

Voices Against War Escalate Around the World

July 1—When Rep. Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI) stated on June 26, during the first Democratic Party 2020 presidential candidates’ debate, “We’re in a greater risk of nuclear war today than ever before in history,” there was a tidal wave of ridicule unleashed against her in the British, American and European liberal media. “How silly of her! How preposterous to think there is actually a danger of war! Why that’s just a load of Russian propaganda,” they pronounced in near unison.

And yet Rep. Gabbard was absolutely correct: She stated the stark reality that the British and their allies in Washington have deliberately provoked, in an effort to salvage their collapsing empire. In this issue of *EIR*, the matter of that urgent danger is addressed both in Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s weekly webcast, as well as in the article, “Lyndon LaRouche at Work: Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative and the Moon-Mars Mission,” which significantly reviews the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, the last such threat of nuclear war.

Here the reader will learn more about the discussion of this threat in Russia and will find documentary excerpts from explicit, sharp warnings from the Russian side by President Vladimir Putin and Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov, as well as a series of voices of sanity in the West who at least recognize the strategic danger the planet faces, if not yet stating agreement with those policies of Lyndon LaRouche that alone provide a solution for a durable planetary peace.

Putin: The World Is ‘Pretending To Be Deaf, Blind or Dyslexic’ to Nuclear War Danger

Before the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum (SPIEF) got underway on June 6, Russian President Vladimir Putin held his traditional press conference with heads of the world’s leading news agencies attending the event, which this year represented Great Britain, Germany, Iran, Spain, Italy, China, the United States, France, and Japan. The roundtable press conference was chaired by TASS Director General Sergei



kremlin.ru

Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Mikhailov, who said that those present “account for almost 90% of the global news landscape.”

Mikhailov’s opening question was very broad: “Why is the world not becoming any safer? Where is our civilization going? Do you see the light at the end of the tunnel? What can the countries that are the main players in the political process do about it?”

Putin delivered a very tough response, addressing the news directors personally, and not just as journalists, slamming the British for launching the Cold War:

“Let’s recall Winston Churchill, who first hated the Soviet Union, then called Stalin a great revolutionary when they had to fight Nazism, and then, after the Americans developed nuclear weapons, he practically called for the Soviet Union to be destroyed. Remember his speech at Fulton [Missouri] that kick-started the Cold War? . . .

“Little has changed since that time. We should just keep in mind, should understand what kind of world we live in, and what threats and dangers might await us. If we do not keep this ‘fiery serpent’ under control, if we let it out of the bottle, God forbid, this could lead to a global catastrophe.”

Putin proposed dialogue and cooperation as the way to address the crisis. “What’s the solution? It is in cooperation, period. The most recent conversation I had with President Trump, I must say, inspires certain opti-

mism, because Donald told me that he, too, was concerned about this. He is fully cognizant of the amount of arms-related expenses incurred by the United States and other countries. This money could be used for other purposes. I completely agree with him.”

Putin elaborated on the nature of the problem, noting that youth today are very concerned about environmental issues. “But they do not realize, these young people, especially teenagers and children, they are not aware of the global threat and serious challenge posed by possible global conflicts. This is something adult men and women should think about.

“Our U.S. partners upped and withdrew from the ABM Treaty [in 2002]. So, ladies and gentlemen, I want to ask you: Did any one of you go out with a poster and protest? No one, silence. As if this is the way it’s supposed to be. Incidentally, this was the first step towards a fundamental destabilization of the global security framework, and a major step at that. Now, we are talking about our American partners terminating, also unilaterally, their INF Treaty membership . . .

“Listen: you and your readers, your audience should open the INF Treaty and read it. Its articles clearly stipulate that short- and medium-range missile launchers cannot be deployed on land. The treaty says so outright. However, they went ahead and deployed them in Romania and Poland which is a direct violation . . .

“Everyone is pretending to be deaf, blind or dyslexic. We have to react to this somehow, don’t we? Clearly, so . . . Our latest systems guarantee Russia’s security for a fairly long period into the future, I mean we have made significant strides. And, I must put it bluntly, we have outrun our competitors in terms of creating hyper-weapon systems. If no one is interested in renewing the START-3 Treaty, we will not renew it. We have already said a hundred times that we are ready to do so, but no one is willing to talk about it with us. Please note that there is no formal negotiating process, and everything will expire in 2021. Mind you, there will be no more instruments to limit an arms race. Or, for example, deploying weapons in outer space. Do we understand what this means or not? Ask the experts . . .

