

## HOW TO DEFEAT THE BRITISH COUP AGAINST TRUMP

# Apply the Flank of the Mind Over the Next 52 Days

Will Wertz' presentation to the Manhattan Project

*The following are edited excerpts from the transcript of William Wertz' presentation to the LaRouche PAC Manhattan Project Dialogue with LaRouche on Saturday, Dec. 9, 2017. Mr. Wertz' full presentation and the ensuing dialogue may be found [here](#).*

**Dennis Speed:** I want to welcome everybody here to today's Saturday Dialogue with LaRouche for December 9, 2017. As I think everyone in the Manhattan Project is aware, and many people around the nation are aware, we've been involved in a campaign which involves a principle which we've been calling the "double envelopment" campaign. This has involved the idea of simultaneously attacking the author of the assault on the Presidency, the attempted coup, which is the British intelligence forces deploying Robert Mueller—but at the same time emphasizing the work that the Schiller Institute's Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche's organization, through his Four Laws, have done with the nation of China. We have two pamphlets now in circulation—one is "Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin. He Will Do His Job if You Let Him," and we are about to reissue "LaRouche's Four Laws, the Physical Economic Principles for the Recovery of the United States; America's Future on the New Silk Road."

In approximately 52 days, the President will give his State of the Union address. At that time, something

has to be said to the American people with respect to the promised transformation in the American physical economic circumstance. Whether you talk about that as being a new form of infrastructure or a new economic platform, however you put it, that is not going to come into being unless our organization, the Manhattan Project, is successful in galvanizing, as we've done before, the nation as a whole, to do that.



*Special Counsel Robert Mueller.*

White House/Pete Souza

What we are hoping to do over the next 50 days, is create a new form of dialogue allowing the President of the United States, free from Mueller and the British empire, to cause the United States population to be brought onto the stage of history directly with Russia and China, with a new unleashing of economic power that the world has never seen. To give you an idea of how we can approach doing that, it's my honor to introduce again to everybody Will Wertz.

**Will Wertz:** Thank you, Dennis. What I want to do today is to give you an update on the British coup against the Presidency of the United States—because there have been major developments occurring at a rather rapid pace over the last couple of weeks, which are in large part a result of what we have done in the circulation of the pamphlet which Dennis just referred to on Robert Mueller. At the same time what I want to do is to step back and discuss the question of the principle of grand strategy as designed by Lyndon LaRouche in two cases: One, with respect to his design of the Strategic Defense Initiative, in the late 1970s and early 1980s and then, applying the same principles in respect to the current struggle which we are engaged in, and have been engaged in for decades, to bring about a New Paradigm, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche refers to it, based upon the World Land-Bridge and LaRouche’s Four Laws, including the extra-terrestrial imperative of Krafft Ehrlicke for man to explore and to colonize not only the Solar system, but eventually the Galaxy and the Universe.



*Bruce Ohr*

C-Span

---

## I. Britain-gate, not Russia-gate

---

To begin with, I think what we have stressed from the beginning is becoming increasingly clear to more and more people, that there was an intervention in the U.S. elections, but it wasn’t Russia that carried out the intervention: It was the British empire, British intelligence. This is very well documented in the pamphlet on Robert Mueller. But there’s more that has come out in recent days, which underscores this.

There are many in the Congress who tend to be opportunistic; there are those who want to make the argument that if there was Russian collusion, it wasn’t with Donald Trump, it was with Hillary Clinton. But they fall into the same British trap in such opportunism. The only way you can really address what’s going on right now is to focus on Christopher Steele and the role of the British in all of this—actually dating back at least to 2014, as we’ll see in respect to Christopher Steele’s role in Ukraine.

There is a timeline of the British intervention [see p. 43] in the U.S. 2016 election, which people can refer to. Christopher Steele was a British MI6 agent for 22 years.

Beginning in 1990, through 1993, he was assigned to Moscow, where he was essentially in the British Embassy, not as an MI6 agent ostensibly, but under a different cover. He left Moscow in 1993; he later, in 1998, was assigned to the British Embassy in Paris as First Secretary Financial. Then in 1999, he was exposed online as a British MI6 agent which made it impossible for him to carry out his functions, particularly in Russia. In 2006, he was assigned to the MI6 Russian desk in London and he continued in that position through 2009, at which point he is alleged to have left MI6 after 22 years. It’s highly questionable that he disassociated himself from MI6 and the rest of British intelligence at that point.

