy to follow up on that? And then an acknowledgement that any military attack would precipitate a much higher escalation in the

conflict, and could lead to a war with Russia. So, you'll see Tulsi Gabbard say that explicitly. So, here's this video clip from the Congressional hearing yesterday.

REP. TULSI GABBARD

: Thank you, gentlemen, for your service. The President indicated recently his intention to launch US military attacks against Syria. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the sole power to declare war. Congress has not done so against the Syrian government. Syria has not declared war against the US, or threatened the US. The launch of 59 missiles against Syria by Trump last year was illegal and did not meet any of those criteria in the War Powers Resolution. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018, which was signed into law by President Trump, states that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution; including for the introduction of US armed military forces into hostilities in Syria. My question is: Will the President uphold the Constitution, the War Powers Resolution, and comply with the law that he signed, by obtaining authorization from Congress before launching US military attacks against Syria?

DEFENSE SECRETARY JAMES MATTIS: Congresswoman, we have not yet made any decision to launch military attacks into Syria.

GABBARD: It is simple, however, what the Constitution requires, so while you are correct in saying the President has not yet made a decision, my question is: Will he abide by the

Constitution and comply with the law?

MATTIS: I believe that the President will carry out his duties under the Constitution to protect the country.

GABBARD: What would the objective of an attack on Syria be, and how does that serve the interests of the American people?

MATTIS: I don't want to talk about a specific attack that is not yet in the offing, knowing that this would be pre-decisional. Again, the President has not made that decision.

However, looking at the Chemical Warfare Convention, I think it's

by far in the best interests of civilization, certainly the best

interests of America, that that Convention be obeyed by the nations that have signed it. What has happened in Salisbury, England and now has happened in Syria again, shows that this is

not an idle concern.

GABBARD: So, if the decision is made, as you have stated publicly, you are laying out all the options on the table for the

President. If the decision is made to launch a military attack

against Syria, Russia has already responded that they would respond to our US strike. As this action is considered, can you

justify for the American people how going to war with Russia over

Syria serves the interests of the American people?

MATTIS: No, Congresswoman, I can't answer that question. I'm not ready to speculate that that would happen.

GABBARD: Would you not say that it is a highly likely occurrence, given what Russia has stated directly that they

will
respond?

MATTIS: No, Congresswoman, I would not. There's a lot of ways to respond to the violation of the Chemical Weapons Convention diplomatically, economically, militarily, that taken in total would represent I think what we have to do in this world if

in accordance with international norms and international law.

OGDEN: So, as I said, numerous members of Congress are insisting that the War Powers Act and Article I of the Constitution – the Constitutional privilege of the US Congress to declare war and not the President; that this be observed. Both Democrats and Republicans. This is also being brought up in the UK by Jeremy Corbyn, saying Theresa May cannot be allowed to just launch a unilateral attack on Syria without coming to the Parliament first. So, there is huge push back; but I would insist that this comes, this was catalyzed by the mobilization that LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche organization internationally launched at the beginning of this week. The actions by activists such as you who are viewing this webcast, and other people who have been mobilizing in an all-out mobilization over the course of this week, has had a very significant impact, and may be the reason why we are not at war in Syria already, and have not escalated this into some sort of an attack, a missile launch in

Syria at this point. Now, we remain in the danger zone. By no means is anything decided. We have to continue this mobilization in a way which goes beyond even what has been done thus far this week.

What I would like to do, just to conclude this broadcast, is to bring you an excerpt of a webcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered just yesterday. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been receiving a lot of traction in what she's been saying. A webcast which was delivered last week, which she delivered in German on a website in Germany, has already received over 60,000 views. This is really catalyzing a major interest in the leadership that the LaRouche movement is providing on this issue. So, you'll hear Helga Zepp-LaRouche say here in this webcast is that we are in a very dangerous situation that could get out of control in no time. This is, indeed, a British trap that President Trump is walking right into, and we have to prevent him from walking into this kind of British intelligence trap. So, here's what Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Yeah, we are indeed in a very dangerous situation, which could get out of control in no time. And just to underline that point, this tweet by President Trump which made the headlines internationally everywhere, namely, Russia, the missiles are coming. That turns out to be a reaction

to a fake news! The background of this story is that about a week ago, the Russian ambassador to Lebanon, gave an interview where he supposedly said that any attack on Syria would be answered by a full military reaction by Russia.

Now, it turns out that that interview which appeared on Hezbollah TV [Al Manar] and was translated into Arabic was mistranslated, and obviously referred to an earlier remark which

General Valery Gerasimov, the Chief of Staff of the Russian military had made, where he said, that if there is an attack on a

Russian soldier in Syria, that Russia would react. So, it was not that any attack on Syria would be met with a Russian retaliation, but if the lives of Russian soldiers would be attacked, which is a huge difference.

But obviously, that was the trigger point for Trump to send out this tweet. But it also shows you that in this environment

of complete orchestration of fake news, false flag attacks, secret service manipulation of all kinds, how easy it is to stage

an incident and how things can get out of control.

We are right now not off the war danger. It's still unclear what will happen. Yesterday at the White House briefing, apparently it was said that "all options are on the table."

Theresa May meets with her cabinet – supposedly according to media reports, which are not very reliable, but it's the only source we have on that – to decide if the British would participate in a US military attack. Now, the US warship *USS Donald Cook* is 100 km from Tartus, which is the Russian military

port in Syria, and another US warship has left Norfolk, and is on

the way already since several days.

Now, since Russia has full air control over Syria, and Syria has also extremely effective missile defense systems, if there is a US missile attack on Syria, it could be right in a confrontation between the two nuclear powers, the United States and Russia. So I can only urge you, all of you who are watching this program, you should join our mobilization. In every parliament in the world where you are, get your congressman, get your deputy to intervene and make sure the respective governments are completely distancing themselves, that there is a public debate and investigation. And we must really have a total mobilization against this war danger.

OGDEN: So, that is a call to action from Helga Zepp-LaRouche. We remain in a red alert. We need a total mobilization against this war danger; not only here in the United States, but across the entire planet. The resistance to this must be vocal, loud, clear, and it must be made clear that this is exactly the kind of provocation which could directly lead to World War III. So, don't let President Trump walk into a trap. That's the subject of the leaflet that we are circulating – "Enough! Call Congress and Your Senator and Tell Them To Shut Down Robert Mueller and Stop the British Drive to War". So, we implore you: If you haven't yet, do this; do it again. Get all of your friends and neighbors to inundate Congress with these calls. And to call the White House switchboard as well. We must

continue in this all-out mobilization and respond to the call to action that you just heard Helga Zepp-LaRouche deliver. So, thank you very much for viewing this webcast here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

NU ER DET NOK! STOP BRITERNES FREMSTØD FOR KRIG!

Ring til danske politikere – ring til USA's Kongres!

9. april, 2018 – Vi, De forenede Stater, står over for at lancere et angreb mod Syrien, med de russiske styrker, der er til stede dér, baseret på perfide, britiske løgne; baseret på det, der kunne vise sig at være historiens endegyldige og sorteste efterretningssvindler, den, der gjorde det af med den menneskelige race. Samtidig blev præsident Trumps personlige advokats kontor i dag, 9. april, 2018, udsat for et raid, baseret på en henvisning fra den særlige anklager Robert Mueller. Spørgsmålet skulle angiveligt dreje sig om beskyldninger i forbindelse med, at præsidenten skulle have haft en årelang affære med den løgnagtige og afskyelige pornostjerne, Stormy Daniels. Dette anses af Mueller og vores korrupte FBI for at være så alvorligt, at det Sjette Tillæg til USA's Forfatning også blot kan kastes til side. Disse to uhyrlige begivenheder er fuldstændig relateret. Med mindre I nu rejser jer sammen med os for at stoppe det, er dette land i alvorlig, alvorlig fare. Det kategoriske forsøg på at afpresse

denne præsident ind i den krig, han blev valgt til at stoppe, er nu blevet optrappet ud over enhver forstand.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Et angreb mod Syrien ville være en Nürnberg-krigsforbrydelse

12. april, 2018 – I går udstedte syv eksperter i international lov, eller folkeretten, en erklæring, hvor de advarede om, at alle militære angreb fra USA's og dets allieredes side mod Syrien, ville, »med mindre disse udføres i selvforsvar eller med en godkendelse fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd«, overtræde international lov »og ville udgøre en kriminel aggressionshandling: den højeste internationale forbrydelse, der med sig fører ondskaben i alle andre internationale forbrydelser, som det fastslås af den Internationale Militærdomstol i Nürnberg i 1946 ...«

»Vi opfordrer følgelig indtrængende USA og dets allierede til at afholde sig fra ulovlig opførsel mod Syrien«, skrev eksperterne. De bemærker, at USA's bevæbning af oprørere med det formål at vælte den nuværende regering i Syrien, allerede er »ulovlig under international lov« og tilføjer: »vores pointe er enkel: den eneste måde at løse krisen i Syrien på, er gennem en forpligtelse over for veletablerede principper for internationale, juridiske normer«.

Underskriverne er: tidligere justitsminister (USA) Ramsey Clark; tidligere præsident for National Lawyers Guild Majorie

Cohn; Inder Comar, adm. dir. for Just Atonement (en juridisk NGO, involveret i sagsanlæg mod Bush, Cheney et.al. for deres illegale aggressionskrig mod Irak); Jeanne Mirer, præsident for International Association of Democratic Lawyers; dr. Curtis F.J. Doebbler, FN-repræsentant for International Lawyers.org; Abdeen Jabara, medstifter af American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; og Associate Law Professor dr. Ryan Alford.

Erklæringen blev udgivet i går af Consortium News. <https://consortiumnews.com/2018/04/11/international-lawyers-strike-against-syria-would-be-illegal/>

Foto: Medlemmer af krigsforbrydertribunalet i Nürnberg (venstre) 1946.

Tidligere generalstabschef i Bundeswehr, general Kujat, kritiserer Merkels manglende mådeholdenhed mht. Syrien

12. april, 2018 – Tidligere generalstabschef i Bundeswehr, general Harald Kujat (pens.), der også var formand for NATO's Militærkomite, har været kritisk over for den tyske regering i nylige interviews i Tv og radio. Det er Kujats mening, at den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump ikke kan gå tilbage på sine egne udtalelser, efter sin »annoncering« af et angreb. Hans forsvarsminister Mattis og andre i administrationen er mådeholdne, og deres indflydelse ses i de senere udtalelser fra Det Hvide Hus om, at alle muligheder er på bordet.

»Jeg er skuffet over den tyske kanslers opførsel. Det forventes, at den tyske regering i en sådan situation bør udøve indflydelse for at moderere andres opførsel«, sagde Kujat. Han advarede mod en konfrontation »på baggrund af antagelser« med hensyn til det angivelige kemiske angreb i Douma. »USA er vores nærmeste allierede. Det kan ikke være sådan, at vi lader USA trække os ind i en konfrontation og så håbe på, at Rusland vil reagere med mådehold og ikke skyde krydsermissilerne ned«, sagde Kujat.

Foto: General Harald Kujat (pens.) var stabschef for det tyske Bundeswehr (2000-2002) og formand for NATO's Militærkomite (2002-2005). Arkivfoto.

Tyskland vil ikke deltage i nogen militæraktion i Syrien

12. april, 2018 – På en pressekonference i Berlin i dag efter sit møde med den danske statsminister Løkke Rasmussen, sagde den tyske kansler Angela Merkel til reportere: »Tyskland vil ikke deltage i en mulig – der er ikke truffet nogen beslutning endnu, det vil jeg gerne understrege – militæraktion«, rapporterer RT. Merkel ville imidlertid ikke bryde med dem, der støtter et angreb mod Syrien og sagde, »men vi støtter alt, der gøres for at vise, at brugen af kemiske våben ikke er acceptabelt«. Hun tilføjede, at Vesten har demonstreret en »enorm« enhed i spørgsmålet om Syrien, bemærker RT.

Det vides ikke, på basis af hvilke beviser, hun hævdede, at noget af det syriske arsenal af kemiske våben havde overlevet destruktionsen af lagrene tilbage i 2014. »Vi må nu erkende, at det er åbenbart, at destruktionsen [af kemiske våben] ikke blev

fuldført fuldstændigt«, sagde hun og hævdede, at der findes »stærke beviser« for, at Damaskus brugte kemiske våben, rapporterede RT.

Foto: Fra pressekonferencen i Berlin med Angela Merkel og statsminister Løkke Rasmussen.

Syriens FN-ambassadør: Briterne står bag krigsfremstødet og arbejder for, at USA går i gang med »mislykkede krige«

12. april, 2018 – I en presseerklæring i dag i New York, rapporteret af nyhedstjenesten SANA, sagde Syriens ambassadør til FN, dr. Bashar al-Jaafari, at Storbritannien var drivkraften bag krigsfremstødet mod Syrien og i Mellemøsten og tilføjede, at briterne rent historisk er dem, der har fået USA til at kaste sig ud i »mislykkede krigseventyr«.

Storbritannien er, understregede han, således en del af problemet, ikke en del af løsningen. »Vi hører ikke efter, hvad den britiske regering kunne sige, for vi ved allerede, at Storbritannien arbejder for en eskalering, en kompleksitet af den internationale situation og imod fred og stabilitet i verden.«

Dr. Al-Jaafari kom med denne erklæring i sammenhæng med sin

rapportering af, at de første medlemmer af Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våbens undersøgelsesmission var ankommet til Syrien, og at den syriske regering vil gøre alt, hvad den kan, for at fremme undersøgelsesmissionens adgang til ethvert sted, den ønsker at få adgang til i Douma, når som helst, den måtte ønske det, »for at tjekke, om der var eller ikke var brugt kemiske stoffer« 7. april.

Det Russiske Udenrigsministerium har ligeledes gentaget sin støtte til OPCW's mission, rapporterer Reuters, og endnu en gang udtalt, at russisk militærpersonel vil være til stede for at garantere sikkerheden for undersøgelsesmissionens specialister. Ruslands FN-ambassadør Vasily Nebenzia udtalte ligeledes i dag, at Rusland vil arbejde sammen med Syrien for at garantere sikkerheden for OPCW-teamet.

