

# The Question of the British Empire

*April 26—An excerpt from the discussion that followed Panel 4 of the Schiller Institute's April 25-26 teleconference.*

**Dennis Speed:** We have a question for all of our panelists from Jessica White, a long-time political activist in New York.

As a member of the LaRouche PAC and an active follower of LaRouche for many years, I have come to realize that many people, especially Americans, see the definition of the term “empire,” as an enemy that only exists in the fantasy world of a George Lucas movie, with no correlation to the so-called “real world.” They have been taught to believe that the British Empire was something created and controlled by kings and queens centuries ago. They naively do not understand that the British Empire, in its many covert, evil forms, still exists to this day. Many Americans talk about the so-called “deep state,” or the “American empire,” but they dismiss the truth of the existence of a very dangerous, and very present British Empire, along with its notorious, traitorous American puppet allies.

It is this British geopolitical entity that continues to control and manipulate the U.S. and the world economy, mainly through Wall Street and the City of London. It is this British geopolitical entity which continues to spread war and famine and regime change. It is the British Empire that also continues to incorporate the ideology of eugenics, describing most of humanity as “useless eaters,” and continues to instill the evils of racism all over the world.

This may seem like a simplistic or stupid question, but please ask any or all of the panelists to explain, how would you address those Americans and others, who refuse to comprehend that Wall Street and the City of London are, actually, the arms and legs of the body of the British Empire, which must be destroyed, and replaced by a New Paradigm under LaRouche's Four Laws, beginning immediately with establishing a global Glass-

Steagall in order to infuse the funds in the form ...

**Ramasimong Phillip Tsokolibane:** We should look at the media, the role that the media in the United States of America is spreading. You can start with the hippies' sex counterculture era. That's when the strike started. You can add it up, education: The education that most people of less than maybe 50 or 40 years got in America, killed them. It turned them into zombies through the attacks of the media. The British Empire controls the media. The youth of today are always on Facebook, WhatsApp, social media. What are they texting? They don't go to internet sites like LaRouche PAC; that's the only place where you can get what we talk about, within the LaRouche movement.

They've been turned into animals. They are living there. It's our job. At times, I picture LaRouche speaking when he came from the Second World War, from India. In a webcast, he related somebody asking him, “Who the hell are you, Lyndon LaRouche?” It was an Afro-American. He said, “Since I've joined your movement, I'm no longer being invited to tables, to dinners that I used to be invited to. I'm bruised. Who the hell are you?” So I think LaRouche was singing, silently, while making fishers of men—if you follow me. And he fished me.

So it's our job. We don't need to be paid to do this job, because we are human beings. We don't have to follow animals, because we see that they've chosen evil ways. We must always fight for the truth, try to bring them to the light, because we are the torchbearers. Let their blood not be on our shoulders. Thanks.

**Sébastien Périmony:** Concerning what Helga was saying about whether it is too late to act: Of course, it's never too late, but we all know that we have 25,000 people dying *every day* of hunger. That's an official figure from the Food and Agriculture Organization. So, already in the last decades, 10 million people dying every year of hunger. What I have heard from the American farmers is just unbelievable. We have the same problem in France, the same problem in Germany, farmers striking, demonstrations all over the world. It's just amazing that civilization is no longer able to feed its population. I think one of the most important ques-

tions for the world health system, is food production that we have to develop worldwide. I think it's very important that we fight on this subject.

**Ellen Brown:** The British and American systems go back to the Bank of England. The British system was, banks privately issued money at interest, and the American System was government-issued money. We clearly need to go back to the American System. It has gradually eroded. Originally, the American colonies issued all of their own money, and then we had coins. Coins were the official money when the Constitution was written, and were a big part of the money supply at that time. They were issued by the Treasury. The portion of coins has gotten smaller and smaller, and now we're just talking about nickels, dimes and quarters, and all of the rest is issued privately by banks and particularly by central banks. The Bank for International Settlements is the head of the central banking system, but it was originally British until after World War I, when they no longer had the money to do it themselves, at which point they partnered with three other central bankers and that moved to Switzerland.

The locus of the problem is this parasite that is sucking money out of the system at all times, the whole financialized system, which you could call the British system. I think the British system is probably more nefarious than that. I've seen whistleblowers talking of being in meetings where the talk was about quite bad things, like bringing down the global economy with a pandemic.

I would agree that that's where the problem is, and to get control of it we do need some sort of global movement. But first, I think we need a global understanding of what the problem really is, and how it can be fixed.

**Speed:** We are approaching the 250th anniversary of the American Revolution. Most Americans think that revolution is "over," that it doesn't exist dynamically. I'd like to see if you have any recommendation for the questioner about how you would explain to Americans, the idea of how these two systems operate.

**Cédric Mbeng Mezui:** I don't know if this will explain it to Americans, but it's more to try to share the American experience with Africans: The story of America as the way to build our economy has to be well-known. All these discussions about some countries exporting raw materials, about producing manufactures

are somewhat known. There is much international suppression. You can see that in the fact that Africa depends 100% especially for food, for jobs, for everything, even for money. And this is where I think there is a lot for Africans to learn from what was implemented in U.S. during the same period. This is a Hamilton time for Africa. To make a decision and work to implement the same kind of measures, not exactly the same, because it's not exactly the same story, but there is a key fundamental in the way the economy can be built, the way to build up industry, and the way to use manufacturing to absorb the workforce on the continent. This is the kind of experience that can be shared between the U.S. and Africa in this kind of discussion.