In 2009, Steele incorporated a private business called Orbis Business and in 2010 Fusion GPS was created, headed by one Glenn Simpson, who had worked for the *Wall Street Journal*. But the interesting thing is that a 2017 book authored by Luke Harding, *Collusion*, describes how Simpson and Steele shared the same FBI contacts, and Glenn Simpson was also involved in his “journalistic” work in specializing on the Russian mafia and its relationship to the Russian state. So, they were kindred souls. The author Harding is close to Christopher Steele. Harding wrote a book called *Mafia State* in 2011, describing Putin’s Russia as a mafia state.

What I want to stress here is that there is a nexus in the FBI and the Justice Department which has worked with Christopher Steele and British intelligence, in-

cluding the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), throughout this entire period. For instance, it was just reported that Bruce Ohr, who was an Associate Deputy Attorney General until he was removed from that position, knew Christopher Steele in 2006 when Christopher Steele was an active MI6 agent in London. You can see in the timeline, one of the probable reasons for his contact with Christopher Steele, going back to 2006, is that he was, from 1999 through 2011, chief of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section. Then in 2014 Ohr became Counselor for Transnational Organized Crime and International Affairs in the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. He was demoted just recently, because the House Intelligence Committee discovered that during the Presidential campaign he had met with Christopher Steele and that around Thanksgiving of 2016, he met with Glenn Simpson. These are the people who you have in the Justice Department: Ohr occupied an office about four offices away from Rod Rosenstein, who is the person carrying out the investigation of so-called Russian collusion, in the Justice Department.

We know that Christopher Steele also had very close relations with the Eurasian Organized Crime Unit of the FBI. The current deputy director of the FBI, Andrew McCabe, was a special supervisory agent, beginning in 2003, of the Eurasian Organized Crime Unit of the FBI in New York City. McCabe is suspected to be very directly involved with Steele to this day. After he allegedly left MI6, Steele, in 2010, met with members of the New York-based FBI Eurasian Organized Crime Unit in London. Basically, you have an MI6 agent who's acting as an FBI informant.

Now the interesting thing—and this is emphasized in the Mueller dossier—is that the operation against Trump starts as early as 2014, way before he even announced for office. And this is the time of the Nazi coup carried out in Ukraine against the elected President of that country. Now what has come out in this book by Luke Harding titled *Collusion*, is that from 2014 to 2016, Christopher Steele wrote more than 100 memos on Russia and Ukraine. These memos, funded by some unidentified client—and it's not clear whether this was also through Fusion GPS, which it may have been—were circulated in the U.S. State Department to Secretary of State John Kerry, and also to Victoria Nuland, who was the individual responsible for hand-



Andrew McCabe

FBI

ing out cookies and other desserts to the Maidan Nazi demonstrators in Ukraine. In 2014, you have the first FISA court-authorized surveillance of Paul Manafort—2014! So the question here is, were Steele's memos from 2014 to 2016 on Ukraine used by the FBI and the Justice Department, with the support of the State Department, to authorize surveillance of Manafort back in 2014? That's a question which now has to be asked.

## Ukraine

When you talk about Ukraine, one of the things you have to realize is that MI6—which is the organization Christopher Steele is associated with—was heavily involved in supporting the Nazis in Ukraine. MI6 funded the organization headed up by Stepan Bandera in 1930s. After the war, MI6 recruited Bandera and brought him to London in 1948. Allen Dulles brought the second-in-command of Bandera's organization, Nicola Lebed, to New York City in 1948. This was part of the Nazi rat line, where they wanted to use Nazis against the Soviet Union. The coup carried out in Ukraine in 2014, with Yanukovich fleeing Kiev in February of 2014 under threat of assassination by these Maidan demonstrators—this coup was carried out by organizations like the Right Sector, which support the ideology and tradition of Stepan Bandera. So, the MI6 involvement of Christopher Steele in Ukraine is extraordinarily important. In a certain sense, this is the degeneration of relations between the U.S. and Russia—the U.S. support of this coup in Ukraine. This has to be investigated, as well as the dossier which Christopher Steele wrote, with the funding of Hillary's

Presidential campaign and the DNC and also Obama, funding through Fusion GPS which then hired Christopher Steele.