RT og Reuters rapporterer, at undersøgelsesmissionen vil påbegynde sit arbejde lørdag, 14. april. Dr. Al-Jaafari advarede skarpt om, at enhver forsinkelse eller forvirring i forbindelse med OPCW's besøg vil være et resultat af politisk pres fra USA, UK, Frankrig og deres allierede, for at »forhindre« eksperternes besøg.

Foto: Syriens FN-ambassadør Bashar al-Jaafari.

**Britiske provokationer under
Falsk Flag
sætter faren for krig på Rød**

Alarm. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Internationalt Strategisk Webcast, 12. april, 2018

I skrivende stund, hvor denne meddelelse går ud ved middagstid på USA's østkyst den 10. april, er der »rød alarm« over muligheden for, at en generel krig i de kommende dage bryder ud pga. en række provokationer, der kommer fra Det britiske Imperiums højeste niveauer. Med forsøget på at give Rusland skylden for den angivelige forgiftning af den britiske dobbeltagent Skripal og hans datter, og som kollapsede, da eksperter fra UK's laboratorium for kemiske våben i Porton Down ikke kunne bekræfte, at stoffet, der blev brugt mod Skripal og datter, kom fra Rusland, blev de Londonbaserede »Hvide Hjelme« udkommanderet og hævdede – uden beviser – at syriske regeringsstyrker brugte kemiske våben i Ghouta. Dette udløste krav i FN's Sikkerhedsråd om aktion mod Syrien, men også mod Iran og Rusland – et krav, der kom fra briterne, franskmændene og USA's neokonservative.

Tredje provokation var raidet mod præsident Trumps personlige advokat Michael Cohens kontor, baseret på en henvisning fra den særlige anklager Robert Mueller, relateret til anklagerne imod Trump fra pornostjernen Stormy Daniels. Selv om Muellers efterforskning af Cohen intet har at gøre med beskyldninger om, at Trump indgik et 'aftalt spil' med Putin for at vinde valget i 2016, så er kilden til alle tre provokationer den samme – de er alle en del af kampagnen fra City of Londons imperiekræfter og deres neokonservative allierede på Wall Street, for at forhindre Trump i at lykkes med sit kampagneløfte om at afslutte krige for regimeskifte og skabe

en positiv samarbejdsrelation med Ruslands præsident Putin.

En publikation fra LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite kaldte raidet mod Cohens kontor for »et direkte forsøg på at afpresse denne præsident [Trump] ind i den krig, han blev valgt til at stoppe«. Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde om denne situation, at vi »sidder på en krudttønde«.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af videoen:

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, April 12, 2018
With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

– British False Flag Provocations Put War Danger –
– at “Red Alert” Level –

Harley SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with the Schiller Institute and welcome to today's international webcast featuring our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Since Monday, our organization has been on a Red Alert status, given the escalation of the danger of an all-out breaking out, following the most recent provocations coming from the British Empire. Helga, in an earlier statement this week, said we're sitting on a powder keg, and this has to do with the threats to go to war against Syria, to attack or even punish Assad, even possibly to punish the Russians, as President Trump indicated in a tweet earlier this week. So, we're still sitting on a powder keg, and Helga, despite being ill, is here for a brief period, so she can give us the picture and the strategy

for
the mobilization to stop this escalating war danger. So
Helga, I
turn it over to you, now.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah, we are indeed in a very
dangerous situation, which could get out of control in no
time.

And just to underline that point, this tweet by President
Trump

which made the headlines internationally everywhere, namely,
Russia, the missiles are coming. That turns out to be a
reaction

to a fake news! The background of this story is, that about a
week ago, the Russian ambassador to Lebanon, gave an interview
where he supposedly said that any attack on Syria would be
answered by a full military reaction by Russia.

Now, it turns out that that interview which appeared on
Hezbollah TV [Al Manar] and was translated into Arabic was
mistranslated, and referred to an earlier remark which General
Valery Gerasimov, the Chief of Staff of the Russian had made,
where he said, that if there is an attack on a Russian soldier
in

Syria, that Russia would react. So, it was not that any
attack

on Syria would be met with a Russian retaliation, but if the
lives of Russian soldiers would be attacked, which is a huge
difference.

But obviously, that was the trigger point for Trump to send
out this tweet. But it also shows you that in this
environment

of complete orchestration of fake news, false flag attacks,
secret service manipulation of all kinds, how easy it is to
stage

an incident and how things can get out of control.

We are right now not off the war danger. It's still unclear
what will happen. Yesterday at the White House briefing,

apparently it was said that "all options are on the table." Theresa May meets with her cabinet – supposedly according to media reports, which are not very reliable, but it's the only source we have on that – to decide if the British would participate in a U.S. military attack. Now, the U.S. warship {USS Donald Cook} is 100 km from Tartus, which is the Russian military port in Syria, and another U.S. warship has left Norfolk, and is on the way already since several days. Now, since Russia has full air control over Syria, and Syria has also extremely effective missile defense systems, if there is a U.S. missile attack on Syria, it could be right in a confrontation between the two nuclear powers, the United States and Russia. So I can only urge you, all of you who are watching this program, you should join our mobilization. In every parliament in the world where you are, get your congressman, get your deputy to intervene and make sure the respective governments are completely distancing themselves, that there is a public debate and investigation. And we must really have a total mobilization against this war danger.

SCHLANGER: It's really important, I think that people also have a sense of the continuity of this threat, because what we've been covering here in the last few weeks, it started with the fake news from Theresa May and Boris Johnson, in which they accused the Russians of trying to poison a former spy, Sergei Skripal and his daughter. When that fell apart, when the British chemical warfare experts said they could not determine that the origin of this chemical weapon was from Russia, as soon as that

falls apart, we see an escalation with the so-called chemical weapons usage in East Ghouta, in Douma, Syria.

Now, it occurs also at precisely the point that Donald Trump said he's prepared to pull the United States troops out of Syria

entirely! So, as some of the Russians are saying, I think it's worth, Helga, for you to go through some of what the Russians have been saying on this, including Putin – but that they've said that it's very obvious that this is a scripted assault against Russia and against Trump.

So what are we hearing from the Russians?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: The Deputy Chief of the General Staff of Russia just reported that Russian ABC specialists have been or are in Douma, and they inspected both the material of the so-called chemical weapons and also the patients in the hospital,

and they confirmed what earlier representatives of the Red Crescent Society had said, that there was absolutely no trace of

chemical weapons, and also no sign that patients in the hospital

had been injured by such a weapon.

Now, that is, again, pointing to the fact that the entire information about this so-called incident came from the White Helmets, an organization which is entirely funded by the British

government and in part, also by the [State Department] USAID.

And various whistleblowers have documented that this is an organization which is very close to the jihadists, and that they

have completely staged this affair.

Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov also said that Russia had signs of a planned provocation for the past month, and that they

have given this information to both the UN Security Council and

the OPCW, so that it was known that this was in preparation; and also that the jihadists had, in various cities, dug tunnels under cities, out of which they then operated with explosive materials, mixed with chemical weapons. This thing is such an obvious case of a false-flag operation, that, if this is being used for a pretext to launch an attack, then we're really in World War III, because this is obviously designed to target Russia. And I would even say, it did not start with the Skripal case, it started with the Russiagate against Trump which fell apart completely. Now the Skripal case also has fallen apart, because the OPCW was just in Salisbury. They investigated the material which was used in the Skripal attack, and they said they were not able to identify either that it was Novichok – they didn't mention that name – nor the origin of it. Now, the OPCW, that's their whole purpose of existence, has been visiting every country, every laboratory, so they have samples of every chemical substance, of every nerve gas, so they could compare it, and obviously, they could not identify that it comes from Russia, so it doesn't come from Russia. So this case is also falling apart. So I think it's really important that people see the continuity, as you say, of these lies, which are designed to be a war preparation for a war against Russia. There is no other

explanation possible.

SCHLANGER: And it's a war against Russia that's designed to sabotage President Trump's policy of working with Putin, working with Russia, cooperation against terrorism. And also, as Trump noted in one of his tweets, economic cooperation. There's also, General Mattis, the U.S. Defense Secretary, who is urging caution, saying we have to wait until we can see that there's some evidence of this. Mattis came out after the April 2017 false flag against, which led to a U.S. attack, and said there was no evidence of chemical weapons, or that it was the Assad government. So we're seeing a certain amount of backing away; and very importantly, the former British Ambassador to Syria, Peter Ford, and also the former United Kingdom Ambassador to Uzbekistan Craig Murray, both of whom have been very outspoken on this, warned that this is a crazy escalation to war. What should people do? You have voices coming out now, there are people who want to know what to do. What are we doing as part of our mobilization?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: We have various appeals, one in Germany which you will find in German on our website there [<https://bueso.de/alarmstufe-rot>]; we have one on the American site of our colleagues from LaRouche PAC [<https://larouchepac.com/sites/default/files/20180410-enough-final.pdf>] and both of these appeals should be used to mobilize every parliament around the world. In the United States, our colleagues there are mobilizing. They have already distributed tens of thousands of leaflets; they have contacted everybody in the Congress; they have a general mobilization. They're doing similar things in Europe. But I

think we really have to take it very seriously

The former German highest military officer, Gen. Harald Kujat, gave three interviews today to different TV stations, where he made the point, which I can only fully endorse, that we

are confronted with a political class which is incapable of calculating the consequences of their deeds, and that therefore

the danger is that they will sleepwalk into a Third World War, just as it happened in the case of the First World War. And I may not share all the reasons why this is so; he says this is an

unfortunate combination of an inexperienced French President; a

Prime Minister in Great Britain who has tremendous domestic problems; an erratic American President, but then he blasts the

German government, that rather than trying to calm the situation

down, that Merkel is actually heating it up! I mean, this is incredible! Germany was destroyed two times in the world wars,

and now we have a Chancellor, who is immediately defending May in

her accusations; who is immediately condoning that Assad must be

the guilty one. And General Kujat puts Merkel on the spot, and

says, she should intervene [against war].

Now, I think the problem is that these politicians are really incapable of recognizing what they are doing, and therefore I think we need to really have a full-fledged mobilization, in depth, of all the parliamentarians of every country where you are: You should use these materials and demand

that all the governments are completely coming out against this,

that they should denounce the false-flag operations. And we should not forget, there is a German judge whose name is Peter Vonnahme, who was a judge in a Bavarian court until 2007; and he pointed to the fact that there is a continuity in all of these provocations, with the obvious aim of regime-change in Russia. And then he points to the fact, asking, have people forgotten the Gulf of Tonkin incident, which led to the Vietnam War? Or the case of the so-called babies ripped out of the incubators in Kuwait, which led to the pretext to attack Iraq [in 1990]? Or the “yellowcake” case in the case of Niger, where Saddam Hussein supposedly bought yellowcake uranium, which was another pretext for a war against Iraq [2003]? Or, the so-called “Operation Horseshoe” incident, which led to the Kosovo intervention [1999]? Now, all these things were orchestrated and fabricated, and I think we must have a discussion, who is doing that? It’s not enough that Tony Blair apologized for the Iraq war – I mean, these wars have cost {millions} of people their lives! And I think it is high time that these people are being called to justice, because this is just too much, and has been going on for too long.

SCHLANGER: I’m glad you mentioned Tony Blair, because he’s one of the people saying that Theresa May doesn’t have to go to the Parliament, and she should immediately join the coalition with Macron and Trump, and start bombing in Syria. So Blair is a war criminal, whose time has come to be brought before a tribunal. Now, the picture wouldn’t be complete without us just

getting into this question of going back to what you said was the initial phase, which is Russiagate. There was a development, right in the middle of the Syria mobilization, with the Southern District of New York U.S. Attorney launching an FBI raid against Donald Trump's personal attorney, Michael Cohen, for something that was referred by Mueller, which has {nothing whatsoever} to do with Russiagate.

Helga, how do you see this? we've basically said, this is part of a blackmail operation against Trump. How do you see this functioning?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think it discredits Mueller even more, because it's very obvious that this whole Russiagate is falling apart, or has fallen apart, and now he has shifted what clearly is not in his mandate [as Special Counsel], by going into a fishing expedition on a so-called sex story that Trump was supposedly involved in with some pornographic movie star. And obviously, this is so out of order, that I think it should fall back on Mueller.

It is also very important, what the famous Harvard lawyer, Alan Dershowitz said, that this is a complete violation of the U.S. Constitution, the Fourth and the Sixth Amendment. I think he is a Democrat, but he blasts the silence of the Democrats and even the silence of the ACLU, that they do not react. And he says, "this is black day for the client-lawyer relations," and obviously, it's one of the many things which absolutely must be

clarified.

Now, we should note the fact that Congressman Nunes had to go so far as to threaten impeachment against FBI Director Wray and

Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, because they were blocking to submit data and documents to the Congressional oversight committees. Now, they finally did give two pages in a

relatively unredacted form, which referred to the origins of the

Trump investigation.

So, I think there will be more about that, but I can only reiterate my call: We should absolutely mobilize with the Schiller Institute. Join the Schiller Institute, become an active member. It is very important that we build a movement to

improve relations among nations, to create a New Paradigm, to have absolute condemnation of this war danger, and establish a decent relationship with Russia, China and among all nations on

this planet, which is absolutely possible, as we have discussed

many times on this show.

But it requires more people to become active, and therefore, I again invite you: Join the Schiller Institute and help us in this mobilization.

SCHLANGER: And we'll be putting a number up on the screen for the White House, so people can make calls to the White House.

And also to the Congress [Capitol Hill Switchboard: 202-224-2131], because there are congressmen, such as Thomas Massie [R-KY] and others, who are demanding that nothing be done

without the Congress being consulted.

I just wanted to throw one other thing in, which is that in spite of the danger of the situation, it's good to see there

are

some people who are keeping their sense of humor: Maria Zakharova, the spokesperson for the Russian Foreign Ministry, said about Trump's tweet about "smart" missiles, that if they're

really "smart" they'll go after the terrorists who are the ones

responsible for the false flag chemical weapons scare.

