

LAROCHE'S URGENT MESSAGE TO THE U.S. PRESIDENT AND PEOPLE

'Cancel the British System, Save the People'

The following transcript is an edited version of a presentation given by Will Wertz on the Aug. 11 LaRouche PAC Weekly Webcast. A video of the full interview may be found [here](#).

Jason Ross: Today on our show we are going to have a special guest whom we will be hearing from, *EIR* Editorial Board member Will Wertz. Will is going to help us understand that there is far more to the ongoing coup attempt against the Donald Trump Presidency than what's sometimes called the "Deep State." The roots of this coup operation go beyond the bounds of the United States, and go very prominently to Britain, to the still-existing British empire. So, let's turn it over. Will, what can you tell us about the deeper implications that we should take from this attempted coup against the President? What does this mean; where is it coming from?

Will Wertz: Lyndon LaRouche made the following comment: "The American people must demand that the ongoing treasonous British coup against the U.S. Presidency and the nation itself must be stopped, and the perpetrators prosecuted and imprisoned. The British system must be cancelled, and the President must make every effort to save the people of this country and the rest of humanity from further British-directed depredations against their lives. Cancel the British system; save the people."

What I'm going to do today is to present the documentation which shows that what we have here is not a Russian interference in the domestic affairs of the United States of America, but rather a very directed interference on the part of the British empire. This is what should be

"What Lyndon LaRouche has called the Four Powers concept, an alliance among the United States, Russia, China, and potentially India, which represent the industrial power on this planet and the vast majority of the world's population ... can solve virtually any problem with which we are faced on planet Earth ... The Korean Peninsula crisis, the fight against terrorism in the Middle East and North Africa require such collaboration."

investigated, as opposed to so-called "collusion" between President Trump's campaign team and the Russians. This is very important to document, and it's absolutely critical that this coup be stopped; because we are, at this moment in world history, on the brink of another financial breakdown, far larger than in 2008. We are in a situation where the British, to preserve their bankrupt financial system based in the City of London and in Wall Street, are committed to bringing down the U.S. President to prevent the alternative to that collapse from being realized.

The alternative to that collapse is what Lyndon LaRouche has called the Four Powers concept, an alliance among the United States, Russia, China, and potentially India, which represent the industrial power on this planet and the vast majority of the world's population. That combination can solve virtually any problem with which we are faced on planet Earth and beyond. For

instance, the Korean Peninsula crisis requires the collaboration of the United States with China, and Russia; both of which are neighbors of North and South Korea. The fight against terrorism in the Middle East and North Africa, which extends even beyond those areas, requires such collaboration. The rebuilding of the world economy requires such collaboration, particularly by the United States joining the efforts initiated by China—the so-called Silk Road or the "One Belt, One Road" initiative, which Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have fought for for decades, when it was referred to as the World Land-Bridge.

All of these problems can be solved with that collaboration, and that collaboration would destroy the



Xinhua

Candidate Donald Trump on the presidential campaign trail.

British empire once and for all. That is what is at stake right now. I would also point out that the British empire has historically been committed to massive population reduction, genocide, reducing the world's population from the current level of more than seven billion, to one billion. That empire is willing to bring the world to the brink of thermonuclear war, with its geopolitical strategy against Russia and China. That is the underlying issue which is behind the current attempt to carry out a coup against the President of the United States.

The British Hand in Russia-Gate

The evidence of the British involvement is transparent. Donald Trump announced his Presidential campaign on June 16, 2015. An article appeared in the London *Guardian* on April 13, 2017, in which the authors say that “British intelligence first became aware in late 2015”—that is, just months after Donald Trump announced his Presidential campaign—of what they call “suspicious interactions between figures connected to Trump and known or suspected Russian agents.” The title of this article is “[British Spies Were First to Spot Trump Team’s Links with Russia.](#)” In that article, they say that these so-called “interactions” were first uncovered by the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) which is the equivalent of our NSA. They go to great lengths to point out that “It is understood that GCHQ was at no point carrying out a targetted operation against Trump or his team, or proactively seeking information. The alleged conver-

sations were picked up by chance.”

