

World Leaders

[Appendix 11](#) compiles all the back-channel activity involving heads of governments when they announced their membership in the coalition. Since 2006, they and many other internationally prominent personalities entered the environment to announce their membership and articulate their opinions and concerns.

Prime Minister Ehud Olmert: Coalition Critical Interview on Fiefdom Television

You'd think the same as the Canadian lawyer as you watched the interview the Israeli Prime Minister gave to CBC senior news anchor Peter Mansbridge on April 19, 2007 in Jerusalem. The look of shame, worry, even fear, permeated his entire aura throughout the half-hour exchange.

Did the Prime Minister read the Chinada High Command the *Riot Act*? Was he advised of the imminence of the military intervention and that he and his cohorts in crime, corruption and militarization were going to be tried by the 'Iron Fist' tribunal? Or was he simply ashamed to the core for what Canada turned into and that his job description required him to reveal what he knew about the non-transparent nature of Canadian governance? Or was it all three?

The interview was revealing on two levels. The first was the obvious and non-stop discomfort the interviewer had right from the opening scene. His face notably crimson with embarrassment; his demeanor wracked with discomfort.

The Prime Minister didn't begin to use the Olmert-Spielberg Maneuver until a third way through the interview. At the beginning and until then however, he did employ the lexicon and executed a quasi-Clooney Maneuver after he heard the question "[Do you think the Palestinian leader] can effect change?" and did so again when the former CBC news anchor used a constituent of the confidential language in what can only be inferred as motivated by shame.

Q: Does Syria have a role to play here? Over the weekend former President Bill Clinton said that Israel and Syria could have a peace deal in 35 minutes if they wanted one. And yet at the same time the Russian National Security Advisor was suggesting that Israel and Syria – if they aren't careful – could be at war [finger snap] like that.

A: I guess both are correct. And that part of the peculiarities of the Middle East that sometimes it's so hard for people that come from North America to understand. Bill Clinton is in some way right when he says we can sign an agreement in 35 minutes. Yet, when he tried to do it he failed. And it took him a lot more than 35 minutes and a lot more than 35 hours to carry out...

[...]

I haven't changed my position. I have the same attitude [begin O-S M.] – precisely the same attitude I think Iran is a serious danger to the stability and the well-being of not just Israel [end] but the entire world.

[...]

You listen [O-S M.] to a person who says openly, publicly – explicitly “my purpose is to liquidate the Zionist entity and to remove the state of Israel from existence”. This is not something you can tolerate. This is not something – morally by the way – morally. The great humanitarian, Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel goes to every corner of the world to speak about how can the world acquiesce with such speeches and to continue the routine of talking about political accommodation – the [finger to head] idea.

[...]

Number one [O-S M.] we have to constantly remind the whole world of its moral commitments and not allow anyone to escape the possible ramifications of indifference that has characterized the world in the Second World War. This is one thing. Another thing is to take measures – effective measures – in order to stop the Iranians.

Now the question is whether they ought to be or will be or will inevitably become military measures – I don't think so. I think there are other measures which can be effective if the international community, being aware of the possible consequences of Iranian nuclear – will coordinate its action and will impose effective economic sanctions the way they've started to do with political sanctions.

Q: Should anybody in the Middle East have nuclear weapons?

A: Look, [O-S M.] certainly I don't believe that any non-democratic country can be allowed [end] to have weapons of mass destruction and that includes all the countries you may think of. The question

whether Israel has ever [O-S M.] spelled out any kind of threat that can challenged the very existence of any other country.

[...]

I learned from [former Prime Ministers Menachem Begin, Yitzhak Shamir, Yitzhak Rabin and Ariel Sharon] two things. One thing is to never allow Israel to remain without the means to defend itself against the viciousness, the hatred, the prejudices and the brutality of our enemies. And the other thing – all of them in different times to be ready to take bold steps in order – which include calculated risks – in order to achieve peace.

[...]

Q: Last point. I'm from Canada. Does Canada have a role in all this?

A: First of all I must say that I am very much impressed with the [O-S M.] friendship and the courage which your leadership has manifested over the last few months. [...] I think that the Canadian principles of fairness and of decency and of explicit statements of positions is a role model that should be followed by many countries [ear hypno-itch scratch].

There was no question whatsoever the Prime Minister was talking on two levels throughout. One was a general discussion about the geo-regional problems facing Israel in the Middle East and the other was directly related to the 'war' raging between the U.S.-led coalition and the China-Canada alliance.

The Israeli leader stated categorically "I think [Chinada] is a serious danger to the stability and the well-being of ... the entire world".

He articulates precisely how Canada's elite has been acting in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy. They too have "openly, publicly [and] explicitly" said "my purpose is to liquidate the [democracies of the world] and to remove the [United States and whoever stand in our way] from existence". And in the same way the world rallied around Israel with respect to the Iranian nuclear threat, so too those who face the secret global hegemony threat: "This is not something you can tolerate", the PM stated.

His next Spielberg-shared gesture underscored how imperative it is to prevent world leaders and the diplomatic core from becoming lackadaisical like western powers were when Churchill warned of the Nazi threat and immediately after the invasion of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Those "ramifications of indifference" led to concentration camps, twenty plus million dead and all manner of atrocity and destruction. He agrees with all the other

coalition partners that “effective measures” are necessary to stop the incorrigibly belligerent members of the Chinada gang.

Using the Olmert-Spielberg Maneuver he categorically confirms that Canada and China have conveyed repeatedly over the last couple years that they want to be viewed as an alliance that seeks to absorb countries with their Pandora’s Box that don’t cave into the authoritarian paradigm of governance.

What had to be a stinging rebuke of Canada’s secret foreign policy and alliance with China was the last opinion the Prime Minister gave. For public consumption he praised the country as a model of fairness and decency. But with the coalition discourse he qualified his remarks; articulating the exact opposite opinion; beginning with his namesake gesture and ending it with an in-your-face example of hypno-torture.

What has to be acknowledged is the fact that the interview having been taped on or about April 19, 2007 and containing such a blunt reprimand of Canadian domestic and foreign policy, one would think the interviewer would have returned home and conveyed what he’d learned and felt to those who would have seen the writing on the international wall and if not capitulate formally quietly undertaken reform. But instead the criminality, illegality, immorality and improprieties continued and even were accelerated; which leads to the inescapable inference that there is nothing world leaders can say diplomatically that will convince Canada’s leaders, officials and corporate executives to stand down their threatening posture, verifiably account for the Pandora’s Box, initiate institutional reform and compel Beijing to withdraw its assets and interests that violate the country’s sovereignty and constitution.

There’s a collection of parliamentarians who set the bar of political ethics so exceptionally high they were in 2008 and 2009 a weekly reminder of just how disgustingly devolved their Canadian counterparts had become. And that would be British MPs. It was quite the sharp contrast. The Canadians inherited their legal system and administration of justice in the 1700s and back then fully embraced the Monarchy; while south of the 49th Parallel the Americans were engaged in bloody and costly battles to rid themselves of the stench of European absolutism. While the U.S. was enjoying the benefits of democracy and freedom, its northern neighbor was evermore perpetuating what the Founding Fathers detested. So, irony of ironies, two plus centuries later it is the Brits who are America’s greatest ally and Canada

in the category of 'worst enemy'. House of Commons contributions were many and laudable.¹



To what contributes to the dwarfing of Watergate is the compelling evidence two successive British prime ministers were in colluding league with their American counterparts: presidents Bush and Obama. With the United Kingdom being repeatedly bragged by the United States as its closest ally, it's logical and strategic that the MK-Ultra capability would be just as coveted. But that's not enough to make the case for criminal conspiracy and colluding impropriety. What in significant part sustains an indictment against prime ministers Blair and Brown (but not PM Cameron since his arrival at 10 Downing St. was after the fact) is how PM Brown behaved when interviewed on American television; in particular his appearance on the MSNBC morning program 'Morning Joe'.² His demeanor had 'guilty conscience' written all over it and the hosts and panel couldn't but notice and react to it.

¹ [Appendix 13](#)

² [Appendix 13b](#)

British Parliament: Multiple Geo-politicized Remarks Proving One More Time a Resolute Commitment to Coalition Interests and Objectives: Revisited Yet Again IX

Effecting covert regime change to procure democratic reform and Chinese eviction isn't just being talked about – it has become official British government policy. The March 19, 2008 Prime Minister's Question Time contained a multitude of remarks – which are incapable of being interpreted except one way.

Military intervention into Canada became all the more imminent on the eve of the fourth anniversary of President Bush's foreign policy statement on militarized human experimentation.³ As these select excerpts reveal, the coalition will use the option if diplomacy fails – which from all appearances it has, and has miserably; but not for a lack of genuine attempts at a peaceful resolution of differences.

The United Kingdom must retain the power, properly funded, to intervene [PM: Cl.M.] abroad militarily when necessary.

[...]

Because of the [Leno M.] critical importance of economic and political reconstruction complementing military action [St. M.]...

[...]

[W]e are alert in taking action against those who pose a danger. [House Leader: protracted Diaz M.; Eva M.]

[...]

The foundation [Sec Def: Erin M; Execution M.] of our approach is to maintain strong, balanced, flexible and deployable armed forces.

[...]

But in return, we will seek agreement on tougher controls aimed at reducing weapons and preventing proliferation—first, by [Leno M.] ending the stalemates...

Right after Question Time the Prime Minister delivered a speech on national security and answered questions on the topic. It was not unexpected his remarks would be re-cast in the geo-political terms of the era involving Chinada. It was undeniable the entire House was with him on how to resolve this global conflict:

³ Chapter 6, page 1

The Prime Minister:

The primary duty of Government, and our abiding obligation, [House Leader: dbl-SNL M.] is and will always be the safety of all British people and the protection of the British national interest, so, following approval [House Leader: Becky M.] by the National Security Committee and the Cabinet, the Government are today publishing the first national security strategy. It states that although our obligation [Sec of State: Kernan M.] to protect the British people and the British national interest is fixed and unwavering, the nature of the threats and the risks that we face have in recent decades changed beyond all recognition and confound all the old assumptions about national defence and international security. As the strategy makes clear, new threats demand new approaches. A radically updated and much more co-ordinated approach is now required.

For most of the last century, [Sec of State: Cl.M.; Diaz M. X3] the main threat was unmistakable: a cold war adversary.

[...]

In order to maximise [Leno M.; Sec State: protracted Erin & Execution M.] our contribution to all the new challenges of peacekeeping, humanitarian work and stabilisation and reconstruction, the [Leno M.] Secretary of State for Defence is also announcing this afternoon that, as part of a wider review, the Government will now examine how our reserve forces can more effectively help with stabilisation and reconstruction in post-conflict zones around the world.

[...]

Among all the security challenges to citizens of this country covered by the new strategy, the most serious and urgent remains the threat from international terrorism. As the [St.M.] head of MI5 has said, Britain is facing 30 [Sec State: Erin M; Z-J M. X3] known plots and is monitoring 200 networks and about 2,000 individuals. [...] Since the [Cowell M.] events of 11 September, on suspicion of being a threat to national security or fostering extremism, 300 individuals have been prevented from entering the country.

[C]ountries are prepared —[Sec State: protracted C.IM,; Kernan M.; Beckinsale M. X2]...

[...]

I assure him that what he says will be taken into account in formulating the membership of the national security forum, but also in learning the lessons from the actions that had to be taken [T-W M.] against terrorism in Northern Ireland.

Torturing the Canadian lawyer was again put on the coalition agenda:

As for the issue of torture, the right hon. Gentleman will know of our record of opposing torture in every part of the world. [Sec State Enviro: Erin M. X2]

So was empowering the international criminal court to prosecute Canada's international law violating malfasant:

His proposal for the world environment court is an interesting one. [Sec State: protracted Cl.M.]

The other communiqués that were generated during the session include:

- confirming the death penalty and lethal force will be used if necessary to contain and neutralize
- demanding Canadian independence from china's *de facto* governance
- government's allocated amounts in the billions to combat the Chinada threat
- confirms increase in police powers to protect the homeland
- Canada is a travesty that must be rectified
- Britain's national security is seriously jeopardized by the China-Canada alliance
- arms and authority will never be enough, need the power of ideas to defeat Chinada
- committed to end the current stalemate
- prime minister expressly threatens military intervention to effect covert regime change
- the United Kingdom parliament is committed to democratic reform in Canada
- Chinada has created an increasingly uncertain international security landscape
- Canada's leadership is heading for disaster
- confirming the Canadian lawyer's post-emancipation entrepreneurial opportunities
- describing Canada's governments as "leaderless organisations"
- defeat of the China-Canada alliance will be a "slam victory"
- billions in funds have been allocated to challenge Beijing's global hegemony policy
- new technical capabilities are being developed to contain and neutralize the Chinada threat
- the Canadian lawyer has become an *ad hoc* intelligence advisor to the British government

Hansard

The Prime Minister (Mr. Gordon Brown):

This morning I had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. [Sec of State: Cl.M.] In addition to my duties in the House, I shall have further such meetings later today.

Mrs. Moon:

[Condi M. X 2] Having met four young people from my Bridgend constituency, my right hon. Friend will be aware that it is vital that those young people have the [Madonna M.] assurance and confidence that, for their futures, there will be apprenticeships and good jobs available for them, on which they can build their future lives. Can I [Condi M.] give them that assurance from the Prime Minister?

The Prime Minister:

I was pleased to meet young people from my hon. Friend's constituency and to talk about the creation of jobs and opportunities for young people. The whole House will be pleased to know today that the employment figures show that we have more people in employment than at any time in our history.

Despite the global financial turbulence, which has meant unemployment rising in America and unemployment twice as high as ours in France and Germany, we have seen unemployment fall in every region and nation of the country over the last year. That is possible only because of the policies of stability and the creation of the new deal, which we will continue to pursue; that never happened under the previous Government.

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

The whole world will have been shocked by the pictures on television last night of the security crackdown and the dead [MP: Cl.M.] bodies on the streets of Lhasa and other parts of Tibet. Does the Prime Minister agree with me that, yes, our relationship with China is vital, and China is a major power, but we must be absolutely clear in telling the Chinese Government that this is completely unacceptable? [Anne McIntosh: Chinada color scheme; quasi-Colbert M.]

The Prime Minister:

I spoke to Premier Wen of China this morning, and I made it absolutely clear that there had to be an end to violence in Tibet. I hope that Members on both sides of the House will agree with that [Cl.M.]. I also called for constraint, and I called for an end to the violence by dialogue between the different parties. The Premier told me that subject to two things that the Dalai Lama has already said—that [Beckinsale M.] he does not support the total independence of Tibet and that he renounces violence—he would be prepared to enter into dialogue with the Dalai Lama. I will meet the Dalai Lama when he is in London. I think it is important that

we all facilitate discussions, but the most important thing at the moment is to bring about an end to the violence, to see reconciliation, and to see legitimate talks taking place between those people in China.

Mr. Cameron:

Can I congratulate the Prime Minister on making absolutely the right decision with regard to the Dalai Lama? It is a difficult decision, but it would not have been made any better by delaying it, and I congratulate him on doing the right thing.

The Prime Minister: We make the right decisions at all times [Brown M.].

Andrew Miller (Ellesmere Port and Neston) (Lab):

May I say to my right hon. Friend that long-term unemployment is down 82 per cent. in my constituency, and overall unemployment is down by 39 per cent.? I have just been in discussions with a prospective inward investor who proposes [MP: protracted Cl.M.] to bring another 600 jobs to my constituency. My right hon. Friend knows that the success in turning around the economy in my area is due to the relationship between the Government and the private sector. Will he ensure that we invest in training, so that those good trends continue in future?

The Prime Minister:

My hon. Friend has fought hard for the car industry and other jobs for his constituency, and for the development of the science-based industries in the whole of the north-west region. He will be pleased to know that unemployment is falling in the whole region, that [St.M.] unemployment is down on a year ago, and that more jobs are being created in all parts of the country. We will continue to pursue the policies that are necessary—putting stability first by bearing down hard on inflation, a new deal to give people chances of jobs, and apprenticeships for young people. None of that would happen under the policies of the Opposition.

