

ON THE EVE OF THE NATO SUMMIT

## Medvedev Warns of Danger Of ‘Nuclear Apocalypse’

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

May 18—It is obvious how dramatic the world situation is, when Charles Dallara, the managing director of the International Institute of Finance, characterizes the results of an exit from the Eurozone by Greece as “between catastrophic and Apocalypse,” and Russian Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev warns a day later: “Infringing on national sovereignty could lead to a nuclear Apocalypse,” as *Russia Today* headlined his remarks. Apparently different subject areas—yet both processes are most closely connected.

On the eve of his visit to the United States for the meeting of the G8, and the immediately following NATO summit, Medvedev delivered an unequivocal warning at the International Legal Forum in St. Petersburg. The policy of certain Western states, of violating the national sovereignty of certain states under the pretext of humanitarian intervention, he said, could easily lead to full-scale regional wars, including the use of nuclear weapons. With that



government.ru

*Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev, speaking in St. Petersburg on May 17, warned that wars under the guise of “humanitarian interventions” can lead to thermonuclear war.*

statement, the Russian government once again conveyed the message that President Vladimir Putin had delivered himself in a decree issued immediately after taking office: Russian will not allow further aggressive wars under the pretext of humanitarian intervention according to the model of the war against Libya—in this

case, against Syria, Iran, and other states.

Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin had previously pointed out that Eastern Europe is making itself a target and a hostage, when it participates in a strategy of encirclement against Russia, and Chief of the General Staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov had recently announced, at a security conference in Moscow, the possibility of carrying out a preventive strike against the planned U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense System in Eastern Europe, in the case that the U.S. and NATO stick to their current scheme. Therefore, the world finds itself at the brink of a Third World War.

President Putin is said to have transmitted the same message via Russian diplomats across the globe to the respective host nations, a policy of absolute respect

for national sovereignty, that by now is called the “Putin Doctrine.” The Russian President responded immediately after his inauguration to the creation of the so-called “Atrocity Prevention Board” of the Obama Administration, a new government agency that, under the pretext of combatting violations of democracy and human rights, topples regimes disagreeable to it.

### Application of the Blair Doctrine

Obama is essentially only implementing the so-called Blair Doctrine, which former British Prime Minister Tony Blair had put forward in his infamous 1999 speech in Chicago during the Kosovo War. Blair asserted at that time that the era of the Peace of Westphalia

## Medvedev’s May 17 Warning

*May 17—Speaking to the International Legal Forum in St. Petersburg today, Russian Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev gave the following warning, as translated on the website of the government of the Russian Federation:*

I would like to emphasise that we need to act in unison against such modern global challenges as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, organised transnational crime, drug trafficking, and the threat of natural and man-made disasters. We can achieve this only through the collective efforts of states based on undeviating respect for the supremacy of law.

Many say that the international legal system has become obsolete. I have heard this said many times during my political practice. They say that its norms do not always ensure an effective response to new challenges. This is partly true, because everything eventually becomes obsolete, and the legal system is no exception. But the acute need for modernising international law does not mean that we should abandon its founding principles, which I believe is an obvious truth.

Particularly dangerous, in my view, are unilateral

actions made in violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which is the main venue where the international community brings its problems. In fact, this is the only venue we have, even though some may not like it. But it truly is the only venue. And we understand that the UN Charter calls for respecting the supreme power of law and the sovereignty of states.

One more thing that I believe is important, considering my experience in politics, is the concept of state sovereignty. It should not be undermined even if for the sake of achieving some immediate political gain, including an election to a particular post. Such attempts threaten global order. There have been many recent examples of the concept of state sovereignty being undermined. Military operations against foreign states bypassing the United Nations, declarations of illegitimacy of certain political regimes on behalf of foreign states rather than the people of the country involved, and imposing various collective sanctions, again bypassing international institutions, are some of them. This does not improve the situation in the world, while rash military interference in the affairs of another state usually results in radicals coming to power. *Such actions, which undermine state sovereignty, can easily lead to full-scale regional wars even—I am not trying to scare anyone here—with the use of nuclear weapons.* Everybody should remember this especially when we analyse the concept of state sovereignty [emphasis added].



Russian Presidential Press Service

*Russian President Vladimir Putin (center right, with red tie) at a heads of state summit of the Collective Security Treaty Organization on May 15 at the Kremlin. Putin issued a decree immediately after taking office, saying that Russia will not tolerate more aggressive wars on the Libya model.*

lia, and with it the respect for national sovereignty, was over. In its place the “Community of States,” by which he naturally meant the Anglo-American empire, is to have the authority to make military interventions for “humanitarian purposes.” Ever since, this has meant in practice that all states that defy the empire, based upon the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain, will be designated as belonging to the “Axis of Evil,” and regime change will be brought about, be it through military intervention, sanctions, or subversive activities.