Helga, thanks for taking the time and making the effort, even though you're ill, to join us today, and to bring this forward: We are still on a Red Alert, and it's very significant

that you took the time and put this out. Is there anything you

want to add?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: No, I think that's what we have to do.

SCHLANGER: OK, very good. So we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: OK, till next week.

Den Nye Silkevej former strategiske anliggender. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i strategisk webcast, torsdag 5. april 2018

Introduktion: Den hysteriske og bidende retorik mod Rusland, der kommer fra Storbritanniens imperiale oligarker og deres

efterretningstjenester og kanaliseres gennem Theresa May og Boris 'BoJo' Johnson, narrer ingen. Alt imens nogle regeringer underdanigt er gået med i de farlige provokationer, så er andre, inklusive USA, blot kommet med symbolske handlinger. Mange nationer synes at ligge mere på linje med tankegangen hos den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov, der om May-regeringens ubegrundede beskyldninger i Skripal-affæren sagde, at det er »kun alt for åbenlyst, at vore britiske kolleger har mistet deres realitetssans«.

De ledere, som derimod ikke har mistet deres realitetssans, har i stedet været engageret i et imponerende opbud af diplomatisk og økonomisk aktivitet og har indgået aftaler om at deltage i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ (BVI). Parallelt med disse bestræbelser er et russisk initiativ for at bringe fred i Syrien og arbejde sammen med Syriens naboer. De britiskdirigerede geopolitikere har uden tvivl bemærket, at, i takt med, at dette initiativ går fremad, har præsident Trump gentaget sit kampagneløfte om at afslutte al amerikansk militær involvering i Syrien og har gentaget sit ønske om et topmøde med Putin i den nærmeste fremtid.

Det, der ligger bag de britiske angreb mod Putin og Rusland, er ikke den svindelagtige påstand, at Putin beordrede forgiftningen af en tidligere russisk efterretningsofficer, lige så vel som at Mueller-efterforskningen intet har at gøre med »russisk indblanding« i det amerikanske valg. Målet for disse provokationer er det Nye Paradigme, der er knyttet til BVI, som City of London og dets Wall Street allierede korrekt har identificeret som efterfølgeren til deres fallerede system. Hvis USA tilsluttede sig Rusland, Kina og Indien sådan, som Lyndon LaRouche opfordrede det til i kølvandet på krakket i 2008, ville det være umuligt at forhindre fremvæksten af det Nye Paradigme.

Her følger engelsk udskrift:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to this week's Schiller Institute webcast for April 5, 2018, featuring our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

In the last couple of weeks, Helga has spoken about the potential for a backfire as a result of the Skripal affair, that

Theresa May and her somewhat unhinged Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson have been using as a way of attacking both Russia and the

United States. Now, we've seen this play out in a very big way

in the last couple of days: The fact that they came out in their

own name, and the name of their intelligence services and their

government, to attack Russia, has in fact, put "egg on their faces" as some have said. So, Helga, why don't you catch us up

on what's happened in the last days, because this is quite significant, in terms of shaping the strategic relationships?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah. I think it is incredibly

serious, because now you have a situation where I think the whole

group of nations which committed themselves to sort of unprincipled solidarity with May and Johnson, they really have to

reflect on what has actually happened. Just to mention some of

the recent developments: The head of the research lab Porton Down, Gary Aitkenhead, came out actually and said they could not

find any proof that the origin of this nerve agent was Russia; that they could establish that it was Novichok, or belonging to

the group of Novichoks, but that they could not say that it came

from Russia.

This has led to quite a series of events. One was that the Foreign Office removed the tweet in which they had said very clearly that there was no doubt that the origin was Russia, and I

think they even mentioned that the scientists of the Porton Down

lab had said so. So, they were obliged to remove the tweet, because that also is evidence that Boris Johnson was lying, because he had said that he had heard from the scientists that

there was absolutely unrefutable proof that this came from Russia. This is the first thing.

Then the London {Times} had a comment about this, where they say that the statement by Aitkenhead is threatening to bring down

the international coalition against Russia. Well, that's indeed

the case, because now naturally everybody is reviewing this, and

I think in the case of the German government, for example, they

gave a press conference afterwards, in which journalists were asking, did this statement mean that you've changed your

perspective? And they basically refused to do so, which shows you really the absolute grip in which these people are in, namely

the grip of the British Empire.

So, I think this is now backfiring very clearly. The role of the British government and the British Empire, for that matter, is completely exposed, but they are not stopping the confrontation with Russia, so that some of the Russian responses,

for example, people speaking at the Seventh Moscow Conference on

International Security which is now taking place in Moscow,

[Sergei] Naryshkin, who is the head of Russia's foreign intelligence [SVR], he said that this is basically as serious as the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. Others were saying, this time these idiots went way beyond any line, and that is clearly the case. But you also have a whole series of people who are saying, look, we cannot continue like that, we have to resume a dialogue with Russia; we have to go back to straighten out the relations.

And I want to really point to the fact that, despite the fact that naturally the United States expelled 60 Russian diplomats, which is clearly part of this escalation, that President Trump himself, who did not at any point use this incident to attack Russia as the origin. And I think this stands clearly out. And people who are always totally freaked out about

Trump, they should really review this and ask if their perspective and their optical approach actually the correct one?

Because in many cases, it turns out that Trump is actually the one who is not going for confrontation, and some of the people

who are so much for “democracy and human rights” that they can't

even walk straight, because they're so heavily burdened with their responsibilities, that they are the actual warmongers. So

I think this is really something to reflect about.

But I think the kind of procedure that NATO, however, the European Union, the German and French government, they were all

immediately jumping on this, without evidence, condemning Russia.

And I think if you look at this, when the dust settles down, it

{is} a blow to the whole Western system, because if there is not

an establishment of scientific fact, first, and the condemnation

first so that basically Russia is declared guilty, and then maybe

you find the evidence sometime down the road, or not, I think

this does big damage to the Western system, because if you play

with these things lightly, it is contributing to the

discreditation of the governments that did that, and that is not

a good thing.

SCHLANGER: Well, minimally, we could say this is a rush to judgment, but more importantly, this is part of an established pattern of British intelligence. We've seen it with the repeated charges, without evidence, that the Assad government was using chemical weapons against his population; and of course, the famous case of Tony Blair and Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, which turned out to be another fabrication of the highest levels of British intelligence.

But there's another aspect of this which I think you may want to comment on, which is the case of David Kelly, because this also hits at home, where there was opposition from within the scientific community in the United Kingdom against the actions of the government and the intelligence community.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yeah. This is clearly a pattern. And before the statement by the head of the Porton Down lab came out, the former British ambassador to Uzbekistan, Craig Murray, had actually said that he had from high-level sources in the intelligence community or the science community, that the

scientists would not basically produce the evidence – and they didn't. And [Porton Down weapons inspector] David Kelly, at the

time of the Iraq war, had basically blown the whistle, saying there were no weapons of mass destruction, and then he found an

early death under extremely dubious circumstances which were said

to be a suicide, but nobody really believes that.

So, I think this is really something – if you think the

Iraq War was based on lies, and I think Willy Wimmer, the former

vice president of the OSCE and former state secretary to the

minister of defense, pointed to the fact that the Iraq war, after

all, has caused hundreds of thousands of deaths in Europe, in the

Middle East, in North Africa, and that the Chilcot Commission,

which from our standpoint was a relative cover-up, but

nevertheless, pointed to the fact that Tony Blair had willfully,

intentionally exaggerated the danger coming from Iraq and Saddam

Hussein at the time. And then [Bush Secretary of State] Colin

Powell used the MI6 “dodgy dossier” [on Iraq's alleged WMD] from

that period, to argue in the UN for the U.S. joining the Iraq War.

I mean, the fact that governments can do these things which cost – really – if you look at the totality of these wars, millions of people's lives, and then, it just goes by and there

is no accountability. And it's a complete hypocrisy and duplicity, when the people who are saying that they are the defenders of human rights and democracy, then go around and make

these interventions into sovereign countries, which have these horrible results. And then they are self-righteous and pretend

that they are the good ones, and the Russians and the Chinese are

the bad ones.

I think we need to have, really, a review of this, because this cannot continue. It is very dangerous to world peace.

SCHLANGER: And another aspect of this is that this was a major feature of President Trump's election campaign in 2016, where he, at a very important debate in South Carolina, openly accused George W. Bush of lying to create the Iraq War, and he said that his administration would oppose these kinds of wars.

Now, this week the President announced that he's preparing to remove U.S. troops from Syria, despite demands from some in the military, and the CIA, that the U.S. remain in Syria.

Helga, this is a fairly significant departure from the standard Bush/Obama policy of pursuing these wars, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Oh, yes! And, again, you can see certain representatives of the U.S. military and others, who say, "no, no, we still have a lot of fighting to do against ISIS," but Trump I think is clearly sticking to guns, and he has promised to

stop the interventionist wars, and I think he is going very far

to do so. Especially, if you consider that in in this middle of

this whole hysteria, he telephoned President Putin, and has reiterated that he wants to have a summit with Putin in the near

future. And he was also meeting with the three Presidents of the

Baltic countries, who as everybody knows are extremely anti-Russians, and he reiterated that to have a good relationship

with Russia "is a good thing and not a bad thing."

So I think people should really review their slanders, or

their believing the slanders against both Trump, Putin and Xi Jinping because it comes from the same circles: it comes from the neo-con/neo-liberal geopolitical faction who are seeing that their system is clearly in bad shape and who are obviously stopping short of nothing, if you look at this recent affair.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned earlier the Moscow International Security Conference. Clearly, there's a discussion going on there, about something that your husband Lyndon LaRouche brought up many, many years ago, and that you've been calling for, which is the establishment of a new security architecture. How is this proceeding in Moscow? Do you have some reports on what the discussion process has been, there?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think it's an extremely important event. There are 95 countries represented, 840 guests, 700 media; and obviously, this alone speaks to the fact that Russia is very far from being isolated, as some people in the West are trying to portray.

The discussions were very focussed on the need to have an international alliance to combat terrorism. There was a warning

by the head of the FSB [Alexander Bortnikov], that there are signs that ISIS and al-Qaeda are merging, and he basically said

this means you will have sleepers and cells in every country around the globe, and the only way you can defend against that,

is to work together internationally.

Now, another very important aspect of this conference, is that the Defense Minister of China went to this conference and made a statement that this was meant as a signal to the West that

the Russian and the Chinese military are in an extremely close strategic partnership, and that this is meant as a signal to the

West.

So there were many warnings, as I mentioned already, that the present confrontation is approaching the danger of a Cuban Missile Crisis, so people are obviously extremely attuned to what

is coming there from the British and their allies. But on the other side, it also shows who is talking in favor of international solidarity, cooperation; who is addressing the

real dangers of the world: It is clearly not the West, but it is

clearly Russia, China and the countries that are participating in

this conference.

And again, this is really something people should reflect

about, rather than believing the propaganda. If you read

{Bildzeitung}, this morning on page 2, they have a picture of

Putin, Erdogan, and Rouhani, and they say this is the “axis of

evil.” This is ridiculous! These three countries [Russia,

Turkey, Iran] have collaborated to bring about a solution to the

terrible crisis in Syria, and this is a very good thing. Now,

not all aspects of the policies of these countries I would

always subscribe to, – I mean, there’s the unresolved tensions

between the Kurds and Erdogan, between Turkey and Greece – so

not everything is perfect.

But I think on the larger picture, if you think that the

misery of the Syrian people who have had war for seven years [is

being addressed] because of the intervention of these countries,

and not to forget the cooperation between the U.S. and Russian

military under the leadership of Trump and Putin; I think people

should not just fall for these propaganda lines. Because there

are some people who have suffered with their lives and their livelihoods and their happiness, as a result of these [geopolitical] policies, and for Syria, this [intervention] is a good thing.

SCHLANGER: Especially, this should have meaning for people in Europe, because in 2015-2016, there was the explosion of the refugee crisis, and with all the hand-wringing and crocodile tears that were shed, nothing was done to support the Russian intervention to stop the war in Syria. And the fact that the Russians, the Iranians and the Turkish government were meeting to discuss this, is something that should be welcomed, as opposed to a source for criticism.

Now, on the Russia-Turkey cooperation, there was another aspect to it, because when you deal with these problems in the real world, there's always an economic element, and there was just an agreement between Putin and [Turkish President Recep Tayyip] Erdogan to move ahead with nuclear energy development.

Helga, this is part of the broader package of the New Silk Road

and economic cooperation that you've been talking about, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. I think the remarks of President Putin, who was at the opening ceremony of this [Akkuyu] nuclear plant was to emphasize the extreme importance of nuclear energy, giving a country cheap and secure energy, and leading to an increase in the productivity of the entire economy; which is absolutely the case. And you have many, many projects, Russia, China, India, having with developing countries the building of nuclear energy in Africa, in Latin America, and in Asia. So, soon, countries like Germany will be the only ones that will not have nuclear energy, and if they keep this course, they will be sidelined at the disadvantage of the population. So, I think this is really something we should change.

SCHLANGER: The other story that's getting a lot of coverage internationally, and I think it's being covered typically by

the

media as a way of trying to drum up war, is this whole argument

that the discussion and the negotiations under way between the U.S. and China on tariff policy is nothing but a trade war. Now,

there's a danger to this, as the Chinese have pointed out, but I

think it's important for people to hear your perspective on this:

Because obviously, there are problems in the U.S.-China

relationship, a huge trade imbalance, but it's not just a trade

war, there's actually a much broader discussion under way. How

do you see this evolving, from what you've seen over the last few

days?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: There are negotiations going on, and it must not necessarily come to the execution of these tariffs, which both sides have now drawn up, up to the value of \$60 billion in

terms of products. One thing is that the Prime Minister Li

Keqiang has pointed out that there is another way to overcome the

trade imbalance: namely by increasing trade, by especially investments in joint ventures in third countries, that there are

many ways how you can get rid of this trade imbalance.

