

‘The British Empire Is Now Fully Exposed: It Must Be Crushed!’

This is the edited transcript of the Thursday, March 15, 2018 Schiller Institute New Paradigm webcast interview with the founder of the Schiller Institutes, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. She was interviewed by Harley Schlanger. A [video](#) of the webcast is available.

Harley Schlanger: Hello. I’m Harley Schlanger. Welcome to this week’s Schiller Institute webcast, featuring our founder, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Extraordinary, fast-breaking developments are happening by the hour, confirming what we’ve been saying on this program over the last several weeks. The imperial geopoliticians will not let their system go without a big fight. Not surprisingly, we’re seeing at the center of the fight forces in the United Kingdom coming into the open, who have taken the fight against Russia up a notch by blaming the Russians for the poisoning of a former Russian operative, Sergei Skripal. Helga what’s the latest you have on this?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I think this is characterized quite correctly by the former British ambassador to Uzbekistan, Craig Murray. He said this is another attempt, like the fraudulent claims of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction—this time personally blaming Putin for being behind this assassination attempt against Skripal and his daughter.

Now, this story is not credible: Mr. Murray reports that according to Dr. Robin Black, formerly of the UK Porton Down research laboratory and a former member of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) Scientific Advisory Board, the actual existence of this alleged poison gas, Novichok, has never been proven. The OPCW has not included it on the list of banned substances, because the OPCW has never seen it; it has never been investigated. The



Russian Foreign Ministry spokesperson Maria Zakharova countered Prime Minister May's accusation.

cc

OPCW does not have it. For the British government to immediately state that it has absolute proof that this has come from Russia, and it is definitely this substance, when it has nothing to compare it with, is really not a believable story. I think it really is, as the Russians said, an outrageous provocation. When an operation like this is run, the question is: what is the purpose of this?

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov immediately said the charge against Russia has no substance. The spokeswoman of the Foreign Ministry, Maria Zakharova, immediately said this is an insane accusation; there is absolutely no proof. The British gave an ultimatum to Russia, giving Russia one day to explain how this substance came from Russia into Great Britain. The rules of the OPCW are that if any such case erupts, the accused country has ten days to respond. In that time samples have to be given to the accused party so that they can be investigated. All of this did not take place.

So, this is completely unusual behavior on the part

of the accusers, and I think it stinks to high heaven.

Schlanger: Part of the background is that the government of British Prime Minister May is in big trouble in Britain. Her government has not been exactly stable. But at the same time, British intelligence is now in the spotlight for the role it played through Christopher Steele, and the Steele dossier, in setting up Russiagate against President Trump. So this is not surprising that May is the one who's coming forward with this right now.

Zepp-LaRouche: Whenever you hear the name "Christopher Steele," you should remember that the U.S. House Intelligence Committee, after one year of investigation, found that there was no evidence of collusion of Trump with Russia. And remember, that accusation was entirely based on the Steele dossier.

So the fact that Christopher Steele has now emerged as a very prominent figure in this case of an alleged poison attack, is really quite stunning.

Mr. Skripal, a Russian agent who was "turned" in 1995, was turned by MI6 agent Pablo Miller. This whole operation of turning Skripal into a British double agent was apparently coordinated by Christopher Steele, who in that period was the head of MI6 Russia operations. Steele had also led the so-called investigation in the Litvinenko case, which has exactly the same profile as this present case. Steele left MI6 in 2009—now, "left" is in quotation marks, because it's a big question if he really left MI6, or if he was just outsourced into a so-called private security firm with the name of "Orbis Business Intelligence," whose main task ever since has been to produce so-called evidence of Russian operations—really accusations against Russia.

One of the operations run by Orbis was called Project Charlemagne, which claimed to have proof of Russian meddling into election campaigns in Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy; of Russians financing Le Pen, Berlusconi, and the Alternative for Germany party



(AfD); and of alleged Russian operations to destroy the European Union. Orbis was also the place where the Steele dossier was produced. And, no surprise, Pablo Miller has also been working for Orbis.

Remember that many articles have appeared which demonstrate that Christopher Steele is not just some crazy guy who produced this filthy dossier about Trump. Former U.S. Foreign Service officer Peter van Buren had an article in the *American Conservative* which I would advise people to really

re-read. He describes what a sophisticated intelligence operation Christopher Steele conducted, not only producing this dossier, for which Skripal may have been one of Steele's sources, but then creating so-called "secondary evidence" that was really his own leaks to the media, which were then used to corroborate reports to the FISA Court, as independent proofs of the original dossier. This article, "[Christopher Steele: The Real Foreign Influence in the 2016 Election?](#)" by Peter van Buren, very effectively reports how Steele's Russia dossier was part of a very sophisticated intelligence operation.