They also say that the GCHQ played an early prominent role in kick-starting the FBI’s Trump-Russia investigation, which began in late July, 2016. It should be recalled that the Republican Convention which nominated Donald Trump occurred on July 18-21, 2016. So, GCHQ is following Donald Trump within months of his announcement for the Republican nomination for President, and the GCHQ kick-starts the FBI investigation of Donald Trump, probably within days of his getting the Republican nomination in July of 2016. The *Guardian* article continues, saying that “The FBI and CIA were slow to appreciate the extensive nature of the contacts between Trump’s team and Moscow ahead of the U.S. election. This was in part due to U.S. law that prohibits U.S. agencies from examining the private communications of American citizens without warrants.

They were trained not to do this.” Of course the law that they’re referring to is the U.S. Constitution; which unfortunately U.S. intelligence agencies have not so closely adhered to, as was exposed by Edward Snowden.

They also then report that Robert Hannigan, head of the GCHQ, passed material in the summer of 2016 to CIA chief John Brennan, and that Brennan used this information to launch a major interagency investigation. He further briefed the Gang of Eight—that’s the chairs and the ranking members of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees—in August and September, about this so-called information from GCHQ. So, what you have here is the British equivalent of the NSA, kick-starting an investigation of Donald Trump soon after the Republican nominating convention. Then, John Brennan launches an interagency investigation into a domestic affair—one wonders if it is a violation of the CIA’s charter that such an investigation is being launched in the first place—and began briefing the leadership of the Democratic and Republican chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees, on this information, which even to this day is not verified.

So, this is an intervention on the part of British Intelligence into the elections. Add to this the dossier which was prepared by so-called “former” MI6 agent Christopher Steele. This has functioned as the roadmap for the FBI’s investigation. Copies of it were given directly to the FBI, if not by GCHQ, by MI6. We know that John McCain gave a copy to the FBI when he was given such a copy. What do we have here in terms of Christopher



*British Government
Communications Headquarters
(GCHQ)*



OGL/Foreign and Commonwealth Office
*Robert Hannigan, adviser to
the British Prime Minister.*



CIA portrait
*John Brennan, former CIA
director.*



fbi.gov
*FBI deputy director Andrew
McCabe.*

information from Russians, which in this case is not very reliable; we have the use of all of this as a road-map for launching an investigation of the President of the United States after he was elected.

It should be pointed out that one of the key people in the FBI who has been involved in this is the former acting Director of the FBI, Andrew McCabe. He was acting director of the FBI after Comey left, and now he's been replaced by Christopher

Steele? Christopher Steele is a former MI6 operative; he worked under cover of the British Foreign Ministry in the Moscow Embassy, but was an intelligence operative. He formed a company called Orbis Business Intelligence back in 2009.

From at least 2010 on, Steele had been working with the Eurasian Organized Crime Unit of the FBI, based in New York City. In the same year that Orbis Business Intelligence was launched—2009—another company in the United States called Fusion GPS was launched—same year. As early as 2010, according to court documents, those two companies had a confidentiality agreement. So, although the public story is that Fusion GPS hired Orbis Business Intelligence to do opposition research against Donald Trump on behalf of Hillary Clinton, the reality is that these two companies have been working together since their founding in 2009, and their confidentiality agreement goes back to one year later, 2010. That confidentiality agreement is being used by Fusion GPS as a reason for not handing over information to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has requested it with respect to this dossier.

What do we have here? We have GCHQ kick-starting an investigation through international surveillance; we have former MI6 agent Christopher Steele getting

Wray. But, in his early career, McCabe was head of the Eurasian Organized Crime Unit of the FBI in New York City. Senator Grassley has sent a whole series of questions to the Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, about Andrew McCabe, because the suspicion is that Andrew McCabe was directly involved as the handler of Christopher Steele. It should also be pointed out that at a certain point, the FBI entertained the idea of paying Christopher Steele to continue his so-called research.