Mr. Nick Clegg (Sheffield, Hallam) (LD):

Two hours ago a retired Gurkha soldier handed over this medal to me in protest at the Government's refusal to grant him British citizenship. Does the Prime Minister know what it means for a loyal British soldier to give up a medal that he won for his long years of service to this country? Can he explain to the Gurkhas why on earth he believes that Gurkhas who have served in the Army after 1997 are worthy of British citizenship, but those who served before that date should be deported?

The Prime Minister:

Let me also pay a tribute to the Gurkhas. They have [St.M.] been in existence since 1815. They have served loyally in every part of the world, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan, where they fought with Prince Harry over the past few months. They have done a tremendous job for our country. [MP: quasi-Blitzer M.] We are the first

Government to have given Gurkhas the right to a pension, for those serving after 1997. We are the first to have given equal pay to the Gurkhas. We are the first to have dealt with the problems of married accommodation, and we are the first to say that after four years in the Army they will have the right to residence in this country. Those are changes that we have brought about. Why is the date 1997? It is the date that the Gurkhas, once based in Hong Kong, moved to be based in Britain. That is why we are honouring the promises that we made for the period after 1997.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I made the position clear last week about this Bill. This is an important [MP: Cl.M.] Bill that improves the facilities for research and is vital for dealing with life-threatening diseases. It is a Bill that has gone through the House of Lords. I said very clearly that everybody in this House should have the right to exercise their consciences. We will come back to the House with our proposals to take it through in later times.

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

So the Prime Minister can give us absolutely no answer for after 2013. That means that children at secondary school and their parents have no idea about what sort of examination system is going to be in place.

The Prime Minister cannot make a decision about free votes and he cannot make a decision about A-levels. No wonder his new spin doctor Stephen Carter says 'living in Downing street is like living in a surreal cartoon'. There are now so many spin doctors in Downing street that they have started spinning against each other and leaving in floods of tears. There is a new strategist, a man called David Muir. Yes, I have done a bit of research—he is the chief strategist and on the internet he has listed his favourite book. It is called— [Interruption.] Is his favourite book not the following? It is called "The unstoppable power of leaderless organisations". [MP: Z-J M.] If the Prime Minister cannot make a decision, and if he cannot run his office, why does anyone wonder why he cannot run the country?

The Prime Minister:

We are dealing with the substance of issues. The Opposition are playing at politics; we are dealing with the substance of governing. It is interesting that there was not one question about the global economy. Why? Because the Conservatives do not have a policy on the global economy. There was not one question about the health service, because they have no proper policy on the national health service. There was not one question about local government services because they are cutting local government services. They have no answer to the problems of this country.

Mr. Andrew Love (Edmonton) (Lab/Co-op):

With current market conditions deteriorating, will my right hon. Friend reassure this House that now is not the time to abandon the target that we have set—that 50 per cent. of all new housing in London should be affordable?

The Prime Minister:

Fifteen thousand houses are being built in London [St.M.] in the course of a year. The Mayor has raised the target to 30,000, but he also wants 50 per cent. of those houses to be affordable housing. It is very sad that the Conservative mayoral candidate for London has abandoned pursuing that target, in the event that he were ever elected. Surely in London, of all places, we need more affordable housing. We will deliver it; the Conservatives would not.

[...]

I understand that the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council is currently looking [MP: Gutierrez M.] at this very issue and at whether the disease should be prescribed and therefore liable to compensation and help. It will make recommendations to Ministers at the Department for Work and Pensions in due course, and we will take action on that. I can say to my hon. Friend that it is only because we have taken action on industrial diseases over these past 10 years that miners are now receiving the compensation that they never received under the previous Government.

Annette Brooke (Mid-Dorset and North Poole) (LD):

2008 is the year of reading. Is the Prime Minister aware that many visually impaired and dyslexic children cannot obtain vital textbooks in accessible formats? Last year, the Government made a welcome commitment to improve the provision of such materials. Will he ensure that that commitment is delivered?

The Prime Minister:

I had the privilege of being at the launch of the national year of reading. It is very important to encourage all children to get the benefits of reading. The hon. Lady rightly raises the problem of dyslexic children and others who are in need of special help. I will look at everything that she says on that matter and write to her.

Helen Southworth (Warrington, South) (Lab):

Will my right hon. Friend take action [MP: Erin M.] to protect children and young people from harmful content on the internet and in video games?

The Prime Minister:

My hon. Friend has been very active in protecting children, particularly children who are away from their homes, from abuse and exploitation. As she may know, we

have set up the review [St. M.] under Dr. Tanya Byron, which is to look into the evidence of harm and measures to protect children from inappropriate content online. I have talked to Dr. Tanya Byron about her review. She will report soon. I believe that she will make recommendations that will take into account the need to see the internet as a means by which people get access to learning materials and to new technology but also as a danger and a harm on which we have to take action where necessary. I hope that my hon. Friend will look forward to Dr. Byron's report.

Mr. Robert Goodwill (Scarborough and Whitby) (Con) [prison certainty X3]:

Is it right that a person who has been given a driving ban for a serious offence such as causing death by dangerous driving and is subsequently given a prison sentence for an unrelated criminal offence can continue to use up their driving ban while in prison? Should it not be deferred until they are released?

The Prime Minister:

The hon. Gentleman raises an important point, and we will look at it.

Albert Owen (Ynys Môn) (Lab) [protracted Blitzer M.]:

Last Saturday's grand slam victory shows the sporting skills and passion of the Welsh nation. In looking forward to the Olympic games in 2012 and the opportunities that they will provide to Welsh communities such as my own, Ynys Môn, which has been chosen for potential training facilities for athletes from across the world, does the Prime Minister agree that the legacy from the Olympics must be spread across the United Kingdom, and will he urge his Ministers to work with the devolved Administrations and the Olympics committee to ensure that that legacy crosses the United Kingdom and peripheral areas such as north-west Wales?

The Prime Minister:

I hear that my hon. Friend has a sore throat, no doubt from cheering [St. M.] all over the weekend. I, too, send my congratulations to the captain and the manager of the Welsh team on their great success in the international championship.

[...]

The post offices are losing half a million pounds a day. I, too, want to see good services for post offices in every part of the country, but the fact of the matter is that there are 800 post offices where, on average, 16 people attend every week. We have got to take action. I take it from the motion that the Conservatives have tabled for debate today that they are not proposing extra money to save the post offices. Unfunded promises are empty and hollow promises to the people of this country. We have put aside £1.7 billion [Lord Ch: Cl.M. X2] to make such money available to the post office network. I can only repeat what the chairman of the National Federation of SubPostmasters said this morning:

[...]

We have promised police authorities a minimum of 2.5 per cent. extra per year for the next three years. I have not seen similar promises to fund policing made by the Conservative party. As a result of doubling expenditure on police since 1997, [Lord Ch: Rumsfeld M. X2] we have more police than ever before in our history, and we are better served by police and community support officers. I hope that the right hon. and learned Gentleman will agree that that is one of the reasons why crime has fallen in this country.

[...]

Mr. John Leech (Manchester, Withington) (LD):

My constituent, Adela Mahoro Mugabo, who is HIV positive after being raped and tortured in Rwanda, is threatened with being sent back to that country, where she will not be able to access the treatment that she requires to stay alive. Will the Prime Minister intervene to stop that travesty [MP: St.M.; SNL M.] of justice?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I attended the European Council last Friday and we are holding fast to the general environmental targets, which include a 60 per cent. or more reduction in carbon emissions by 2050. My hon. Friend will have noted the Chancellor's proposals on biofuels in the Budget. [Ch Exchq: Paulson M.] Of course, we wish other countries to do as we are doing in making it clear that we will make the necessary changes, based on the scientific evidence.

[...]

I am grateful to my hon. Friend. We provided £100 million a year [MP: Z-J M.] as transitional support for those who receive gift aid relief as charities to enable them to deal with the consequences of reducing the basic rate from 22p to 20p. We have also introduced several other measures, such as a comprehensive programme for bringing additional smaller charities into gift aid and outreach to many new charities to help them use gift aid to advantage. Of course, in the past few years, the amount of tax relief available to charities has risen from £1.9 billion to £2.9 billion. That is £1 billion extra through tax relief going to the charities of this country. That would not have been possible without proper economic policies that were working for the people of Britain.

National Security Strategy

The Prime Minister (Mr. Gordon Brown):

The primary duty of Government, and our abiding obligation, [House Leader: dbl-SNL M.] is and will always be the safety of all British people and the protection of the British national interest, so, following approval [House Leader: Becky M.] by the National Security Committee and the Cabinet, the Government are today publishing the first national security strategy. It states that although our obligation [Sec of State: Kernan M.] to protect the British people and the British national interest is fixed and unwavering, the nature of the threats and the risks that we face have in recent decades changed beyond all recognition and confound all the old assumptions about national defence and international security. As the strategy makes clear, new threats demand new approaches. A radically updated and much more co-ordinated approach is now required.

For most of the last century, [Sec of State: Cl.M.; Diaz M. X3] the main threat was unmistakable: a cold war adversary. Today, the potential threats that we face come from far less predictable sources, both state and non-state. Twenty years ago, the terrorist threat to Britain was principally that from the IRA; now it comes from loosely affiliated global networks that threaten us and other nations across continents. Once, when there was instability in faraway regions or countries, we had a choice: to become involved or not. Today no country is, in the old sense, far away, when the consequences of regional instability and terrorism, as well as risks such as climate change, poverty, mass population movements and even organised crime, reverberate quickly round the globe.

To address these great insecurities—war and terrorism, and now climate change, disease and poverty; threats that redefine national security [MP: SNL M. X2] not just as the protection of the state, but as the protection of all people—we need to mobilise all the resources available to us. They include: the hard power of our military, police, security and intelligence services; the persuasive force and reach of diplomacy and cultural connections; the authority of strengthened global institutions, which can deploy both hard and soft power; and, [Bl.M.] not least because arms and authority will never be enough, the power of ideas and of shared values and hopes that can win over hearts and minds and can forge new partnerships for progress and tolerance, involving Government, the private and voluntary sectors, community and faith organisations, as well as individuals.

The foundation [Sec Def: Erin M; Execution M.] of our approach is to maintain strong, balanced, flexible and deployable armed forces. I want to pay tribute to Britain's servicemen and women, and those civilians deployed on operations, who every day face danger doing vital work in the service of our country, and in particular to remember today the sacrifices made for our country by all who have been injured or who have lost their lives in recent years in Iraq, Afghanistan and other theatres of war.

[...]

I can also confirm that, to [B.M.] meet future security needs, we have set aside funds to modernise our interception capability; that at GCHQ and in the [B.M.] Secret Intelligence Service, we are developing new technical capabilities to root out terrorism; and that the new Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure, which we set up last year, will provide a higher level of protection against internet-based threats.

[...]

To harness a much wider range of expertise and experience from outside Government, and to help us plan for the future, we are inviting business, academics, community organisations and military and security experts from outside Government to join a new national security forum that will advise the recently constituted National Security Committee. Having accepted the recommendation of the Intelligence and Security Committee—I thank it for its work—to separate the position of Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee from policy adviser to the Government, [Sec of State: Erin M.] and having appointed Mr. Alex Allan as Chair of the JIC, I can confirm that, as proposed by the Butler review, his responsibility will be solely to provide Ministers with security assessments formulated independently of the political process.

We will also immediately go ahead to introduce a resolution of both Houses—[House Leader: Cl.M.] in advance of any future legislation—that will enshrine an enhanced scrutiny and public role for the Intelligence and Security Committee. This will lead to more parliamentary debate on security matters, to public hearings on the national security strategy, and—as promised—greater transparency over appointments to the Committee, so that the Committee can not only review intelligence and security but perform a public role more akin to the practice of Select Committees generally in reporting to and informing the country on security matters.

[...]

But in return, we will seek agreement on tougher controls aimed at reducing weapons and preventing proliferation—first, by [Leno M.] ending the stalemates on the fissile material cut-off treaty and the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and, secondly, by achieving, after 2010, a more robust implementation of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty with the aim of accelerating disarmament among possessor states, preventing proliferation and, ultimately, freeing the world from nuclear weapons.

[...]

As great a potential threat and as demanding of a co-ordinated international response is, of course, the risk from failing and unstable states. Again, the national security strategy published today proposes a new departure—and, again, it is a lesson learned from recent conflicts ranging [St.M.] from Rwanda and Bosnia to Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia. It is to create a stand-by international civilian

capability so that for fragile and failing states, we can act quickly and comprehensively by combining humanitarian, peacekeeping, stabilisation and reconstruction support that these countries need. Sp in the same way as we have military forces ready to respond to conflict, we must have civilian experts and professionals ready to deploy quickly to assist failing states and to help rebuild countries emerging from conflict, putting them on the road to economic and political recovery.

I can tell the House that [Leno M.] Britain will start by making available a 1,000-strong UK civilian stand-by capacity that will include police, emergency service professionals, judges and trainers. And I am calling on EU and NATO partners to set high and ambitious targets for their contributions to such a force.

Between now and 2011, Britain is offering £600 million for conflict prevention, conflict resolution and stabilisation work around the world, including work in Israel and Palestine, Darfur, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq and Afghanistan, Kenya and the Balkans. And as we assume our presidency of the UN Security Council in May, we are proposing an appeal by [St.M.] the UN Secretary-General for a co-ordinated crisis recovery fund to provide immediate support where reconstruction is needed, to which Britain will be prepared to contribute.

Specifically, because we know the importance of peace in Darfur, I am announcing today more help from Britain to train, equip and employ African troops for the joint UN-African Union peacekeeping operation. Because of the importance of safeguarding peace in Somalia, I can announce that Britain will help to pay for [Kernan M.] 850 Burundian troops as part of the African Union peacekeeping force there. Because of the [Leno M.] critical importance of economic and political reconstruction complementing military action [St. M.] as the elected Afghan Government face down the Taliban, we are proposing an integrated civilian-military headquarters—headed by a civilian—that will now be constituted in Helmand. And in Iraq, where we have already brought electricity and water supplies to more than 1 million citizens, we are stepping up our contribution to the work of long-term economic reconstruction by supporting the Basra development commission, led for the British by the businessman, Michael Wareing, who is doing an excellent job.

In order to maximise [Leno M.; Sec State: protracted Erin & Execution M.] our contribution to all the new challenges of peacekeeping, humanitarian work and stabilisation and reconstruction, the [Leno M.] Secretary of State for Defence is also announcing this afternoon that, as part of a wider review, the Government will now examine how our reserve forces can more effectively help with stabilisation and reconstruction in post-conflict zones around the world. With this year being the 100th anniversary of the Territorial Army, I want to pay tribute to the servicemen and women in our reserves, who provide such an essential element of our nation's defence. [Sec State to here]

Mr. Speaker, the security strategy published today also makes clear that, as well as being able to [Defence Sec: Erin M.] respond to crises as they develop, we need to be able to tackle the underlying drivers of conflict and instability. Those include

poverty, inequality and poor governance, where by focusing on areas where poverty breeds conflict, we have quadrupled Britain's aid budget and we are pushing for bold international action to meet the millennium development goals.

The second set of underlying drivers is climate change and competition for natural resources, where we are leading the way in arguing for a post-2012 international agreement and for a new global fund to help developing countries mitigate and adapt to climate change, [Leno M.] including in the areas most under stress and therefore most likely to suffer instability as well as humanitarian disasters.

The third drivers are disease and global pandemics, where, with the World Health Organisation, the priority is to improve early warning systems, to increase global vaccine supplies and to help put in place a more co-ordinated global response.

Because of the importance of building stability and countering violent extremism in the middle east and south Asia, we are also increasing the number of Foreign Office staff there by 30 per cent.

Among all the security challenges to citizens of this country covered by the new strategy, the most serious and urgent remains the threat from international terrorism. As the [St.M.] head of MI5 has said, Britain is facing 30 [Sec State: Erin M; Z-J M. X3] known plots and is monitoring 200 networks and about 2,000 individuals. There have been 58 convictions for terrorism in just over a year and the Home Secretary is announcing today that we will have four regional counter-terrorism units and four regional intelligence units, significantly increasing anti-terrorism police capability in the regions.