I find it stunning that Western governments—the German, French, and also the U.S. government—immediately backed up the British position with all of these questions still looming. I think this will not be the end of the story.

Mrs. May's actions remind me of the James Bond movies. Many people have probably seen at least one or two of these movies—remember that there is this character "M," who was James Bond's boss, who in several movies was played by Judy Dench. Mrs. May has certainly seen one too many of these movies. She probably thinks that she is "M," not in a James Bond movie but in real life, and is attempting to orchestrate a scenario, which eventually could lead to NATO Article 5 military action.

But, this is not a game; however I think it really is this kind of James Bond stuff. If you ever look at a James Bond movie again, ask yourself: what are they doing? They're terrorists! They're breaking the law, driving

cars into crowds and shooting wildly. This is all the fantasy-driven realm of British intelligence. People should really take a second look at this, and start an investigation, asking: what is the British collusion in the Trump case and now, in the Skripal case?

Schlanger: Some people are asking why Trump—who himself is a target of British intelligence, who knows that the British have lied about him—would then sign on to a statement with Merkel and Macron that originated with British intelligence, which he knows is corrupt and immoral and a bunch of liars?

Another aspect of this is the media side of it, which takes us back to the Litvinenko case, which you mentioned. There's a British author, a reporter for *The Guardian*, Luke Harding, who wrote the so-called official book on the Litvinenko case, blaming it on Putin. He's written a book on Russia, called *The Mafia State*. And he also wrote a book recently called *Collusion: Secret Meetings, Dirty Money, and How Russia Helped Donald Trump Win*, which is a total defense of Christopher Steele.

So you see this is one network being deployed against the United States and against Russia. In the midst of this, at least in Britain, there was one fairly sound response which came from Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn. Do you have the remarks that he made, Helga?

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes, he made a speech in the House of Commons, where he warned against this, and demanded proof, saying that the relationship with Russia must be maintained.

Let me go to what you just said about Trump. *The Guardian* yesterday, before Trump signed on to this statement with Macron and Merkel, reported that Trump was reluctant to do that, because Trump knows perfectly well that it was British intelligence which was behind Russiagate for the last two years. So, I can only think that Trump is somewhat overwhelmed. He is surrounded by a lot of hyenas among the neo-cons and Wall Street, and that he does not yet have the kind of team together to really do what he wants to do. We are seeing a new facet of the effort to box Trump in, to get him into the anti-Russia camp, and I think it's a very dangerous situation.

I find it absolutely scandalous that Merkel and



UN/Loey Philippe

UK Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN, Jonathan Guy Allen (left) speaking with U.S. Permanent Representative to the UN, Nikki Haley, March 14, 2018.

Macron, who are not under such attack, immediately sided with the British. That should give German and French voters and citizens, real food for thought: Are these people helping to prepare what can only be described as a pre-war scenario?

Schlanger: Another example of this pre-war scenario is what's happening with Syria. U.S. UN Ambassador Nikki Haley and Former Secretary of State Rex Tillerson have come out saying that the Russians are to blame for the alleged use of chemical weapons in Syria, even though, just as in this Skripal case, there's no evidence that Assad was using chemical weapons.

So, Helga, I assume you see this whole operation in Syria coming to a head as part of this same anti-Russian commitment?

Zepp-LaRouche: When you bring up Nikki Haley—I keep thinking there is a certain type of American woman: Condoleezza Rice, Susan Rice, Samantha Power, and now Nikki Haley—are all from the same type of Gestalt. And it's really unfortunate that America would be represented by such women, especially in the United Nations.

Nikki Haley threatened an American attack on Damascus, which is pretty wild, and the Russian Chief of General Staff, Gen. Valery Gerasimov, immediately said that if the life of even one Russian soldier were threatened, Russia would take determined and adequate countermeasures. So, we are on the verge of an escalation in Syria.

This all has to do with the fact that the New Para-

digm is winning, the old paradigm is shattered. A new strategic reality is emerging from the ever-expanding New Silk Road, which is progressively moving, now including more than 140 countries as Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi recently said in a press conference in Beijing.

Don't underestimate the impact of the March 1 speech by President Putin as part of this new strategic reality. Putin announced new weapons systems, the Mach 20 rocket, which does not depend on a ballistic trajectory but is highly maneuverable, and therefore can outmaneuver the ABM systems of the United States; and also render impotent the stationing of U.S. troops close to Russia. This has created a new strategic reality: I think this British operation and the escalation in Syria are really rearguard battles of a system which is clearly failing.