“Will anyone ever think about it, talk about it, or show any concern? No, complete silence. Do you realize how serious and dangerous this is?”

Russian Diplomats Issue Sharp Warnings on the Danger of War

Russian Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Antonov, spoke at a meeting of the Seattle World Affairs Council on June 17, held at the Perkins Coie headquarters in that city:

“As I travelled through Seattle today, I saw many smiling people. Many shop owners who looked happy. Surely they do not want nuclear war. But if we do not fix these problems, this is what we face.”

He insisted that the U.S. and Russia “can and must find a common ground. . . . In order to rebuild trust, a dialogue is essential,” stating that “it’s impossible to speak to each other through mass media.”



U.S. Mission Geneva/Eric Bridiers

Anatoly Antonov, Ambassador of Russia to the United States.

Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov told reporters on June 18 that, “For quite a while, we have been witnessing the United States’ continuous attempts to increase political, psychological, economic and military pressure on Iran. I think that such actions are rather provocative and cannot be considered as anything other than a deliberate policy to instigate a war,” TASS reported.

Speaking to the State Duma, the lower house of the Russian legislature, Ryabkov also addressed the question of possible U.S. deployment of intermediate-range missiles near Russia’s borders: “The Russian President said on Feb. 2 that, being guided by our responsible approach to ensuring global peace and security, we were launching scientific, research and development activities for creating medium-range missiles so that we were able to repel prospective U.S. missiles, the production of which has entered an advanced stage.” But, he continued, Putin had made it clear that Russia “will abstain from deploying our units anywhere until the U.S. does it.”

Less than a week later, on June 24, Ryabkov told the upper house of Russia's legislature, the Federation Council, during debates on a bill on the suspension of Russia's participation in the INF Treaty, according to TASS: "We should brace for the worst scenario. There are no plans, but the [NATO] Mk-41 launchers are a reality. NATO's intentions have been aggressive all along and they remain so. If it comes to the real deployment of such systems on the ground [referring to U.S. ABM batteries in Eastern Europe and withdrawal from the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty—ed.], the situation will not just get worse, but aggravate to the maximum and we may find ourselves in the situation of a missile crisis pretty close to the Caribbean one."

Ryabkov had earlier stated that, "The U.S. is seeking to impose concepts saying that a nuclear war can be won" with very low-yield nuclear weapons "that cannot be seen as anything but meant for combat uses." Then, in response of the June 25 demand by NATO General Secretary Jens Stoltenberg that Russia destroy its 9M729 (NATO designation SSC-8) cruise missiles for allegedly violating the INF Treaty within five weeks or NATO will take countermeasures, Ryabkov stated that Moscow will be forced to take "countervailing military measures" should NATO make good on its threats. "Attempts to portray what is happening as a military and political response to Russia's actions reek of a propaganda campaign with a large element of deliberate misinformation being fed to global public opinion. When these threats begin to materialize into real action, we will have to take countervailing military measures. We will contain NATO's aggressive plans, measure them and adopt a very selective approach to dialogue with the alliance, which the member-states of this organization are promoting."

U.S. Political Voices

Donald Trump, President of the United States. To Fox News, May 20: "Don't kid yourself, you do have a military-industrial complex. They do like war... I wiped out 100 percent of the caliphate. I said, 'I want to bring our troops back home.' The place went crazy. They want to keep—you have people here in Washington, they never want to leave. I said, 'You know what I'll do, I'll leave a couple hundred soldiers behind,' but if it was up to them they'd bring thousands of soldiers in. Someday people will explain it, but you do have a group, and they call it the military-industrial complex.

They never want to leave, they always want to fight."

Rep. Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI), Iraq war veteran, presidential candidate.

June 26: "We're in a greater risk of nuclear war today than ever before in history... That's why it is so important that every one of us, every single American, stand up and say 'no war with Iran'."

May 16: "President Trump promised to get the U.S. out of stupid wars. The U.S. must not go to war with Iran... [It] would prove far more costly and devastating than anything we experienced in Iraq, far more American troops being killed and injured and great suffering for the Iranian people."

May 3: "Neocons, neolib, and the mainstream media all sing from the same songsheet: *war war war*. Trump never gets positive media unless he's threatening war/carrying out military action. Today, Venezuela, tomorrow, Iran? Cuba? Next? No wonder North Korea won't give up their nukes."