Then in April 2016, the DNC and Hillary Clinton's campaign, through Fusion GPS, hired Christopher Steele to write that dossier. The first assignment was to get intelligence on Paul Manafort, who at that point was the campaign manager for Trump. Well, this would be no problem for Christopher Steele, because he had already been involved in writing 100 memos on Ukraine previously. Of course, there are elements in Ukraine who were very much opposed to Donald Trump becoming President, and they intervened in the U.S. elections directly on behalf of Hillary and against Trump. Steele begins to write these memos in 2016.

Before this, you had the intervention of GCHQ from Great Britain. The reports that we have, primarily from the *Guardian*, are that in 2015, around the time that Trump announced that he was going to run for President, the *Guardian* reports, GCHQ began to pick up what they claimed were intelligence clues that associates of Trump were somehow working with Russian intelligence. And they began to hand this material over to their U.S. counterparts, the CIA and the NSA and so forth. So, even before Christopher Steele is hired to produce the dossier, GCHQ is already beginning to interfere against candidate Donald Trump, through this routine exchange of intelligence.

### **GCHQ Marching Orders to the CIA**

After Christopher Steele wrote his first memos in June 2016, he flew to Rome to brief his FBI contact in the Eurasian Serious Crime Division of the FBI, which is the unit that Andrew McCabe was previously associated with in New York City. Then, it's reported by the *Guardian* that in the summer of 2016, Robert Hannigan, the head of GCHQ, flew to the United States to meet with Brennan to argue that Trump's associates are



White House/Pete Souza  
*President Barack Obama and Vice President Joe Biden meet with senior advisors in the Oval Office, July 20, 2012. From left, are: Kathryn Ruemmler, Counsel to the President, and FBI Director Robert Mueller.*

colluding somehow with the Russians and that GCHQ has such intelligence. Brennan, head of the CIA, prompts an investigation, by a taskforce of six intelligence agencies in the United States, of Republican Presidential candidate Donald Trump. We don't know all of the details of this, and there is undoubtedly much more that occurred. Even the timescale might not be absolutely accurate, because what we've got are merely reports from the *Guardian* in terms of these critical dates. The collusion between GCHQ, MI6, Brennan, Clapper, and Comey could have actually been occurring much earlier.

I think we can safely assume that Christopher Steele was not operating on his own in a private business venture in putting together these dossiers, but that he had an ongoing connection with GCHQ and MI6 in addition to being an FBI informant going back at least to 2010. The fact that Bruce Ohr of the Justice Department knew of him from 2006, gives you a further indication of the depth of this British infiltration of the Justice Department and the FBI, as that has come much more to the fore.

Then what happens is, in July 2016, the investigation of alleged Trump-Russian collusion begins. The person who signs the documents is Peter Strzok, who, it was just revealed, was the person who interviewed Hill-

ary Clinton—not under oath, and there are reportedly no tape recordings of the interview. Strzok was personally involved in the decision by Comey to change the earlier language in Comey’s drafts exonerating Hillary Clinton from “gross negligence” to “extremely reckless.” At the same time, Strzok was the person who signed the documents that initiated the investigation of Trump—all in July, all in the same time period that you had MI6 and GCHQ intervening with U.S. intelligence agencies and individuals with whom they had a longstanding relationship, like Andrew McCabe and Bruce Ohr of the Justice Department.

In September 2016 Steele flew back to Rome to meet the FBI leadership team: it wasn’t just his particular contact in the Eurasian Organized Crime Unit in Rome—this was the FBI leadership team. After that meeting is when he was told that the FBI wanted him to continue working for them, and the FBI offered to pay him \$50,000. We still don’t know whether he was actually paid that \$50,000, or whether he was reimbursed for any of his expenses.

### The British-Run Peanut Gallery

Then there is Andrew McCabe, a deeply conflicted individual. He is currently under investigation by a number of U.S. investigative authorities. One, he’s under investigation for violating the Hatch Act, because he deliberately campaigned for his wife, who ran against Senator Richard Black in Virginia. She was given nearly \$1 million from Terry McAuliffe, the Governor of Virginia. Hillary Clinton campaigned and did a fundraiser for her. He’s under investigation for



*Peter Strzok*


violation of the Hatch Act, because as a high level FBI agent, he was supporting his wife’s candidacy, and she received money from the Clintons. Then, he becomes Deputy Director of the FBI and had oversight of the investigation during 2016 of Hillary Clinton—and doesn’t recuse himself.