Schlanger: Now, in the midst of this, Trump has fired Tillerson, bringing in CIA director Pompeo. Do you have any reading on that?

Zepp-LaRouche: I don't have an evaluation of Pompeo. I read an article that said his career was sponsored by the Koch brothers. We will have to see how this works out, if he will work with Trump. The problem was that Tillerson obviously didn't. The tension between President Trump and Tillerson had grown recently, over issues including North Korea and the approach to Syria. How long should U.S. troops stay in Syria? Trump had said U.S. troops have only one task, that is, to defeat ISIS and then return home. Tillerson said, no, we will stay there for a long time. Then Tillerson immediately, without any hesitation, backed May in her accusations against Russia. I think one of the really revealing signs that Tillerson had moved closer to the neo-cons in the recent period was that he, on his recent Africa trip, told every African country he visited to be watchful with respect to China; be careful, do not work with China. In Africa, that was, as you could expect, not exactly welcome. The Africans have seen very clearly who are their friends—who is investing, and who is improving their



U.S. Department of State
Former U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, in Nigeria, March 12, 2018.

living conditions, and who is not.

All of this accumulated. Trump laid Tillerson off, and I think there is no reason to be unhappy about that.

Schlanger: Then we have the recent interesting comments from Defense Secretary Mattis in Afghanistan. One of the things Trump had promised, as a candidate, is that he would end the war in Afghanistan, and that the United States would not engage in these practices. It now appears that Mattis is putting forward what you might call the original Trump doctrine.

Zepp-LaRouche: I think this is a clear shift away from the last 16 years' policy of the U.S.A. with respect to Afghanistan, which has not led to any stabilization of that country. The idea that you have to have some kind of reconciliation between the government and the Taliban is one step in the right direction. The economic reconstruction of Afghanistan will then be immediately and urgently needed. President Ghani has requested help from China, Russia, India, and other countries. Extending the New Silk Road into Afghanistan will be the only way to get this done.

The Russians and the Iranians have, for a very long time, called for the reconciliation of the government and the Taliban. I think that that *is* one of the spots where something seems to be going in the right direction.

Schlanger: The other spot where things seem to be moving along is, more surprisingly, North Korea. It's clear that there's a very concerted effort, from Russia, China, and the United States, and possibly Japan and South Korea as well, toward a solution there. This, again, goes *against* what many people think, because most commentators were saying that Trump was about to start a war there. This is moving pretty quickly, don't you think?

Zepp-LaRouche: I think you can now really see who are the warmongers, and who are the people willing to work to resolve these conflicts through diplo-

macy and negotiations. The Democrats and most of the mainstream media have had insane responses, attacking it, saying this can never work, that it's a big mistake by Trump. But a few leading Democrats, such as Bill Richardson and former President Jimmy Carter, said this is absolutely the right thing to do; it's a good thing to try to solve this conflict through negotiations. And I think that today people are revealing themselves in a very stark manner.

Schlanger: Sixty-eight former members of the Obama Administration have formed something called National Security Action—ironically, NSA—which includes Susan Rice, Samantha Power, a lot of the old Clinton/Obama networks. They signed a statement which is essentially a war against Trump, complaining that Trump is not committed to war against Russia and China! How does the world look at something like this?

Zepp-LaRouche: This document is another piece of very useful reading material for anyone in the United States who is still nostalgic about President Obama, but also in Europe. This National Security Action group is blatantly mistaken. Obviously, that statement was written and published just before the breakthrough occurred with respect to the Korean Peninsula: they are completely off on that point. But their open call for confrontation with Russia and China is really an important lesson for anyone concerned about world peace: Who is the war party? It is definitely these Democrats from the Obama/Hillary Clinton period. And people who have nostalgia for Obama should really reflect on that. Do they want World War III? This statement is really bad. I think people should really rethink things. The Trump policy is, in part, very problematic. He has had a very difficult time, being under constant attack by these putschists all the time. So, I strongly urge people to reflect seriously on what I've just raised here.

Schlanger: Before we close, I want to give you a chance to say something about what seems to be the next phase of the soap opera here in Berlin, where the Merkel government has just been finalized. She's now got a fourth term, and yet, her government is still looking for something that its actually going to do.



Bundeskanzlerin.de
German Chancellor Angela Merkel speaking to the German Bundestag.