Since the [Cowell M.] events of 11 September, on suspicion of being a threat to national security or fostering extremism, 300 individuals have been prevented from entering the country. Now—backing up the unified border agency, compulsory ID cards for foreign nationals [St. M.] and our proposals in the Counter-Terrorism Bill that would allow us in unique circumstances to extend detention to ensure full investigation of terror threats—the Government will match stronger action against those whom we suspect of stirring up tensions with collaborative work with our European partners to strengthen the EU rules on deporting criminals—a matter I shall discuss with President Sarkozy when he visits Britain next week.

For action against terrorism and against organised crime, it is important to strengthen Europol and Eurojust, [St.M.] to ensure the rapid and secure exchange of information across borders, and to speed up the extradition of criminals and the confiscation of their assets. Starting with the United Arab Emirates, we are signing more agreements so that once the assets of a convicted criminal are seized in one country, with the assistance of the other, both countries will get a share of the proceeds. [Sec State: Eva M.]

Our new approach to security also means local resilience against emergencies: building and strengthening local capacity to respond effectively to a range of circumstances from floods to potential terrorism incidents. That means not the

[Leno M.] old cold-war idea of civil defence, but a new form of civil protection that combines expert preparedness at local level for potential emergencies with a greater local engagement of individuals and families themselves. Next month the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government will report on additional measures that we propose for young people in colleges and universities and in prisons and working in faith communities to disrupt the promoters of violent extremism; all building on the support of the vast majority of people of all faiths and all backgrounds [House Leader: Diaz M. X2; MP: Z-J M.] who condemn terrorism, terrorists and their actions.

The national security strategy shows a Britain resolute in the face of an unstable and increasingly uncertain international security landscape [St. M.]. It demonstrates the lessons that we and other countries have learnt in recent years: that we must expand our policing, security and intelligence capacity—and we are doing so; that we must do more to prevent conflict by, for instance, more effective international control of arms—and we are doing so; and that we must strengthen the effectiveness of international institutions to promote stability and reconstruction, for which we have presented proposals today.

And we will always be vigilant, never leave ourselves vulnerable, and will support and at all times and wherever necessary strengthen—as we do today—our defences and civilian support for national security.

I commend my statement to the House.

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

I thank the Prime Minister for his statement. Let me first put on record the huge debt of gratitude [MP: Z-J M.] that we owe the police, the security services and our armed forces for the work that they do to keep our country safe.

The Prime Minister made a very wide-ranging statement, and there was much in it that we support. We welcome the idea, which we have long supported, of a stand-by civilian capacity so that we can act quickly in fragile or failing states. We also support the idea of a cross-cutting manifesto for forces' families. Indeed, I set it out in my party conference speech two years ago, and I am glad that it is bearing fruit. We strongly back what the Prime Minister said about greater co-ordination of our effort in Helmand province. Anyone who has been there knows that that really is needed.

But I want to focus my questions on the theory and practice of a national security approach. Because this statement has been a long time coming, and at first sight it looks—and sounded from the Prime Minister—rather more like a list than a strategy. It would help if instead of announcing a series of things that the Secretary of State for Defence or the Home Secretary is going to announce, the Prime Minister simply told us more clearly what will change and why the position will be different. Owing to the tenor of his approach, that did not come across at all clearly.

[Gov't MP: Paulson M.; SNL M.] That may be because the strategy has had a very difficult birth. According to sources inside Downing street,

“it... has proved a bit of a disaster... Its genesis has been marked by delays, indecisiveness at the top, a total lack of funds”—

[Interruption.] I am reading because it is a very long quote. The hon. Member for Dudley, North (Mr. Austin) has been warned before. He is slowly getting closer to the door—he used to sit behind the Prime Minister—and, as I said yesterday, apparently the door is what he will be going through.

“and some glorious Whitehall squabbling.”

We will study the strategy in detail, but the idea of a national security strategy—

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Jacqui Smith): Shocking!

Mr. Cameron:

Shocking? It is shocking when people interrupt all the time when I am trying to reply to the statement.

The idea of a national security strategy is one we welcome. The need for a national security approach is clear: the threats to our national security, [MP: Erin M.] from terrorism to climate change and energy security, have proliferated, and the Government must adapt to deal with them. That is why in 2006 my party said that it was time not just for a national security strategy but for a national security council. Does the Prime Minister agree with me that a national security strategy will work only if it is put in place and carried out properly? And to achieve that, three things must happen. First, institutions in the UK need to be properly organised to deliver a national security approach. Second, we need to understand fully the connections between foreign and domestic policy, and how they impact on our security. And third, and vitally, any strategy will make sense only if the Government follow through and take all the necessary practical steps.

Let me take each of those in turn. Can the Prime Minister explain why the Government have decided to set up a national security forum—another talking shop—instead of a proper national security council? Surely, a proper national security council would have dedicated staff— [Interruption.] Perhaps the Prime Minister will sit and wait, then he can answer the questions at the end. Surely a proper national security council would have dedicated staff and decision-making powers. It would be at the heart of Government, with all the relevant Ministers, and it would be chaired by the Prime Minister. We do not have that; we should have it. Can he explain how a forum and an existing Cabinet committee will be able to drive the implementation of a national security strategy across all Departments? Are we not in danger of just having a talking shop and confusion?

On the connection between foreign and domestic policy, are we going to be a properly joined-up approach? The Prime Minister talked about a single security budget, but will it genuinely cover all the areas. For instance—and I have asked him this before—will the single security budget include special branch, is currently funded by separate forces? The United Kingdom must retain the power, properly funded, to intervene [PM: Cl.M.] abroad militarily when necessary, as the strategy says, but we must understand that military operations abroad have consequences for security at home. As the Joint Intelligence Committee warned, our interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, which we supported, increase in the short term the threat of terrorism domestically in the UK, yet we have to ask whether all the necessary action was taken domestically at the time. It is clear that the answer is no.

This leads to the third issue—the importance of following through on the national security strategy. The Prime Minister has a number of questions to answer. First, why, despite Government statements to the contrary, has he still not banned Hizb ut-Tahrir. It is clearly a gateway group that seeks to poison young minds against our country and way of life? [Interruption.] He says, “My goodness”, but the previous Prime Minister said that he would ban it, so why has it not happened? [MP: quasi-Brown M.] Why, despite rightly preventing the preacher of hate, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, from entering Britain following our recommendation to do so, has he not followed the lead of the Irish Government and excluded Ibrahim Moussawi, a spokesman for the terrorist organisation, Hezbollah, who recently conducted a speaking tour of the UK? Why has his Government allowed public money to end up in the hands of extremist groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood? Does he understand the damage done to our reputation by the perception that the UK has allowed itself to become a terrorist breeding ground and a threat to others? And why, despite the urgent need to secure our borders, does he still refuse to create a proper border police force with enforcement powers? What is holding him back from those obvious and necessary measures?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful [House Leader: protracted Russell M.] to the right hon. Gentleman for his support for the standby facility and for the co-ordination of our efforts in Helmand. I am grateful, [Z-J M.] too, for his support for our armed forces and security services generally. I am afraid, however, that only he can trivialise a national security statement. If he had done his research, he would know that there is a National Security Committee, which includes the Chief of the Defence Staff, the chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, the heads of all the intelligence agencies—MI5, MI6 and GCHQ—the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, and the head of the Association of Chief Police Officers, who attend the meetings. The terms of reference are to consider issues relating to national security and the Government’s international and European policies, as well as their international development policies. What the right hon. Gentleman is asking for we already have. It is chaired by the Prime Minister, and it met only last week. It meets regularly to

look at the relationship between domestic and international issues, and it has been in existence for several months, apparently without his knowing about its existence.

The right hon. Gentleman raised the question of an inquiry on Iraq and asked what lessons we have learned. I made it very clear in my statement that we are expanding our policing, security and intelligence capability. We want to do more on the early prevention of conflicts by more effective international control of arms. We want to [B.M.] strengthen the international institutions to promote stability and reconstruction, and, of course, our forces, including the security forces, are always vigilant.

As for an inquiry, [House Leader: protracted Diaz M.] four inquiries have reported to the House on conditions related to the action in Iraq. [Sec State: dbl-h Diaz M.] It would not be a good use of Ministry of Defence resources to have to reply to an inquiry, when we have troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would not be right, when we have troops in danger and at risk, particularly in Iraq, for the country to turn its attention to an inquiry [House Leader: Cl.M.] instead of doing everything we can to protect them. We will therefore be consistent in our judgment, even if his party is not consistent on this matter, that the right time to look at these issues and review the lessons learned is when our troops have finished the work in Iraq, which they are conducting with great efficiency. They deserve our full support, the wholehearted attention of the Ministry of Defence and the support of all the institutions of government.

I take issue with the right hon. Gentleman about the thesis behind the work that we are doing. As I said at the beginning of the statement, there is growing recognition that you cannot distinguish between issues that are somehow “over there”, as if they have no effect on our country, whether it be the environment, terrorism or [Pelley M.] national disasters, and what happens in our own country. It is a fact, as we found with 11 September, that the richest citizen in the richest city in the richest country can be directly affected by what is happening to the poorest citizens in the poorest countries in other parts of the world. And our security strategy must reflect that, which is why we are looking at what we can do internationally on the control of weapons and to rebuild international institutions. And that is why, too, we are looking at what we can do domestically do improve our resilience.

The right hon. Gentleman raised the question of people who have come into the country. Three hundred potential terrorists or people suspected of extremism have been refused admission into the UK in recent years, so we are alert in taking action against those who pose a danger. [House Leader: protracted Diaz M.; Eva M.] As he knows, the decision was made to refuse Mr. al-Qaradawi a visa—he has not applied for entry into the UK—for this country. Mr. Moussawi came to the UK in December and again on 28 February. On both occasions, his visit passed without incident. In all those cases, however, we keep these matters under review. In relation to Hizb ut-Tahrir, I have said that we will be vigilant in examining its activities. Our consistent advice is not to give that organisation the oxygen of publicity by banning it. We wish, however, to keep it always under review. We will always take the action that is necessary, but we will look at it case by case, and

everyone with a sensible voice on these matters in the House would propose that we do so.

Mr. Nick Clegg (Sheffield, Hallam) (LD):

I am grateful to the Prime Minister for his statement. Before dealing with it, may I say that we have witnessed some breathtaking political opportunism, because the leader of the Conservative party pressed for an inquiry into a war that he and all his colleagues signed up to support lock, stock and barrel, with no questions asked? Perhaps we need an inquiry into how his party has flip-flopped on Iraq.

[...]

Will the Prime Minister agree that many of the threats he has enumerated—terrorism, climate change, cross-border crime—cannot be dealt with by the United Kingdom on its own, and, indispensably, we can deal with them only as full and committed members of the European Union? I noted that in his statement he referred to the EU only third after the United States and NATO as a crucial forum in which many of the collective security threats will be tackled. Does that attach enough significance [MP: Cl.M. X3] to the extent to which our membership of the EU affords us a certain safety in numbers?

The Prime Minister has in the past talked about drawing red lines in Brussels. I wonder whether the time has now come for him also to draw red lines in our relationship with Washington. Why, for instance, has he entered into a secret deal with the United States Administration to base George Bush's "son of star wars" missile defence system on British soil? Does he seriously think that that enhances our national security? [MP: Cl.M.]

The Prime Minister spoke about the need to have strengthened global institutions. I agree with that. We all agree that we need a rules-based multilateral system [MP: Z-J M.] to safeguard all our security. Does he, however, think it is compatible with that view of the value of a strong, multilateral, rules-based system that he has been completely silent—so far at least—on President Bush's veto of the proposed ban on the use of torture by American military personnel around the world?

I hope the Prime Minister will also agree with me that security and liberty are two sides of the same coin. We should never be forced to accept that there should be a trade-off of one in favour of another—that our security can only be promoted only by a sacrifice of our liberty. For that to be the case, does he also agree that any measures that infringe on our liberty in the name of security must be based on overwhelming, compelling evidence that they are necessary; and does he truly think that the Government have yet marshalled that overwhelming, compelling evidence in favour of their proposal to extend further the period of detention [Condi M.] without charge?

The Prime Minister spoke of a wider review [PM: Sarkozy M.] being undertaken by the Secretary of State for Defence. We all know that our armed forces are

overstretched, overcommitted and under-resourced. Does the Prime Minister agree that as it has been 10 years since there was a full strategic defence review, it is high time that he announced a new full strategic review of our defence capabilities for today and the years ahead?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

As for the issue of torture, the right hon. Gentleman will know of our record of opposing torture in every part of the world. [Sec State Enviro: Erin M. X2] As for what he says about the powers of detention, he—and even the Conservative party—has supported the Liberty proposals that say there may be circumstances in which more than 28 days is necessary for arresting and interviewing someone before charge. I believe he should look seriously at the similarities between the original Liberty proposals and those we are putting forward. We are not saying that in every circumstance someone who is detained must be detained for up to 42 days; we are saying that there should be a reserve power and that if the Home Secretary, with others, decides it should be used, she would come to the House of Commons and ask for that power to be activated. That is very similar to the power proposed by Liberty that the right hon. Gentleman supported because he recognised that there may be circumstances in which it might be necessary to go beyond 28 days. That is not what is at dispute, even though he wants to think that is the issue. The issue is the mechanism that we use. I hope the Liberal party will rethink what I believe is an incredible position on this issue.

[...]

Keith Vaz (Leicester, East) (Lab):

[protracted Bl.M.] I, too, warmly welcome the Prime Minister's statement, with its emphasis on co-ordination and benchmarking. On parliamentary accountability, the last time the Select Committee on Home Affairs took evidence from the head of MI5 we travelled in a car that had darkened windows, we entered the building through the garage and we had a private session. Even though the information he gave us was excellent, we could not quote from it in our report [end Bl.M.]. Will other Committees be able to take evidence from the head of MI5 in public, where it better informs us of decisions, so that we can report back to Parliament?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful to my hon. Friend, who takes a huge interest in these matters having been a Minister at the Foreign Office. He rightly says that although I emphasised [MP: Harriet M.] in my statement the measures that we wish to take to promote nuclear disarmament, references are also made in the national security strategy document to the dangers and risks posed by chemical and biological weapons. He is

right to say that the dangers of those weapons falling into the hands of potential terrorists mean that we have to examine not only the owners of those weapons but who is supplying them. We now have excellent ability to do post-fact detection of who the supplier is, which should enable us to locate the suppliers of chemical, biological and nuclear weapon parts and take strong action against them. That is an important part of the national security strategy as published.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I praise the work of Her Majesty's coastguards—indeed, I [George W. M.] visited many of them some weeks ago to thank them for the work they do both on rescue and on the security of the country.

As for Darfur, I agree with the hon. Gentleman: this is a [Sec State: Harriet M.] human tragedy that is being acted out, involving a threat to the lives of young children as well as to those of adults. He rightly says that we should consider a no-fly zone. The problem with such a zone, as I have said before in this House, is that we are dealing with an area the size of France—a massive geographical area. Therefore, the aircraft requirement to be able to police a no-fly zone is way beyond what countries are prepared —[Sec State: protracted Cl.M.; Kernan M.; Beckinsale M. X2] or able at this time, because of other action in Afghanistan and elsewhere—to supply. That is the problem in respect of a no-fly zone at the moment. People must be realistic enough to recognise that it is difficult enough to get the supply of helicopters that he is talking about, so staffing and policing a no-fly zone is very difficult, even when aerial bombings, which are completely unacceptable, are taking place.

[...]