He also had animus towards Michael Flynn. There was a woman who was an FBI counter-terrorism officer, her name was, I believe, Gritz. When McCabe took over the Counter-Terrorism office in the FBI, he forced her out, and Michael Flynn came to her defense. She sued Andrew McCabe for sexual discrimination, and Flynn supported her in this effort. I’m sure the policy issue was that McCabe was supporting Obama’s pro-terrorist

policy on regime change, and Flynn was opposed to it, because afterwards, Flynn was fired from the Obama administration. Yet, McCabe never recused himself from that investigation either.

These are just some of the other characters involved in this. Peter Strzok was removed from his role in the Mueller Special Counsel team in August. What they did

is, they stonewalled Congress and wouldn’t tell the Congress that he had been removed or why he had been removed. It’s now been disclosed that there are 10,000 text messages between him and his mistress, FBI lawyer Lisa Page, that the DOJ is now going through and will have to hand over to the House Intelligence Committee. But he was absolutely opposed to Trump and in favor of Hillary Clinton; that’s what came out in these messages. The interesting thing is, it was withheld from public knowledge and withheld



*Institute of Politics/Kristyn Ulanday*

*Lt. General Michael Flynn.*



FBI

*FBI Director Christopher Wray.*



C-Span

*Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.*

from the House Intelligence Committee until one day after Flynn pleaded guilty to lying to the FBI. If that had been known beforehand, it is questionable whether Flynn would have pled guilty, because Strzok was the guy who interviewed him. The animus in this is really quite extraordinary.

The House Intelligence Committee, led by Congressman Devin Nunes, is now drawing up a contempt of Congress citation against FBI Director Christopher Wray and also against Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein because of their failure to deliver material which has been subpoenaed by the Committee.

The point I want to make in all this, without going through any further details, is that you have a very close network of operatives in the Justice Department and the FBI who have already been exposed, who have a longstanding relationship with Christopher Steele of MI6, and a longstanding relationship with GCHQ. This is the intervention which has occurred. As the Mueller dossier documents, the reason for this is that they want to stop Trump from going with the One Belt, One Road policy of China; that's what they want to prevent.

So, when people talk about Deep State or other phenomena, and don't identify the British role in this; when they opportunistically keep within the geometry of being anti-Russia, they not only miss the point, but they fail to identify the enemy that's actually involved in subverting the United States of America. It's critical that that be done. And it's what we have done with the dossier on Mueller.

---

## II. Understanding the Strategic Flank

---

The second point of what I want to develop here is two battles in history which Lyndon LaRouche has referred to. The battle of Cannae, which occurred in 216 BC. This involved Hannibal, the Carthaginian general, against the Roman general Varro. The second was in 1757, and it involved Frederick the Great of Prussia against an Austrian general by the name of Charles of Lorraine. The reason I'm raising these is because these two battles demonstrate the principle of the flank.

Let me begin with the battle of Cannae to give you a first idea. In this battle Hannibal had 55,000 troops, and the Romans had 79,000 troops. What Hannibal had was about 20,000 infantry in the center, and the rest of his forces on the right and left wings. Varro's Roman troops were lined up something like 36-deep, and they marched right into the center. Hannibal's forces backed up to some extent, and then the infantry on the wings basically created a V-shape which allowed them to attack the Roman forces from both sides. Then the cavalry of Hannibal deployed from the right wing and struck Varro's Roman forces from the rear. So, it was a concentric operation in which they entirely surrounded the Roman forces. The Roman forces were rendered unable to defend themselves, because if you're 36-deep, that means that all of your troops except those on the outside are incapable of fighting. This is what Hannibal took advantage of in the situation. The results of this battle were that 48,000

Romans were killed, 3,000 captured. Hannibal lost 6,000 total. With a smaller force, he was able to succeed in this battle.