Rep. Rand Paul (R-KY). June 21: "I have strongly



Gage Skidmore

Sen. Rand Paul, MD (R-KY)

encouraged Donald Trump to trust *his* instincts and avoid another war."

Sen. Richard Black, Virginia (R-Dist. 13), former U.S. Marine and U.S. Army JAG Corps officer. June 8: "John Bolton has usurped your authority as Commander-in-Chief. He countermanded your order for an immediate withdrawal from Syria, and now he has alarmed our allies by agitating for war against Iran... America elected you to end wars of regime change, and to lower tensions. Our nation is war-weary, there is no public support for a war against Iran."

Tucker Carlson, Fox News.

June 20: "Hungry for War. The permanent foreign

policy establishment in Washington wants a war *badly*. That's why they are putting American troops in a position where conflict is inevitable, in order to *start* a war—and everyone in Washington knows it, because they have seen it before.”

June 21: “War Averted—U.S. was minutes from a disastrous mistake. . . . Bombing Iran would have ended [Trump's] political career in a minute. There would be no chance of re-election after that.”

Steven F. Cohen, professor emeritus of Russian studies at Princeton University and New York University. May 13: “Russiagate Zealotry Continues to Endanger American National Security” . . . “by depriving a U.S. President, for the first time in the nuclear age, of the diplomatic flexibility to deal with the Kremlin leader in times of crisis.”

Retired Military and Intelligence Professionals Speak Out

Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS), June 22: VIPS Memo to the President: “We are concerned that you are about to be mousetrapped into war with Iran. . . . We have serious doubts about Secretary Pompeo; it is clear to us that he has his own agenda, and we know from our experience with him that his agenda is not always the same as yours. . . . Pompeo's behavior betrays a strong desire to respond with military force—perhaps even without your express approval—to Iranian provocation (real or imagined). . . . He is a neophyte compared to his anti-Iran partner John Bolton, whose decades-long dilettante approach to interpreting intelligence, strong advocacy of the misbegotten war on Iraq . . . and his own aggressive agenda are a matter of record.”

Admiral (ret.) Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (2007-2011). June 24: “My biggest concern is, the President is running out of room, running out of options, and while rhetoric goes back and forth on how close we came to hitting Iran just the other day, that this thing could spin out of control. The last thing in the world we need right now is a war with Iran.”

Scott Ritter, former Marine Corps intelligence officer and UN weapons inspector. May 19: “By purposely escalating tensions with Iran using manufactured intelligence about an all-too-real threat, [National Security Advisor John] Bolton is setting the country up for a war it is not prepared to fight and most likely cannot win. . . . It is John Bolton, not Iran, who poses the

greatest threat to American national security today.”

Col. (ret.) Pat Lang, *Sic Semper Tyrannis* website. May 14: “Once [Trump] is committed to a war in the Mideast, he's just screwed. . . . It's time for Bolton and [Secretary of State Mike] Pompeo to be hung out to dry.”

Col. (ret.) Ann Wright. May 13: “Trump might wish to double check Bolton and Pompeo's statements on the threat coming from Iran's actions, against the interests of the U.S. and its allies . . . before Bolton's long-standing regime-change and war agenda [leads to] an unnecessary and horrific military confrontation with Iran.”

Foreign Leaders

Jeremy Corbyn, UK Labour Party Leader. June 15: “Britain should act to ease tensions in the Gulf, not fuel a military escalation that began with U.S. withdrawal from the Iran nuclear agreement. Without credible evidence about the tanker attacks, the government's rhetoric will only increase the threat of war.”



Joey O. Razon

Delfin Lorenzana, Philippines Department of National Defense Secretary.

Delfin Lorenzana, Philippine Secretary of Defense. June 2: “A troubling form of superpower rivalry [has brought the danger of] confrontation that could lead to war . . . , sleepwalking into another international conflict like World War I. . . . The risk of miscalculation and unwanted conflict is rising on a daily basis, as great powers expand their military footprint and pursue divergent visions.”

Barham Salih, President of Iraq. June 25: “We do not want our territory to be a staging post for any hostile action against any of our neighbors, including Iran. This is definitely not part of the agreement between the Iraqi government and the United States. . . . It's easy to start a war, but very, very difficult to end a war.”