

Is the United States Conducting British War Without the Knowledge of the President?

Who holds the power to launch cyberwar, and even thermonuclear war, the President of the United States, or Her Majesty's Secret Service and her Tory accomplices?

Multiple news outlets followed the *New York Times* report on June 15 with stories proclaiming that the Pentagon's U.S. Cyber Command has expanded offensive cyber-attacks on Russia's power grid and other infrastructure targets. At a *Wall Street Journal* seminar on Tuesday, June 11, the loud-mouthed warmonger, National Security Adviser John Bolton, proclaimed that this expanded warfare regime was in existence. This was followed by the above *Times* story citing sources within U.S. Cyber Command and the National Security Council. All agree: President Trump has not been briefed on this; information concerning these warfare measures is deliberately being kept from him because he might countermand them.

It appears to be part of a concerted strategy by the intelligence community, taking orders from the City of London and Wall Street's financial houses, to lure the President into wars, which will ensure his electoral defeat while risking the annihilation of the human race in the process.

President Trump responded to the *Times* story with tweets saying it was treason and not true. The *Times* story itself says that the aggressiveness of this strategy could have incalculable results—as in nuclear warfare escalation.

According to the *Times*, U.S. cyber warfare has been targeted at the Russians since 2012, but has recently become more aggressive. The *Washington Post* reported that President Obama conducted the first stage of this dangerous escalation shortly before leaving office—in response to the alleged Russian hacking of the Democratic National Committee and John Podesta.

Last year, according to the *Times*, Congress snuck a new provision into the Defense Authorization Act, which gives the Pentagon's Cyber Command the ability to conduct cyber strikes without informing the Presi-

dent. General Paul M. Nakasone, who now heads the Cyber Command and the NSA, is described as a proponent of aggressive offensive cyberwar. The *Times* says that the American strategy has now shifted more toward the offense, with placement of potentially crippling malware inside the Russian system, at a depth and with an aggressiveness never previously attempted. It is partly intended as a warning, and partly to be poised to conduct cyber-strikes if a major conflict were to break out between Washington and Moscow.

The British House of Lords, in a 2018 foreign policy review that *prioritized preventing a second term of the Trump presidency*, also recommended cyberwar measures against Russia. This year, UK funds have been earmarked for an increase in operational cyberwar capabilities.

Russian President Vladimir Putin, in a June 13 interview with the *Mir* channel, warned, "Our relations with the U.S.—they are in fact deteriorating, getting worse by the hour."

Recent visitors to Moscow have found almost universal agreement that nuclear war with the United States seems to be becoming inevitable. This is the latest manifestation of the ongoing, and absolutely treasonous, coup taking place against Donald Trump in response to his vow to end imperial wars conducted in the name of the United States—and it is, perhaps, the most dangerous.

How the President, under persistent attack, responds to these actions, which could lead to nuclear Armageddon, is one thing. Hopefully, he will fire all those involved and seek a new strategic agreement on all fronts with Russia and China.

To send a clear signal to Russia, China, and to the true friends of United States, the exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche—the leading adversary throughout his life of British geopolitics and "perpetual war" strategy—may be the best, if not the only means for reestablishing the trust among nations that is the prerequisite to ensuring the survival of the human race.

EDITORIAL