
II. The Power To Change History

Great Opportunity—Great Danger

LaRouche PAC Nationwide Fireside Chat with Will Wertz (edited) of Aug, 24, 2017

Moderator Lynne Speed of Mahattan opened the call.

Will Wertz: Okay, thank you Lynne. I think you have to look at this moment in history in the way that the German poet, dramatist and historian, Friedrich Schiller, looked at the period of the French Revolution. He wrote a short two-line poem shortly after the French Revolution, called, “The Moment”; and it goes as follows: “A momentous epoch has the century engendered. Yet the moment so great findeth a people so small.” And that’s the challenge before us at this point in history: to overcome smallness of mind—not to be taken in by infantile fixations, to put it in those terms. We are at a situation where we have potential to move forward for a common destiny of all humanity. President Trump’s election, particularly in certain key areas, represents the potential for the United States to join in this grand strategy for humanity. And as Lynne Speed just mentioned, there are especially two areas which are critical. First of all, he rejected the entire policy of regime-change, which we’ve been involved in—perpetual warfare—over the last couple of decades, especially under George W. Bush and then under President Obama. He rejected the war in Iraq; he criticized heavily the effort in Libya, which resulted in the assassination of President Qaddafi; he has moved, although slowly in a certain sense because of the attack on him for his alleged collusion with Russians—he has moved to work with the Russians to defeat ISIS and al-Nusra in Syria. Those are very positive developments and, of course, that is responsive to what President Putin proposed back in September of 2015 at the UN General Assembly, which is a united coalition internationally to fight terrorism, similar to the coalition which emerged to defeat the Nazis during World War II.

Strategic Opportunity

The second area is what he has at least expressed a commitment to, over the course of the campaign and since then. That is to implement Glass-Steagall, which would, as most people know, separate legitimate banking activity involved in investment in real production, real social services, from speculative, casino type banking which has destroyed our economy. He has also, since being elected, made a number of speeches in which he has called for a return to the American System of economy, and has cited Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln among others in that context. And



U.S. Army




U.S. Air Force/Staff Sgt. Lorie Jewell

War presidents: President Bush (top) in Iraq, December 2008; (above) Barack Obama with U.S. Army Gen. David Petraeus, in Iraq.


even in the most recent situation involving Charlottesville, he made the statement that the way to improve human relations, including racial relations in this country, is to create jobs—to actually increase the standard of living of all people in the country, and that involves creating productive jobs, at a higher wage level, so that people can actually afford to have a family and they can afford to make a commitment to a brighter future for the next generation, which is, after all, one of the things that is absolutely critical in anyone's life, is through one's life to contribute to improve conditions for one's children, or if one doesn't have children of one's own, to all children, to posterity. So those are the two areas which are really crucial.

Now with the entire operation to conduct a coup against President Trump, he has not fully acted on those, and in some areas actually acted contrary to that promise. That was the case when he, without evidence that Syria had actually engaged in the use of chemical weapons as claimed, bombed the Syrian air base. The recent speech that he gave on Afghanistan has dangers attached to it, because there is no military solution per se, in Afghanistan, and we've already been there sixteen years with no great results. In fact one thing that has been accomplished in Afghanistan is that the world has been flooded with heroin from the opium crops in that country.


And on the domestic front, there may have been jobs that have been created through the measures that he has taken thus far, including not going along with the free trade agreements, and other similar efforts to bring jobs back to the United States as opposed to outsourcing under these free trade agreements, but the situation has not improved overall. To do that we need to go with Glass-Steagall. We need to go with Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws, which include Glass-Steagall; which include providing public credit through



Alexander Hamilton



Henry Clay



Abraham Lincoln

a National Bank, with an emphasis on investment in capital-intensive forms of manufacturing, and involve committing ourselves to the future by developing fusion power and by reviving the space program. Those are the things that are necessary right now. Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have called for launching an emergency action in this country to ensure that those policies are actually implemented now, because President Trump is being boxed in. He's certainly combative against his enemies, but he is increasingly being boxed in. You have an environment in the country which the Chinese compare to the Cultural Revolution under Mao Zedong, in terms of the tyranny being set up by the news media and by the former intelligence agents like Clapper, Brennan, Comey, Mueller and his office as Special Counsel—and by Democrats and also opponents of President Trump in the Republican Party. You have a McCarthyite environment that is being created in the country which is extraordinarily dangerous. This is preventing the kind of collaboration which is required with, in particular, the Russians and the Chinese.