The question that Grassley asks is, was McCabe involved in that situation specifically? You have to understand that Andrew McCabe is under investigation right now because he was involved in a decision that his wife, Jill McCabe, would run for State Senator in the state of Virginia against Senator Dick Black. This was arranged through Governor McAuliffe, a close supporter of Hillary Clinton, who herself at the time was under investigation by the FBI. McCabe is also believed to have been involved in the investigation of Hillary Clinton's emails. The issue here is a complete conflict of interest on the part of McCabe, who may have been the key person working at the FBI with Christopher Steele.

This is the British empire nexus that is directly involved in the operation against the President of the

United States. The purpose of it is to destroy the Presidency of the United States, so that President Trump cannot develop collaborative relations with Russia and China, in particular, in the fight against terrorism, and cannot move forward in order to bring the United States into collaboration with Russia and China on the “One Belt, One Road” perspective, which would be crucial to developing the economy of the United States using American system methods.

Geopolitics or Human Development

Ross: You discussed the difference between what the motivation would be behind a British outlook versus what America might do. Could you describe for us, or help us understand, the difference between British geopolitics and what the United States could adopt as a national policy orientation?

Wertz: Yes. British policy is a policy of geopolitics, and this is a longstanding policy. In 1919, Halford Mackinder wrote a paper entitled “The Geographical Pivot of History.” What he wrote there, in summary, is as follows: Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland. Who rules the Heartland commands the World Island. Who rules the World Island commands the World. Russia is the pivot area, the heartland. Surrounding it is an area which is called the Inner Crescent, which today would be called the Arc of Crisis, as defined by another geopolitician, Bernard Lewis, who was born in Britain but later became an American citizen. That’s the policy that we’ve been carrying out. Who rules East Europe? Think about the move eastward by NATO to the very borders of Russia. Think about the policy of regime change in the entire Arc of Crisis area surrounding Russia.

This is the policy that was implemented under Zbigniew Brzezinski during the Carter Administration. It’s continuing today, with the regime change policies in Libya, and in Egypt, before it was reversed by el-Sisi against Morsi. We see it in Iraq beginning in 2003; we see it today in the attempt in Syria. Before that, we saw it in Afghanistan, and that’s still a crisis today. We see it in Ukraine, today. This is the geopolitical policy of the British, which led to World War II by the way, because this was the policy of Hitler. The Mackinder policy was picked up by Haushofer, who was instrumental in defining Hitler’s policy of marching East to Russia—the Soviet Union at that time. So this is the geopolitical policy which is operative today.



The British geopolitical view of the world as described by Halford Mackinder.

Now, contrast that to the World Land-Bridge policy. This is the policy proposed by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. The world island is essentially Asia, Europe, and Africa. The World Land-Bridge policy is not limited to the so-called world island; this is a policy for all of humanity, extending into the Western Hemisphere. The policy is one of economic development—as the Chinese say, a “win-win” strategy, of peace based upon economic development. That is the central conception, so as to realize the actual potential of humanity for further improvements in its standard of living, its quality of mentation, and its ability not only to develop the planet Earth for man’s benefit, but eventually to colonize outer space, which is man’s fundamental mission.

So, these are the two contrasting views, and what Americans and others throughout the world need to know, is that the British empire is alive, and it is carrying out the same policy which it has carried out at least over the last 100 years, which led previously to world wars, and threatens to lead to world wars today. But there is an alternative, which is the World Land-Bridge, the “One Belt, One Road” policy; the Silk Road, which has been adopted by a vast majority of countries throughout the world.

Nature of the British empire

Ross: You talked about the British empire and the geopolitical objectives of Halford Mackinder. This is some time in the past. Today, I think that most people believe that there is no British empire; or that the power of the British empire has waned so dramatically from its peak that it’s hardly a driving force in world affairs today. Why do you speak about the importance of the British empire? What’s its power? How does it exist?

Wertz: Most people don't understand that the British empire is really based upon the Venetian system. Venice was not big in terms of military forces, or geography; it's a city. Yet, the Venetian system, as a financial system, was an imperial system, and the British system, from its inception, is modeled upon that financial imperial system. The goals of the British empire are really totally anti-human. You could compare it to the Greek mythological figure Zeus, who did not want mankind to develop; did not want mankind to have science; and did not want mankind to have technology. In opposition to that, you had Prometheus, who gave man fire—science, the means of developing the human mind so as to further the mission of humanity. The British policy is fundamentally a policy of financial imperialism, particularly after World War II, and it is also a policy based upon a perspective of destroying the notion of the sovereign nation-state, of reducing world population from the current level of over seven billion to a level of one billion or less, as I said earlier.