And there is a renewed discussion, something which we have brought into the discussion early on, namely, that you have the

possibility of Chinese investments in the infrastructure in the

United States. And that would also be a way to completely change

this dynamic. If the Chinese investment in American

infrastructure would create many, many productive jobs for

Americans, it would create the infrastructure precondition for a

real industrial revolution: for the building of new cities,

science cities, connecting all American cities with fast trains

systems.

There are so many ways of changing this dynamic for the

better, and I'm absolutely convinced that China is having this

mind. There was a program on the Chinese TV channel CGTN,

proposing exactly that, that there should be a dialogue on

infrastructure. Then you have some Americans, a Trump supporter

who had already made such a proposal early on, also. So I think

there is a discussion. And I would imagine that President Xi Jinping, who will give a very important speech at the "Asian Davos" as they call it, the Boao Forum for Asia, which will start

in three days, where he is expected to make a major speech on the

continuation on international reforms, and opening up. So I think you can expect something important to come from there. And I think the Chinese are also extremely aware of the fact that we are sitting on a powder keg in terms the financial system. Xi Jinping has defined three priorities: One, to overcome the risks of the financial system; to alleviate poverty;

and to get rid of air pollution. So I think the Chinese are very

much aware of the dangers of this present Western financial system. And you know, you had several articles warning that with

the outbreak of a new 2008 could happen at any moment, one of the

many new aspects which were mentioned is the difference between

the LIBOR rate and the Fed rate; and that was exactly the

beginning sign of the 2008 crisis.

So that really requires that the discussion which we and our colleagues in the United States and in Europe have formulated, to

implement the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche – Glass-Steagall, national bank, a credit system, and then cooperation of the Western countries, with the financial systems of the New Silk Road, the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund; all of these things need

to be urgently discussed. Because one danger which is clearly there, that if you had now a financial crash, and some people are

even speculating that the same people who are making these provocations against Russia, could also trigger, deliberately, such a financial crash, to pull the rug out from underneath President Trump, to bring the neo-cons back in, and just get rid

of this phenomenon of Trump.

So anybody who thinks this is conspiracy theory, or this is totally over the top, well, look at the Skripal case, and learn

the lesson from that, how things can be manipulated and orchestrated.

So I think the urgency is really to draw the lesson out from

all of this, and end this system of looting, which is only for the privilege of the very few rich; it's destroying the middle class, it's making the poor, more poor. And we need really a return to Hamiltonian economics. This is what is the basis of the Chinese economic miracle, as I have said many times: The Chinese economic miracle, or Chinese economic model, is much, much closer to the economic policies of the young republic of the United States than people think. It's no coincidence that the distinction which Friedrich List, for example, made between the American System and the British System, that that is exactly what is playing out today, and we need {clearly} a return to the American System of economy.

SCHLANGER: It's also important to keep in mind that President Trump has repeatedly referred to his great friendship with Xi Jinping, and the strategic importance of a China-U.S. relationship is also clear when it comes to the question of the collaboration to bring a peaceful solution to the Korean Peninsula. There's a lot of diplomacy coming up: The Trump-Putin

meeting; Trump meeting with Prime Minister Abe of Japan; and also

the coming meeting with Kim Jong-un. So there's a lot more at stake here than just the question of a few dollars off the trade

imbalance.

And Helga, just to go back to one final note on the Belt and Road Initiative: I'm sure you took note of the importance of the

visit recently of the Swiss government to China and also a very

large delegation heading to China from Austria. Maybe there's a

lesson here for Germany, huh?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, one would hope so!

I mean, I'm very happy, because all the neighbors of Germany are clearly joining the Silk Road, it increases the pressure on

those who are obviously too stupid or too arrogant to see the potential for German industry which lies in this initiative.

Now, the Swiss Foreign Minister was just in China and he and his Chinese counterpart, both [Foreign Minister] Wang Yi and also

[former Foreign Minister] Yang Jiechi, they declared that the

collaboration of China and Switzerland in the New Silk Road is at the best historical level ever, and both emphasized the importance of Xi Jinping's visit last year to Switzerland, where he addressed Davos as a keynote speaker, and then went to Geneva, emphasizing the importance of Switzerland. So they're deepening the relationship between China and Switzerland. And the Austrian government, they have a huge delegation, the largest ever: It is President Van der Bellen, Chancellor Sebastian Kurz; four cabinet ministers, and 170 CEOs from large corporations, spending five days in China. And what Kurz said is, there is no ceiling to improve the relationship between Austria and China on the New Silk Road. The same, by the way, is happening with Zimbabwe, where the new President [Emmerson Mnangagwa] is going with a large delegation of 12 ministers and also many, many CEOs. So, you can see almost every day, a little breaking development. And as I have said many times, the Spirit of the New Silk Road is, in my view, absolutely unstoppable,

except if we have World War III, which obviously some people are
risking.

But nevertheless, the idea of a new relationship among
nations, of respect for the sovereignty of the other nation,
respect for the difference of the social system, the ending of
internationalist wars, the idea of a win-win cooperation, this
is
just a new model of international relations and a New
Paradigm.

And the biggest problem is that because of the Western media
being so much in control of this geopolitical faction that most
people don't know enough about it.

So, please, I would appeal to you: Join the Schiller
Institute, help us to spread the knowledge about the New Silk
Road, and also the options to solve the present financial
crisis
and many other crises around the world with such an approach.
I

would really appeal to you: Don't sit on the fence. This is
an
incredibly important historic moment, and the British have
just
suffered a terrible defeat, which freaks them out, but it's

visible for everybody and so therefore, it's a good moment to move forward and establish a completely different political, social, and economic system on this planet.

SCHLANGER: And we will be launching a new membership drive for the Schiller Institute, and if you want to increase the misery of the British intelligence establishment and the City of

London, become a member of the Schiller Institute, and help us build the audience for these webcasts, so people have an alternative to the lying media that otherwise is the only option

they have to allegedly find out about the world.

So Helga, I think that covers quite a bit. Thank you for joining us again, and we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. Till next week.

Briternes løgn er afsløret og de kan besejres, men de forsøger stadig at sætte verden i brand. Politisk Orientering med formand Tom Gillesberg, 5. april, 2018.

Tom Gillesberg: Velkommen til endnu et dramatisk kapitel i kampen om verden; kampen om, hvem der skal regere planeten Jorden og dermed også kan få mulighed for at få en betydende indflydelse på det univers, vi befinder os i, på den lange bane. Det er bare så ufattelig spændende, hvad der foregår netop nu, for på den ene side har vi jo de her absurde tosserier, den seneste af hvilke har været denne her kampagne, man har kørt de seneste par uger med den såkaldte Skripal-sag, hvor ud af det blå pludselig fra London tonede Theresa May frem på Tv-skærmene og sagde, 'Der har været et angreb med biologiske våben her på efterretningsagenter, og vi er sikre på, at det kun kan være Rusland, der har gjort det, og derfor kræver vi af resten af verden, at de nu går sammen med os om at straffe Rusland for denne uhørte, ubehagelig dåd, som de har begået'. Det har jo bl.a. ført til, at USA udviste 60 diplomater, Danmark udviste 2 osv., og vi ligesom er i et kraftigt momentum frem til, at nu skal vi have en konfrontation med Rusland.

Igen, det kommer ikke ud af det blå; det kommer efter man har haft et NATO, som har stået på og drevet på og sagt, nu skal vi mobilisere mod den russiske fare; vi skal have en brigade ovre i Baltikum for at kunne beskytte de baltiske lande mod

den store russiske bjørn. Igen og igen har Stoltenberg fra NATO's talerstol sagt, og vi ved jo godt, at vi er under angreb, og frem for alt cyberangreb; men I skal vide derude, frem for alt jer i Rusland, at vi betragter et cyberangreb på et af vore lande som et angreb, der kan udløse Artikel 5 og derfor være et angreb på hele NATO, så hele NATO må svare igen med alt, hvad de har. Og dermed har man i princippet sagt, at, hvis der er et såkaldt cyberangreb på et NATO-land, så kan det være, at vi svarer igen med atomvåben over for Rusland. Det er ligesom det, man har sagt, og det er vildt, og det er farligt! Og det er helt vanvittigt.

Men, når det så er sagt, så er det også et vanvid, der står mere og mere afsløret for hver dag, der går. Dette sidste vanvid kommer jo efter, at vi nu i over et år har haft en ny amerikansk præsident, Donald Trump, som har haft svært ved at regere, fordi der har været skandale på skandale, der har kørt i medierne mod ham; 'Trump-gate', 'Russia-gate' osv., med det fokus at få Trump afsat, så man kunne fortsætte den politik for konfrontation og krig, man havde før, og som Hillary havde svoret, at hun ville fortsætte. Men alle disse skandaler har det til fælles, at deres udspring er London. ...

Hør hele Toms analyse:

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/britisk-pastand-imod-rusland-er-ved-at-smuldre-lnu-kan-vi-besejre-den-britiske-imperium

Det britiske Imperium er afsløret, men desperat

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 4. april, 2018 – De britiske, imperiale Lords befinder sig i choktilstand. Deres hektiske forsøg på at redde Imperiet brasede sammen tirsdag, da forskerne på Porton Down nægtede at lyve for Imperiet – nægtede at sige, at nervegiften i Skripal-sagen kom fra Rusland. Husk, at det var David Kelly, chefen for Afdelingen for Mikrobiologi til Forsvarsformål i Porton Down og medlem af inspektionsteamet i Irak, som afslørede Tony Blairs »udmajede« dossier, der hævdede, at Saddam Hussein havde masseødelæggelsesvåben. Som videnskabsmand nægtede han at lyve. Kelly blev »bragt til selvmord« som resultat, og den ulovlige folkemordskrig fortsatte.

Denne gang er hverken George W. Bush eller Barack Obama til stede for at yde tilsløring af Imperiets løgne. Præsident Trump har, til de britiske og amerikanske oligarkers og pressehorers forfærdelse, nægtet at sige (eller tweete) ét ord om russernes rolle i Skripal-sagen. Han talte med Putin efter hændelsen uden at nævne den og sagde så sent som i går, at, at »komme godt ud af det med Rusland er en god ting, ikke en dårlig ting«.

Imperiet er afsløret og alvorligt såret – men endnu ikke dødt og derfor i stand til hvad som helst for at redde sit skind. I halvtreds år har Lyndon LaRouche advaret amerikanerne og andre om, at Det britiske Imperium ikke er et fænomen fra fortiden, men derimod er centrum i den finansielle udplyndring og spekulation, der har drevet det vestlige finanssystem til randen af ruin, mens det samtidigt manipulerer den »dumme kæmpe« i Washington til at udkæmpe kolonikrige på Imperiets vegne, først i Indokina og dernæst i Mellempøsten. Han har ligeledes advaret om, at Imperiet ville foretrække en global krig, selv en atomkrig, snarere end de ville se deres Imperium

forsvinde.

I dag fokuserede Helga Zepp-LaRouche opmærksomheden på denne dødbringende kendsgerning. Russiagate-kampagnen kollapsede, og dens gerningsmænd i MI6 og i Obamas efterretningsteam står nu over for anklager om forbrydelser, for deres forræderiske handlinger. Dernæst lancerede Theresa Mays controllers Skripal-hændelsen og krævede, at de vestlige nationer skulle gå med i beskyldningerne mod Rusland, uden noget som helst bevis. Kun halvdelen af de europæiske nationer gik med til det, og, alt imens Trump gav sin administration lov til at udvise russiske diplomater, så lagde han ikke selv nogen skyld på russerne og annoncerede, at Moskva kunne erstatte deres diplomater.

Men nu har UK's egne eksperter i kemiske våben afsløret de onde og farlige løgne, der kommer fra premierminister May og hendes klovn af en udenrigsminister Boris Johnson. I dag hersker der hysteri i London. Vil Imperiet ty til endnu mere desperate handlinger ved at starte en krig? Vil de bruge det forestående kollaps af den multi-billiondollar store boble i det vestlige finanssystem, som de har skabt, til at gøre dette?

LaRouches politiske platform – for en genindførsel af metoderne i det Amerikanske Økonomiske System og for videnskabeligt fremskridt i USA, og for USA's tilslutning til den Nye Silkevej, hvor det arbejder sammen med Kina og Rusland i opbygningen af nationer i hele verden, som USA engang erklærede – må vedtages og kæmpes for nu, i dag, af alle mennesker af god vilje. Imperiet er tæt på at lide nederlag, men er farligere end nogensinde før.

Foto: Dr. David Kelly. »Begik selvmord« efter at have aflagt forklaring imod Blairs »udmajede« dossier, som førte til Irakkrigen.

Chefen for Ruslands udenrigsefterretningstjeneste kommer med en alvorlig advarsel om en ny Cuba-missilkrise

4. april, 2018 – Med bemærkninger, der faldt i stærke vendinger ved åbningsceremonien for den Syvende Moskva-konference om International Sikkerhed, sammenlignede Sergei Naryshkin, chef for Ruslands udenrigsefterretningstjeneste (SVR), Vestens konfrontation med Rusland, der har eskaleret over Skripal-forgiftningen, med den cubanske missilkrise i 1962, hvor USA og Sovjetunionen kom meget tæt på atomkrig.

»Vi må holde op med at forhøje indsatsen på uansvarlig vis og med at projicere magt over i relationer mellem staterne, for at undgå en ny krise«, sagde han. Den måde, hvorpå Vesten i dag projicerer magt, er »forbløffende hyklerisk«.

Naryshkin beskrev ligeledes forgiftningen i Storbritannien af den tidligere militære efterretningsofficer, der blev britisk dobbeltagent, Sergei Skripal, og hans datter Yulia, som »en grotesk provokation, der blev groft iscenesat af britiske og amerikanske efterretningstjenester«. Vesten, anklagede han, bruger »orwellsk tvetunge-tale« med anvendelse af ord, der betyder det modsatte af deres sande betydning, for at retfærdiggøre sine politikker. »Situationen strider imod almindelig sund fornuft er virkelig farlig«, advarede han, rapporterer RT.