Now, we have advocated for a long time that the United States join with the BRICS nations, that is Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, in terms of what has come to be known as the “One Belt One Road” policy of China, or the Silk Road, or what we used to call the World Land-Bridge, which was initiated by Lyn and Helga LaRouche decades ago, and which the Chinese have adopted. We need to be working with that program, which is a program of peace based on economic development. You see the potential for success by the progress which is being made in Syria now as a result of the fact that the U.S., after President Trump's meeting with President Putin, agreed to setting up a de-escalation zone in southwestern Syria. And now you've got a situation where there may not be direct, joint

military action between the United States and Russia against ISIS and al-Nusra, but nonetheless, as the Russian Minister of Defense just said, the civil war in Syria is de-facto over. And now what you have is a very successful effort to wipe out ISIS, not only in Iraq, but also in Syria.

So, that is an example of what can be done. If you take other areas of the world—in North Korea, you could have collaboration between China, Russia, Japan and South Korea to solve that situation, but you would have to agree to do what the Russians and the Chinese have called for—and the Germans have actually advocated this well—which is a dual freeze, where the North Koreans agree no more missile tests, no more nuclear tests, and the United States and South Korea agree no more military drills, which at least in the past, have included the decapitation of the North Korean government. So that's the kind of move you have to take. Similarly in Afghanistan; look at the situation there. Rather than the U.S. going along with NATO militarily after sixteen years of failure, what should be done is collaboration between Russia, China, India, Pakistan, and Iran to settle the crisis in Afghanistan. That's eminently possible to do, but you have to actually make a decision to do that. Similar crises, such as Ukraine, can be solved in the same way.

Development the New Name for Peace

So that represents a New Paradigm of thinking, which is what Helga Zepp LaRouche has referred to. You have the old paradigm, which is based on geopolitics, based on free trade economics, and a certain kind of egoism. And then there is the New Paradigm, which is based upon what the Chinese call a “win-win” approach. This is not just a Chinese invention; this is really the way in which the Thirty Years War in Europe was ended. That was a religious war between Catholics and Protestants that devastated Europe for 30 years. It was ended in the Treaty of Westphalia, in which the principle that defined the peace process, was that you act to the benefit of the other. That's the kind of approach we have to have. That's a win-win strategy.

In a certain sense, what you have, is that most of the rest of the world has adopted the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia, which is having a foreign policy which is based on the advantage of the other, not your narrowly defined self-interest. The rest of the world is committed to a policy of peace and development, which

was the policy advocated by the late Pope Paul VI, in an encyclical called *Populorum Progressio*, basically, that the new name of peace is economic development. That's the new paradigm, and if we don't implement that new paradigm now, and fight for that now—which is a global paradigm. It needs to be implemented here in the United States in terms of LaRouche's Four Laws, but it has to be part of a global strategy to be successful. That is what we have to mobilize the American people to understand—that we either do that, or we are facing a danger of the situation spiraling out of control; of complete chaos in the United States, and the removal of a duly elected President from office, for political reasons—by, effectively, a foreign government, the British Empire. And that would mean the danger of thermonuclear war.

That's why Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have said that this is a dire situation requiring emergency action. And so I want to just end with that, and we'll be able to say more in response to your questions.

Speed: Okay, great. Thanks very much, Will. We will be moving to the question portion of this. And while people are thinking of their questions, I think what Will said gives a lot of food for thought, we have to think outside of the box; this is the key thing right now.

We are going to go to the questions that are lined up. Go ahead, can you hear me?

Q 1: This is Sarah from Indiana. And I just wanted to make a comment, but I think what's very important in light of what the gentleman was talking about, is that China has, within 30 years, raised up 700 million people out of poverty in only 30 years. There's a new article floating on the internet that in the last 15 years, the United States has increased terrorism by 6500%; so kind of a little bit of a difference there. The fact that 700 million is over twice the population of the United States. So, it is so vital for people to realize that the United States could be totally out of deficit, if people choose it.

Wertz: Well, I think the other thing to look at is that China, under Mao Zedong and the Cultural Revolution, was a horrendous, tyrannical society in which the population was very much oppressed; particularly intellectuals—people who actually thought—and not just the politically correct views of Chairman Mao and his Little Red Book. Now what you have is a situation where, not only—as you point out—over 700 million

people have been lifted out of poverty, but China is playing a very positive role on a global scale, if you look at what they're doing. They're a member of the BRICS, which I mentioned earlier, which is Brazil, Russia, India, China, and the Union of South Africa; a very unique organization because it represents a wide range of countries in the world. They're committed to a policy of economic development. Now the BRICS will have, I think it's its 9th annual summit in China in early September; this will be the 3rd to the 5th of September. The title of the conference is "Stronger Partnership for a Brighter Future." Of course the Chinese have invited the United States to join this effort, which is involved with the "One Belt, One Road"—or the Silk Road—perspective. Obama, of course, refused.