Mr. Julian Brazier (Canterbury) (Con):

Although I welcome the Prime Minister's earlier answer on the Territorial Army and reserves, could I urge him to look across the Atlantic at the model of the National Guard, which, besides making a [Bl.M.] remarkable contribution in dealing with both Hurricane Katrina and the aftermath of 9/11, also provides highly effective combat brigades and fast jet fighter squadrons for use in Iraq? May I suggest that the basic lesson that we can learn from America is that an organisation is most successful—the National Guard is the only part of the American armed forces that is fully recruited—when it is led at all levels by volunteer reserves, when it has a real footprint in every part of the country; and, above all, when it is used as a force in its own right, whether its combat, peacekeeping, disaster relief and so on, and not merely as a provision of spare parts for the regular counterparts?

The Prime Minister:

The hon. Gentleman is a great champion of the Territorial Army [B.M.; Cl.M.] and I understand his deep interest in these matters. I believe that the proposals that he puts forward and his desire that we look at what is successful in other countries, including the United States of America, are things that we can draw on during this review. I hope that he will contribute his thoughts to the Defence Secretary as he moves forward with the review.

[...]

My hon. Friend is right about the importance of taking action on climate change. That is why not only are we making proposals for international action to secure a post-2012 agreement; we are proposing that the World Bank should take on a new role as a world bank for the environment, as well as for development, so that it can provide money for energy-efficiency schemes and for alternative sources of energy to be invested in by some of the poorer countries in the world. International co-operation is vital to deal with the problems of climate change. She probably knows that we are sponsoring [Pacino M.] a major afforestation project in the Congo basin. It is one of many projects that we are prepared to support with the environmental transformation fund.

My hon. Friend also raises the issue of armed forces' accommodation. In total, £5 billion has been allocated for improvements in accommodation over many years; but it is important that we make a start as quickly as possible with some of the schemes that can give the greatest results. That is why the £20 million set aside for these armed forces equity sharing and home ownership pilots is important to send a message [Cl.M.] to members of the armed forces that as they prepare to move to new careers later, we will help them to buy their first home.

[...]

They will work together. The right hon. Gentleman may know that we are determined to move as quickly as possible to appoint a development co-ordinator in Afghanistan, as that is urgently needed. As he will know, Lord Ashdown would have been a great appointment to that job [Cl.M.], but that was not possible. Now we have a proposal for a regional appointment and I hope that that will make quick progress.

On aid, I have to disagree with the right hon. Gentleman. The budget of DFID, and Britain's aid budget generally, has quadrupled from £2.1 billion to nearly £9 billion by 2011; so there is additional money available for the priorities of the Department. [Sec State Enviro: Paulson M.; Cl.M.] He is right to say that in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan—as well as in Africa and in Israel, and in dealing with the Palestinian authorities—we will need DFID. If we are to combine humanitarian aid, peacekeeping, stabilisation and reconstruction, DFID has a key role to play.

Nigel Griffiths (Edinburgh, South) (Lab):

I, too, welcome my right hon. Friend's commitment to climate change. Will he support my proposals for a world environment court and review the work of the working group chaired by Stephen Hockman QC to ensure that the Kyoto targets and the post-Kyoto targets are enforceable?

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful for the interest that my hon. Friend has taken in this matter and the effort he makes in his constituency to persuade young people, especially schoolchildren, to take an interest in the environment. His proposal for the world environment court is an interesting one. [Sec State: protracted Cl.M.] We have to get to the first stage first, and that is persuading all countries to accept binding targets. That will be our priority in the post-2012 negotiations, and we will ally to that our proposal that funding be made available to developing countries to persuade them that it is in their interests to sign up to those agreements. How we make those agreements binding is a matter for the discussions, and obviously his proposal is one that will be taken into account.

[...]

I agree entirely with the hon. Gentleman. We have to draw on the expertise that is available from all parts of the United Kingdom. I assure him that what he says will be taken into account in formulating the membership of the national security forum, but also in learning the lessons from the actions that had to be taken [T-W M.] against terrorism in Northern Ireland.

Several hon. Members rose —

Mr. Speaker: Order. We must move on.

The foregoing is only one of several dozen instances when Prime Minister's Question Time, watched live every week on the equivalent of C-SPAN, was heavily geo-politicized to advance coalition interests and objectives.⁴ One of the consequences of the February 2011 epiphany was concluding that both prime ministers Tony Blair and Gordon Brown were complicit with the White House in advancing disingenuous diplomacy that had as its goal to extend the R&D program.

⁴ More is compiled in [Appendix 14](#). Video links to these geo-transcripts are no longer available as the House of Commons archivist only maintains this content on the website for a one year period.

Given quirks in human nature, there were times when something slipped off the tongue because of just how intensely and inter-subjectively focused all partners were on the global threat. If there was an award for the Coalition's Biggest Freudian Slip, it would go to former Prime Minister Gordon Brown.

While U.K parliamentarians howled with laughter during Prime Minister's Question Time on December 10, 2008 because of a PM's slip of the tongue, clearly nobody's finding any humor in the threat posed by the China-Canada alliance.

Freudian slips have found their way into coalition activity – principally because the Chinada threat is viewed as so profoundly serious and is thought about constantly, it was inevitable coalition partners would occasional blurt things out related to containing and neutralizing it and democratizing Canada.

And on Wednesday, Gordon saved the world

Prime minister: How I saved the world

by Simon Hoggart

The Guardian

December 11, 2008

[View Video](#)

It was obviously a slip, but was it a Freudian slip? There is no way Gordon Brown would have announced during prime minister's questions yesterday that he had saved the world, like Superman recalling how he had shoved the giant meteor aside as it was about to crash into the Earth, if he'd been in full command of his brain.

But did it express some profound, half-secret feeling buried deep in his id, or ego, or wherever these things lurk? Did he really mean it, or did he just sort of mean it?

Other countries have congratulated him on the way he prevented British banks going bust. Some have followed his example. Possibly there is a small cluster of synapses which believes he really did save the world from sudden and total disaster. Perhaps the thought just popped out like champagne from a badly corked bottle. Or he could, like so many politicians, be in thrall to his own publicity. Margaret Thatcher never got over the thrill of being called the Iron Lady by the Soviets.

Here's what happened.

David Cameron was launching into his assault for the day. Putting money into the banks was all very well, but it hadn't worked. When was Gordon going to change his strategy?

He replied: "The first point of recapitalisation was to save banks that would otherwise have collapsed." So far, so predictable. He went on: "We not only saved the world ..."

There was a pause, in which MPs looked at each other and wondered whether they had heard what they had heard. In that moment, the prime minister had a chance to correct himself - "saved the banks and led the way," he said - but it was too late.

He was buried under a sudden, overwhelming, mountainous avalanche of laughter - laughter, hooting, derision, chortling, spluttering, screeching and general mayhem filled the chamber like oil in a lava lamp, bubbling and swirling.

The Tories, of course, were the most affected. Genuine hilarity mixed with the joy of seeing the hated Brown discomfited. They slapped thighs, anybody's thighs, waved their order papers, rolled around, and allowed their faces to turn a deep red colour like a Christmas glass of port.

The U.K. leader contributed again:

British Prime Minister Brown Again Underscoring the Use of Lethal Military Force to Combat Chinada

Coming on the heels of U.S. Senator Dodd's "death sentence" coercive diplomacy is the U.K. leader's statement of the same genre. Standing in front of British troops on December 16, 2008, he aggressively and repeatedly employed the diplomatic lexicon in addition to choosing 'justice' for the occasion to generate the threat that's been made so many times since 2005 only the foolhardy and irredeemably belligerent would mock and ignore.



[protracted Bl.M.] It is a terrible [Bernanke M.] commentary on the Taliban that they should use [Bernanke M.] a 13-year old child as a suicide bomber to [Bernanke M.] kill some of our British troops. My thoughts are with the families of those who have died; with the friends of those who have [Bernanke M.] died. These men will never be forgotten

Just how coveted having a geo-gesture named after oneself, the British Prime Minister, like several of his international counterparts, introduced into the lexicon the Brown Maneuver.

That wasn't the first time a tenaciously committed, round-the-clock working, coalition partner would accidentally blurt something out relevant to containing and neutralizing the Chinese imperialistic threat and institutionally reforming Canada. The *Fiefdom* treatise recorded them all – and from both sides of the conflict:

How a Freudian Slip Demonstrates How Deeply Committed and Unified the Coalition is Against the Last Democratic Fiefdom

It is widely suspected that making a 'Freudian slip' reveals what a person really believes and is really thinking. The error created by a disjunction between what one wants to say and does in fact say discloses a deeply held belief in what is actually uttered.

Such is the case when CNBC's veteran anchor Maria Bartiromo made a routine observation about the status of the stock market on Wednesday, April 5, 2006.

Now after close to three years of ever more attention and dedication to achieving the objective, it wouldn't be out of the ordinary for a coalition partner to make a Freudian slip. Such was the case when Maria was giving her market summary as she always does just after her show begins broadcasting. At 1:07 p.m. PST she was reciting the closing numbers on the Dow Jones Industrial Average, the NASDAQ and S&P stock markets. When she got to the NASDAQ closing number, Instead of remarking that the NASDAQ closed at "2,360 even", she said the NASDAQ closed at "2,360 **evil**".

Then two weeks later:

Hollywood powerhouse Michael Douglas let it slip [on 'Leno'] he was subconsciously thinking about hypnotizing children.

Maria did it again on July 6th:

At 12:38, Maria made another slip when she remarked "been his Deputy, er, his heir apparent" in her discussion with a Goldman Sachs executive who was taking over from departing Hank Paulsen. Maria was referring subconsciously to the Canadian lawyer's appointment to the esteemed position of U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CNN's Lou Dobbs did it too:

At 3:43 p.m. PT on the Canadian lawyer's 49th birthday – April 23rd, 2007 – Lou generated another insight into what coalition partners are thinking about. He was talking about President Bush's policies and corrected himself after he implied the President believed the country belonged to him. After a slight fluster, "His country" was immediately corrected to "the country" – but the subconscious reference to the Canadian lawyer as 'custodian' was articulated. Lou then executed a quasi-Clooney and Erin Maneuver to confirm what everyone watching in the East-West corridor knew had just happened.

Senator John McCain: A Freudian Slip Revealing What Coalition Partners Think of the Mental Capacity and Development of Canada's Three Sub-Factions

During a live CNN feed of Senator McCain stumping in Michigan on January 12, 2008 he was signalled he'd just entered the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy. He was in the middle of a town hall meeting and had his train of thought disrupted with the signal to the point of immediately altering his thoughts to reflect upon what he and the coalition think of the mind-set of those who run Canada, who support them and who lead, organize and follow the dictates of the China-Canada alliance.

He wanted to use the phrase "young Americans". Instead he executed a Freudian slip and used the phrase "young children".

The veteran Senator was, of course, articulating the *Fiefdom* treatise revelation and my observations that Canada's political and economic leaders had devolved into pubescent psychopaths.

Revealing inner thoughts accidentally wasn't the exclusive domain of the coalition. The intense pressure brought to bear on the Chinada malfeasant delivered a remark that procured the same kind of rambunctious response observed in the British House of Commons. It came from a CBC news anchor chosen because she was able to maliciously high profile decades of intimacy isolation to advance the human experimentation program.

Should You Trust This Woman? -- Stunning, Articulate ... and Deadly

or

An Example of the Quality of Beauty Employed by Canada's Elite to Undermine Democracy and Capitalism

Canada's government owned national television station, CBC, moved into the anchor chair a stunning woman in early July 2007; and who became a daily East-West Corridor of Diplomacy fixture; and then shortly after uttering a death threat at the Canadian lawyer with the diplomatic lexicon she was pulled off the air.



Here was the paradigmatic example of that kind of attractiveness aggressively recruited by Canada's trans-generationally corrupt and the China-Canada alliance to advance its nefarious domestic and foreign policy interests and objectives.

From Lab Monkey to Popsicle: A Freudian Slip by Canada's Most Beautiful But Dangerous News Anchor

It was a Freudian slip as massively revealing as any committed by members of the coalition. During Sarika Sehgal's opening salutations on August 29, 2007, instead of stating about a CBC news item "We'll have a look at...", she said "We'll have a lick...". What was on her mind was obviously of a sexual nature and laughable in the extreme.

The Canadian immediately burst into laughter since it was ironic that he'd been turned into a lab monkey for two decades and deprived of intimacy and sexuality to advance the R&D and to torture him with loneliness.

Since China, human rights and government hegemony in other lands was at the center of coalition concerns and trepidations, it should be no surprise at who the partners recruited - arguably the biggest thorn in Beijing's side.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama: Repeatedly Condemning Chinada for the *Fiefdom* Indictment

On October 31st the Dalai Lama gave a lecture and entertained a Q&A during his visit to Canada. The telltale quick utilization of the diplomatic lexicon when first tuning in and thereafter geo-politicized remarks clearly tailored to condemn Canada's three sub-factions and Beijing proved yet again how Canada's leadership seeks to keep the country divided, uninformed, vulnerable and victimized.

His Holiness' mastery of the confidential language was as much in full view as it was impressive. Many of the recognized hypno-itch mimics were employed to give substance to his comments, observations and teachings.

His contributions to coalition interests and objectives spanned the spectrum:

- (i) many problems due to negative emotion [Preston M.; embellished Becky-Halle M];
- (ii) warm-heartedness [Cl.M.];
- (iii) actually feels the pains [CBS M.];
- (iv) love [Cl.M.];
- (v) plenty of sleep [Zeta-Jones M.: the isolation-deprivation issue];
- (vi) family planning we didn't encourage [in Tibet in the mid-century; Preston M.; the isolation-deprivation issue];
- (vii) **three** thousand acres, **three** thousand people [protracted Branson M.; acknowledgment of the coalition and his membership in it];

- (viii) that one problem [Cl.M.];
- (ix) in order to stop [problems with] some harsh words looks violence but not violence [Preston M.];
- (x) in '89 Tiananmen Square [Damon M.];
- (xi) Burma military junta [quasi-Execution M.];
- (xii) Follow non-violent way [Preston M.];
- (xiii) We have moral responsibility [Pfeiffer M.]

What was of extraordinary significance was his opening remarks to a question posed about using violence. He said that sometimes violence is justified.

What was demonstrative of his commendation of both Canada's governing clique and Beijing's Canada-resident *de facto* rulers was as follows. He ended his visit with the audience, there was a standing ovation and just before walking off stage he re-engaged the international audience with:

If you want to cheat more people [...] you will fail.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama Weighs in Again on China's Unconstitutional and Internationally Unlawful Involvement in Canada's Sovereign Affairs

His Holiness made his views on China's involvement in this country and Canada's vile paradigm of government known again ([Video](#)); this time while being interviewed by NBC. He employed the gun-to-the-head Richie-Santelli Maneuver to underscore what he thinks of China's track-record both in his country and ours:

Unfortunately, Chinese government [1:05: Richie-Santelli M.] carried easiest through method: suppression, killing, torture, arrest.

When leaders of coalition governments got together in the U.S. and Europe, these public appearances were always heavily geo-politicized. During German Chancellor Angela Merkel's joint press conference on March 14, 2009 with Prime Minister Brown, she employed the lexicon an exceptionally large number of times to generate communiqués:



[6:53: protracted Bl.M.] We did make good use of the time to discuss very important issues and to prepare for the challenges ahead this year. This is going to be a [Bl.M.] crucial year which will show whether we are actually able as an international community to cooperate [Bl.M.] and to meet these challenges or if we are not. The international financial crisis is calling for just that cooperation.

Translation: The Chancellor confirms she and the British Prime Minister discussed strategy, tactics and resource allocation to defeat the global spread of authoritarianism and effect institutional reform, personal accountability in Canada.

2009 is a critical year to address the Chinada problem and will demonstrate whether the civilized constituent of the world community can galvanize and synergize sufficiently to defeat this menace.

We are making our first steps in this direction; but now we [7:29: protracted Bl.M.] have to come up with substantive results. And I must say I am positive; I'm very optimistic that we will be able looking at your state of preparation that we will come to an agreement together with the United States, with emerging economies such as China and India and to come up with results that see to it that through new regulations, through new supervisory functions we [Bl.M.] we ward off such a crisis in the future and prevent them from occurring again.

And part in parcel of that is we [Bl.M.] have ... no places in the world, no players in the world that can in any way escape supervision.