I dag, fortsatte Naryshkin, er der et større behov for at

»tilbageføre det internationale system for relationer, så det fungerer«. For at det kan ske, må lande opgive deres hykleri »og begynde at tale i et sandt fælles menneskeligt sprog, før det er for sent«. Så ofte, sagde han, blev »store ord om menneskerettigheder og demokrati ledsaget af militære interventioner ind i suveræne nationer. Disse nationer blev kastet ud i et blodigt kaos, hvor der ikke var plads til så fundamental en rettighed som retten til at leve. I løbet af de seneste to årtier er hundrede tusinder af uskyldige mennesker blevet ofre for NATO's aggression i Europa, Mellemøsten og Nordafrika«.

I en antydet reference til fremvæksten af et nyt paradigme, som Vesten ignorerer, formanede SVR-chefen også, at de vestlige nationer »ikke kan og ikke vil konfrontere sandheden og erkende, at deres egen indflydelse, som plejede at være uantastet, nu er i færd med at mindskes. De forsøger stadig at bygge relationer med andre nationer, baseret på gamle principper, der har deres rod i kolonialisme og bygger på tvang og diktater«. Vesten retter vilde anklager mod Rusland, fordi det opfatter Rusland som »drivkraft bag forandring«.

Washingtons fiksering på kampen »mod en ikkeeksisterende, såkaldt russisk trussel ... har nået sådanne proportioner og fået sådanne absurde karaktertræk, at det er muligt at tale om en tilbagevenden til den Kolde Krigs mørke tider«, fremførte Naryshkin.

Foto: Chefen for Ruslands udenrigsefterretningstjeneste Sergei Narushkin taler på den Syvende Moskva-konference om International Sikkerhed.

Det Nye Paradigme: Et nyt koncept for udenrigspolitik LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 30. marts, 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: God eftermiddag. Det er den 30. marts, 2018; Langfredag.

Hvis man ser på begivenhederne i verden i løbet af de seneste to uger, kunne man sige, at, på den ene hånd, er vi meget tæt på krig; at truslen om krig er alvorligt forøget. Men på den anden side kan man også sige, at muligheden for en reel, permanent, holdbar fred er meget tæt på. I realiteten er begge disse udsagn sande. Jeg mener, at denne kendsgerning viser os sandheden omkring, hvor, vi står i historiens forløb. Vi er usikkert anbragt på en knivspids og balancerer mellem to, modsatrettede paradigmer, som ikke kan sameksistere. Der er paradigmet for geopolitik og krig, og som desperat forsøger atter at gøre sig gældende på den transatlantiske scene netop nu; men så har vi også det modsatte paradigme for win-win-samarbejde og fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Det er det Nye Paradigme, der vokser frem og fejer hen over planeten. Det er præcis dette Nye Paradigmes succes, der har sat den geopolitiske gruppering her i det transatlantiske område i alarmtilstand. Det viser os også, at det er absolut nødvendigt, at folk af god vilje, inkl. LaRouche-bevægelsen her i USA og internationalt, intervenserer for fred, og for det Nye Paradigme.

Her følger resten af webcastet i engelsk udskrift:

On the one hand, you have this incredible provocation from

Mad Theresa May, or as she's being called "Theresa Mayhem"; a very appropriate nickname. She's trying to rally an international war coalition. She's going from a very weak government that was on the verge of collapse three weeks ago, to now; she's probably casting herself in the image of Margaret Thatcher, or even her image of Winston Churchill. However, while an unprecedented number of countries have fallen into lockstep behind the UK in expelling these Russian agents, the more interesting thing is how many countries did not do so. Including nearly a dozen European countries, which include Austria, which sees itself as a bridge between Europe and Russia; Belgium, the seat of the EU government interesting; Bulgaria; Cypress; Greece; Luxembourg; Malta; Portugal; Slovakia; Slovenia. Then on top of that, you have Japan – a major US-UK ally; but also under the recent years under Abe's government, an ever-increasingly close relationship with Russia. Then, even New Zealand, which is the most fascinating of them all. New Zealand is a member of the so-called Five Eyes, which is the intelligence sharing group comprised of the United States, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. There was an article in the {Guardian} saying this was a huge surprise that New Zealand, which they characterize as Lilliputian, would go against the diktat that came from Theresa May in London. So, you can see that this is a very precarious and dangerous situation, and that continues to play out. But on the other hand, take a look at the extremely promising developments

towards

actual peace and towards averting nuclear war which are now occurring on the Korean peninsula. While the geo-politicians would have you believe that second only to Russia, China is the

biggest global threat that we have to face right now; or perhaps

even more so. The reality is that China has played a key role in bringing Kim Jong-un to the negotiating table. This is closer

to a real peaceful settlement of this crisis than we've seen in

many years. The crucial factor in this has been the close personal relationship that was forged between President Xi Jinping of China and President Donald Trump here in the United States. So, in an absolutely surprising development which caught

the entire intelligence community here in the United States – for one – by surprise, Chairman Kim Jong-un made a personal trip

to China; travelling by special train to Beijing on March 25th.

He stayed in the official government guest house, and had a series of meetings stretching over the course of three and a half

days from March 25th to March 28th, meeting with Chinese President Xi Jinping in Beijing's Great Hall of the People. They

engaged in very serious talks. According to reports, this is the

first time in his seven years as President of North Korea that Kim travelled outside of the country. Now, what President Xi Jinping said, as was reported in Chinese media about this meeting

during the summit that he had with Kim Jong-un, he said, "The basics of the traditional friendship between China and North Korea were founded and nurtured by the elder generations of

leaders of both countries. This is our invaluable heritage.” Then, Kim Jong-un, who is slated to meet face-to-face with President Trump of the United States within the coming weeks in the next month or so, said that he is ready to conduct this high-level dialogue with the United States. He said, “The issue of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula can be resolved, if South Korea and the United States respond to our efforts with goodwill. It will create an atmosphere of peace and stability, while taking progressive and synchronous measures for the realization of peace. It is our consistent stand to be committed to denuclearization on the peninsula, in accordance of the will of late President Kim Il-Sung and late General Secretary Kim Jong-Il.

According to reports, Kim also told Xi Jinping that North Korea is ready to make some pretty reforms to its domestic economic policy. He’s ready to further open up to a market economy, along the lines of what China has done over the past couple of decades, going back to Deng Xiao-ping; what is called “socialism with Chinese characteristics”. Also, the reports are that China, coming out of this meeting, agreed to invest in and expand North Korea’s two major ocean ports; one on the west coast of North Korea in Nan Pao, and one on the east coast in Wonsan.

What President Trump had to say following this summit between Kim Jong-un and President Xi Jinping, he posted on twitter. He said, “Received a message last night from Xi Jinping

of China that his meeting with Kim Jong-un went very well and that Kim looks forward to his meeting with me. In the meantime

and unfortunately, maximum sanctions and pressure must be maintained at all costs." But I think this shows you very clearly that this is a joint project between President Trump and

President Xi Jinping personally. This is an example of the kinds

of benefits that the world can gain if major nations such as the

United States and China work together towards these common ends.

Now, let me play you a clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast from yesterday, where she addressed the very positive outcome that is developing there on the Korean peninsula.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Oh, I think this is the absolute overwhelming event, happening this past week.

Because

the Western mainstream media are again so ridiculous. They were

saying, "oh, these two dictators meeting..." and so forth, but this is very, very good, because obviously, both Xi Jinping and

Kim Jong-un recalled the long friendship between the two countries, North Korea and China, and Kim Jong-un, in particular,

promised to carry on policy in the tradition of his father and other relatives in the past. He basically promised that he wants

to work towards the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, provided that this offer is being met in an atmosphere of peace

and constructive attitude. Obviously, North Korea will need security guarantees; without that, he probably will not give up the nuclear weapons. But the fact that he first went to China, and then is going to meet with President Moon Jae-in from South Korea, at the end of April, and then, in all likelihood, with President Trump in May, that means that one of the most dangerous possible points for a World War III scenario could be peacefully resolved.

And, you know, the fact that, as contacts were telling us in South Korea, this whole thing had an economic dimension to it. China – according to these sources – is going to build ports in North Korea on the east coast and the west coast, and also obviously, the whole question of the extension of the Belt and Road Initiative, involving South Korea, North Korea, Russia, and China, – that is the framework within which one can get a really stable development.

So Trump immediately made a tweet, where he said he got a phone call from President Xi Jinping, who told him that the meeting went very well, and that he is extremely optimistic, looking forward; that unfortunately the sanctions [against North Korea] have to be maintained until the problem is resolved, but that he is absolutely looking forward towards this coming summit.

So I think this is {really} good, and it shows you that if you have back-channels and in this case, you had everybody involved, – Trump, Xi Jinping, Putin, but also Abe from Japan – so this really shows that if you have this kind of diplomacy

and

negotiation, there is no problem on this planet which cannot be solved by people who have a good will. And I think everybody should be very happy about this development.

OGDEN: So, exactly as I said, that is a testament that there are major crises on the planet which cannot be resolved unilaterally, but if we have this kind of great powers relationship, these kinds of crises can be confronted, and can be

resolved. Crises that have hung over our heads for decades. This relationship between China and the United States through this close personal relationship between Xi Jinping and President

Trump is already paying dividends, as you can see in the case of

this Korean peninsula here, and the possibility of not just positive effects abroad, but very positive effects here at home

is also very real if we continue to cultivate this special great

powers relationship between China and the United States.

Now, despite all the talk of trade war, etc., there are very interesting openings for joint Chinese-US investments and cooperation in development projects right here in the United States. This, of course, is right along the lines of exactly what LaRouche PAC has been campaigning for in terms of the United

States joining this New Paradigm, joining the New Silk Road, and

also exactly what Lyndon LaRouche has addressed in his Four Economic Laws for drastically upgrading the productive powers of

the US labor force and lifting the United States to a much higher

platform of high-technology development. This can be done with

this kind of US-Chinese relationship. So, some of the very

interesting US to China, China to US relationships, some news on that front over just the last few days. Some US Republican Senators – Senator Danes from Montana, Senator Grassley from Iowa, Senator Johnson from Wisconsin, Purdue from Georgia, and Senator Sass from Nebraska – all were in Beijing just a few days ago this week on March 27th, where they had a meeting with Premier Li Keqiang. The Senators called the United States-China relationship “one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world.” So, this is very interesting, especially coming from Republicans in the US Senate who have been taking a very anti-China line up to this point. Of course we see contrary voices, such as Marco Rubio, who is accusing every Chinese student in the United States of being a secret Chinese spy. But this trip is interesting, and it comes from Senators who are mainly from the so-called Farm Belt. I think the involvement of Senator Grassley is interesting, because of Terry Branstad’s roots in Iowa. Terry Branstad, former Governor of Iowa; now the ambassador to China. Also, we had news of the mayor of Miami-Dade County in Florida, Mayor Carlos Jimenez, who just returned from a visit to China, where he led a delegation of 50 elected officials and business leaders from Florida. He met with the mayor of Shanghai, who stated to Mayor Jimenez, “The bilateral relationship between China and the United States is the most important. It will affect the well-being of the people from both countries and the world’s peace and prosperity as well.” So, interestingly, exactly the same wordings that came out of that

communiqué from the five US Senators, that the China-US bilateral relationship is one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world. The mayor of Shanghai also made the

point very correctly that this is a win-win; the well-being of the people of both countries – the United States and China – can benefit out of this kind of bilateral relationship; but also,

the world's peace and prosperity as well. So, this is exactly along the lines that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been making and has

continued to make this week, as we will see.

Also – this is very interesting – the Governor of Alaska, Governor Bill Walker, has announced that he will lead a trade delegation to China in May; which interestingly, he first proposed during his January 2018 State of the State address. This is has been subsequently worked out, so this is another state along the lines of what Governor Jim Justice in West Virginia has been discussing. Jim Justice, in his State of the

State, obviously discussed the importance of these \$80 billion Chinese investments into the state of West Virginia. Now, you have Governor Bill Walker from Alaska. This does come in the wake of Governor Walker personally hosting President Xi Jinping

last April in Anchorage when President Xi was flying back from Florida, where he had his meeting with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago on his way back to China; where he took a brief opportunity to visit Governor Walker in Anchorage, Alaska. Then

on November 8, 2017, Governor Walker was the only governor to accompany President Trump on his delegation for the so-called “state visit plus” to Beijing, where one of the deals that was signed out of the \$300 billion of deals and memoranda of understanding, one of the deals that was signed was a \$43 billion

China investment and purchase deal for an 800-mile Alaska gas

pipeline. Also, there were important commitments made for liquefied natural gas sales. But this pipeline project which is now being very much emphasized by Governor Walker, is being characterized by the CEO of the Alaska Gas Line Development Corporation – one of the parties in this memorandum of understanding – is being characterized as having the potential of “turbo-charging” the Alaskan economy.

So, these are states that have been on the margins and are some of the poorer states. West Virginia for sure, Alaska very isolated, who are now developing these relationships with China and are becoming gateways for the Silk Road spirit to enter into the United States. This is exactly what we’ve been discussing in terms of the crucial importance of the role that China can play; these mutual investments and joint projects that China is willing to assist in building here in the United States. And just the idea of the United States joining this wave of mega-projects which is sweeping the globe and upgrading our infrastructure from the point that it’s now reached, which is a very sorry state of disrepair and deterioration that has come from decades and decades of disinvestment.

President Trump was in Ohio just yesterday, where he was speaking to a room full of union members and building trades workers. The point of his trip was to address his so-called infrastructure plan. We know that there are many deficits when it comes to the actual content of what Trump has proposed, but Trump in this speech made it clear that he is still very clear in

terms of what the urgency of the problem here in the United States is when it comes to infrastructure. And also the image of the United States as a nation of builders, and reclaiming the legacy that we had over centuries that we were the premier building nation in the world. Our infrastructure was second to none, and other nations were coming to the United States to try to emulate what we had accomplished. So, I'd like to just play a couple of excerpts from President Trump's address in Ohio yesterday, and you'll see that this infrastructure debate is still very much on the front burner. It desperately needs the kind of input that the LaRouche movement is uniquely positioned to make.