The pressing issue now is the destabilization and drive for regime change against Syria and Iran. It is no secret that the so-called opposition in Syria is directed and financed from London, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar, and to a great extent consists of al-Qaeda networks, the subject of a present probe in the American Congress. It is likewise known that members of the Israeli secret service have for a long time conducted false-flag sabotage operations in Iran, and may have taken part in the assassinations of Iranian nuclear scientists. It is also known that in the Arabian Sea, the eastern Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean, there are enormous American, British, Canadian, and other naval flotillas, which

that the intention of the British Empire was regime change for Russia as well. In the context of the forward deployment of U.S. ballistic missile defense systems in Europe by the George W. Bush and Obama administrations, along with Obama’s policy of encirclement of China in the Pacific, it is obvious that, for the Russian government, the tripwire has been reached, the absolute limit which can’t be exceeded without catastrophe.

### **Respecting International Law**

In his St. Petersburg speech, Prime Minister Medvedev emphatically opposed the line that the system of international law has become obsolete. Even if it, like everything else in life, must be modernized, that must not mean that its essential principles be abandoned. It would be especially dangerous to violate the fundamental principles of the UN Charter, which is the only court of justice before which the international community can bring its problems. And the UN Charter underscores the highest power of law and the sovereignty of states. The extremely important concept of national sovereignty may not be undermined, otherwise the global order would be in danger.

have at their command a potential for nuclear destruction that is orders of magnitude greater than that which would be deployed in a regional conflict in the Near East and Persian Gulf region.

At the latest, in late Summer of last year, when Putin and Medvedev had announced the switch of their offices, the same apparatus that was already responsible for the “Orange Revolution” against Ukraine and diverse other revolutions, had attempted, in vain, to set into motion a so-called “White Revolution” against the Russian government. It must have been clear to everyone

Military operations against other nations, circumventing the UN; the conferring of legitimacy to a particular political regime by foreign governments instead of by its own population, again circumventing international institutions—all of this degrades the situation in the world, Medvedev said, and precipitous military interventions into the affairs of other nations have shown themselves to lead only to the assumption of power by radical forces. “Such actions, which undermine state sovereignty, can easily lead to full-scale regional wars, and even—I am not trying to scare anyone here—to the deployment of nuclear weapons. Everyone should remember this especially when we analyze the concept of national sovereignty,” said Medvedev with unmistakable emphasis.

Especially U.S. Congressmen and Senators who have ties to the military are, like the Russians, in a state of highest alert over the possibility that President Obama, in a repeat of the war of aggression against Libya, could set into motion military operations against Syria and Iran, and possibly even against Russia and China. This is demonstrated by the legislation introduced by Democratic Sen. Jim Webb (Va.), whose resolution demands that Obama obtain the agreement of the Congress before launching so-called humanitarian interventions; and also by Republican Rep. Walter Jones (N.C.), whose resolution, HCR 107, would initiate the impeachment of the President in the event of unprovoked military actions without the consent of Congress. In the text of his bill, Senator Webb emphasized—in a clear allusion to the Blair Doctrine—the significance of the American Constitution, which, in contrast to British law, grants the right to declare war exclusively to the Congress (and not to a king or prime minister.)

Without the anti-war mobilization that Lyndon LaRouche launched in November of last year, and without the massive interventions of leading American military officers, the wars against Syria, Iran, and thereby against Russia and China, would in all probability have already taken place. On May 15, Gen. James Cartwright (ret.), who, until last September, was acting head of U.S. the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned that the concept of “Air-Sea-Battle” was demonizing China, and that Russia had a justified concern that the U.S. ballistic missile defense system in Europe would destroy the strategic balance. “There’s the potential,” he said, “that you could, in fact, generate a scenario in which, in a

bolt from the blue, we launch a pre-emptive attack, and then use missile defense to weed out their residual fires [that is, destroy their second strike capability—HZL]. . . . We’re going to have to think our way out of this.”

### **No Illusions About Obama!**

The U.S. military officers are less romantically befogged than many Europeans, who still don’t wish to recognize that Obama is in no way the Messiah, as he was depicted during the 2008 election, but on the contrary, has not only propagated the policies of George W. Bush, but has actually escalated them on all fronts. The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) permits the indefinite detention of persons, including Americans, anywhere in the world, without due process; drone deployments have killed roughly 5,000 people in the past three years, including many civilians; Obama has repeatedly overridden the constitutional rights of the Congress, and, in the tradition of [Nazi crown jurist] Carl Schmitt, ruled by decree; and above all, he has demonstrated, in the case of the war against Libya and the brutal execution of Qaddafi, that he is absolutely prepared to flout the Constitution.

In light of the imminently threatening confrontation with Russia and China, it is clear to many patriotic Americans that only impeachment proceedings pursuant to Section 4 of the 25th Amendment can prevent a great catastrophe.

The war danger is obviously not the result of anything that Russia and China are doing, but rather simply that they exist and are led by governments that are focusing on economic growth and scientific and technological progress, while the trans-Atlantic world is going under, with its casino economy and Green policy. And as long as the European nations submit to the diktat of the EU and consequently the policy of the British Empire, we are caught in a trap.

There is a way out: the immediate implementation of a two-tier banking system in the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall law; the reclaiming of national sovereignty over one’s own monetary and economic policy, and a credit system for the reconstruction of the real economy, with an economic miracle for southern Europe as part of the construction of the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

*—Translated from German by Daniel Platt*