I want to indicate two of the leading figures in developing the British conception of empire. One is H.G. Wells, who wrote a book called *The Open Conspiracy* in the year 1928. What he said there is the following: "It lies within the power of the Atlantic communities to impose a world state, a world directorate upon the world. The open conspiracy rests upon a disrespect for national sovereignty. Its main political idea, its political strategy is to weaken, deface, incorporate, or supersede existing governments. It considers all existing governments as entirely provisional in nature." At one point he says, "There will be little need for a President." That's the policy of H.G. Wells.

As you can see, this is the policy of so-called limited sovereignty; it's the policy of supra-national institutions,



H.G. Wells


CC

like, for instance, the European Union has become. The basic idea is to eliminate national sovereignty, and create supra-national institutions in which you'd have no need for a President. Of course that's the view that the British take today. They would just as soon there not be a President who would assert the principle of national sovereignty and develop the people, through developing the economy of the nation, and working with other nations to have the same effect with respect to the world population.

Lyndon LaRouche at one point called Bertrand Russell the most evil man of the 20th Century. He's often known as an advocate of peace. Well, H.G. Wells made the same kind of argu-

ment for world peace; that was his justification for dictatorial methods. In the case of Bertrand Russell, after World War II Bertrand Russell actually proposed—when he thought the United States had a monopoly on nuclear weapons—that the United States threaten to use nuclear weapons against the then Soviet Union. He was not able to act on that idea, because as it turned out, the Soviet Union had developed nuclear weapons.

Let me just read an interchange with Bertrand Russell on this subject. He was asked, "Is it true or untrue that in recent years you advocated that a preventive war might be made against Communism, against Soviet Russia?" Russell: "It's entirely true. And I don't repent of it now. It was not inconsistent with what I think now. There was a time just after the last war when the Americans had a monopoly of nuclear weapons, and offered to internationalize nuclear weapons by the Baruch Proposal. I thought this was an extremely generous proposal on their part, one which it would be very desirable that the world should accept. Not that I advocated a nuclear war, but I did think that great pressure should be put upon Russia to accept the Baruch Proposal,



Bassano

Bertrand Russell in 1936.



Library of Congress

From left to right: Joseph Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill at the Tehran conference on Dec. 1, 1943.

and I did think that if they continued to refuse, it might be necessary actually to go to war. At that time, nuclear weapons existed only on one side, and therefore the odds were the Russians would have given way. I thought they would.” Question: “Suppose they hadn’t given way?” Russell: “I thought and hoped that the Russians would give way. But of course, you can’t threaten unless you’re prepared to have your bluff called.”

So, this is the policy of Bertrand Russell, to create a one-world directorate as in the case of H.G. Wells, and to threaten pre-emptive nuclear war against the then-Soviet Union in order to enforce such a perspective. Now we are once again on the verge of, in this case, thermonuclear war, and that is the policy of the British empire. The British basically view war as one means by which they can reduce world population.

America’s Historic Enemy

Ross: In the American Revolution, the first of the complaints in the Declaration of Independence wasn’t about taxation without representation; it was that the King had refused his assent to laws that were necessary for the common good. This must have shifted at some point. Now, there are so many factions in the United States who are adopting policies that sound very much like British policies. When did the United States begin to adopt an almost British outlook on foreign affairs?

Wertz: It’s important for people to maintain a perspective involving a long arc of history. People know

that the United States fought, before it became officially the United States and adopted a Constitution, fought a Revolution against the British empire. In 1814, it was the British who burned down the White House. This has been an ongoing conflict between the British and the United States. And when I’m referring to the British, I’m not referring to the British people; I’m referring to the British Monarchy, the British empire as a system of government. Now, the British also supported the Confederacy in the Civil War. Lincoln was assassinated at the end of that war by individuals who it is believed were actually funded by the British, specifically by one James Bulloch, the uncle of Theodore Roosevelt, who was based in Great Britain during the entire Civil War, and was essentially the foreign agent of the Confederacy based in Britain.