Obama put massive pressure on other countries, including Japan, Australia, and South Korea, not to work with China in terms of the major development bank which they set up. On the other hand, after his meeting with President Xi, President Trump did send a delegation to the One Belt, One Road summit which occurred in Beijing earlier this year. And this One Belt, One Road effort now includes something like 69 countries; and it's a conception of nations throughout the world working together to lift all of their populations out of poverty, and also to counter the tendency under conditions of poverty for people to be pitted against each other for racial, religious, ethnic, and tribal reasons. Not really good reasons, but to be manipulated against each other under conditions of poverty.

Urgent Changes

So this, in a certain sense, is a model which we should absolutely join at this point; and see it, along with the implementation of LaRouche's Four Laws in the United States, as the means of actually accomplishing rates of growth in the range of 7%-8% per year, as they have achieved in China previously. That's the kind of thing that we have as a potential which we have to move with right now. Again, I stress, this is urgent; it's not something to be done in the distant future. It's urgent because it will also be a tremendous flank on the current effort to unseat the duly-elected President of the United States. If he moves with that, that will mobilize the entire population—the forgotten men and women of



FDR Library

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in Mandan, North Dakota, August 27, 1936.

this country that he references, as did Franklin Roosevelt. It's the way to actually unite the country, as he said after Charlottesville. It's also something which Rev. Andrew Young, who worked with Martin Luther King, emphasized this past Sunday. He said the biggest problem in the country is poverty, and that that's what you have to focus on, as opposed to turning everything into a race issue.

Speed: OK, very good, and we'll go to the next question. Go ahead.

Q 2: It is the problem that there is such a barrage against the President. The fact that he can function at all is amazing. Outside of our street demonstrations and calling the White House with encouraging words, I don't know what else to do.

Wertz: Really what's required is creativity. And an actual passion for the good, which has traditionally been identified with love for humanity, love for the truth. That which goes to the issue of the Treaty of Westphalia again; that you act to the benefit of others. But the problem is, we've got a situation where the American people have to realize that they also have to think out of the box in terms of how they've been conditioned. I want to give you just one example, which I find very useful. It's the battle of Cannae, which occurred in 216 BC. This was in Italy, and it was fought between the Romans and the Carthaginians. The Carthaginians were led by Hannibal, a Carthaginian general. I'm citing this because it's a good example; it's a

classical military example. Of course we're not talking about a military implementation in terms of our action, but we're talking about a state of mind. What he did was, he encircled the Roman troops. The Roman troops amounted to 85,000 total; Hannibal's forces were much less —56,000. They had their backs to a river and the Romans were massing for a frontal assault on Hannibal's forces. What he did was, he created a V-shaped formation, and he drew the Romans into a frontal assault, just marching straight into this V. They actually became entrapped, and they were so densely packed that they couldn't even use their own weapons. Then what he did was, he used his cavalry to encircle the Roman forces and to strike them from the rear. It's an enveloping flanking operation. The Romans were completely devastated; Hannibal lost less than 6000 troops, and the Romans—out of 85,000—lost over 70,000 dead or captured.

What I'm getting at here is an encircling action; I'm getting at getting outside of the box. You've got to actually encircle the enemy from the standpoint of the mind, the standpoint of being creative. That's why there are really two initiatives which we've been engaged in. One is the petition against the intervention in the United States by the British Empire to overthrow a duly-elected U.S. President. Also, to get President Trump to move on the evidence presented by the VIPS—the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity—that it wasn't Russian hacking; that it was a leak. The whole thing is just a big lie, that's all this is. Just like Adolf Hitler, a big lie; that's what Mr. Binney said.

Q 2 [continued]: If you're going to lie, make it a big one.

The British Factor

Wertz: Right. And even Scott Ritter, the weapons inspector for Iraq, said that having read this report, this borders on sedition against a duly-elected President of the United States. Now, that's one initiative. The second initiative is to move to get President Trump to realize that he has got to encircle the enemy and hit them from the rear. The best way to do that is to go with LaRouche's Four Laws and to join the Silk Road; that's the policy that he needs to move on. So, that's the use of creativity—and you don't get boxed in, you don't operate on the basis of the options which you think you're presented with; which are not good options. They lead to self-destruction. So, you look for the

flanking operation. And these are the two flanking operations which Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have identified.

Q 2 [continued]: That's exactly the point I made when I called the White House. I think I call them two or three times a week. I find that the number I use, instead of the 1111, I call the 1414; that's 202 456-1414. I always get in on that line. They ask me if I want the comment line; I say yes, and I get heard.

Q 3: With the British, this is very good. The main thing that's caused me concern in the last 48 hours is this idea that it's a civil war that we're having, and they're promoting that. I think it's the Trojan Horse. Trump warned us about having a Trojan Horse with these immigrants coming in, and I think that's really what it is. We don't have a civil war, but we have a Soros-funded mercenary army out there fighting with their baseball bats and whatnot. The situation, they upped the ante in the last 24 hours by saying they're bringing in the UN, might come in to protect the Antifa and the Black Lives Matter as a matter of human rights in case we got to having an armed conflict with them, and it looks like they're going to lose. So, that's a potential flare-up that needs to be squelched, and see what kind of British influence is influencing the UN, when we're talking about getting the British influence out. Start squelching them so we don't have that possibility of a UN invasion.