Translation: It's not enough anymore to merely engage in diplomacy. It hasn't been efficacious except to put the malfeasant on notice what they will face for refusing to stand down their military posture, verifiably account for their Pandora's

Box of stealth cognition technologies and decouple Canada and other countries from China's global sphere of control and influence.

All indications are the coalition has competently executed the planning stage.

It's not enough anymore to simply deal with crises on a case-by-case basis. The international community must create organizations and strategies that will prevent the kind of global threat that faced it in the 20th century, i.e., Nazism and the Cold War.

[8:22: Bl.M.] I think that [transparency in tax havens] is a very good step forward in the right direction and I trust that before London we will see similar steps by other countries who follow suit.

[Bl.M.] In the European Union and worldwide we have -- all of us -- put together our packages to bring about a stimulus not only to our economies but also to the global economy.

Translation: The coalition has done its job in bringing transparency to the threat is, discovering who its principals and financiers are, what Chinada's networks comprise of and where throughout the world they operate.

Coalition partners have pooled political, economic, military and intelligence resources.

[8:58: protracted Bl.M.] As Gordon Brown has already spoke about that – those who need help through multilateral institutions will be given help.

Translation: Canada needs help in fundamental reform, viz. trans-generational corruption and China joint hegemony, and the international community's organizations are there to provide necessary resources.

[9:15: protracted Bl.M.] Through European facilities we have very much welcomed the [X] report. We will see to it that the conclusions drawn in the report will be implemented as quickly as possible.

Translation: The *Fiefdom* treatise is a valuable source of information; and its recommendation and blueprint for going forward will be put into practice as soon as it is practicable.

We want to be very serious in combating the fallout of the crisis; that we see to it that these large imbalances that we have today are [9:48: protracted Bl.M.] eradicated as best as possible. We will also lay down the principles we agreed on in a Charter as we suggested that's going to be on the agenda at the G20 meeting.

Translation: The Chinada threat must be challenged and defeated as soon and as comprehensively as possible.

It is valuable to author a *Charter* – an enunciation of principles, values and beliefs that underlay the purpose of the coalition; and it ought to include a fully articulated plan of action so that coalition partners have a guide to follow when confronting Chinada principals, operatives and circumstances.

It is crucial I believe for us to work so we come to a post-Kyoto agreement. And as regards to the financial crisis, as regards to the climate issue – that again is a [10:27: Bl.M.] very clear testimony that countries going it alone will not be able to sort problems of this magnitude; but the United Kingdom and Germany will act together and give their contributions to it.

Translation: The coalition is a most necessary institution that will be more effective in achieving stated objectives. Each partner ought to coordinate on all levels and in all matters with the whole so there is the least amount of resource, time and commitment overlap, each can take advantage of synergies that produce efficiencies and productivities and nobody's working at cross-purposes.

In the United States, for example, this whole pension system, this whole [15:13: Bl.M.] unemployment is far more cyclical...

Translation: The German government is committed to the objective of purging those from Canadian political and corporate office who are in violation of domestic and international law.

This Summit Meeting will yield concrete results; we'll also come up with very clear-cut regulatory progress; that was after all the starting point of our debate. And this builds on the Washington action plan [16:04: Brown: R-S M.].

Translation: The British government agrees with Washington's bi-partisan support for using lethal military force* if necessary.

Germany, as the United Kingdom, has [16:39: protracted B.I.M.] a facility like the World Bank to give impetus to infrastructure programs.

Translation: The German government will commit funds to help build a democratic infrastructure in Canada.

On April 4, 2009 the French President addressed the NATO membership:

French President Nicolas Sarkozy Geo-Politicizes NATO Remarks to Continue a Multi-Year Acknowledgement His Government's Coalition Partnership

The French leader indicated on July 20, 2007 he and his government had joined the coalition. Thereafter he proved to be regular contributor to the diplomacy archive – using as many opportunities as there were to reiterate and underscore his determination the coalition achieve stated objectives.

The NATO Summit that followed the G20 Summit was an opportunity for the French co-host to draw attention to an important principal of the military alliance, namely that it is a peace-seeking multilateral institution with a defensive posture. He said just that and linked it to the current conflict with Chinada in front of the entire membership:



[1:18: protracted O-S M.] The duties of the leaders of our two countries is to seek friendship between both our two peoples – the most precious treasure we have.

The foregoing, along with years of non-stop and most often coercive diplomacy, serves as the geo-political context to appreciate what was said during the May 18, 2009 press conference involving the new Israeli Prime Minister and the new U.S. President.

The communiqués generated were as follows:

- The Israeli government shares the same goal as all coalition partners to halt human experimentation, bring the principals to justice and fix the institutions that led to them becoming systemic;
- The ultimate objective is to ensure the peace, security and prosperity of the 21st century world;
- Stealth cognition technologies are the new WMDs and they must be eradicated;
- This is a major clash of civilizations – democracy vs. authoritarianism and Israel is going to do its part to help the coalition;
- Acknowledges coalition synergy and the fact its partners are in the process of changing political reality in Canada and around the world; and
- There is nothing inconsistent or contradictory in seeking peace and employing lethal military force to achieve stated objectives.



[Prime Minister: 0:01: Paulson M.; SNL M.]

PM: We share [7:58: Bl.M.] the same goal and we face the same threats. The [Bl.M.] common goal is peace. Everybody in Israel as in the United States [protracted Bl.M.] wants peace. The common threats we face are terrorist regimes and organizations that seek to undermine the peace and endanger both our peoples.

[...]

If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons [8:52: Bl.M.] it could give a nuclear umbrella to terrorists or worse could actually give nuclear weapons to terrorists. That would put us all in great peril.

[...]

[10:10: Clash of Civ. M.] We're ready to do our share if the Palestinians will do their share as well.

[...]

If those conditions are met [including Israel being able to defend itself] - security conditions are met [10:38: Bl.M.] - and there is recognition of Israel's legitimacy, its permanent legitimacy, then I think we can envision [we living] side by side in dignity, security and in peace [10:52: protracted Bl.M.]. And I look forward to working with you Mr. President. You're a true friend of Israel to the achievement of our common goals, which are security, prosperity and above all peace. [11:14: President: SNL M.; Paulson M.]

[...]

Q: Can you react to King Abdullah's statement [18:27: PM: Cl.M.]...

[...]

PM: [19:41: Bl.M.] We have ways to capitalize in the sense of urgency; and we're prepared to move with the President...

[...]

The thing we discussed, among other things, is how to buttress the Israeli- Palestinians peace track we want to resume right away with participation with others in the Arab world [20:06: protracted Clash of Civ. M.] how we give confidence to each other - that we're changing the reality - changing the reality on the ground, changing political realities top down as well; while [Bl.M.] we widen the circle of peace.

[...]

Pres.: [21:29: Bl.M.] It will not been easy. It never has been easy.

[...]

If you keep your eye on the long term goal [...] [then] we can make great progress [26:04: Cl.M.; Erin M.]

[...]

Let me say this [26:45: Gutierrez M.] there's no doubt it is difficult for any Israeli government to negotiate in a situation in which they feel under immediate threat...

[...]

PM: [30:04: protracted Bl.M.] We've had extraordinarily friendly and constructive talks here today and I am very grateful to you Mr. President for that. We want to move peace forward and ward off the great threats. [Bl.M.] There isn't a policy linkage - and that's what I hear the President is saying and what I'm saying too, and I've always said - there's not a policy link [Bl.M.] between pursuing simultaneously peace between Israel and the Palestinians and the rest of the Arab world and trying to deal with removing the threat of a nuclear Iran.

[...]

We see exactly eye-to-eye on this. We want to move [31:10: O-S M.] simultaneously and in parallel on two fronts - the front of peace and the front of preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear capability [Bl.M.]

[...]

I think we can [32:12: Clash of Civ. M.] come [to] a substantive solution that allows the two peoples to live side-by-side in security and peace. And I add prosperity [Bl.M.] because I'm a great believer in this.

[...]

[Ends with President dbi-h Rumsfeld M. @52:58]

How Coalition Partners Geo-Politicized the London G20 Summit

Prime Minister Brown & President Calderon

On March 31, 2009 the British and Mexican leaders held a joint press conference – one in which both employed the diplomatic lexicon to generate communiqués.

The global nature and strength of the coalition was in evidence during the press conference. Both used the lexicon to generate messages.



PM Brown: [1:12: Bl.M.] We can only meet these challenges that President Calderon and I've been discussing if we recognize the new realities of the global economy.

Translation: The Chinada threat is "the new realit[y]". While world leaders appear in public to be amicable, the aggressors press on with their foreign policy agenda unrelentingly and unapologetically and the defenders strategize, pool resources and amass intel for the day when aggressive action is collectively taken.

Pres Calderon: During this meeting we also talked briefly about the [8:40: T-W M.] international situation as the Prime Minister has already mentioned. And we have agreed, as he has already pointed out, in the regulation of the global financial situation through international bodies the need to foresee any other financial crises.

[...]

Just like the United Kingdom [9:42: T-W M.] Mexico has a commitment with the establishment of economic [regulation] in the world.

[...]

[11:06: Bl.M.] Mexico is part of this idea that all of the developed countries or not have to contribute with a global strategy...

Translation: The Mexican president confirms he and the British leader had the Chinada threat and reforming Canada on the agenda; and the continued the discussion that's been going on amongst threatened nations as to how to defeat China's ideological imperialism.

The government of Mexico is committed to coalition objectives and will use all its assets and resources to address the threat.

The Mexican president underscored the need for a multi-lateral approach to the Chinada problem and addressing Canada's political and economic dysfunctionalities.

PM Brown: We've got to look at banks and [14:39: Bl.M.] putting money into the economy; and we've got to look at what we're doing with trade. I think you'll find when the leaders are here for the G20 [14:47: Bl.M.] we will meet the **five** tests that I've set for the G20.

[...]

[19:08: Bl.M.] Mr. Obama and I are well aware and we are [Bl.M.] actively looking for the culprits.

Translation: The British leader underscores again that the way to end Canada's participation in China's imperialism is seizing the country's banks and turning them over to Custodian governance.

The British leader again ratifies the Canadian lawyer's entitlement to *quantum* for the pain and suffering he endured being an enslaved and tortured human experimentation victim and for economic loss as a result of his ventures and law practice.

The coalition has mobilized the most sophisticated intel collection and surveillance assets to hunt for all Chinada cells and operatives wherever they are in the world.

Question: We would like to ask you if you don't see a double discourse with regards to drug trafficking when the Secretary of State denies Mexico is a failed state [23:06: Calderon: SNL M.] and things like this.

Translation: The Mexican leader agrees with the *Fiefdom* treatise proposition that Canada is a failed and rogue state.

How Coalition Partners Geo-Politicized the London G20 Summit

Prime Minister Brown & President Obama

On April 1st, the two tenaciously resolved coalition partners held a lengthy joint press conference, and both employed the lexicon repeatedly to generate communiqués.

The diplomatic record has quickly grown since January 20th when the new U.S. President took office. He stated in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy he would

hit the geo-political ground running, and that's exactly what he's done. He wasted no time in confirming his desire to work with other world leaders in addressing the Chinada threat and fixing Canada's dysfunctionalities; and that commitment was observed during the protracted press conference hosted by the British PM the day before the start of the G20 Summit.



Pres Obama: What we have to understand is that's going to require some sort of regulatory framework to make sure it doesn't jump the rails. And that is something we are going to be able to put together [19:13: Brown: Pfeiffer M.].

Translation: The British leader indicates on behalf of the coalition for the first time its partners intend on instituting a legal infrastructure within the international community – a multilateral agreement – that prevents the kind of threat Chinada represents from occurring again.

PM Brown: You're going to see action [on a whole range of issues]. And of course it is difficult; of course it is complex. You have a large number of countries. But I'm very confident that people not only want to work together but we can agree on a common global plan for recovery and reform [27:03: Obama: Prince Harry M.]

Translation: Being hosted by the British government and not long before being in the company of Her Majesty, the President employed the relevant constituent of the diplomatic lexicon to red flag that the coalition has reach an agreement on how to address Chinada's imperialism.

Pres Obama: [27:36: protracted Soledad M.] We're in the worse crisis we've seen since the '30s – that governments are going to have to act. And certainly the United States does not intend to act alone.

Translation: The Chinada threat is a generational challenge much like the Cold War and each coalition partner is going to have to do its part to confront this threat to democracy, human rights and free market capitalism. And he asserts it is his policy to work within a multilateral framework of cooperation.

PM Brown: [31:21: O-S M.] The combination of all of this, as you will see when you get our communiqué tomorrow, is the most substantial fiscal stimulus – something in the order of \$2 trillion.

Translation: The British leader is drawing attention to the quickness of diplomacy documentation and uploading onto the website for the edification of original and new *Fiefdom* treatise recipients and coalition partners around the world who use the website as a means of staying informed and tapping into their community synergy.

Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu: Underscores the Use of Military Force to Achieve Stated Objectives and to Defend Against Stealth Cognition Technologies

The civilized world has become fully galvanized to synergistically protect the integrity of its institutions of democracy and capitalism and ensure citizens are not ravaged by pubescent sociopaths and serial human rights abusers on a deluded quest for more territory to conquer and millions of new victims with which to satisfy their uncontrollable desires for domination, schadenfreude and perversion.

Almost a year has elapsed since the Chinese secret police and military blatantly assassinated an innocent American and almost caused the same to his wife to tell the coalition in no uncertain terms Chinada imperialism cannot be contained and neutralized.

Israel's new and former Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, made his foreign policy clear on May 18, 2009 as was documented in *Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu: Generates Communiqués to Underscore Israel's Historic Interest in Militarized Human Experimentation*.

He again appeared in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy on June 15, 2009. During a CBS News interview, attired in prison certainty, justice and *quantum*, he employed the gesturing constituent of the lexicon several times to underscore the global support for coalition objectives; in particular the use of military force to procure change in Canada and to do what is necessary in

this major clash of civilizations to prevent the proliferation and use of stealth cognition technologies.

And second, the Palestinian state would be demilitarized; so we don't experience once again the hurling of thousands of rockets on our cities. And think this is an equitable formula for peace. It's [0:52: Bl.M.] one that enjoys enormous unity in the Israeli public and I think among Israelis' friends.

[...]

There are two questions about this: One is what is [3:00: Bl.M.] the military force that we face?

[...]

We have to make sure those weapons are not [3:26: Clash of Civ. M.] used against us.



[justice]

[View video](#)

On June 16th, 2009 the South Korean leader employed the lexicon in the presence of his U.S. counterpart to generate several communiqués – all going to the heart of the geo-political crisis:

- the proliferation of stealth cognition technologies is unacceptable and South Korea's government will do what is necessary to prevent this from occurring;
- the alliance between the U.S. and South Korea *viz.* the Chinada threat is firm and the imperialistic spread of principals, values, beliefs and practices inimical to democracy and capitalism will be successfully challenged;
- the diplomatic lexicon is an internationally recognized language; and
- rendition is an appropriate response to the Chinada threat.



[View video](#)

[28:47 runtime*]

* Sorkin China identifier and assassination reminder

Pres. Obama: Our friendship is often understandably focused on security issues; particularly in northeast Asia. But we're also committed to a sustained strategic partnership with the Republic of South Korea on the full range of global challenges that we're facing: from economic development to our support for democracy and human rights, from non-proliferation [4:46: Myung-Bak: C.I.M.] to counter terrorism and peacekeeping.

[...]

Pres. Myung-Bak: When [North Koreans] look at the firm alliance between our two countries they will think twice about taking any measures that they will regret. And again this very firm

alliance we have between the United States and Korea is going to prevent anything from happening; and of course North Korea may wish to do so. But [13:18: Kernan M.] of course they will not be allowed to do so.

[...]

We will not accept such [unreasonable] demands being laid out by the North Koreans. Whereas the South Korean government is very much for maintain the [X] industrial complex [16:13: Richie-Santelli M.] because the [X] complex is a channelled dialogue between the two Koreas.

[...]