PRESIDENT TRUMP

: We will breathe new life into your very run-down highways, railways, and waterways. We'll transform our roads and bridges from a source of endless frustration into a source of absolutely incredible pride. And we're going to do it all under budget and ahead of schedule. You ever hear those words in the public world? Under budget and ahead of schedule.

We have other things. Nearly 40% of our bridges were built before – think of this – before the first Moon landing. You go to some countries, they're building bridges all over the place; all over you have bridges going up. One particular country, I won't use it because they're friendly to me, they weren't

friendly to us as a nation, but now they're friendly; they're building 29 bridges. We don't build bridges like that very much anymore. A little bit, every once in a while. But our roads are clogged, we have average drivers spend 42 hours every year stuck in traffic, costing us at least \$160 billion annually. Our mass transit systems are a mess; they're dilapidated and they're decayed. Nationwide, we average 300 power outages per year; compared to just five per year in the 1980s. A total mess. In recent years, Americans have watched as Washington spent trillions and trillions of dollars building up foreign countries while allowing our own country's infrastructure to fall into a state of total disrepair. We spent – and I was against it from the beginning – they try and say “Well, maybe not â!” I was against it from the beginning. And by the way, we're knocking the hell out of ISIS; we'll be coming out of Syria like very soon. Let the other people take care of it now. Very soon, very soon we're coming out. We're going to have 100% of the Caliphate as they call it, sometimes referred to as land; we're taking it all back, quickly, quickly. But we're going to be coming out of there real soon; we're going to get back to our country where we belong, where we want to be. But think of it. We spent, as of three months ago, \$7 trillion – not billion, not million – \$7 trillion with a “t”; nobody every heard of the word trillion until ten years ago. We spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East. We build a school, they

blow it up; we build it again, they blow it up. We build it again, it hasn't been blown up yet, but it will be. But if we want a school in Ohio to fix the windows, you can't get the money. If you want a school in Pennsylvania or Iowa to get Federal money, you can't get the money. We spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East. And you know what we have for it? Nothing. Stupid! Stupid! But we spent \$7 trillion, but we barely have money for the infrastructure. For most of our history, American infrastructure was the envy of the world – true. Go back 30, 40, 50 years. They would look at us like – now, we are like in many places a Third World country. It's an embarrassment! And we're the ones that had the imagination and the drive to get it done, but we've got that again. Other nations marveled as we connected our shores with transcontinental railroads and brought power to our cities that lit up the sky like no other place on Earth, and build mile after mile of interstate highways to carry American products all across the country and around the globe. Nobody did it like us! We dug out the Panama Canal; think of that! Thousands of lives were lost to the mosquito, to the mosquito – malaria. We dug out the Panama Canal. We transformed our skylines with towering works of concrete and steel, and laid the foundation for the modern economy. To rebuild this nation, we must reclaim that proud heritage – have to reclaim it. And we're on our way. We must recapture the excitement of creation, the spirit of innovation, and the spark of invention. We're starting! You saw the rocket the other day, you see what's going on with cars.

You

see what's going on with so much. NASA, space agency, all of sudden it's back, you notice? It was dormant for many, many years. Now it's back, and they're doing a great job. America is

a nation like you, of builders. It's a nation of pioneers, a nation that accepts no limits, no hardship, and never ever gives

up. We don't give up! We don't give up. Anything we can dream,

you can build. You will create the new highways, the new dams and skyscrapers that will become lasting monuments to American strength and continued greatness. You will forge new American steel into the spine of our country. You will cement the foundation of a glorious American future, and you will do it all

with those beautiful American hands. Powerful hands, powerful heart, and powerful American pride, right? Powerful American pride.

But you're the ones who are truly making America great again. We're going to work together. We're going to work with

the state of Ohio, we're going to work with everybody. And we're

going to bring our country to a level of success and prominence

and pride like it has never ever seen before. Thank you, and God

bless America. Thank you. Thank you very much.

OGDEN: So you can see, the commitment truly is there. This is obviously what got President Trump elected in the first place.

He's back in Ohio, back in the industrial heartland. That commitment to the reindustrialization of the United States, the

reclaiming of the legacy of the great manufacturing power and returning to that image of the United States as the envy of

the world in terms of builders. He cited the transcontinental railroad connecting the sea to the sea, ocean to ocean, stretching across the United States. The Moon landing, so many other things that the United States accomplished. Now, in his words, there are parts of the United States that literally have come to resemble a Third World country. So, the commitment is there.

The program is exactly what LaRouche PAC has issued. This is the Four Laws economic program, and that's why it's so indispensable that this pamphlet is circulated across the country, and that this is studied by people in the United States everywhere. This should be the material which is being used by these trade delegations that are travelling to China. Alaska, Miami-Dade County, West Virginia; all of these states, all of these local government officials, all of these governors, all of these Senators and Congressmen. If they really want to figure out what is the policy that the United States should be discussing, this is the source material. This is what they should be studying. You are the ones who play the critical role in getting it into their hands and communicating the ideas that are contained in this pamphlet.

The way that this is going to happen, and this is exactly what Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been addressing from the standpoint of the New Silk Road becoming the World Land-Bridge and the United States becoming part of this New Paradigm of development and mega-projects. One very interesting development, which is really just a continuation of what has been discussed by

numerous officials coming out of China, and really was originated by Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the LaRouche movement when she went to the Belt and Road Initiative forum last Spring, along the lines of China actually converting their US Treasury bonds that they hold into equity in a national infrastructure bank here in the United States and putting that money in terms of credit into allowing the United States to capitalize such an infrastructure fund; and to build these great projects that you heard President Trump discussing.

So, let me just say, this week, as publicized by CGTN, which is the China Daily global television network, an organization called the Center for China and Globalization has reiterated the idea that the only pathway towards stability in terms of US-China trade relations, and evening out this so-called trade deficit, the only pathway should be based on joint economic initiatives and joint investments. Instead of tit-for-tat tariff retaliation this way and that way, the Center for China and Globalization – according to CGTN – said that China should continue ten measures that it should take to foster US-China trade ties. They recommend, in addition to adjustments that should be made in areas such as lifting excessive limits on high technology exports to China, and various other aspects. The two most important steps that they propose here are the following: 1. “Consider the establishment of an investment fund to help the United States upgrade its infrastructure, capitalizing on China’s advanced

technology and expertise in the field.” 2. “Enlist the participation of American companies in Belt and Road projects as third party partners.” So again, the establishment of an investment fund where China can invest in the upgrading of US infrastructure, and also contribute its significant expertise that it has developed in terms of the projects that China has built over the last 10-15 years. Then, two, enlist American companies in Belt and Road projects as third party partners. So, in other words, the United States and US companies actually join China as third party partners in some of these development projects in other countries. Why could the United States not be participating as joint investors and joint partners in some of these fantastic rail projects that China has been building in Africa, for example? Or some of the water projects, or some of the power projects? And this kind of win-win relationship between the United States and China could then benefit both China and the United States, but also benefit the world. So, in this way, China can continue to adhere to their professed goal of long-term stable economic and trade relations between the two nations, but also third party partners can also benefit.

So, that’s what was proposed by this organization – the Center for China and Globalization. And emphatically, this is not a new idea. In fact, this idea comes directly from what the LaRouche movement has been discussing in terms of America’s future on the New Silk Road. So, this is a very significant opportunity, and despite the fact that everything you’re hearing right now is trade war, tariffs, tit-for-tat, and so forth, President Trump even in that speech in Ohio that you just heard,

praised what China has been able to accomplish in terms of these marvels of infrastructure. Bridge building, so forth and so on, over the recent years. It's exactly that spirit, the spirit of the New Silk Road that the United States must emulate right now.

We see some very interesting potentials around that sort of development. Again, as I said, these are the dividends of the close personal relationship that President Trump and President Xi

Jinping have forged. And it's our job to continue to develop things along that path.

So, let me conclude here by playing another clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's webcast from yesterday, where she addresses this

proposal for the United States joining the Belt and Road Initiative as a third party partner in development projects abroad, and also this idea of Chinese investment through an infrastructure bank or similar investment fund in infrastructure

projects here in the United States. So, here's this clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Well, there is actually a very interesting response from China, where the Prime Minister Li Keqiang made a proposal: He said, rather than reducing the trade deficit by imposing tariffs, which would end up in a trade war, and nobody would be the winner in the end, he said, the other way to resolve the trade deficit would be to increase the volume of

trade, and that way you could have also joint ventures between the United States and China and third countries. And that is obviously the approach which we have been proposing for a very long time.

There was also an extremely productive approach being discussed on CGTN, the China Global Television Network, where they said that the United States and China should start a dialogue about infrastructure, and that Chinese investors could

invest in the development of infrastructure in the United States,

through a fund. Now, this is a proposal which we have been pushing from way back, saying that China has these very large US

Treasury reserves, which if they just sit there, don't do anything good. But if they would be invested in the infrastructure inside the United States, through an infrastructure bank or some other mechanism, it could help to solve the financing problem which President Trump clearly has; given the fact that presently what is available in terms of funding, is very far from the \$1 trillion he had mentioned during

the election campaign. And the American Society of Civil Engineers had said what is needed is not \$1 trillion but actually

\$4.5 trillion; and some experts have even said, in order to get

modern infrastructure in the United States, you need \$8 trillion

in investment.

So, I think there is a situation where you could get rid of the trade imbalance by really using the Chinese expertise in high-speed train systems and other infrastructure. And what we have shaping up from the Schiller Institute was this idea to do

exactly in the United States what China has been doing and will

complete by 2025, or even 2020, to connect all its major cities through fast train systems. Now, obviously the infrastructure in the United States is in terrible shape and needs urgent repair, most of it is almost 100 years old or even older. So this would be an approach to really resolve this on a higher level. I think many people should discuss this, and there are already many forces in the United States who have opened channels with their Chinese counterparts. The governor of West Virginia, the mayor of Houston, Texas, the governor of Alaska. Naturally people in Iowa are very tuned in, because the former Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad is U.S. Ambassador in Beijing. So there are actually other alternatives than going into a trade war, which nobody would really benefit from.

[T]he world has reached a point where we {have} to overcome geopolitics. Because if, at this point, the United States, or the West in general, would go into the Thucydides Trap, take the rise of China as a reason to go into war and confrontation, this could very easily be the end of all of humanity, so we have to find a different way. And China has said many times, they do not want to surpass the United States and replace with a unipolar world order, but they want to be in a new alliance of sovereign countries, and have the idea of the one humanity first.

And I think this is a new concept of foreign policy, and people should study it and relate to it, rather than going for the rather uninformed opinions of such people as Marco Rubio, who is on a rampage against anything Chinese. But it really is not going to work, because the rest of the world is very happy

with

what China is doing, and I think it would be for the absolute benefit of humanity if the United States and China could find a

way to cooperate in their mutual interest.

OGDEN: So there, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, it would be of the absolute benefit of the people of the United States and of

China and the benefit of all humanity, if these two countries can

find a pathway towards cooperation in their mutual interest.

In

fact, that's the reality with all countries. This is the point

of the idea of a great powers relationship. Russia, China, India, the United States; and that really is the foundation of exactly what this idea of a new win-win paradigm of relations between nations is. There are problems to be overcome; there are

disagreements that will invariably occur; there are conflicts that different nations must resolve. But all of these can be resolved by elevating the dialogue to a higher level, and to look

at what the common challenges are and what are the avenues of the

common benefit that all nations can work together towards this idea of a common destiny for mankind.

So, we're out of time right now. As I said in the beginning, if you looked at in one way, you would say the possibility of war is very near at hand. But if you look at it

in another way, you say the possibility of a New Paradigm of peace and mutual development is also very close at hand, and is

right there for the taking. It is all that much more necessary

that those of us who have this perspective and understand that

the big picture – events on the ground are being dictated and are being driven by this fight; by this struggle between two mutually opposing paradigms. The geopolitical paradigm, that has brought us to the threshold of this kind of war situation; but also, this New Paradigm of economic development and mega-projects. And the offer, that we will assist you, not expecting something in return, not trying to impose our will on you; but just from the standpoint that this kind of cooperation is in our mutual benefit. It's up to us and it's up to the elected leadership here in the United States on all levels, to gain that perspective and to look for those avenues of mutually beneficial cooperation and win-win relationships that can build the bridge from now into this future in which the New Paradigm is dominant.

So, as I said, we have the material which you need, which is in the contents of this Four Laws pamphlet. This is "Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws; The Physical Economic Principles for the Recovery of the United States: America's Future on the New Silk Road." This was originally printed many months ago, but it remains highly relevant and a very timely intervention that we can use to educate our fellow Americans according to this potential for the dividends of the New Paradigm of win-win cooperation and economic development. With that perspective in mind, we wish you a Happy Easter, and we thank you for tuning to larouchepac.com. Please stay tuned, and we'll see you on Monday.

»Hvordan man udmanøvrerer gale Theresa Mays march mod Tredje Verdenskrig« Helga Zepp-LaRouche i internationalt webcast; 29. marts, 2018

Xi Jinping har, i alle sine skrifter, i alle sine taler, understreget, at dette »fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid« er baseret på total respekt for det andets lands suverænitet, total respekt for den andens samfundssystem, og der kommer ingen bestræbelse på at påtvinge noget andet land den kinesiske model. Det er ganske enkelt, at Kina har tilbudt især udviklingslandene at hjælpe dem til at overvinde deres underudvikling. Det er et win-win-samarbejde, hvilket er grunden til, at 140 lande i mellemtiden samarbejder med dette, for det er naturligvis i Kinas interesse – for det er en stor befolkning, et stort land, en meget rig kultur, 5.000 års meget rig kulturtradition, så det er et af verdens store lande, og måske endda det vigtigste, i betragtning af dets befolknings størrelse.