Wertz: I don't think it occurs on that level. The level on which you've got to look at this is how this entire operation against President Trump started. It was started by MI-6, which is the British equivalent of the CIA. A so-called "former" MI-6 agent, Christopher Steele, was paid to put together a dossier of unverified material which he then circulated very widely to Obama's intelligence agency stooges like Brennan and Comey and Clapper. This is the roadmap on which they're operating; so this is straight British intelligence MI-6. The second indication of this is something called the Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ), which is a pretty dull name for what is the British equivalent of the NSA. They were the ones who, according to the published accounts—and the published accounts may not be completely true, but what the published accounts say is that the head of GCHQ went directly to Brennan. In other words, they don't have to operate under the U.S. Constitution, and the re-

straints of the U.S. Constitution against surveilling Trump associates, so they surveilled Trump associates all over the world. Then they go to Brennan, the head of the CIA, who's not supposed to operate domestically according to the charter; and he puts together a six-intelligence agency taskforce to begin to investigate Trump in the middle of the Presidential campaign. There are various reports as to when this occurred, some say it was in the Summer of 2016, which is the time of the Republican convention; others say it was before that. But the point is, once Trump was a serious threat to win the nomination, GCHQ began to conduct what would be illegal surveillance in the United States against Trump and his associates. This is all done in collaboration with Obama and with Comey and with Clapper, and with Brennan in particular. And of course, we've gotten from Wikileaks that Brennan put together a cyber warfare unit in the CIA of over 5000 employees; it rivals the NSA.

So, this is what we're talking about. And you see how prominent Clapper and Brennan have been—even in the last few days—in going after President Trump. So the point is, you've got a Clinton-Obama-Comey-Brennan-Clapper operation, which is in fact, funded by Soros. Soros—his pedigree is British; that's what his pedigree is. So, if you go after this and investigate this, then you will upset the entire coup plot. But then combine that—it's got to be combined with the economic program. So, that's the way we have to do it. The other stuff becomes a lower-level fixation which gets you not to think strategically. That's what you've got to do. You've got to clear your mind so you can think strategically and creatively in terms of who the enemy is, and how to defeat the enemy. What we've defined is two initiatives which are critical to defeating the enemy right now; and we've got to get President Trump to move on these as quickly as possible.

Q 3 [continued]: What about Obama giving the internet to the UN?

Solon and Lycurgus

Wertz: Listen, the UN has got all sorts of problems; but frankly, it's not the primary problem in the world. It's basically an assembly of nations; it's as good as it's made. There are good things that are done at the UN when people collaborate. When they don't collaborate, and it's used for geopolitical purposes, including by the British, then it's a mess. For instance, the UN has

backed all of the initiatives that have been taken—I mean, look at Syria. You've got Turkey and Iran working together with the Russians. A Sunni country, a predominantly Shi'a country, and they're working with the Russians to defeat terrorism and to restore stability and sovereignty to Syria. That's a positive development which has been backed by the UN Security Council. The UN as a whole in a number of cases has actually positively responded to the Chinese Silk Road, or "One Belt, One Road" Initiative. So, it's really a question of, do the countries who are members of the UN change the way in which they function so they collaborate to solve problems and create a prosperous future for all of mankind? That's the real issue. It has nothing to do with the UN per se as an institution; it's as good or as bad as its members make it. But you have to look beyond the UN, to the question of the British; and you look at it through the whole history. We're talking about two systems, and it goes back before the British.

For instance, the German poet Friedrich Schiller, whom I mentioned earlier, wrote a piece called "On Solon and Lycurgus." Solon was the head of Athens; Lycurgus was the head of Sparta. They had two completely different systems. Solon, as Schiller wrote, had respect for human nature and never sacrificed the people to the state. Never sacrifice the ends to the means; rather he let the state serve the people, and all paths were open to genius. And the basic principle is, the progress of the mind should be the purpose of the state. So, that's like what our country was designed to be; it hasn't always been that, but that's what we would want it to be. That's what you would want other nations to be like. Lycurgus, on the other hand, the way Schiller characterizes him as follows: The laws were iron chains which pulled down the mind. All industry was barred; all science neglected. His state could only persist under one condition—that the mind of the people stagnates. If you look at it, there's another Greek mythology: Zeus was a tyrannical, Olympian so-called "god." He wanted to suppress mankind; he was threatened by the idea that mankind might actually develop technology, develop science, educate themselves, learn languages and so forth. Prometheus gave man fire; that is, technology. He also gave him a Promethean method of thinking, which is the creative method of thinking. So, you have two systems. This means, in a certain sense, that when Helga LaRouche talks about the New Paradigm, she's talking about the paradigm of Solon, the paradigm of Prometheus; versus the imperial policy of depressing



Rodney Dunning

“Left” and “Right” gangs in Charlottesville.