Zepp-LaRouche: I have never seen such despondent articles greeting a newly formed government. Even conservative papers like *Die Welt* referred to this situation as “Italian conditions.” People are completely frustrated with this political class. It is constantly changing its political outlook. So, it's really a terrible beginning. Merkel only got 364 votes of the 399 votes held by members of the so-called “Grand Coalition,” which is not so grand any more. They barely have a majority. The three parties comprising the coalition lost very significantly in the September general elections.

But the biggest problem is that they have no positive conceptions! They have no vision for the future; they want to stick to all the old rotten policies. The new finance minister, Olaf Scholz, is committed to staying with the “Black Zero” policy [of avoiding new public debt] of his predecessor Schäuble. Jens Spahn, the health minister, is from the pharmaceutical industry and has already made outrageous statements about the poor in Germany, provoking a wave of attacks. But that all reflects that they have absolutely no conception, which is really bad for Germany. I think the German people deserve a better government than that, but they have not learned that lesson quickly enough yet.

This makes the task for our organization all the clearer. We have to intervene with a clear vision: Germany should join the New Silk Road. We should do something against the pending danger of a new financial crash. We should implement Glass-Steagall. This means going back to the economic policies of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau in the postwar period, which

was based on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We, in Germany, do have a tradition of having a decent credit policy, but nothing like that is coming from this government. We, our work and our policies, are extremely necessary not only in Germany; but also in other European countries, because the Damocles sword of a new financial crash is hanging over the world.

We just talked to some insiders who said that beyond the \$570 trillion in over-the-counter derivatives officially acknowledged by the bank for International Settlements, there is another \$70 trillion in admitted derivatives contracts, which is obviously a powder keg which could blow up the monetary system at any moment.

I appeal to you, our viewers, to get in contact with us, become active, help us spread the idea of Glass-Steagall and the organization of the [Four Laws](#) which were proposed by my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, several years ago. We need increased discussion of the necessity of our nations joining the New Paradigm and absolutely abandoning this destructive geopolitical approach. I said it at the beginning of this year, *we must overcome geopolitics*, because in this era of thermonuclear weapons, no conflict should be solved, or can be solved, through military means. If you don't consider that, we are on the edge of World War III. What is coming from the British, right now, is useful only in one respect: It makes the role the British are playing absolutely clear. It has been going on the whole time, but now it is more out in the open than ever before. So, we should really move to end the British empire and replace it with a New Paradigm, a new set of international relations among nations based on sovereignty, on respect for other nations' social systems, and for the common aims of mankind. I think that debate is urgently needed.

Schlanger: And, as we've been pointing out throughout this discussion, the British are now fully exposed.

Helga, I want to end with an important question for you. I think you basically answered this just now, in a certain way, but I think it's worth revisiting, because this is such an overwhelming situation—there's so much happening, so much to be on top of, and the media, of course, are trying to demoralize people, to convince them there's nothing that can be done. What advice would you give to someone who wants to participate in the debate you're calling for? How should they be thinking about themselves and this moment in history?

Zepp-LaRouche: There are many subjects we could discuss, and many things we should do. The image people have about the West is really something people should think about. Why is it that China, which is a socialist country, based on "socialism with Chinese characteristics," as they put it—why is this country doing so much better than the West? That should be food for thought. What is wrong with the neo-liberal method, the system which is causing the gap between rich and poor to become wider all the time? I think in every European country—and the Trump election reflects that as well—many people are completely disgusted with the political class, with the class of the managers, bankers, and academia. People do not feel represented by these institutions any longer, which can be very dangerous. In Europe, it has given rise to some really very dangerous or at least problematic parties and organizations.

So the lack of reason is giving birth to monsters, as Goya pointed out so clearly in his drawings.

I think people should start to become active. You cannot sit by in a paradigm change like the one we are experiencing at this point. Become active; contact us, the Schiller Institute. Invite some of your friends and neighbors to discuss the subject we are raising here. You can speak with members of the Schiller Institute to discuss this further, to set up speaking engagements. You should start studying all of these issues in depth—don't just go by whatever the daily newspapers are trying to feed you. Try to develop your own thinking, to understand what Russia is really doing. Is Putin the demon the Western media are making him, or is Russian policy something totally different? Is Russian history totally different than you think? Is China maybe completely different?

Just don't fall for the kinds of prejudices which are being pre-cooked for you by the mainstream media every day. I think it's really time for everyone to take seriously becoming an independent thinker, having independent knowledge, and being able to form your own judgment; to search for the truth and become politically active. I think that that is the only advice I can give you.

Schlanger: I think that's pretty good advice and I hope people take it to heart.

Helga, thank you for joining us this week, and we'll be back again next week.

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes. Bye-bye.

hz.zepp@schiller-institut.de