Let's go to the second battle, Leuthen. The basic thing here is that Prince Charles of Lorraine, commanding the Austrian army, had something in the range of 65,000 troops; King Frederick of Prussia had only 35,000 troops. Charles of Lorraine was not ignorant; he was schooled in the battle of Cannae. He had a force in the center, and a wing on the northernmost tip which was his right wing; and he had also forces on the southernmost wing, which was his left wing. Frederick came in from the north. The Austrians had almost twice as many forces. What Frederick did was, he deployed just one cavalry unit and some infantry on the right wing of the Austrians to give them the impression that he was going to attack from there. The terrain in this area was very hilly; they call them knolls or hillocks. It was also foggy. Frederick had the rest of his army deployed under the cover of these hills and the fog. The whole army was deployed to attack the Austrian force on its weakest, southernmost wing, and up to the end the Austrians thought that the major attack was going to come from the north. So, it wasn't a double enveloping operation, it was a massing of forces attacking on one flank in this case. The issue is not some formalism of a double envelopment; the issue is the deployment of a creative principle.

Lyndon LaRouche wrote that what Frederick the Great's forces did is they "scampered"; they essentially ran under the fog and through the hills to reach the battlefield. The Austrian forces found themselves in the wrong place, and they tried to reposition, but the effect of this was that they were also about 40-100 troops deep at that position, similar to the conditions that the Romans were forced into in the battle of Cannae. What happened was, the Austrian forces were routed; they fled. And by the evening—this is all done in one day—by the evening, Frederick the Great slept at the castle at Lissa. The result here was that the

casualties and losses on the part of the Austrians were 22,000, and Frederick lost 6,300 troops to casualties.

### The Creative Flank as the Key to Victory

Now Lyndon LaRouche wrote a paper called "[Who Needs Brains When We Have Muscles?](#)" I'll just read some of what he writes there, which I think is really crucial:

"The secret of military principle of the flank lies with the mind of the commander. Frederick's conduct paralleled the quality of mind shown by the scientist who discovers and validates a newly discovered universal physical principle. He outflanked Charles' forces by inventing a tactic which had not yet been introduced into the Austrian school book. Charles had

learned the model of Cannae, but it was Frederick who knew the principle involved. At Leuthen, Frederick defeated the Austrians by surprising them; by doing what the Austrian commanders would not have believed were a possible course of Prussian action. In the words of the physicist, Frederick recognized a usable added dimension of the physical space-time field of action which the Austrian command failed to recognize as existing. Just so, Hannibal had recognized the folly misguiding the Roman commanders into a fatally errant tight disposition of their troops."

It's been said that Robert Mueller is very linear in his thinking. I would suggest that Robert Mueller's office is probably about 36 lawyers deep who are hostile to President Trump, favorable to Hillary Clinton, and work with the British. That's very definitely to our advantage in this situation. Lyndon LaRouche continues in this piece: "Prussian troops under Frederick the Great's command did what the Austrians had assumed to be an impossible deployment—scampering." But I highly recommend scampering when it serves a strategic purpose. "Surprise lies in the mind of him who either does not know or is self-blinded by his refusal to know, like the routed Roman commanders at Cannae."



*Frederick the Great*



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche, at SDI conference, Washington, D.C., 1983.

What Lyndon LaRouche does in this article is then go forward to discuss how this principle was used by him to design the Strategic Defense Initiative. This was written in 1999. LaRouche devised the Strategic Defense Initiative in the late 1970s and early 1980s. He says, “The root definition of grand strategy lies in the multiply-connected character of two sets of universal principles. These are, respectively, sets of universal physical principles and also sets of universal principles of social relations; the latter typified by the greatest works of Classical artistic composition. The multiple connectedness among these two sets of universal principles defines the means by which mankind increases our species’ power in and over the physical universe, and also the means of cooperation by which the physical power is developed and effectively applied.”

With respect to the SDI, the physical principle was to deploy new physical principles, particularly the use of lasers, of electron beams, and so forth, to render nuclear weapons obsolete. In other words, to rely on a

defense strategy to defeat the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction which had been put forward by people like Bertrand Russell and H.G. Wells, the doctrine which dominated the post-World War II period once the Soviet Union had developed thermonuclear weapons.