Rodney Dunning

the mental creative capacity of the population in order to maintain political control. The British are like the Roman Empire, like the Venetian Empire; the British Empire has a policy of reducing the world's population and keeping people dumb in order to politically control them.

Q 3 [continued]: Exactly right.

Speed: OK, great. We're going to go on to the next question here. Just say your first name and what state you're calling in from.

Q 4: Hello, this is Wally in Denver. I was reading on the computer about a problem. The Ukrainian government was complaining that Russia was impinging on its sovereignty by constructing a road to Crimea. Do you have any information about that?

From Kiev to Charlottesville

Wertz: Yeah, sure. The picture is straightforward. Obama put Nazis in power in Kiev with the backing of the British and many of the members of the European Union. It's basically part of a strategy to move eastward to the borders of Russia. When the Soviet Union collapsed, it was agreed upon between George H.W. Bush and Gorbachev and other participants, that NATO would not move eastward. But that's precisely what they've done, which is part of a geopolitical strategy. So, they're basically moving to try to encircle Russia, and Ukraine was a critical aspect of that policy. So

what they did was, they backed Nazi groups in Ukraine to take power. Now you had the duly-elected President—Yanukovich—in Ukraine; and under the Constitution of Ukraine, a President cannot be removed from office unless he's impeached. They never impeached him; they never brought impeachment. What they did was use the thugs in the street who were members of what is called the Right Sector. These guys trace themselves back to an actual Nazi who worked with Hitler, named Stepan Bandera. During World War II, his organization was involved in killing tens of thousands of Poles and Jews, working with Hitler. That's what this group traces its background to. The U.S. knows that, because after the war, people like Allen Dulles and MI-6 of Britain brought Bandera and his top aide to London and the United States. Because at that point, they wanted to use the Nazis against the Soviet Union, particularly in Ukraine. The Soviet Union fell, but nonetheless, that's the policy which they've continued to this day. So, they carried out a coup against the duly-elected President, and among the things that they were going to do, is outlaw the use of the Russian language as a second official language in Ukraine. So, the people of Crimea voted in a referendum, called self-determination under the UN Charter, to sever themselves from Ukraine where a coup d'état had been carried out by Nazis, and to join Russia. So, Russia acknowledged that democratic vote, based on the principle of self-determination in the face of a Nazi coup. Here you've got people in the United States up in

arms against Nazi KKK white supremacists; but in fact, Obama put Nazis in power in Ukraine. John McCain backed Nazis in power in Ukraine. The political establishment in Washington DC is backing Nazis in Ukraine; white supremacists in Ukraine. These people who support Nazis then get upset about a staged incident in Charlottesville, which was staged probably with provocateurs both among the Nazis and KKK, and also within the Antifa—the Antifascist organization—the guys with the black masks, black helmets, and black uniforms who carry out violence in all of these events.

So, this thing was set up. If you look at the people involved on the Democratic Party side in Charlottesville, they're all former employees of the State Department, they're all funded by George Soros. As is the mayor, Michael Signer; as is the guy who took the video of the deranged guy who killed one protester and injured others—his name is Brennan Gilmore; and another guy, Tom Periello. They are all funded by, they all worked with John Podesta's Center for American Progress; which is the center of the so-called "Resist" movement against Trump in the United States. And they were all there, along with Virginia Governor Terry McAuliffe, who's a longstanding supporter of the Clintons. They basically immediately used this to go after Trump; it was like you put two chemicals together which you know will react with an explosion. You don't separate the demonstrators, and then you prepare to use the incident—whether you planned the specific incident or not—you use the incident to go after the President of the United States. These are the same guys who backed Nazis in Ukraine. That's the hypocritical irony of this entire operation.

Speed: OK, excellent.

Q 4 [continued]: Then CNN wants to call it civil war, and we're calling that fake news; that it's not civil war.

Not a Civil War

Wertz: Sure. I mean, it's like Syria. It wasn't a civil war. It was a deliberate policy on the part of Obama to carry out regime change against countries which had nothing to do with al-Qaeda. Iraq had nothing to do with al-Qaeda; Libya had nothing to do with al-Qaeda, except to put them in prison. Syria had nothing to do with al-Qaeda. Saudi Arabia did. Britain did. Because

Saudi Arabia is just a satrap of the British Empire. But the point is, that what happened in Syria was that they brought in terrorists from all over the world—from Chechnya in Russia, from Europe, from Tunisia, from Libya, and so forth—in a war of aggression against a sovereign state which is a member of the UN; and then they call it a civil war. But this was Obama; this was one of the great crimes of Obama. This a guy who committed extra-judicial murders against—among others—American citizens after meetings that he held on Tuesdays every week with Brennan in the Oval Office. It would be like Caligula at the Coliseum; he puts his thumb up or down; this guy is to be killed. And that's what they did. So, this is what we're talking about here. The real evil in this thing, is people like Obama. As Lyndon LaRouche has always emphasized, Obama was trained by his stepfather, who was involved in the genocide in Indonesia back in the 1960s; that's where he grew up, with that stepfather. Obama's a murderer and a supporter of Nazis.