Men de påtvinger ikke nogen det, de anser for at være »kinesiske karaktertræk« – helt forskelligt fra de neokonservative og de neoliberale, der havde regimeskifte, 'farvede revolutioner', eksport af 'demokrati' og det, de kalder »menneskerettigheder«. Folk bør virkelig ikke være

fordomsfulde, men bør se på det med friske øjne, selv læse Xi Jinpings taler. ...

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Europæiske og amerikanske borgere køber ikke Hendes Sataniske Majestæts krav om krig med Rusland

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. marts, 2018 – Farcen med premierminister Theresa Mays krav om, at verden skal bøje sig for den britiske krone og acceptere den åbenlyse løgn, at Rusland gennemførte en »ulovlig magthandling« mod UK samtidig med, at Kongeriget nægter at fremlægge så meget som antydningen af bevis, overbeviser ikke mange borgere i USA eller Europa og stort set ingen uden for NATO. Organisatorer fra LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA, Tyskland (Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet; BüSo) og andre steder finder, at der er et dramatisk skift i befolkningens respons, siden PM May lancerede sin kampagne for krig med Rusland. De svingagtige britiske anklager mod Rusland – som minder stort

set alle om Tony Blairs løgne om Iraks masseødelæggelsesvåben, og om denne løgns forfærdelige konsekvenser – er begyndt at vække et spirende had til denne imperieholdning, som udstråler fra briterne og fra de spyttslikkere for briterne, som i 16 år sad på det amerikanske præsidentskab, før valget af Trump.

Lad os se på timingen i dette fupnummer:

- MI6-kampagnen for at bringe USA's præsident til fald gennem »Russiagate« er ikke alene kollapsede, men dens gerningsmænd i FBI, CIA og blandt de neokonservative i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske parti, står nu selv over for mulige anklager for kriminelle handlinger for deres løgne, læk, ulovlige brug af føderale myndigheder og mere endnu.
- Theresa Mays regering hang i en tynd tråd, alt imens Labour-partiets leder Jeremy Corbyn blev set som en sandsynlig vinder, hvis der blev udskrevet valg.
- De kombinerede britisk/Obama-bestræbelser på at vælte regeringen i Syrien og overgive landet til kaos under krigsførende terrorgrupper, ligesom i Irak og Libyen, er blevet alvorligt undermineret af præsident Trumps åbne samarbejde med Rusland omkring udslettelse af terroristerne.
- Flere europæiske nationer har afvist dæmoniseringen af Rusland, og Italien befinder sig i processen med at danne en ny regering, som sandsynligvis vil afvise europæiske sanktioner mod Rusland i det hele taget.

Så briterne forsøger at gøre det, de plejer at gøre qua deres imperienatur – opfinde en krise, der kan retfærdiggøre krig, få USA til at stå i spidsen og tyrannisere deres fordums »allierede« til underkastelse.

Men, planen virker ikke så godt. Alt imens det er sandt, at Trump-administrationen gik med i masseudvisningen af russiske diplomater, så er det imidlertid klart for briterne, at Trump ikke vil opgive sine planer om at arbejde sammen med præsident

Putin. Hans telefonopringning til Putin 20. marts, hvor de diskuterede løsninger på globale problemer uden at nævne den britiske Skripal-sag med ét eneste ord, slog Dronningen og hendes britiske Lords med rædsel, såvel som også den ynkelige Theresa 'M' May, og som alle ser skriften på væggen: Enden på selve Imperiet.

Næsten et dusin europæiske lande har nægtet at udvise nogen russiske diplomater og har krævet først at se beviser. Briterne har omdelt seks power point-slides som »bevis«, som ikke var andet end en liste over deres svigagtige anklager om russisk »aggression«. Ligesom Christopher Steele-dossieret, vil anklagerne måske narre nogle, for en tid; men briternes troværdighed er slidt ned.

Men, hvad der er meget vigtigt, så har millioner af mennesker i løbet af de seneste halvtreds år hørt Lyndon LaRouche advare om, at USA er blevet holdt for nar af briterne, med at udkæmpe deres kolonikrige siden Vietnam og med at gennemføre deres finanspolitikker med det »frie marked«, på bekostning af det Amerikanske System for dirigeret kredit til industriudvikling. Alt imens mange har fundet dette vanskeligt at tro på, så ser de pludselig de afskyelige løgne og Londons lige så afskyelige politik for anstiftelse af krige, og de reflekterer over, hvem, det var, der i alle disse år fortalte sandheden.

For en gangs skyld er briterne blevet tvunget til at stå i spidsen af deres fupnummer i deres eget navn – og det er deres sårbare punkt. Trumps plan om at arbejde sammen med Putin og med Xi Jinping og afslutte imperie-æraen for krige for regimeskifte og truslen om en atomar udslettelse, må støttes og fuldt og helt gennemføres, og det omgående.

Foto: Dronningen og Prinsen af Wales forlader parlamentet efter dronningens tale, 2017. Copyright House of Lords 2017 / Photography by Roger Harris. This image is subject to parliamentary copyright. www.parliament.uk

Rusland gør UK ansvarligt for Skripal-forgiftningerne, med mindre de fremlægger bevis for det modsatte

28. marts, 2018 – Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium rejste i dag officielt spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt Storbritanniens efterretningstjenester var involveret i drabsforsøget på Skripal og hans datter »som en del af en massiv, politisk provokation« og nævnte den britiske regerings åbenlyse afvisning af at fremlægge nogen som helst beviser for at retfærdiggøre dens globale krav om krig mod Rusland, med baggrund i denne forgiftningsaffære.

Ruslands »Erklæring fra Udenrigsministeriet«, som i dag blev publiceret på ministeriets webside, afslører Det britiske Imperiums latterlige bluffnummer omkring Skripal-affæren på samme måde, som præsident Vladimir Putin afslørede Imperiets strategiske bluff i sin tale 1. marts, hvor han annoncerede Ruslands nye missiler, der kan undvige Vestens ABM-systemer. Læserne kan selv dømme ud fra de følgende uddrag:

»De britiske myndigheder har mere en én gang demonstreret deres manglende evne til at sikre russiske borgeres sikkerhed ...

I det seneste tilfælde [med Sergei Skripal og hans datter, Yulia, idet sidstnævnte stadig er russisk borger], handlede London i modstrid med alle normer for international lov, etik og endda sund fornuft. London har anklaget Rusland for at forgifte russiske borgere uden at levere nogen beviser eller noget komplet billede af forbrydelsen. Samtidig har det

leveret det angivelige navn på den giftige substans, som aldrig er blevet brugt i Rusland, og de har lanceret en storstilet politisk kampagne og mediekampagne mod Rusland. Det har indledt kampagnen for udvisning af russiske diplomater fra en række lande og repræsentative kontorer og internationale organisationer og har annonceret en pakke af andre sanktioner ...

De britiske myndigheders handlinger rejser mange spørgsmål. Den britiske offentlighed holdes hen i mørke med hensyn til hovedelementer i denne hændelse, som er blevet beskrevet som ekstremt farlig, og antallet af personer, der er blevet ramt, holdes hemmeligt. Ingen information er blevet givet om aktiviteterne i Storbritanniens hemmelige forskningsfacilitet i Porton Down i nærheden af Salisbury, hvor man udfører forskning i kemiske substanser. Der er ikke frigivet information om 'Operation Toxic Dagger', en årlig øvelse i kemisk krigsførelse, der gennemføres på Porton Downs faciliteter sammen med UK's militær, og som afsluttedes umiddelbart forud for forgiftningen af Skripal og hans datter.

I mellemtiden har London indledt en global kampagne for at sprede antagelsen om Ruslands skyld. Vi ser en overløbet og målbevidst eskalering af konfrontation og demonstration af militærmagt på Ruslands grænser. Det er en åbenlys bestræbelse på at underminere den politiske og diplomatiske interaktion, som kunne føre til en objektiv og omfattende efterforskning af Salisbury-hændelsen.

Analysen af alle disse omstændigheder viser, at UK's myndigheder ikke er interesseret i at identificere de virkelige årsager og de virkelige gerningsmænd til forbrydelsen i Salisbury, hvilket indikerer en mulig involvering af UK's efterretningstjenester. Med mindre vi modtager overbevisende bevis for det modsatte, vil vi anse denne hændelse som værende et drabsforsøg på russiske borgere som en del af en massiv, politisk provokation. Vi understreger, at bevisbyrden udelukkende hviler på

Storbritannien.«

Foto: Fra venstre: Ruslands forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu, udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og præsident Vladimir Putin. Foto fra 2015.

UK's Nationale Sikkerhedsstrategi tilsigter krig med Rusland og tankepoliti på hjemmefronten

28. marts, 2018 – Briterne udgav i dag en ny **Strategic Security Capability Review**, der reviderer deres nationale sikkerhedsstrategi fra 2015, med en isnende opfordring fra selveste premierminister Theresa May til mobilisering for krig med Rusland, såvel som også udvidelse af »tankepoliti-kontrol« over sociale medier, forklædt som modspil mod russisk »fake news«.

I introduktionen, skrevet af May, erklærer hun, at, siden 2015, »er truslerne fortsat blevet intensiveret og udviklet, og vi står over for en række komplicerede udfordringer hjemme og i udlandet: en genopblussen af statsbaserede trusler og voksende konkurrence mellem stater; underminering af den internationale orden, baseret på regler; fremvæksten af cyberangreb fra både statslige og ikkestatslige aktører og den generelle indvirkning af teknologiske udviklinger; og den voksende trussel, som udgøres af terrorisme, ekstremisme og ustabilitet.« Uden at efterlade nogen tvivl om, hvem målet er,

fortsætter hun: »I løbet af det seneste år har vi i UK været vidne til oprørende terrorangreb i London og Manchester. Men også til fræk og uansvarlig aggressionshandling i Salisburys gader: mordforsøg ved at bruge et ulovligt, kemisk våben, som er en ulovlig magthandling mod UK.«

I dokumentets hovedtekst lyder det: »En opblussen af statsbaserede trusler, en intensivering af mere udbredt statslig konkurrence og udhuling af den på regler baserede, internationale orden, som gør det vanskeligere at bygge konsensus og takle globale trusler ... Den vilkårlige og ansvarsløse brug af nervegift til militærbrug på britisk jord var en ulovlig magtanvendelse fra den russiske stats side. Det skete på baggrund af et veletableret mønster af russisk statsaggression. Ruslands ulovlige annektering af Krim var første gang, siden Anden Verdenskrig, at én suveræn nation med magt har taget territorium fra en anden nation i Europa. Rusland har anstiftet konflikt i Donbass-området og støttet Assads regime, inklusive, da dette regime med overlæg ignorerede dets forpligtelse til at standse al brug af kemiske våben. Rusland har ligeledes krænket europæiske landes nationale luftrum og etableret en vedvarende kampagne for cyber-spionage og opbrud, inklusive indblanding i valg.«

Med hensyn til »tankepoliti«, erklærer dokumentet: »Kommunikationer bliver i stigende grad, både af vore partnere og vore modstandere, brugt til at opnå strategiske fordele i den virkelige verden. Traditionelle kanaler er i vid udstrækning blevet tilsidesat til fordel for digitale og sociale medieplatforme. Dette kombineres med en nedgang i tiltroen til traditionelle informationskilder og den såkaldte »fake news«-æra. Parallelt hermed er spillereglerne ændret. Demokratiseringen af information, og midlerne til at udnytte det, har gjort det muligt for aktører at udøve uforholdsmæssig indflydelse, som er i konkurrence med offentlighedens interesse.«

Foto: Storbritanniens premierminister Theresa May har skrevet

introduktionen til UK's nye Strategic Security Capability Review.

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 menneskehedens historie i mange generationer fremover.

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

Han sagde:

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

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

Men, snarere end klart og nøgternt at vurdere denne ændrede, strategiske virkelighed, med denne game-changing tale af Ruslands præsident, og besvare dette tilbud for at forhandle, med hans ord, »et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation«, for endelig at bringe denne nihilistiske dødsspiral med stadigt mere dødbringende masseudslettelsesvåben til en afslutning; snarere end at gøre dette, har briterne og deres såkaldte »partnere« i Europa

forsøgt at oppiske en generel støtte til en krigskonfrontation mod Rusland ved anvendelse af det, Labour-partiets leder, Jeremy Corbyn, meget korrekt karakteriserede som det, han kaldte »fejlbehæftet efterretning« og »uvederhæftige dossiers« af den type, som blev brugt til at retfærdiggøre invasionen af Irak. Og som Jeremy Corbyn advarede om, så bør vi ikke »affinde os med en ny Kold Krig ... og en intolerance over for dissens som under McCarthy-perioden«.

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

Umiddelbart efter denne telefonsamtale, blev pressen, som I kan tænke jer, hysterisk, og Det Hvide Hus' pressesekretær Sarah Sanders holdt en pressekonference i briefing-værelset i Det Hvide Hus, hvor hun ikke mindre end et halvt dusin gange understregede den absolutte betydning af at opretholde en

dialog mellem USA og Rusland på lederskabsniveau, omkring fælles interesser og fælles udfordringer.

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

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

SARAH SANDERS: We want to continue to have a dialogue with Russia, and continue to talk about some of the shared interests

we have, whether it's North Korea, Iran, and particularly as the

President noted today, slowing the tensions when it comes to an

arms race, something that is clearly important to both leaders....

We want to continue to have dialogue so that we can work on some of the issues that concern both countries, and we're going

to continue to do that, while also continuing to be tough on a number of things....

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

These are conversations that sometimes take place, and certainly the President finds there to be an importance in having

that dialogue with Russia so that we can talk about some of the

big problems that face the world....

We disagree with the fact that we shouldn't have

conversations with Russia. There are important topics that we should be able to discuss, and that is why the President's going

to continue to have that dialogue.

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

We know that we need to continue a dialogue. It's important for

a lot of the safety and security of people across the globe.

We

would like to be able to work with them on things like North Korea, on Iran, and also both countries shared interest in lowering the tensions when it comes to an arms race, recognizing

that that's not the best thing for either country, and so we want

to be able to have those conversations and that was the point of

today's call... [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's a very clear message, obviously. Now, on the same day, President Trump himself reiterated exactly the same

points in a couple of tweets that he posted, and I would like to

just read you those tweets. He said:

"I called President Putin of Russia to congratulate him on his election victory (in past, Obama called him also). The Fake

News Media is crazed because they wanted me to excoriate him.