The international community is asking the North Koreans to take that path [of releasing [two American journalists] and once again urge in the strongest terms that they release these two American journalists as well as the Korean worker being held [17:20: Cl.M.].

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu: Underscores Regime Change in Canada and Halting Stealth Cognition Technology Proliferation to Protect 21st Century Civilization

The civilized world has become fully galvanized to synergistically protect the integrity of its institutions of democracy and capitalism and ensure citizens are not ravaged by pubescent sociopaths and serial human rights abusers on a deluded quest for more territory to conquer and millions of new victims with which to satisfy their uncontrollable desires for domination, schadenfreude and perversion.

Israel's Prime Minister has been an outspoken proponent for the most aggressive action against the most serious threat to the peace, security and prosperity of the world since Hitler and the Soviet Union.

Coalition identifying prison certainty was articulated employing the diplomatic lexicon as the leader of the only nation that knows militarized human experimentation not from history books but existentially as a culture put it to Canada's political and corporate leaders and their Chinese partners that regime change and all other options remain on the table to achieve stated objectives. He also delivered the following communiqués during his NBC 'Meet the Press' interview the morning of June 21, 2009 – watched live in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy by its proprietor:

- Under no circumstances can there be a proliferation of stealth cognition technologies;
- All world leaders and others at the top levels of government share in an understanding of the Chinada threat and the need to contain and neutralize it completely;
- Not addressing stealth cognition technologies now would lead to what is parallel to an arms race, and what would emerge would be a tragedy for all of civilization;
- The Obama administration and the rest of government on the federal and state level is committed to coalition objectives;
- The malfeasant will be taken out of action because of a refusal to stand down their military posture;
- Canada and China's governance consists of a "brutal regime that sees no inhibitions in how it sees its own citizens and its purported enemies abroad" and thus the coalition can't allow the countries to have stealth cognition technologies or other militarized strategies that exploit the inherent weaknesses and vulnerabilities in democracy and capitalism; and
- Everyone in the world that cherishes democracy, rule of law and human rights and prosperity ought to unite behind the coalition.



[View video](#)

PM: Would a regime change [6:12: Bl.M.] be a game changer?

[...]

[President Obama] made it clear that engagement is not [6:51: Bl.M.] an end in itself. It is a means to an end. And the end has to be to prevent this regime from developing [Bl.M.] nuclear weapons capability. And [protracted Bl.M.] he said he would leave all options on the table. And I'd say if it was right before these demonstrations, well it's doubly right now.

[...]

I've talked to many of the European heads of government and many others [8:33: protracted Bl.M.]. We all don't want to see this regime acquire nuclear weapons - this regime that supports terrorists and [Bl.M.] calls for the annihilation of Israel [end] and for the domination of the Middle East and beyond. I think this is something that would endanger [protracted Bl.M.] the peace of the world; not just my own country's security and the stability of the Middle East.

It would [protracted Bl.M.] spawn for one thing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. Everybody understands that; that the Middle East could become a nuclear tinderbox. [Bl.M.] And that is something that is a very, very grave development.

[protracted Bl.M.] I think stopping Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability is not merely an interest of Israel, as I think the recent events -- the current events now demonstrate this is something of deep interest for all people who want peace and seek peace throughout the world.

Q: If the international community proves unable to stop Iran is it your view that Israel will have to?

PM: [9:31: protracted Bl.M.] It's my view there's an American commitment to make sure that that doesn't happen and I think that I'd leave it at that.

Q: But there is a precedent here. Israel took out a nuclear reactor [end] in Iraq [and then] Syria. That could be the case with regard to Iran, no?

PM: Well, I don't think I have to add to anything that I've said. We're -- [10:09: protracted Maria-Dana M.] the Jewish people have been one of the oldest nations in the world. We've been around for 3,500 years. We have been threatened like no other people have been threatened.

[...]

[11:30: protracted Bl.M.] The problem that now faces the entire world is to ask themselves the simple question: can we allow this brutal regime that sees no inhibitions in how it sees its own citizens and its purported enemies abroad, can we allow such a regime to acquire nuclear weapons? And the answer that we hear from far and wide is 'no'.

Q: There's just about **twenty** seconds before you go, there is concern...

[...]

PM: [Recognizing Israel and a demilitarized Palestine] I think is something that [12:27: Bl.M.] all people who want peace should unite around.

During the June 26, 2009 press conference involving President Obama and German Chancellor Merkel the following communiqués were delivered:

- the coalition's partners speak with one voice and are going to "stand together" and defeat this 21st century scourge;
- rendition is an appropriate option for Chinada principals and their most aggressive operatives; and
- there is strong emotion when it comes to repeats of militarized human experimentation.



[View video](#)

Ch. Merkel: We also know that now in this 21st century challenges cannot be met by one nation going it alone. So [7:04: Bl.M.] we need to stand together.

[...]

Pres. Obama: [The Iranian leader] might want to consider looking at the families of those who have been beaten or shot or detained [15:27: Merkel: NBC M.] and that's where I think [he] and others need to answer their questions.

[...]

As we clearly speak out in a unified voice in opposition to [21:44: Cl.M.-CBS M.] the violence that's taken place in Iraq,...

[...]

First of all, in terms of my emotional maps [28:22: CBS M.], the time's I've visited Germany have been extraordinary.

[...]

Ch. Merkel: I must say that I am very gratified to know that the President feels 100% committed to this issue which has been in all of our talks and he wants to see to it that [32:34: Bl.M.] Copenhagen becomes a success. We are both convinced that...

On February 22, 2010 the Dalai Lama enters the back-channel again:

Tibet's most powerful agent for mitigating the severity of Chinese governance has been a staunch supporter of coalition interests and objectives since October 2007. His contributions are documented and compiled in *His Holiness the Dalai Lama Weighs in Again on China's Unconstitutional and Internationally Unlawful Involvement in Canada's Sovereign Affairs* and *His Holiness the Dalai Lama: Acknowledges Coalition Membership While Receiving High American Human Rights Honor*

We are carrying various kinds of work for preservation for Tibetan culture, Tibetan Buddhist culture – things like that; and [Z-J M. X3] I also request help for more education of Tibetan children. Not only outside but inside Tibet.



In 2008, I publicly express [Z-J M.] now one of our efforts – one aspect of our efforts is bring improvement inside Tibet.



Some positive result is always there [...] improv[ing] not only children's body but also mind, but also intelligence. All of these things. So it is wonderful. [R-S M.] My only hope, my only prayer, is to spread this work everywhere and particularly I mentioned at our meeting yesterday morning, I mentioned ...



British Prime Minister Cameron: His First Geo-Communiqué as U.K. Leader – Lethal Military Force and Capital Punishment are on the Table of Options

The British Parliament's House of Commons, as an institution, was the recipient of a Geo Award because its membership advanced coalition interests and objectives in a most remarkable way.⁵ During that time one MP, the leader of the Conservative Party, authorized his colleagues to employ the lexicon to demonstrate that on both sides of the isle there was a commitment to advancing democracy, rule of law and human rights and containing its opposite. When the election elevated him to the role of PM he showed at his first opportunity he took his commitment with him to 10 Downing Street.

Behind enemy lines and in front of not just the world press, but also Canadian mainstream news agencies, the new British leader employed the lexicon in a manner that proved how committed he and his government are in addressing the Soviet-style threat posed by the Chinada malfeasant. He began his geo-remarks with acknowledging his coalition partnership and stating on the diplomatic record he's all for lethal military force and capital punishment.

His second salvo was to a question posed by a member of Canada's media; choosing the Clooney Maneuver to geo-underscore the word "target", which is what everyone in and linked to the Chinada High Command is for creating stealth cognition technologies and using them for the purposes of hypno-torture.

His third geo-remark involved quoting U.S. General Eisenhower; articulating how with the Chinada malfeasant proving to be an ever-increasing global menace and showing no signs of standing down despite all peaceful efforts to bring them round to being welcomed members of the international community, the coalition is going to have to step up its game and make the response even more mammoth and dramatic than was previous planned for to protect the 21st century from what threatens it. He chose the 'gun to the temple' Richie-Santelli Maneuver to drive home he fully supports the use of lethal military force and capital punishment.

What in part motivated him is documented in *Pushing the Hypno-Torture Envelop Again: Chinada's Malfeasant Mock the Coalition During the June 2010 G8-G20 Summits*.

I do think using technology and sport is a bonus. I'm a keen follower of cricket and tennis. I think the **third** umpire has been a great thing. [R-S M.] The machine's that bleep at Wimbledon are quite handy too; and maybe that's something in football we can have a look at.

⁵ For more see [Appendix 13](#) where geo-transcripts of many Prime Minister's Question Times are compiled



Q: Thank-you Prime Minister. David Akins from Sun Media in Ottawa. Welcome to Canada. I wonder if you could speak to the targets [Cameron: Cl.M.] on heavy deficits.



[...]

A: We'll be meeting those targets as others will. But as I say, actually, having specifics so people can hold our feet to the fire in terms of sorting out our fiscal situation in western European countries is a good thing.

[...]

Well, I think the problem – you’re absolutely right Larry; and I think it is supposedly is a [R-S M.] quite linked to Eisenhower, who said that when the problems are particularly intractable he liked to make them bigger to make them easier to solve. And I know that should be illogical. But the fact is where we are at the moment, we’re stuck. This isn’t progressing. And it doesn’t look like it is going to progress unless we do something different. And the discussion that we had was basically that we should look at enlarging the scale and ambition of the round.



British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: Confirms at a G8 Press Conference the Coalition’s Many Governments Are Working Towards Achieving Stated Objectives

It’s coming – as sure as the sun rises and sets, military procured covert regime change, the ‘Iron Fist’ accountability tribunal, employment termination, appointment revocation, asset seizure and life in prison are an undeniable and inescapable certainty. That was the general message delivered by the British PM during his final press conference of the G8 Summit.

PM Brown must feel the same way as all the other world leaders and the rest of the coalition membership. They’ve made every reasonable attempt to coax the Chinada leadership to the negotiating table, but were met with an unwavering commitment to global hegemony for what’s antithetical to democracy and keeping Canada the authoritarian piggy bank to fund that expansionism.

During his final press conference he employed the lexicon only once – to underscore the synergistic relationship between coalition partners in which resources and intel combined will lead to successful results.



Our strategy is also to share the burden with other countries that they too make troop contributions to Afghanistan. So this is a joint effort of more than forty countries. I believe we are making a larger contribution now, but [Bl.M.] I also believe that other countries and us together must ensure that the Afghan forces themselves are able to be strengthened. I think by the end of next year we'll have about one hundred thousand Afghan troops.

The Prime Minister's wife also chose to inject her views into the geo-political dimension of the Summit – posing in prison certainty, Presidential *quantum* and choreographing a hypno-torture and systemic corruption related Clooney Maneuver:



Geo-politics certainty makes for the strangest of bedfellows:

**Egyptian President Hosni Mubarek Announces Coalition Membership
and Generates Communiqués for East-West Corridor
of Diplomacy Consumption**

The East-West Corridor of Diplomacy is an equal opportunity environment. It's available to anyone who's either a partner of the coalition or has a public or private sector status and has something to contribute to the dialogue about containing China's threatening imperialism or fixing Canada's dysfunctionalities. That inclusiveness was in evidence on August 18, 2009 when the leader of an country that's as dictatorial as the come, but nonetheless a U.S. ally, stepped into the back-channel.

The critical importance and central nature of the diplomatic corridor in world affairs was again evident when two world leaders met at the White House on and the U.S. President's guest repeatedly employed the lexicon to send messages through the trusted conduit to the other side of the historic conflict.

There's a long history to this adage or axiom:

"Politics makes strange bedfellows" Charles Dudley Warner (American Editor and Author, 1829-1900)

The Doolittle raspberries have sprawled all over the strawberry-beds: so true is it that politics makes strange bed-fellows [1870 C. D. Warner My Summer in Garden (1871) 187]

Party politics, like poverty, bring men 'acquainted with strange bedfellows' [1839 P. Hone Diary 9 July (1927) I. 404]

Ashley Wilkes and I are mainly responsible. Platitudinously but truly, politics make strange bedfellows [1936 M. Mitchell Gone with Wind lviii.]

Politics makes strange bedfellows, if Mr. Hyde will forgive the unforgivable but irresistible metaphor [1995 Washington Times 31 Mar. A4]

Even enemies have something in common. Statecraft produces strange bedfellows [1980 P. Van greenaway Dissident vii.]

The archive entry title could well have been what it was in the *Fiefdom* treatise when a world leader announced his or her government's membership in the globally-expanding coalition: *The World Just Got a Little Smaller*. This

series of diplomacy documentations captured the essence of what former President Bush and his inner core sought to achieve beginning in mid-2006 – creating an ever tinier geographical area of the planet that the China-Canada military alliance could operate clandestinely, employing its global hegemony advancing bag of dirty and evil tricks to expand the area in which its vile political and corporate policies and practices operated. The Bush plan, fully embraced by the Obama administration, was to create a world – including both the civilized and civilizing portions – cognizant of what Chinada principals were up to so that national and multilateral safeguards could be conceived and implemented.

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak made it unequivocally evident when engaging in a joint press conference with his U.S. counterpart he'd become a coalition partner* and fully committed to protecting the interests of the global community of democracy, rule of law and human rights advocates and attaining stated objectives.

* Date of membership is not necessarily linked to date of announcement. Many world leaders and multi-national corporate boards joined and never announced or postponed it until it was convenient or opportune to do so.

The aggressiveness of the Egyptian leader in using the diplomatic lexicon from beginning to end is testament to how much he wanted to be included as a committed partner. It is trite to state membership entails agreeing with all intel on the true nature of Canadian governance and the Chinada threat and projections for the 21st century if the former isn't reformed and the latter goes unchecked.

The specific communiqués were:

- He is an announced member of the global coalition committed to fixing Canada's dysfunctionalities and containing and neutralizing the Chinada threat;
- The threat impacts the Muslim and Islamic world as much as it does the West;
- General parallels are to be drawn with Iran and its WMD program – stealth cognition technologies pose a much more serious threat because the Chinada threat is global in nature;
- All matters were thoroughly canvassed and discussed frankly by him and the U.S. President;
- Issues of reforming Canada's dysfunctional public, quasi-public and private sector constituents were specifically discussed;
- Egypt is cooperating with the U.S. as a strategic partner in the battle against the China-Canada military alliance;
- The Chinada threat is a pivotal issue of the times;
- It is an appropriate goal to bring the coalition and Chinada leaders together and negotiate a peaceful settlement of differences;

- The issues to be resolved are complicated and both sides ought to expect the negotiation process to be difficult and wrought with set-backs and significant compromises; and
- The negotiations ought to aim for a final solution, not temporary measures.

President Obama took his cue from what his guest was saying on the geo-political plane and agreed that settlement negotiations will involve complications.

One can reasonably read into that shared position what negotiating will involve: a firm commitment to the principles of democracy, rule of law and human rights. Consequently, a final solution both sides of the conflict can feel comfortable with is unlikely. The malfasant, who aren't modifying their medieval political culture to conform with modern values (i) are hoping to exploit tens of trillions of Canadian oil dollars and the Chinese money making machine of an economy to fund the global hegemony drive, (ii) have developed a fully operational Pandora's Box of technologies, strategies and tactics, including stealth cognition technologies, they believe leaves their opponents defenseless and (iii) are patient because China is an up-and-coming and unstoppable military and economic superpower which mid-century will surpass the United States and its allies combined in strength and prowess.



[3:57: Bl.M.] First of all this is the **third** time I meet with President Obama.

[...]

[4:37: Bl.M.] The importance of the Cairo visit was very appreciated by the Muslim and Islamic world ...

[...]

[5:51: Bl.M.] The third time I meet with President Obama is here today at the White House. We discussed an array of issues [7:01: (during translation) Erin M.].

[...]

[6:27: Bl.M.] We discussed the issue of reform inside Egypt.

[...]

[7:34: Bl.M.] Our relations between us and the United States are very good relations and strategic relations.

[...]

[8:13: protracted Bl.M.] We have focused greatly on the Palestinian issue because it is the pivotal issue.