The other side of it, he explains, is that the key was to have cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in developing this system. The key to developing this cooperation is the spillover effects of the new physical principles in terms of the domestic economy, of not only those two countries, but of the world. “The essence of the strategy was to shift the definition of the adversary away from a conflict between nation-states, to a defense against the economic attrition which had been ruining all the leading states.” So what is this, but a perspective of “win-win”: a perspective of a community of principle among sovereign nation-states.

Those were the conceptions behind the formation of the SDI concept, but it applies to a definition of strategic policy as a whole.

### **To Win a War, Know Your Enemy**

Now, if you go forward, to *Earth’s Next Fifty Years* and what LaRouche lays out there—and this was written in 2004-2005—what we are experiencing today is the application of these principles expressed in Cannae and Leuthen that were critical to the development of the SDI policy. We’re seeing the same approach used by Lyndon LaRouche in 2004-2005, playing out in the world, with the development of the One Belt, One Road perspective on the one hand, and our efforts to defeat the British empire’s coup against the United States.

In *Earth’s Next Fifty Years*, Lyndon LaRouche emphasizes that the key thing to understand in world since 1763, since the Treaty of Paris in 1763 at the end of the Seven Years’ War, is that the key issue is the Anglo-Dutch liberal system. This refers to the Dutch East Indies Company and specifically to the British East India Company which took over India. He actually says in this book that the Anglo-Dutch liberal system is the “veritable elephant standing and trumpeting, unnoticed, in the middle of the honeymoon couple’s bed.” Later on in the same piece, he’s a little bit more graphic; he says that the Anglo-Dutch liberal system is “the elephant defecating where the honeymooners are helplessly sleeping.”

Now the point that LaRouche makes is that the world has to be rid of this system, the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, the liberal capitalist system, which is the system of the City of London and of Wall Street. You can't get rid of it unless you identify it, which is the problem with so many people who want to talk about "Deep State" and other such things. *That is a losers' strategy, because it's not true: You have to identify what the problem is.* What LaRouche is discussing is the Venetian financial imperial system, which, after the Renaissance, shifted to the Netherlands and to London as a center of operations, and this was consolidated in the Paris Treaty of 1763. The American Revolution was fought against this Anglo-Dutch liberal system. This has been the ongoing fight, not just between the United States and Great Britain, but between the entire world, to the extent to which it's conscious of this enemy image, and that Anglo-Dutch system, which has come to dominate.

People like Lincoln, people like Roosevelt were clear on this and fought against this, but after 1971, you had a reassertion of this Anglo-Dutch liberal system, with the takedown of FDR's Bretton Woods system and the introduction of floating exchange rates, the abandonment of the gold-backed fixed exchange rate system by Nixon, under George Shultz.

The point that LaRouche makes is that people have allowed themselves to become confused into thinking that this Anglo-Dutch liberal system, which has taken over the United States increasingly, is the U.S. system. That the U.S. is this Anglo-Dutch empire, and that's not the case. The case is that the United States has been subjected to this, as have other countries. Look at Europe today.

What LaRouche identifies as the problem is "slime mold"—i.e., accepting certain sets of ruling axiomatic assumptions. He says: "the great enemy of civilizations ... is the worship of popular mediocrity in the name of a quality of respect for existing traditions," and that the

problem is the "failure to carry out a needed violation" of accepted opinions or habits.


The key, as LaRouche says, is you have got to get people to realize that we're all oppressed by the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, to the extent to which it continues to exist. You have to break from that system, as the Chinese are doing. You have to bring the United States and other nations into that, and you've got to organize the world around the common destiny of all mankind, based upon the conception that the interests of humanity come first,—that is, the *Advantage of the Other*, as expressed in the Treaty of Westphalia.

As I said earlier, Lyn discusses that you need a new set of physical principles and at the same time you have to address social relations, particularly as expressed in Classical art. And what I want to do, is just read two contrasting states of mind from Friedrich Schiller. The first is a soliloquy by Wallenstein, in Schiller's Wallenstein trilogy of plays. Wallenstein was a general for the Austrians in the Thirty Years' War and he contemplated breaking from the Emperor of Austria and forging a peace agreement with the Swedes, Gustavus Adolphus. He didn't do it, but the word was out that he was thinking of doing it, and he was assassinated. The Thirty Years' War began in 1618

and was concluded with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. He was assassinated in 1630. His failure to act meant that that war continued to be waged throughout Europe, to the destruction of Europe for another 18 years.