Speed: OK, thank you. We have quite a few more questions, so I'm going to move on to the next questioner.

Q 5: This is Greg from St. Louis. Just wanted to make a couple of points for the question out there. One, obviously the analysis of the regime change. The same thing is happening that's attacking the Trump administration, is an attempt to have a regime change, if you will. We simply call it an administration change. So we know all the tools and all the games that they play are related to that. My real issue is the psychosis of Donald Trump himself. I mean, we're putting a lot of marbles in this guy's basket, so to speak. We know he's a wild card; we really didn't know, but for me, it's important that we say what's happening with him as well. It's not like he's not aware of the VIPS report; not like he's not aware of many of these things. My question is, how do we really get him to understand the need to push that VIPS report and get that out there so that we can get at the crux of the Deep State that's attacking him, as well as pushing for this whole war issue, not only within the United States, but across the world?

Wertz: Well, that's—it's not like there's some particular series of tactics that will do this. What we've talked about is two flanks in terms of what he needs to do. In terms of going with the VIPS, going after the

British, and on the other hand, going with LaRouche's Four Laws and the Silk Road. But what you've got to do is, you've got to reach a certain threshold of activity in the country, including among those who support President Trump; but you've also in the process got to create a situation where it becomes much more difficult, as the truth gets out, for certain Democrats and certain Republicans who ran against Trump to carry out the kind of insanity that they're engaged in. So, that's the only way you can do this. You have to mobilize people who support Trump to demand that he take action on these, and that they will support him if he does that. And similarly, you've got to create an environment in which these people like Clapper and Brennan and Comey or Mueller—you've got to box them in. That's why I raised the battle of Cannae in terms of encirclement. The VIPS report boxes in Mueller, it boxes in Comey and Brennan and Clapper. But you've also got to box in the Democrats; these people say they're for Glass-Steagall—many of them. They say they're for working people, some of them; not all that many of them. Certainly Hillary Clinton wasn't too interested in working people. But the point is, that is the party of FDR, the party of Kennedy; or it used to be. So, you've got to really create the situation in which you basically make it clear to them, that if Trump takes the initiative on this, that calls the bluff on these Democrats. They say they're for Glass-Steagall, and yet they're calling for the impeachment of a President who's for Glass-Steagall when Obama was absolutely opposed to Glass-Steagall; as was Hillary Clinton. And they know that.

So, they're engaged in a certain kind of fraud, which needs to be exposed by calling their bluff. If they're real human beings—and you hope that they are on some level—then they'll respond. So you've got to basically do both things by a mobilization of the population.

In the Streets of NY

Q 5 [continued]: How do we box in Trump? I understand boxing in some of those people around him, but Trump himself? His own psychosis is, you're not sure what you're going to get out of this guy at any given time, so you have to force the office of the President to do what you want it to do. So what is that that has to box in Trump, so to speak? I know we've talked about boxing in all these other folks, but he's going to be the head at the head of the arrow; so what are we doing to box him in?

Wertz: We're mobilizing in these two respects; which includes "OK, you said you're for Glass-Steagall. You say that the best way to actually improve human relations, but specifically race relations in this country, is to create jobs." Look at the drug plague. If you don't have decent jobs, which we used to have in urban areas; Baltimore used to have shipbuilding; we used to have steel building, steelworks in Baltimore. Now they've got a tourist harbor, and that's it. You don't have the high-paying jobs that you need, so that people aren't prey to drugs and sales of drugs and so forth, and to gangs—which are related to drugs. So, you've got to actually get him to move on that. But in a certain sense, I think you've just got to convince him that he's combative, but he's not really being combative on the level that he needs to be. He clearly thinks that he is under complete fire; and you can't deny that. They called for his assassination. I put together a list for a webcast last Friday, of the calls for his assassination, impeachment, or forced resignation, or the use of the 25th Amendment against him. This started with the *Spectator*, which is a British paper, saying "Will Donald Trump be assassinated, impeached, or forced to resign?" That was on January 21st. You know the other cases: Johnny Depp, Madonna, Kathy Griffin. You can go through the list. So, you know that this guy really feels that he is under siege. So, he is combative with his tweets and so forth, but the issue here is, if you put this out on the table, if you get this spread widely enough, and he sees that there is support for taking these kinds of actions; and sees that this is an effective flanking operation against those who would destroy this country, then you've got a shot at actually getting him to move on it. That's the only thing I can say.