[8:29: Bl.M.] The Palestinian issue has an impact on the world, on the region, whether for the West or for the United States.

[...]

[8:46: Bl.M.] We have also discussed the issue of Iran and the issue of a nuclear Iran and we discussed these issues very frankly.

In the conclusion of my remarks I would like to [9:04: Bl.M.] thank President Obama for his welcome here at the White House and I also salute him.

[14:02, 14:17, 14:33, 14:57: Bl.M.s] I would like to add what President Obama has just said – that I'm working to bring the two parties to sit together and to get something from the Israeli party [15:29: (during translation) CBS-Cl.M.] and get something from the Palestinian party. If we can perhaps get them to sit together it would help. And also I have contacts with the Israeli party. [...] The two parties have to sit together and this will give hope and there is a possibility of finding a solution to [15:58: Staul M.] to the Palestinian issue [protracted Bl.M.] because it has been on-going [for] sixty years and with this issue on-going we lose a lot. And also this will increase violence. So we support efforts by the United States to move towards finding a solution.

[16:17, 16:29, 16:38: protracted Bl.M.] If this is the issue of Jerusalem you are asking about I take it this is a complicated issue. [During] President Clinton's era we almost neared finding a solution to this issue. But afterwards ... there was nothing and the issue moved very slowly. However, if we can find some solution to this [17:17: Erin M.; Bl.M.]...

[...]

[18:21, 18:27, 18:41, 19:14: Bl.M.s] As I said before, this is a complicated issue. I have worked a long time ago when I was in the army. [...] This issue has been on-going sixty years. And we can't afford wasting more time because violence will increase and violence has increased - the level of violence was much more than it was ten years ago. So we need to move to the final solution and level. [...] [I said to the Israelis] "Forget about the temporary solutions [20:08: (during translation) Erin M.] and forget about temporary borders.

[...]

The final negotiations will not be easy. There will be a lot of complications [20:34: Obama: Pacino M. X2; Cl-Z-J M.; Pacino M.]

[...]

This issue contains the issue of Jerusalem, the issue of [X], the issues of the borders [20:59: Obama: Harriet M. X5]

His Holiness the Dalai Lama: Acknowledges Coalition Membership While Receiving High American Human Rights Honor

While hearing a speech by House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi about him being the recipient of the inaugural Lantos Foundation for Human Rights and Justice award and her referencing China, His Holiness* was signalled he was being filmed; who then executed a coalition identifying **triple** Clooney Maneuver [@ 44:24] to confirm his membership and opposition to what the Beijing leadership is doing in Canada and around the world.

And then during the reading of the citation he employed the lexicon again to acknowledge what is known about Custodian Chief Executive throughout the world:

He has advanced the cause of human rights in every corner of the globe [46:57: Dalia Lama: Preston M.; Aussie M.]

German Chancellor Angela Merkel Addresses Joint Session of Congress: Extends an Invitation to the Custodian Chief Executive to Visit Germany

When Germany's political leader was in Washington for her on November 3, 2009 address to a Joint Session of Congress, she stopped in for an Oval Office chat.

President: [1:26] Chancellor Merkel ... grew up in East Germany; who understands what it's like to be under the shadow of a dictatorial regime and to see how freedom has bloomed in Germany.

[...]

Ch. Merkel: I wanted to use this opportunity today also to express our gratitude [7:56: Bl.M.], my gratitude, to the American people.

[...]

President: Consistently I found Chancellor Merkel to be thoughtful, energetic and to have a strong vision on how we can move forward in the future. [3:22: Merkel: Bl.M.] So, I am very pleased to be working with her as a partner.



[Blair Maneuver]

Her speech to the Joint Session of Congress was peppered with the use of the lexicon to generate communiqués. They are:

- The Custodian Chief will build a free and democratic Canada;
- The dignity of the individual is inviolable and those who violate this principle will be held to account;
- He experienced the horrors of Canada under authoritarianism;

- He is going to travel to the United States to meet with the President and other political leaders and members of the business community and to engage in that which interests him;
- She relied on the *Fiefdom* treatise to gain a full understanding of the true nature of Canadian governance and world affairs relating to China;
- She is passionate about the coalition's cause;
- The German people owe a debt of gratitude to him for what he's done to further the cause of freedom in the world;
- Canada's current political and economic leaders have by their actions and omissions shut themselves off from the rest of the world;
- The coalition's membership have a shared set of interests and common global challenges as it relates to the Chinada threat; and
- NATO's membership is committed to develop and adapt to meet the challenge of addressing the Chinada threat.



[View video](#)

[Bl.M.] After the war [my father] was one of the men and women who built the free and democratic republic of Germany.

[...]

[Bl.M.] Article 1 of the basic law reads as follows and I quote "the dignity of man is inviolable". This short and simple sentence – the dignity of man is inviolable – [Biden: q-Costello M.] was the response to the catastrophe [Biden: Paulson M.] of the Second World War.

[...]

[Bl.M.] There is one guest in the audience today who personally experienced the horrors of Germany under National Socialism and whom I got to know personally some time ago.

[...]

[Bl.M.] In my wildest dreams I would not have thought this possible twenty years ago before the fall of the Wall. For at the time it was beyond my imagination to ever even travel to the United States, let alone stand here before you one day.

[...]

The wall, barbed wire and the order to shoot [Biden: Z-J M. X2] at those who tried to leave limited my access to the free world. Therefore [Bl.M.] I had to rely on films and books ... to gain an impression of the United States.

[...]

I was passionate about the American dream. [...] [Bl.M.] And like many other teenagers I was passionate about jeans of a particular brand that you could not get in the GDR.

[...]

[Bl.M.] I think of John F. Kennedy who won the hearts of the Berliners during his visit in 1961 after the Wall had been built. He reached out to the desperate citizens of Berlin.

[...]

[Bl.M.] To [President Bush I] we owe a debt of gratitude. Ladies and gentlemen, to put it in just one sentence: I know – we Germans know how much we owe to you, our American friends; and we shall never – I shall personally never ever forget this.

[...]

[Bl.M.] The common quest for freedom released incredible forces all over Europe.

[...]

Ladies and gentlemen [Bl.M.] twenty years have gone by since we were given this incredible gift of freedom.

[...]

[Globalization] forces each of us to work together with others. [Bl.M.] The alternative to globalization would mean shutting ourselves off against others. But instead of being a viable alternative this would only lead into isolation [Pelosi: Diaz M.] and misery [Z-J M.].

[...]

For what brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them together is not only a common history; what brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them there are [Bl.M.] shared interests and common global challenges which exist among all regions of the world.

[...]

[dbl-h O-S M.] There is more to it [that makes the partnership last]. What brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them close is a common bases of shared values. It is the common idea of the individual and its inalienable dignity. It's a common understanding of freedom and responsibility. This is what we stand up for in this unique trans-Atlantic partnership and in this community of shared values that is NATO.

[...]

Even after the end of the Cold War therefore what is important is to see to it that we tear down walls in the minds of people [O-S M.] – walls that separate different concepts of life that make it difficult time and again [O-S M.] to understand each other all over the world. And that is why the ability to show tolerance to each other is so important. [Biden: Eva M.] [...] Others do not necessarily feel that way [Bl.M.] or think that way.

[...]

There must be zero tolerance for those who show no respect for the inalienable rights of the individual and who violate human rights.

[...]

The security of the State of Israel is for me non-negotiable now and forever. [Pelosi: q-Cl.M.]

[...]

There is no doubt that NATO is and remains the crucial cornerstone of our security. Its security concept is [Bl.M.] continuously further developed and adapted to meet the [O.S M.] challenges of the day.

[...]

Europeans are currently working on giving a new contractual basis to our European Union. The last signature has been [Biden: dbl-h Michaels M.; dbl-h SNL M.] just put on this document.

[...]

[Bl.M.] We can build stable partnerships on this sound basis with Russia, China and India.

[...]

[O-S M.] In a way, there's a second wall that needs to fall – a wall standing in the way of a truly global economic order.

[...]

[There is another] wall that seemingly separates us from the future. This wall bars from view for future generations and prevents us from doing what is urgently necessary to [Bl.M.] preserve the basis of our very life and climate.

French President Sarkozy: Acknowledges Custodian Chief Executive Election, Assures the Coalition Will Follow Through on All Offers and Promises and Dozens More Communiqués

While everyone in the world of international diplomacy is cognizant of the fact that achieving results is a slow, arduous and frustrating process, within that expectation is the principle that there must always be forward movement towards completing the project. When there appears to be unacceptable foot-dragging by one or more parties, the organic checks and balances one observes in large organizations reveals itself – which is exactly what happened when the French President went to Washington at the end of March 2010.

The diplomacy that seeks to contain China and fix Canada finds its genesis in the spring of 2003 when contact was first made with the Custodian Chief. In 2004, 'Dogville' and 'The Manchurian Candidate' informed the geo-discourse – the militarization of 'mind control' leads to lethal consequences for the Chinada High Command. Not only was this warning ignored, the malfasant's first official act to thumb their noses at the original members of the coalition was to try and have the Canadian lawyer involuntarily incarcerated in a mental institution.

When everything that was attempted during 2006 to compel capitulation having failed and the hypnosis R&D envelop was being pushed and advances were being used to ever-increasingly torture the Canadian in full view of the then U.S.-British-Australian coalition, membership exploded. With thousands around the world now fully committed to achieving stated objectives and non-stop producing diplomatic content, there was a reasonable expectation breakthroughs were imminent. That proved to be an inaccurate prediction.

When President Obama took office in January '09, there was a renewed sense of optimism that where his predecessor failed to act decisively, he would. The same signals from the White House that hitherto indicated George W. Bush would move

against the authoritarian imperialists were being observed almost daily from the new administration. However, a year later it was evident that nothing concrete was being done – that the same methodology of ‘all talk and no action’ engagement was being used. Threats of covert regime change, employment termination, asset seizure and prosecution leading to life in prison were still being laughed at by the Chinada malfeasant; and in that environment the hypnosis envelop was still being pushed, and the Canadian being the victim of evermore painful torture.

Who wouldn’t wonder if the concerns, trepidations and repeatedly expressed intentions of the coalition are but hot air, with no plan of action against an insidious threat that “puts the gains made by democracy, rule of law and human rights in the 20th century in serious peril”, to quote the *Fiefdom* treatise. Where is the sense of imminent danger about imperialistic success that gripped the second half of the last century? Why have those with the most to lose appear on the evidence to have become so complacent? Isn’t proof of what occurred in Canada and especially to the Canadian sufficient to demonstrate what’s coming to civilization? First it was institutionalized and militarized enslaving and torturous human experimentation, combined with economy monopolization, wealth plundering and economic genocide; then it was hypno-rape; then there was the Beijing Olympics assassination of an innocent; and then it was the gruesome use of stealth cognition technologies on the 60th anniversary of Chinese communism.

This is the context with which to understand what President Sarkozy said and why when speaking at considerable length at a world leaders symposium in New York hosted by Columbia University on March 29, 2010. He’s been a very committed and outspoken coalition partner since he joined in July 2007.

During the forty-six minute CSPAN broadcast of the speech and Q&A that followed the French leader employed the lexicon fifty times – *fifty times*. These are the communiqués he generated:

- It is critical that the United States and the European Union’s membership work collaboratively, and with the rest of the coalition, to challenge Chinada’s imperialism;
- Because the U.S. is the only military and economic superpower, it is essential its leadership in the public and private sector not only reflect on what that status entails in terms of the peace, security and prosperity of the world, but also out to listen to what other coalition partners are saying when coalition interests are involved and there are concerns and disagreements;
- Because the 21st^t century poses new challenges, like Chinada’s imperialism that’s based on economic expansionism not military, coalition leaders must formulate new strategies;
- The Custodian Chief was elected at the April ‘09 London G20 Summit;
- Chinada’s imperialism is proving to be “disastrous” in places other than Canada and lethal force is required to stem the tide;
- The seizure of assets – those gained by unlawful means – is one way to address the problem;

- The U.S. President is encouraged to employ lethal force to achieve stated objectives;
- In the wake of Chinada control and influence is so much injustice, it is imperative that this imperialism be contained and neutralized;
- There is always dialogue between coalition leaders on the problem;
- If the U.S. steps up, the victory over the 21st century's first instance of imperialistic authoritarianism will be successful;
- The 21st century's successes must not be gauged merely by the generation of wealth; it must be evaluated through protecting the lives and liberties of people;
- The coalition has committed itself to stated objectives and they will be achieved;
- The French government ratifies the Custodian Chief's historic damages;
- The coalition must show resolve and firmness against the Chinada High Command; and it must not be permitted to continue possessing and researching stealth cognition technologies;
- The U.S. "must never turn [its] back on the rest of the world and look inwards", deciding how to deal with the Chinada threat only by what it deems important to its national and economic security interests; doing so puts the world at risk of not being able to challenge this imperialism; just because it may feel constrained because it's so indebted to China doesn't mean it should put the rest of the world at risk;
- The French government is the true friend of the coalition., the Custodian Chief and Canada and will do everything it can to achieve stated objectives;
- Freedom and equality are essential elements of every society and it is seriously lacking in Canada requiring the intervention of the coalition to institutionally rectify the unlawfulness and dysfunctionalities;
- The Custodian Chief is the internationally and constitutionally recognized leader of Canada;
- Changing the *status quo* is difficult, it's worrisome for those who have much to lose, but it is the duty of anyone who views themselves as a statesman and stateswoman to undertake it when it is necessary; they are judged on results;
- Reform in Canada is going to be expensive; and the coalition has assets to dedicate and there is repatriated wealth that will be used to achieve stated objectives;
- Anyone who stands in the way of coalition military forces when seeking to arrest for prosecution the malfeasant will suffer casualties and end up in hospital;
- A lot of discussion and debate has gone into how to contain China and fix Canada; and that's to be expected given how many partners there are in the coalition;
- Make no mistake there is a war on – it may be a non-conventional kind, involving economics and not military, but it is still a major conflict in which only one side can win at the end of the day;
- Attacking one partner country is an attack on all countries – what the United Nation's *Charter* articulates;

- The French government wants to see an end to coalition foot-dragging as doing so emboldens and strengthens the Chinada High Command;
- With China threatening the world order as it exists today, this is a good time to reflect on and have discussions about what it should look like and how it should operate going forward;
- *The Last Democratic Fiefdom* contains the blueprint for reforming Canada.



[Video stills of all his Olmert-Spielberg Maneuvers, O-S M.s, omitted]

Europe [1:12: O-S M.] and the United States of America must – must – work together. In Europe, we are your European friends. We in Europe admire you. You need not worry about that. However, in Europe what we want is to be heard – to be listened to by the United States of America. We should put our heads together and think. You belong to a country that is the world's number one power; with the strongest currency; with the strongest economy; and the largest army. [2:00: O-S M.] And you have to think about this very carefully. Because what does that mean to be the world's number one power? The world's number one power - leading power - must precisely be that: a leader. [2:19: O-S M.] But the world's number one power must consider because it is powerful that it must share, it must listen; it must discuss; it must exchange ideas and views with others.

At the end of the Second World War one could imagine a [3:02: O-S M.] single world power. But in the 21st century we must all of us understand [Branson M.] that to rule the world – to govern the world rather – which is

now a multi-polar world - one has to accept that strength and power means dialogue. It means that because you are strong you can enter into dialogue. In the history of the world it is only the weak that have turned their backs on dialogue.



Now there is a second thing of which I am totally certain: and that [3:36: O-S M.] in the 21st century we must come up with new answers. And it is new answers -- it is we, the heads of state and government leaders of today [O-S M.] and you the leaders of tomorrow who have to design, have to come up with them.

[...]

And that is the reason why I'm here – that I have come to the States. And that is the reason that has governed all my political choices since [5:16: Sarkozy M.] I was elected the President of the French Republic.



What you have to realize is that the knock-on effect was not only felt in the United States but the knock-on effect was disastrous elsewhere in the world [6:41: R-S M.]; everywhere else in the world.