But the United States was able to proceed after the Civil War, and I think it became clear to the British that they were not going to be able to take over the United States by military means, but rather they had to use other means—those other means continued to involve assassination. One of the key breaking points in the whole process was the assassination of President McKinley in 1901, and of course the person who became President at that point was Theodore Roosevelt. This is in the period leading into World War I. Under McKinley, and prior to his assassination, the United States had very close relations with Germany, with Russia, and with Japan. This was reversed by Teddy Roosevelt, who established the so-called U.S.-British “special relationship.” Undoubtedly, the influence of his uncle on Teddy Roosevelt played a critical role in his perspective.

Now, Franklin Roosevelt had a completely different perspective. He traced his heritage back to Isaac Roosevelt, who worked closely with Alexander Hamilton. Roosevelt’s entire policy was based on the American system of economy, the same kind of American system of economy which President Trump has advocated, in recent speeches in Kentucky, Detroit, and elsewhere, including Glass-Steagall.

During World War II, the British, who had earlier backed Hitler, backed Mussolini and Franco, realized when Hitler turned westward into France and threatened Great Britain, that they needed the United States to defeat Hitler at that point. What you have from that point on, is a situation where the British operated in the United States to help bring the United States into that war.

Roosevelt’s policy was always anti-colonial and

anti-empire. In 1941, there was a famous meeting between Roosevelt and Churchill— reported by Roosevelt’s son, Elliott Roosevelt—in which the senior Roosevelt said, we’re not fighting World War II in order to preserve the British empire, but rather, after this war we’re going to use American system methods of economic development to develop the entire world and to end colonialism altogether.

When Roosevelt died in 1945, the British, through Churchill, through their intelligence agencies, and through Harry Truman, moved to begin the process of attempting to bring the United States into this British empire orbit—to reverse what Roosevelt had done—and that has been the ongoing conflict that we’ve had over the last seventy years or more. It’s not resolved to this day, and it has to be resolved by defeating the British empire.

During World War II, the British set up intelligence operations in the United States. There was an individual by the name of Sir William S. Stephenson, Canadian-born. He set up British covert operations, which operated under the cover of the British Security Coordination, which was located in Rockefeller Center. They ran covert operations in the United States during this whole period, basically from 1939 through 1944. He represented both MI6 and MI5; he worked directly with Allen Dulles who had an office in the same building, on the same floor as Stephenson. Dulles, of course, later became head of the CIA, until he was relieved of duty by John F. Kennedy. Stephenson also worked very closely with the FBI, with J. Edgar Hoover.

In 1946, the “British-U.S. Communication Agreement” was signed as a secret treaty. It was an agreement to have intelligence collaboration between the United States and the U.K. with respect to the Soviet Union and the East Bloc



From a statue of Sir William Stephenson (code named *Intrepid*).
CIA

countries. This later was transformed into the “Five Eyes,” which is the United States, U.K., Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. In a very real sense, the United States became a part of the British empire intelligence apparatus. And what we see today with GCHQ/MI6, their work with Brennan at the CIA, with Comey and McCabe at the FBI, and with Clapper as Director of National Intelligence, is a continuation of that U.S.-U.K. Agreement. The surveillance was done under the codename “Echelon,” and it’s still being done under that name, even after the Soviet Union collapsed—it’s directed against the former Soviet Union and East Bloc countries.

And that is what we see today, as I said. Edward Snowden, in describing this relationship, said, the Five Eyes are a “supranational intelligence organization that doesn’t answer to the known laws of its own countries.” That’s the picture I can give you.

What Is To Be Done?

Ross: This is a chilling picture, a very scary picture. What is it that we ought to do? This is much bigger I think, than people, even those who understand that a coup is in process or that Russia-gate is a whole bunch of baloney—this is a lot deeper than what most people believe they’re up against. How do we fight against this? and what do we create in its stead? What’s our objective here?