Speed: Now, that is what we have been doing increasingly in the streets in New York City and in the Midwest and we should expand this. But I'll just give you a sense of some of the results. On Monday, we had three teams out in Manhattan, Staten Island, and Long Island which raised \$1400; which is extremely good. We got out about 500 copies of the *Hamiltonian*; we collected a number of petition signatures. What was interesting is that one of these deployments was in the middle of Manhattan, which obviously did not go overwhelmingly for Trump; in fact, it went overwhelmingly for Hillary. So, we were deployed in front of the Fox



National Archives

Franklin D. Roosevelt signs the Glass-Steagall Act, 1933.

News building in midtown; and pretty much everyone who considered themselves a Trump supporter who came up to our table had already come to the conclusion that Russia-gate and Charlottesville were part of the same operation. We were expecting far more hostility than what existed, and there were several African-Americans who signed on to the petition. Some of them had voted for Trump, some people had not, and so on. And then you got a certain amount of confusion that existed.

We had another deployment, I think this was out in Queens yesterday, where we actually had a gaggle of these women—literally witches; they had everything but the black skirts and broomsticks with them. They came out with signs and so on. It was a very interesting deployment; it was about 10 or 12 of them who rotated through the day, attempting to yell at people, dissuade them from signing up, signing the petition and so on. Their polemic—and this is how you could see it was really organized—it was not around Trump, it was not around Charlottesville; it was actually “Oh, Lyndon LaRouche. You don’t want to sign up with LaRouche; that’s a cult. Stop signing up.” The response by and large from people coming up was basically, “Get out of my face! I don’t want to talk with you; I’m signing up with these people” and so on. So, we ended up, I believe on that deployment, with something like six or seven people getting memberships; lots and lots of people

giving their names—over 25 contacts—and so forth and so on.

So, that’s what’s out there, and I think part of it is that we have to go out and tell the population themselves that they’re not doing enough. That’s how you box in Trump. We’ve got to mobilize more of the population; they’ve got to be organized around a strategic objective. Stop these wars, and go with the economic policy. That’s what Trump was voted in for, that’s what he’s got to do, and that’s what the American people have got to demand. That’s what was put so beautifully and clearly by Andy Young in his statement on “Meet the Press.” Everybody should really read that, and I think that can be very useful in our organizing. So, that’s just what I would add to what Will said.

How We Win

Wertz: It’s a very principled issue. Countries are destroyed to the extent to which citizens of the countries don’t take responsibility for the republic, for their Constitution. That’s why the basic concept expressed in the Declaration of Independence is the principle of government by the consent of the governed. Similarly, what Lincoln said—government of, for, and by the people. The basic point is—don’t depend on Congress; don’t depend on a President. As good as the President may be, they very often are going to operate upon pragmatic conceptions, or what they think is opportune, or what they think is possible for them to do. For instance, the Civil Rights movement had to force it through. They had to force it with Eisenhower, they had to force it with Kennedy, they had to force Johnson to take action. That’s the way you have to really look at this. The point is, if you are operating from the standpoint of the vital interests of the nation and of humanity as a whole, you’re operating on the basis of principle and of reason; then you have authority within yourself as a citizen of a country—and also the responsibility as a citizen of a country, and as a citizen of the world—to take action and see that those actions which are required are acted upon by an elected official. They’re supposed to represent us; they get elected by us, and they’re supposed to represent our best interests. I think that’s really the issue. And you have to educate yourself so that you



bank that he used to actually engage in investment in the economy—it was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. After the war in Germany, they had the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, which is the Credit Institution for Reconstruction; same principle. But the idea is that the government can extend credit as a sovereign nation, can extend credit for productive investment. The problem here is that many Republicans have no conception of that.

So, you've got to educate both Democrats and Republicans to understand a scientific conception of economics; which they don't have. It's not clear exactly whether Trump has it; he may reference Hamilton and Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln, but it's not clear from his actions so far that he has those conceptions. So, it's a question of educating, it's a question of mobilizing your

know for certain with scientific certainty, that what you're advocating is actually a policy which is required and must be implemented.

What we've defined, is a policy that must be implemented. Take the Four Laws. You have Democrats who say they're for Glass-Steagall, but they're brainwashed in terms of Green ideology. The rest of the Four Laws that Lyndon LaRouche has put forward, put an emphasis on capital intensive forms of investment, including nuclear energy, nuclear desalination, the development of fusion, the expansion of the space program. Many of these Democrats say they're for Glass-Steagall, but what do they mean by Glass-Steagall if they're Green? Then on the Republican side, many of them are not Greenies, in the sense of being opposed to technological progress, but they've been brainwashed in respect to a balanced budget or merely reducing a deficit. So, they have no conception of the idea of public credit, and no conception of what Hamilton put forward with a National Bank, or what Lincoln put forward with greenbacks, or what Franklin Roosevelt put forward with the

fellow citizens to ensure that the policies the nation needs—the world needs—are enacted. It's a very basic principle that the power of government to govern derives from the people; but it has to be an educated people, not a mob.