You can't have the bonuses one day and say no claw back if there's a problem. [8:24: Sarkozy-Kernan-Powell M.] When the crisis fell upon us I asked my own team – my advisors – couldn't we have some kind of claw back system in order to sanction those who [Branson M.] brought us to the brink of disaster.



The market needs responsibility. You can't have people responsible when things are going well and you're earning more and no responsibility when things are going badly and you're earning less. [9:26: R-S M.] And I would like to pay tribute to the courage, the boldness, of President Obama. At the London G20 Summit we wanted to put an end to...



The market economy, [1054: O-S M.] free trade, when there's so much injustice [O-S M.]. I don't think so because it is impossible to defend. Now tomorrow I'll be seeing President Obama. What am I going to be talking about to him [11:08: O-S M.]? What are we going to talk about together? One thing principally and primarily..

[...]

And from that point of view [regulating the world economy] if Europe can be backed by the United States then [12:32: Cl.M.] we will win. If Europe and the United States are in confrontation on this then we'll lose - both of us together. It's only when Europe and the United States together can redesign, invent the new world economy. Now, [12:45: Branson-George W. M.] another example -- a second example I'd like to share with you.



...because we're in the 21st century, which is a very different sort of century [than] the 20th century [14:58: Sarkozy M.]. What we have to gauge and measure is well-being, education, the costs of our environment. These are the criteria we have to weave in to the way we measure and gauge our economies. If we measure our economies exclusively in [15:14: Cl.M.]

quantitative terms and with quantitative criteria then we'll be incapable of availing ourselves of a quality economy worldwide.



[15:49: Cl.M.] We have committed to a production economy, not a speculative economy.



As French president I was a member of the G8. Well I say, 'well, the G8, hmm, so what'. It's difficult to imagine that it actually represents much; because there's not China, [21:19: Sarkozy M.] there's not India; there's not Mexico, there's no South Africa. 'Well, it doesn't matter; we invite them at the end of the G8 Summit for lunch. We were inviting the five [21:36: O-S M.] representatives of 2.5 billion inhabitants of the world to travel across the world to simply have lunch with us?



If we don't change world governance, we don't stand a chance or responding to and managing tomorrow's conflicts. For Iran, where we have to show [22:26: O-S M.] total firmness; that must not [Sarkozy M.] be allowed to get its hands on nuclear weapons.



[25:37: O-S M.] I truly believe you must never turn your back on the rest of the world and look inwards. The world [O-S M.] needs an open America; a generous America. An America that shows the way; that is attune to the suffering and expectations of others. You are much loved throughout the world. But there are many expectations of you. And sometimes when you

are less loved, it is because our expectations are so great that we have the sense that we are a little disappointed. [...] [I]n this world of ours, this world of the 21st century we cannot have the world's number one power not being open to the rest of the world. The world does not stop at the east coast nor at the west coast. So there -- please take this message from the French President who [27:27: Soledad M.] is your true friend; who admires you and loves the United States of America.

[...]

The first thing we're going to look at in terms of what we admire about U.S. universities] is your autonomous status. That is the most important. For me, a university is a place of freedom. The wealth of universities is precisely based on the freedom therein. [28:34: Cl.M.]



The research programs at Columbia. I looked. It's your board, and your scientists that lay these down. It is not up to the state to define the contents of research programs. What was France's problem from that point of view? [29:13: O-S M.] It's, I think, we misunderstood the word 'equality'. Equality does not equate with uniformity. Equality is tailored to the merits and needs of each and every one.

[...]

I'm fed up when I see places like this exist only in the United States. I have in my delegation some major French scientists, ah, [30:02: Eva M.] heads of big, top-ranking schools and colleges.



Change is always difficult, you know. It worries [31:11: O-S M.]. It goes against habit. But the duty of a statesman is to pursue change when change is necessary. [...] [As politicians] [31:53: O-S M.] we should be judged on results and what we produce.

[...]

Of course [health care reform is] difficult; of course [33:46: Cl.M.] its expensive. Because health care is expensive. But you can't let people simply die. The government can't simply turn its back on those who don't have the means to go to hospital [34:00: Cl.M.]. I don't want to get too involved.



Q: Mr. President, how do you see the role of Europe given the present economic difficulties? What way do you see out of it?

A: [36:04: Cl.M.] Well, this has been one helluva debate. And it took a lot of our time with Chancellor Merkel in particular. Chancellor Merkel -- I know that people don't [36:21: Cl.M.] always understand how Europe works; and people get irritated [SNL M.] with the way we go about things.



But do you realize that Europe is twenty-seven countries; twenty-seven [dbl-h O-S M.] member states. Twenty-seven countries who for centuries were at each other's throats; at war with one another; hated one another. Between the French and the Germans -- three wars [36:43: Cl.M.]. Between the British and the French; [smiles] I won't even go down that one.



Now within the twenty-seven countries, sixteen - sixteen countries, who decided – are you listening carefully – that we would have the same currency; the same currency? And when Greece came under attack – the case I put to my colleagues – was not that it was Greece was coming under attack [37:40: O-S M.] but the Euro, our currency. That's what we had to show solidarity [over].

[...]

And that solidarity is essential. It's a sine qua non. The last time I spoke to President Obama, it was just last week over the phone, because we have a video conference with [39:09: Powell M.] Gordon Brown, Chancellor Merkel, President Obama and myself once a month...

[...]

Q: If the developing world is to have its voice heard ... what sort of framework do you envision for that to become the case?

A: [40:39: Cl.M.; dbl-f Gutierrez M.] Well, for me it's a simple system.



My aim – my ambition [42:28: Maria M.] is to fast-track this [reform of the security council] when France is in the presidency of the G20 and G8.

[...]

I'm calling for the establishment of a new international, world monetary system. We cannot continue as we are. In 1945 you had the Marshall Plan; Brettenwood's a few kilometers away from New York. And for a year they sat down [43:03: Cl.M.] and thought about [Gutierrez M.] what the world monetary order would be up to the end of the '70s where there was un-pegging from the dollar.



You know, between the Euro and the dollar [43:56: Gutierrez M.], when we launched the Euro ten years ago - some ten years ago now, there was parity - one dollar was one Euro. [...] In a matter of a fortnight to three weeks the Euro moved from 1.50 to 1.33. Today, who can understand that? Who can

accept that? I mean, how can we still operate under Brettenwoods as designed sixty years ago. Or is it not in our interests to stop and think about a new international [44:41: Gutierrez M.] -- world international monetary order. That is a fascinating discussion which I will push forward when we are in the presidency of the G20 and something which I will be talking about with President Obama.



[What we decide today is] going to shape the world in which you'll be living. And that you will not build and design by simply reading in the books [45:18: R-S M.] that lay out the theories of the 19th century; but by coming up with the ideas that we need for the 21st century.



The next day, March 30th, the French and U.S. presidents held a joint press conference. When the former was the head of the European Union from July 2008

through December 2008 and afterwards, he pushed hard to get consensus on how to deal with the Chinada threat. And that tenacious resolve to achieve stated objectives continues to be so much so that during the White House press conference he used all his skills and the power of his oratory from the day before the United States to impress upon his host that the United States must take a leading role and do more to challenge the 21st century menace.

He was so aggressive in the use of the lexicon the CSPAN director began to cut to a different camera angle to protect coalition confidentiality.

Frustrated that, for example, the Custodian Chief's invitation hadn't yet materialized and no concrete steps have yet been taken to achieve what's been articulated in the diplomatic corridor for years, the French leader assured the coalition's April '09 elected choice for interim Canadian political leader that all offers and promises will be kept.

The communiqués delivered by Canada's French liberator were:

- The Chinada High Command can fully anticipate to be ousted from political and corporate office; and we won't feel sorrow if those who take up arms to repel internationally lawful action in Canada lose their lives;
- It is critical to follow through with the objectives of containing China and fixing Canada; for not to do so would cost civilization in terms of security and prosperity given the nature of authoritarian principles and values;
- Coalition confidentiality is critical now and in the future;
- Where there is a divergence from the path to coalition success and where offers and promises are made by a coalition leader and not kept within a reasonable time, others will step forward to ensure they are;
- The Chinada threat and what Canada poses in terms of U.S. national and economic security and what else it jeopardizes in the world are matters that are constantly discussed by world leaders; and
- President Obama: he has confidence in his Secretary of Defense and military commanders to conduct the necessary due diligence, including intel collection, and plan and strategize implementing a course of action that will successfully deliver covert regime change in Canada.

[The people of Afghanistan] are entitled to live in freedom. Of course, the road is arduous; of course [9:17: O-S M.] nothing can be anticipated. And [O-S M.] of course we are so sorrowful for the loss of young lives. But we have to have the courage to go to the [O-S M.] end of our strategy and explain there is no alternative for us. [Powell M.] To quit would be too high a price for our security of Americans, the French and Europeans.



[12:14: Pfeiffer M.] And insofar as the President has revealed the secret, namely where I had lunch today, I should say I that have a good friend in Washington who could actually recommend that restaurant.



[17:38: Cl.M.] I think on behalf of Chancellor Merkel or Gordon Brown and other leaders, well because President Obama – when he says something, he keeps his word. His word is his bond; and that is so important. There's a joke among us: we don't like surprises. Well, from that point of view there are no surprises. When he can he delivers. When he can't he says so. So there are no surprises; and we try to be likewise.



We're constantly talking about it [18:25: Branson M.]. It's even President Obama who wanted us to have a conference call virtually every month with Angela Merkel and Gordon Brown. [...] Everything can be discussed. What matters, you see, is not whether we agree, symptomatically before we've even [18:53: O-S M.] discussed something. That's suspicious.



We're constantly having a dialogue. I can give you an example of something on which we don't necessarily agree - Syria; or we didn't agree. France took an initiative, as you know. Well, I'll say this to you: at no point, no point has President Obama [19:55: O-S M.] turned his back on what we were doing. Constantly he's watching; he's listening; we're constantly exchanging information on the subject - even when there are complex topics like our relations with the Russians.



President Obama:

The [air tanker contract evaluation] will be free; it will be fair. And that the trust is justified. Now, [22:57: O-S M.] it's important for my European friends to understand that at least here the Secretary of Defense makes procurement decisions. The President does not meddle in these decisions; and that's a long-standing policy.



Mexican President Felipe Calderon: Re-Affirms Commitment to Coalition Objectives

The global growth of the coalition beginning in mid-2006 was remarkable to observe. From the United States' public and private sector and Great Britain and Australia to what is now three dozen plus governments, over 150 of the world's largest corporations and hundreds upon hundreds of the most successful, wealthy and high profile. Whenever they have an opportunity they employ the lexicon to red flag a remark or a series of them to keep the pressure on the Chinada High Command. On May 19, 2010 the Mexican President did just that once again.

In April 2008 the newly elected Mexican leader met with his U.S. counterpart, President George W. Bush and announced his coalition membership: *The World Just Got a Little Smaller: April 22, 2008.*

The next opportunity came when holding a joint press conference with President Obama on May 19, 2010. He employed the lexicon when hearing the translation of this offer and applied to his government's commitment to helping Canada rid itself of Chinese joint sovereignty and everything that's attendant upon it:

As I pledged to you before Mexico can count on the United States as an equal partner in this effort. As your partner we'll give you the support you need to prevail [6:21: Calderon: Erin M.]



**Mexican President Felipe Calderon: Delivers Message Behind Enemy Lines;
Speech to House and Senate Includes the Coalition Message
That Many Parliamentarians Are Going to Prison**

The Mexican President is both a Harvard-educated lawyer and a conservative Catholic. Thus for two reasons he is committed to achieving stated objectives, especially for Canada. He again used his world leader status to coalition advantage in rapid succession. First it was during his speech to Congress on May 19th and then seven days later, this time behind enemy lines.

Being a member of the Bar makes him ultra-sensitive to the failings of Canada's administration of justice and empathetic when discovering how when the judiciary and legal profession were called upon to help one of their own they left him to languish in enslaving and torturous human experimentation – a life so grotesque that the international community moved to action when this circumstance came to its attention. And being a Catholic he's shocked and horrified at what lies at the country's core: the biggest Satanic cult in human history. It is for those reasons and many more he used his visit to Parliament Hill on May 27, 2010 to coalition advantage – employing the lexicon at the heart of federal power to deliver the message in person that many in the Upper and Lower Chamber face life or lengthy terms in prison for what they procured, perpetuated and protected.





British Prime Minister Cameron: His First Geo-Communiqué as U.K. Leader – Lethal Military Force and Capital Punishment are on the Table of Options

The British Parliament's House of Commons, as an institution, was the recipient of a Geo Award because its membership advanced coalition interests and objectives in a most remarkable way. During that time one MP, the leader of the Conservative Party, authorized his colleagues to employ the lexicon to demonstrate that on both sides of the isle there was a commitment to advancing democracy, rule of law and human rights and containing its opposite. When the election elevated him to the role of PM he showed at his first opportunity he took his commitment with him to 10 Downing Street.

Behind enemy lines and in front of not just the world press, but also Canadian mainstream news agencies, the new British leader employed the lexicon in a manner that proved how committed he and his government are in addressing the Soviet-style threat posed by the Chinada malfeasant. He began his geo-remarks with acknowledging his coalition partnership and stating on the diplomatic record he's all for lethal military force and capital punishment.

His second salvo was to a question posed by a member of Canada's media; choosing the Clooney Maneuver to geo-underscore the word "target", which is what everyone in and linked to the Chinada High Command is for creating stealth cognition technologies and using them for the purposes of hypno-torture.

His third geo-remark involved quoting U.S. General Eisenhower; articulating how with the Chinada malfessant proving to be an ever-increasing global menace and showing no signs of standing down despite all peaceful efforts to bring them round to being welcomed members of the international community , the coalition is going to have to step up its game and make the response even more mammoth and dramatic than was previous planned for to protect the 21st century from what threatens it. He chose the 'gun to the temple' Richie-Santelli Maneuver to drive home he fully supports the use of lethal military force and capital punishment.

What in part motivated him is documented in *Pushing the Hypno-Torture Envelop Again: Chinada's Malfessant Mock the Coalition During the June 2010 G8-G20 Summits.*

I do think using technology and sport is a bonus. I'm a keen follower of cricket and tennis. I think the **third** umpire has been a great thing. [R-S M.] The machine's that bleep at Wimbledon are quite handy too; and maybe that's something in football we can have a look at.



Q: Thank-you Prime Minister. David Akins from Sun Media in Ottawa. Welcome to Canada. I wonder if you could speak to the targets [Cameron: Cl.M.] on heavy deficits.



[...]

A: We'll be meeting those targets as others will. But as I say, actually, having specifics so people can hold our feet to the fire in terms of sorting out our fiscal situation in western European countries is a good thing.

[...]

Well, I think the problem – you're absolutely right Larry; and I think it is supposedly is a [R-S M.] quite linked to Eisenhower, who said that when the problems are particularly intractable he liked to make them bigger to make them easier to solve. And I know that should be illogical. But the fact is where we are at the moment, we're stuck. This isn't progressing. And it doesn't look like it is going to progress unless we do something different. And the discussion that we had was basically that we should look at enlarging the scale and ambition of the round.



On December 3, 2010 Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin was interviewed on Larry King Live.⁶

As Larry's iconic show is winding up he snags an hour-long interview with the man who's ruled the former Soviet Union since Boris Yeltsin. Then when a question that came up had geo-implications, he uses the lexicon to red flag it, namely confirming that the Russian government is a member of the coalition. A couple minutes later his guest indicates like other public sector partners, his cabinet is full engaged in conducting intel collection on that which threatens the civilized and civilizing world.

Larry: You were very involved [22:33 R-S M.] in the KGB?

[...]

P.M.: Any country including the United States is engaged in [22:49: CBS M.] intelligence gathering. Nobody doubts that. And, incidentally, the activities of our services – of security services that, are compared to the U.S. services looking much better. Thank God neither these agents or others were seen as organizing clandestine presence, or hostage taking or torturing people. 22:49



⁶ The original YouTube video is no longer available. It's been substituted with another upload, but it's dubbed in Russian.



[View video](#)

Proceed to the [next chapter](#)