Wertz: Lyndon LaRouche yesterday said that we have to “pour it on.” We have to really escalate the mobilization to get a breakthrough with respect to the VIPS memorandum which we discussed at the very beginning. The whole edifice of the lie that the Russians interfered in the elections, and that the Trump campaign colluded with the Russians, is about to fall. We have to make sure that it falls. As you indicated in the beginning, the VIPS



Former CIA director Allen Dulles.
public domain

memo was produced in July, it was sent to the President, it's been sent to the Justice Department, and it's been widely circulated. We, in our movement, distributed something like one hundred copies of the VIPS memo in offices in Washington, D.C. two weeks ago, concentrating on the Intelligence Committees of both the House and Senate, as well as the Judiciary Committee. We also got this out, this week, at the Old Executive Office Building in Washington, D.C. and at the Justice Department.

The story is beginning to break: You mentioned the article in [The Nation](#). This is a very powerful article that just appeared, and what the author, Patrick Lawrence, says is the following: "Under no circumstance can it be acceptable that the relevant authorities, the National Security Agency, the Justice Department (via the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and the Central Intelligence Agency leave these new findings without reply."

Now, the company that the DNC hired, CrowdStrike, the one that claimed that it had evidence that the Russians had hacked the DNC computers, it just said, "we continue to stand by our report," arguing that by July 5, all malware had been removed from the DNC's computers. As Patrick Lawrence points out, "But the presence or absence of malware by that time is entirely immaterial, because the event of July 5 is proven to have been a leak and not a hack."

The point here is, you have *The Nation* article, you have *Newsmax*, which gave coverage to this; *Bloomberg News* had an article yesterday on the VIPS and their conclusions. What's required is for the American people to take back our country and ensure that the Constitution survives, that the republic of the United States survives. We have to mobilize to force a situation where, instead of investigating Trump, what should be investigated is the British role in all of this, and the role of members of U.S. intelligence in participating in this attempt at a coup against the United States of America and against the President of the United States of America. John Brennan recently argued that if President Trump were to fire Mueller as Special Counsel, that members of the Executive should refuse to obey his orders: That's a call for a coup by the ex-CIA director.

Lyndon LaRouche said at the beginning, we've got to cancel the British system; we've got to save our people. What's being run in this country is the equivalent of the British Opium Wars against China of the Nineteenth Century, in the opioid and other widespread drug addiction that's destroying this country. We have

to free the President, to be able to carry out the policies which he at least has indicated he has an intention to implement, to the benefit of this country and the benefit of the world. That's the issue that's before us right now.

Contact the President!

What I would encourage every American citizen to do, is to contact the President: Tell him that he has your support to move on this issue. It was not a hack, it was a leak. A lie has been used as a pretext for overthrowing the President of the United States, and it's being conducted by a foreign government, in collusion with traitors in the United States like Brennan and others. Those people should be investigated. Here you have a situation where a crime was allegedly committed at the Democratic National Committee (DNC); the DNC hired its own private investigator, and that private investigator announced what the conclusion of its investigation was. The police were never invited to the scene. They never secured the crime scene, they never investigated the crime scene, and the computers have never been seen by the FBI. This is completely preposterous!

The entire country has been put in jeopardy as a result of something which is unheard of! Have you ever heard of a crime where the police were not allowed to secure the crime scene and investigate the crime? The alleged victim of the crime, who's now carrying out a campaign against the President of the United States, is allowed to determine how the investigation is conducted, and also what the conclusion of the investigation is.

This is intolerable! As Patrick Lawrence wrote in *The Nation*, it cannot stand, that there is not a reply. The forensic evidence is solid. It has been presented by experts from the NSA itself, who know how this is done.

We have to ensure that this lie collapses immediately, that the people involved in this coup against the President are investigated, and imprisoned if found guilty. That is what's required. So contact the President, tell him that you support him in going public with this. Demand that the representatives of the VIPS be allowed to testify before the various committees of Congress, to get to the bottom of this crime, which has been committed against our President and against our country.

If we do that, then we create the basis for collaboration between the United States, Russia, China, and India, which, as Lyndon LaRouche said in his Four Powers concept, is the necessary means for dismantling the British empire once and for all. What we need to do, is to destroy Zeus and free Prometheus.