Let me just read this soliloquy, because he gets at the contrast to Frederick the Great who acted voluntarily and creatively. What Wallenstein said to himself, before he was assassinated, is the following: [as heard]

"Thou wouldst shake the tranquil, securely reigning power, which in deep-rooted sanctified possession in ancient custom, rests firmly grounded, which to the people's pious childhood faith is fastened with a thousand stubborn roots. This will not be a war of strength



with strength. That fear I not. With any foe I'll venture, whom I can see and look into the eye, who full of courage also kindles mine. It is a foe invisible whom I fear, who in the breast of man opposes me, by cowardly fear alone, to me appalling. Not what proclaims itself alive and forceful is dangerously terrible. 'Tis what's quite common, the eternal yesterday, what always was and always reappears, and tomorrow's good because today 'twas good, for out of what is common is man made, and force of habit he doth call his nurse. Woe is him who moves his worthy ancient household effects, the precious heirlooms of his forebears. The year exerts a consecrating force. What's gray from age, that is to him divine. Be in possession, and thou dweltest in the right, and sacredly the crowd will guard it for thee."

So, think of this: Instead of actually thinking about forging a peace alliance and breaking from the Emperor, which is what he had to do, what does he fear? He fears the slimemold! He fears the culture of adaptation to the imperial system on the part of the population, his own army.

Now, on the other hand, take Schiller's conception of the sublime. This is completely different. In his writing "On the Sublime":

"'No man must must,'... The will is the species character of man, and reason itself is only the eternal rule of the same. All nature acts according to reason; his prerogative is merely, that he act according to reason with consciousness and will. All other things must; man is the being, who wills.

"Precisely for this reason is nothing so unworthy of man, as to suffer violence, for violence annuls him. Who does it to us, disputes nothing less than our humanity; who suffers it in a cowardly manner, throws away his humanity. ...

"For everything, the proverb says, there is a remedy, but not for death. But this single exception, if it actually is one in the strictest sense, would annul the whole notion of Man. By no means can he be the being, which wills, if there is even but a single case, where he absolutely must, what he does not will. ...

"To annihilate violence as a concept, however, is called nothing other, than to voluntarily subject oneself to the same. ...

"This mentality, however, which morality teaches under the concept of resignation to necessity and religion, under the concept of submission to divine counsel, demands, if it shall be a work of free choice and reflection, already a greater clarity of thinking and a

higher energy of the will, than man is characteristically accustomed to in active life. ..."

This is the idea of the sublime. It could also be put forward, "Thy Will be done," in respect of this concept of "divine counsel." But what he's discussing here is the combination of creative reason and will. And that is what Frederick the Great demonstrated in this particular battle. That's what Lyndon LaRouche demonstrated in the creation of the SDI. That is what is reflected in the campaign we are currently engaged in, launched by Lyndon LaRouche, many years ago, to bring about a world in which you have new physical principles — it's the Russian scientist Vernadsky's notion of the noosphere. When you create land-bridge throughout the entire planet, you are changing the biosphere into the noosphere: The human mind is redefining the entire planet on behalf of mankind. That's the new physical principle, combined with the new physical principles that are involved in space exploration, development of fusion power and so forth.

And at the same time it involves the "win-win" strategy as expressed by the Chinese of bringing nations together. It's the John Quincy Adams conception of the Monroe Doctrine, a community of interest among a family of sovereign nation-states. And the key to it, as Lyndon LaRouche says, is, you've got to get people to realize that they're all oppressed by the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, to the extent to which that continues to exist. And so you've got to break from that system, as the Chinese are doing and you've got to bring the United States and other nations into that and you've got to organize the world around the common destiny of all mankind, based upon the conception that the interests of humanity come first,—that is, the advantage of the other, as expressed in the Treaty of Westphalia; and that is coherent with the interests of one's own sovereign nation.

I'm going to conclude with that, because what I really want people to understand is the method used by Lyndon LaRouche to create grand strategy, as he did with the SDI, and as he and his wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, have done into the current period. I want to make it very clear that the Anglo-Dutch liberal system is the enemy, including the enemy of the English people, and of the Dutch people, just to put a point on it. Therefore, you have to see this whole coup operation against the United States, directed from the British, as an expression of this Anglo-Dutch liberal system that must be destroyed.