**Speed:** You're referring to your own writings on Hamilton's economics and the possible applications of that in Africa. Is that what you're saying?

Mbeng Mezui: Yes. In two of my books, I use Hamilton's view as the key for production, in terms of manufacture and banking systems, to see how it can be used to help Africa take off, and also to try to explain the challenges that we faced during our encounters with the British Empire at that time.

In another one of my books using Hamilton's ideas, it was more to show how a country or a region can use Hamilton's public finances as a banking system to actually fund the real economy and use it for the benefit of the population, not just to speculate. These kinds of ideas need to be shared on the continent.

**Speed:** Jack Lynch, on this panel, is also a banker. Jack, do you have anything to say? The questioner said she has a problem being able to explain to dumb Americans that there actually is a British Empire that runs things, because the people she talks to think America runs things, the "American empire."

**Lynch:** I just don't think the British run things. It's one of the areas that I have a hard time understanding, and maybe it's my own fault for not researching it. I've read all the materials from Lyndon LaRouche and I see the point, but—I just think—I don't see how the Brits can really control us. And, frankly, the world economy. I just don't see it.

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:** I can only say that in my presentation yesterday I tried to go into some of the ideology of it. If you look at it just like "facts," it blurs,

because the British are very smart in always taking all sides. They give each side the impression that they're on that side. In a certain sense, it's the "divide and conquer," it's the idea to subvert organizations. If you look at the Integrity Initiative, the way they plant what they call "cluster agents" in the media who spread—I mean, if you look at German TV for example, you don't need to have a list of who is a British agent, because they reveal *themselves* by having *the* line of the geopolitical attack, almost like clockwork. Like when the anti-China campaign started to escalate. If you develop a sense of how it works, you see it every day.

Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, a prominent columnist for the *Daily Telegraph*, once wrote an editorial, saying that the European Union is doing exactly what the British interest is. So that is how they work!

The H.G. Wells book, *The Open Conspiracy*, of 1928, describes it very clearly, that when the British realized that they could not militarily reconquer the American colony, they determined to subvert the American establishment to get Americans to adopt the British Empire as a model to run the world based on the Anglo-American special relationship. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, they decided to establish the unipolar world, based on the model of the British Empire.

So you can say that the Americans have more power, they have more muscle, they have more military—that's all true. But I think if you want to understand how it works, you have to go back in the history of the United States. The British *never* gave up on the idea that they had lost the American colony; they first tried to re-win the colony in the War of 1812. That didn't work. They tried again in the Civil War, siding with the Confederacy against Lincoln. That did not work. Then came the assassinations. Since they managed to get the United States into World War I, it's like a textbook. If you really try to figure it out, you can. The subversion of the establishment is the big problem.

What is lacking is the patriots—the patriots who would reassert the ideals of the American Revolution, to fight for America as a republic. I don't know how to communicate this: The United States would have such an easy time to be friends with every country in the world if they would go back to the ideas of the American Revolution. People are not anti-American. They're anti-this *thing* which has emerged after the assassination of Kennedy, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the regime-change wars, the color revolutions, the interventionist wars—this is really far gone!

It's a calamity, because if the United States is not part

of the solution, it for sure will be part of the problem. I don't think that the United States will dissolve as peacefully as the Soviet Union did in '91. If the United States were to collapse, I think we would have World War III. Therefore, I think it is in the interest of the whole human race to find a solution where the United States plays an important role, is maybe even *primus inter pares*—I don't care. As long as there is the principle of the acceptance of sovereignty, of having alliances. Go back to the John Quincy Adams conception of foreign policy, and there will be no problem. I can tell you, all the people in the world, all the peoples in the world, would be overjoyed if the United States would find its way back to its tradition. That's all I can say.

**Lynch:** Thank you, Helga. I have a better understanding, now that you said all that. I now have a different perspective. Thank you.

**Bob Baker:** The one thing I was thinking is the massive capability through mass media and the advertisements that are used—they've got these things scientifically designed to promote concepts and ideas and philosophies that just overwhelm people at this moment. And that's a process of the Empire. One of the challenges we have is how, even as individuals, to survive over-bombardment through the mass media. In my investigations into agriculture and what's going on there, you can't hardly find a major farm magazine that isn't just completely full of ads from the big cartel monopolies. Of course, that leads everybody in a certain direction. I just use that as a short example of the process that we're discussing.

**Périmony:** Maybe one point for Mr. Lynch about the British Empire: Yesterday, Jacques Cheminade referred to a book by Nicholas Shaxson, *Treasure Islands: Tax Havens and the Men Who Stole the World*, in which Shaxson writes about the second British Empire, with the process of transformation from a *political* British Empire to a *financial* British Empire. It's very interesting. If we take the case of Africa, recent reports show that between 1980 and 2010, you have \$1.2 trillion of capital flight which went to the tax havens, which is the equivalent of the GDP of the whole continent. So you have \$1.2 trillion in 30 years going to the tax havens of the British Empire—most of them are British. So that's a point, also to understand that it's not a political empire, as such, but it's a real financial empire, and I think it's important also to have this idea in mind.