They are wrong! Getting along with Russia (and others) is a good

thing, not a bad thing."

"They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran, and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried

to get along, but didn't have the 'smarts.' Obama and Clinton tried, but didn't have the energy or chemistry (remember

RESET).

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!" he concludes.

Now of course that final phrase is a quotation directly from President Ronald Reagan. And this direct reference is a very timely one, and perhaps is not merely a coincidental one: As I

said, today, March 23rd, is the 35th anniversary of one of the groundbreaking moments in modern history, and it's one which completely reshaped the global, strategic geometry at that time,

and which remains immediately relevant all the way up to the present day.

That moment, March 23rd, 1983 was representative of a complete shock, a shock wave which was felt around the world. This was the surprise announcement by President Ronald Reagan at

the conclusion of a live, national television broadcast which was

an address to the nation, nominally on national security. But what President Reagan did at the conclusion of that broadcast, to

the surprise of almost all of his leading advisors in the White

House even, was to announce what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, what President Reagan called a "vision of the future, which offers hope."

In the speech, what President Reagan did was that he committed the United States to a crash program, a crash scientific program for the development of advanced technologies

which would be based on new physical principles to (quote/unquote) "free the world from the threat of nuclear war."

And so, in so doing, President Reagan completely overthrew the ideology of retaliatory nuclear deterrence through the threat of

instantaneous, total nuclear response in the event of the

detection of a nuclear attack against the territory of the United States. This was what was so-called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).

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

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

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

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never

be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and

defend against aggression – to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States,

or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks

to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he

won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable – quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats. There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age... Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation. This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear

war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisors, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have

underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must

thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on

both sides....

Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly

lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we

embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat

with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and

destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own

soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet,

current

technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort...

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive

policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great

talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us

the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies,

I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research

and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of

eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles.

This

could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose – one all people share – is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history.

There

will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it.

As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

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

OGDEN: That was 35 years ago today.

Now, just as a side note, incidentally, President Trump is not ignorant of this history. In 1999, far before he ever was a

candidate for President, in a an interview with none other than

Wolf Blitzer on CNN, President Trump actually addressed what he

thought of as the necessity for the Strategic Defense Initiative,

but also the necessity for sitting down and having talks to work

out the tensions between the United States and Russia. Here's just a quick quote from President Trump. He said:

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

Wolf Blitzer said, "A Strategic Defense Initiative?"

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

So, that was just a side note. That was Nov. 28, 1999. But as I think you can see, now-President Trump remains committed to

that inclination to sit down with the Russians and many others —

North Korea, for example; and to resolve these nuclear threats.

If you just go back again to that date in 1983, this was 35 years ago. In President Reagan's own words, he said that what he

announced that night would, indeed, change the course of world history; and it did. And, it took most of the world completely

by surprise. But, it didn't come out of nowhere, and this

history is very important for viewers to understand.

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

1983. What Mr. LaRouche had to say was the following:

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

With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

“Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public

action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope for humanity’s future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten.”

So that was Lyndon LaRouche, March 24, 1983. Now, as LaRouche alluded to in that statement, he was no bystander or casual observer of the events of that night President Reagan announced the SDI. In fact, the grand idea behind what Reagan announced that night, came directly from none other than Lyndon

LaRouche himself. I would like to play for you a brief excerpt

of Mr. LaRouche, in his own words, speaking about the background

to what had shocked the world that night – March 23, 1983. This is taken from a video that LaRouche PAC published about ten years ago, back in 2008, on the 25th anniversary of the SDI speech. The video was titled “A Brief History of Lyndon LaRouche’s SDI.” So, let’s listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say in that video.

LYNDON LAROUCHE

: I had been organizing the SDI operation, including initially from 1977, long before it was called an SDI. I was the one who said, “We’re going to make a project of this thing.” So, I adopted this and stated this as my program in 1979, when I was running as a Presidential candidate. Then, I had this conversation with Reagan, and then as a follow-up after he was President, we had a follow-up with various people in the Reagan circle; including his National Security Council. I was working with the head of the National Security Council on this operation, and with people from the CIA and this and that. I was sworn to this and sworn to that, so I was doing the whole thing. The SDI was my work, which they liked. And there was a faction, including the President, who liked it. He liked it because he was against, he always hated Henry Kissinger; and he hated Henry Kissinger particularly because of the so-called “revenge weapons.” The idea that you build super weapons, and if somebody throws a bomb at you, you obliterate the

planet. That is not considered a good defense, and he was against that. When he saw from experts that what I was saying was accepted experts – military and others – and this was French intelligence, the leadership of the Gaullist faction in France; this was the leadership of the German military; this was the leadership of the Italian military, and all over the world.

So, I was the creator of the SDI. Reagan liked it, he adopted it. I was creating the thing in direct cooperation during the entire period, with the cooperation of the National Security Council and the heads of the CIA. People recognized that I was right; I had the scientific capability and knowledge to do it, and we were doing it.

OGDEN: So, that's the story in Lyndon LaRouche's own words. That is merely the tip of a very fascinating iceberg. We encourage you to watch that full video that I cited that that excerpt was taken from. But also, to visit the page on the LaRouche PAC website which gives you the full background of this story. As you can see there, the link is larouchepac.com/sdi. That gives you this full, historic background. But as you heard

Mr. LaRouche say there in that video clip, this effort on his part to craft the idea of what then became adopted by the President of the United States in the form of the SDI, this effort went all the way back to the mid-1970s. Here's an image of a campaign pamphlet which was commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, titled "Sputnik of the '70s: The Science behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon." In this pamphlet, Lyndon LaRouche called for an international crash program to develop a space-based missile defense system based on new physical principles. A Manhattan

project-style mission which would provide the economic driver to fuel global development. The pamphlet proposed "... Long-range economic and scientific collaboration with the Soviet Union, among other nations, which would eliminate the danger of world obliteration," and it emphasized "... Tremendous revolutionary industrial implications available to this nation and the world if the political will of the United States forces a recommitment to technological progress in the form of an International Development Bank and its national concomitant Third National Bank."

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

breakthroughs around these new physical principles in the collaboration of US and Soviet scientists to develop this joint

missile defense to make International Ballistic Missile and nuclear war impotent and obsolete.

The history is as fascinating as it is extensive. Here is not the time or the place to go through every single aspect of this history; but the full background, again as I said is available on that webpage – larouchepac.com/sdi. But if you fast forward from that pamphlet “Sputnik of the '70s” all the way

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

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

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

LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail.

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

representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings

with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with

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

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

special report titled “Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for

Peace.” Here’s the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982.

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

This

was titled “Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War.”

Here’s another one; this is a pamphlet. “How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression.” So, all along, this was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche’s standpoint. As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of

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

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

groundbreaking speech.

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

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

had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization.

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

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

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

that had been announced the evening before.

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

He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work. This image here is an array of different publications that were

issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's announcement

of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the scientific,

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

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

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

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

the entire international economic and strategic architecture of

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

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

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

read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published under

this title "The LaRouche Doctrine." He begins by saying:

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

b)

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

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

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

economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and

those relatively subordinated nations often classed as ‘developing nations.’ Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there

can be no durable peace on this planet.

“Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both,

the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic

policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers.

.”.. [T]he general advancement of the productive powers of labor in all sovereign states, most emphatically so-called developing nations, requires global emphasis on: a) increasing globally the percentiles of the labor force employed in scientific research and related functions of research and development ... b) increasing the absolute and relative scales of

capital-goods production and also

the rate of turnover in capital-goods production; and c)

combining these two factors to accelerate technological progress

in capital-goods outputs.

“Therefore, high rates of export of such capital-goods output to meet the needs of developing nations are indispensable

for the general development of so-called developing nations: Our

common goal, and our common interest, is promoting both the general welfare and promoting preconditions of durable peace between our two powers...

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

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

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

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

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

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

He says:

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

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

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

contingency of what was sometimes named 'preventive nuclear war.'

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

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

"From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called 'détente,'

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

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

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

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

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

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

and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of

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

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

“On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of this planet. This shall become a community of principle coherent with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If any force should endeavor to destroy that community of principle, or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the United States will be prepared to defend that community and its members by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient. With respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United States offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might enter fully into participation within that community of principle... “Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in development of the frontiers of scientific research, in laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations will be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems derived from application of ‘new physical principles.’ “To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other nations in development of these new areas of scientific breakthrough for application to exploration of space. “To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in scientific exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements

protecting national and multinational programs for
colonization
of the Moon and Mars.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

international economic and strategic architecture. In fact,
the

one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have the kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic development and the application of these groundbreaking new physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations – but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB. As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called “developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny, I think that the echoes couldn’t be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the 1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the

United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit

the specific conditions of today.

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

colonization

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

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

of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India and

other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer

space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech.

What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the

late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr.

Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading

science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States

and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other,

and

let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a

whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a “non-zero threat” – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is

all the more timely and all the more relevant today.

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

from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling

it “Star Wars,” and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a

New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical

principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely is in

this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down

and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and

the

Europeans.

This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs,

NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among sovereign

republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic today

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

the economy to use the increased productivity of the real economy

for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector, in

order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

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

participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

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

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

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

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

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

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

humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I

mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of cooperation

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

think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need

more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

OGDEN: So, that was Helga LaRouche's call to action, and I think that's a perfect concluding point for our webcast today, as

we observe this very auspicious date – March 23rd – the 35th anniversary of President Reagan's groundbreaking speech announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative. Let's take that kind of sense of victory and the optimism that indeed, ideas can

change the course of history, and consolidate this New Paradigm;

this new security architecture and new economic architecture for

the planet. The opportunity is greater than it ever has been before; but the need is ever more dire.

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

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 udskift:

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-LAROUICHE: Yes. Because, as you said, there were all kinds of other diplomatic initiatives. The two military chiefs of staff communicated, then there was a meeting between the Russian Ambassador Anatoly Antonov and Senator Rand Paul, which is very important, because in the midst of all of this demonization, almost nobody dared to speak with the Russian Ambassador, like what happened to Sessions. So, the two of them, Antonov and Rand Paul also agreed to reestablish U.S.-Russian inter-parliamentarian dialogue. So every effort to reestablish dialogue and trust building, confidence building, is extremely welcome, because, as it has been developing – in the '60s and '70s you had the idea of an East policy, of rapprochement through cooperation, détente, trying to have a good-neighbor relationship in Europe, and all of that with, really, starting with PNAC, the Project for a New American Century, with the neo-cons when the Soviet Union collapsed, that basically led to a complete build-up of a Cold War mentality, NATO expansion, regime change, interventionist wars, and this has poisoned the atmosphere so much that you can really ask yourself, what was the purpose – or what {is} the purpose of that? What is the purpose, when the British are trying to build such a war-like enemy image of Russia? I mean, there are some few, very lonely voices who share our view, that

once you build up such an enemy image, and you poison the atmosphere, you completely make wild accusations, I mean, this is the kind of atmosphere in which things can go very quickly very wrong. And that would be devastating.

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

So people should not be blind in repeating this Cold War demonization against Russia, and in a certain sense against [China], because this is {really} dangerous. It's very dangerous. And you have the distinct feeling that with the exception as such people as President Trump and a few others, that the present crop of politicians in leading positions have been so self-brainwashed and so incapable of strategic thinking, or even thinking of the consequences of what they're saying and doing, that they are not capable to see the cause and effect of their warmongering. And I think we need a real discussion that

what is needed is cooperation, confidence-building, dialogue, cooperation on economic projects, cooperation in space, which was also mentioned in this context, as a positive step. But we have to have a debate that this kind of confrontation should stop, and we should support President Trump when he is trying to mend fences with Russia and China, and not attack him.

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think it shows like never before, the role of the British, and I think that's a useful thing. Because those among our audience who know the LaRouche movement for a longer time, will remember that we were, and especially my husband, was always attacked for his having pointed to the role of the British. And it was the British Empire – which still exists, not in the old form, but it exists in the form of the leading financial institutions, and their whole system of private security firms, and the whole central bank/insurance company system. The trans-Atlantic financial structure, is the present form of the British Empire, and my husband always pointed to the fact that it is that which is corrupting the United States, and

running much of the dope traffic. And he always was accused that said, the British monarchy is behind all of this. Now, anybody who looks at the present manipulation of the situation, can see very clearly the role of the British, the role of Boris Johnson, the role of Theresa May who are just the instruments of this. But I think this is very useful, because the real United States after all made an American Revolution and War of Independence against this British Empire, and if you look at the history, that same British Empire never gave up the idea of reconquering the United States, and finally they succeeded to establish the "special relationship" between the United States and Great Britain to run the world as a unipolar world. And if President Trump breaks out of that, – and that was the real reason for the attacks on him – and establishes a direct communication with Russia and China, then that's the end of this kind of geopolitical manipulation, of divide and conquer of the world. And that is a very good thing. And I think that should happen, right now.

SCHLANGER: Well, when we talk about backfiring, this calls to mind something you often bring up, Schiller's idea of the "Ibykus principle." We see it also with Russiagate, in the firing of [FBI Deputy Director Andrew] McCabe in the last days; the focus now on [former CIA Director] John Brennan, – there are a whole series of articles attacking John Brennan, who's coming out openly saying, Trump is crazy, he has to be removed. And then, there's a whole story that the attempt to ensnare

Trump

in this Cambridge Analytica, and there's a whole different story

that's now coming out on this. This is the Ibykus principle, isn't it?

ZEPP-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 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: Yes, see you next week.

NYHEDSORIENTERING MARTS 2018: Rusland: Ven eller fjende?

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

Vores formål er præcist at placere Theresa Mays sindssyge bestræbelse den 12.-14. marts på at fabrikere et nyt svindelnummer med »masseødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en 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.

Download (PDF, Unknown)