Speed: OK, great. Will, we have about five more minutes, but we have about six more questions. So, we're going to try to get to as many of them as possible. I want to ask everybody to keep your questions and comments at this point short and succinct so we can try to get through as many of these as we can. OK, go ahead.

How the British Subverted Us

Q 6: Yeah, this is Ken in Moline, Illinois. Is the CIA a subsidiary of MI-6?

Wertz: You have to go back to World War II and the aftermath of World War II. The British Empire backed Hitler, and they wanted him to go east against the Soviet Union; but Hitler at a certain point decided that

he was going to go west. Churchill knew he couldn't defeat Hitler on the continent, so he needed to bring the U.S. into the war. Roosevelt certainly wanted to defeat fascism, but the British actually set up covert operations of British intelligence, MI-6, MI-5, in the United States at Rockefeller Center. They worked closely with Allen Dulles who became Deputy CIA Director and then later CIA Director after Roosevelt died. So, the point is, in 1946 there was an agreement signed which was called the UK-U.S.A. Agreement. Then later it became what's called the Five Eyes, which is Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Britain, and the United States. Basically the problem here is that our intelligence agencies here in the United States are working directly with British intelligence and with other members of the British Empire, or what's called now the Commonwealth.

There may be patriots within these intelligence agencies, many of them have become whistleblowers. But yet, this is how the British have subverted U.S. intelligence.

Speed: OK, very good. We're going to take two more questions now; and in about three minutes or maybe we'll go a little bit over. Go ahead.

Q 7: This is Steve from Pennsylvania. What I've noticed with the different organizations I've worked with—I work with several different patriot organizations, including the Oath Keepers and the Three Percenters and some militia that were there in Charlottesville the day of that event. From my different sources, I understand that these groups on both sides were all hooked in with State Department and Obama appointees and employees and Occupy Wall Street and those groups. Could Charlottesville be considered like a false flag to try to push this narrative of this race card thing, since the Russia thing completely failed and they now want to push the 25th Amendment thing and they want to push that Trump somehow has dementia?

Wertz: You're right; it's a false flag operation. For instance, one of the things that came out is that one of the organizers of the demonstrators—a guy named Kessler—I think it was Charles Grassley who asked the question, or another Senator—this guy was involved in Occupy Wall Street. He was apparently a supporter of Obama. Then all of a sudden, you're expected to believe that there was this transformation, and he ends up being an organizer of this demonstration. So that's on

the one side. On the other side, as I said at the beginning—I don't know if you heard it or not—all of the key players in Charlottesville are Democrats who have worked with John Podesta at the Center for American Progress; which described itself as the institutional center of the Resist movement against Trump in the United States. And Podesta, of course, is Obama, he's Clinton—both Hillary and Bill. This is all funded by Soros. So, the whole thing was in that sense, a set-up. And it's modelled upon what they did in Ukraine; where it was the State Department, it was Soros, and so forth. Think about how that thing operated. For instance, when Yanukovich was forced to flee, he was accused of ordering snipers to shoot demonstrators. But he denies that that was the case, and there's evidence that the snipers may have actually been members of the Right Sector, the Nazis; or organized by them. So, it is a false flag operation. This whole operation was set to take off after Charlottesville. Remember, Charlottesville was declared by the mayor of Charlottesville, Signer, as a capital of the Resistance in a speech he gave on January 31st earlier this year. The point is, Charlottesville was designed as a center of the resistance to Trump before this incident occurred.

Wertz: [After intervening questions.] I just want to go back to the remarks that you cited from Lyndon LaRouche at the very beginning, Lynne, to underscore the urgency of the situation. Again, what he said is that we have to win now; if we lose, we are finished because we will be destroyed by the people opposed to what he is doing in terms of the initiatives we're taking. The existence of the United States depends upon doing the job. It's not making suggestions; it's getting victory against the causes of the things that are destroying the ability of the United States to express itself properly.

So, I just wanted to end with that. I thought the questions tonight were very responsive and showed that people have a sense of the urgency of this. So, our job is to organize a lot of other people. I encourage people to do that, and figure out creative ways in which they can do that. Like the lady who just spoke, get in touch with us in terms of what you might be able to do with us or with others in our movement who may be in your vicinity.

Speed: OK; excellent. So, that concludes the LaRouche activist call for Thursday. We'll be talking with all of you very soon. Hopefully, with lots more results on the petitioning and other activities. Good night.