

Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him

by Barbara Boyd

Sept. 23—Robert Swan Mueller III—the special prosecutor tasked to take down the President of the United States—is, as his name suggests, a product of elite private schools and universities. He is uniformly and soberly praised in the national news media as incorruptible, fair-minded “honest Bob,” “strait-laced Bobby three sticks.” This image, we shall show, is a brazenly false, Washington, D.C. public relations pitch, created for the credulous.

In reality, Robert Swan Mueller III is about as corrupt as they come, if necessary bending and twisting the law every which way to serve the goals of those who provide him assignments. The might of the prosecutorial function and the institutions he serves dictate what is right for him, rather than the unbiased pursuit of justice the law envisions for his vocation.

In what he says was a defining moment, Mueller broke ranks, after college, to serve in the Vietnam War as a Marine. After that he never wanted to do anything but prosecute. His appointment as special prosecutor caps a long career in which he has envisioned himself to be a stern and willing warrior, a dutiful Marine, acting on behalf of whatever evil scheme his superiors present to him, and using whatever means seems necessary to execute it.

In recent weeks, organizers for the LaRouche movement have been repeatedly told by citizens they meet:



Robert Swan Mueller III

“It looks like President Trump is getting the ‘LaRouche treatment.’” The two men could not be more different in station, or cultural and intellectual achievement. LaRouche is a world-historical genius in the mold of Gottfried Leibniz. But, both men touched what has amounted to the third rail of American politics since Franklin Roosevelt’s death. They threatened the post-War Anglo-American British imperial system. LaRouche did so directly, continuously, and explicitly by name. Trump has done so implicitly, by rejecting perpetual war, seeking better relations with Russia, calling for imposition of Glass-Steagall banking separation, endorsing what he refers to as the American System of political economy, and promising massive infrastructure development and a modern manufacturing platform for productive jobs.

In both cases, as we shall see, the British explicitly demanded scalps, based on a perceived threat to them,

most specifically located in the desire for a collaborative relationship with Russia and an end to the “unipolar” framework of relationships between nations. In both cases, a controlled media unleashed an incessant barrage of ugly, salacious, and defamatory coverage, day-in day-out, to create the popular conditions for a criminal prosecution. While there were and are many other players in these Kabuki dances—compromised and terrorized politicians and judges, and an intelli-

gence community which functions as the gendarme of our Orwellian police state—the blunt instrument chosen for the hit was Robert Mueller. Along the way, between the two assignments, Robert Mueller played a hugely significant role in covering up the Saudi/British role in the murders of almost 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001, and the wholesale destruction of the United States Constitution which followed in its wake—a role which, if thoroughly examined, constitutes obstruction of justice, among other crimes.

This dossier will walk you through Mueller’s career based on what is readily and publicly available. It is a trail of prosecutorial misconduct, including what former Senator Bob Graham calls “aggressive deception” of the U.S. Congress and the public concerning the events of September 11, 2001, and includes a major role in the creation of the post-9/11 surveillance state which has eviscerated and destroyed the Fourth Amendment and the rest of our Constitution’s Bill of Rights. Those who work inside our modern Leviathan can surely point to other malfeasance, and we invite you to pile on—please, expose it. You owe no less to your oath to the Constitution of the United States.

The LaRouche Case—An Attempted Murder and then a Legal One

On Aug. 27, 1982, a Top Secret letter was sent from the British government to the FBI. That letter itself remains classified to this day, but it is clear from the FBI’s response to it, from its unclassified attachments, and from subsequent actions, what the British were demanding. On Sept. 24, 1982, under the subject-heading “Re: Lyndon LaRouche and the Executive Intelligence Review,” FBI counterintelligence chief James Nolan responded to the British demands as follows:

We would like to reiterate our conclusion that, while many of the harassment activities of the NCLC and the themes promoted by NCLC publications, such as *EIR*, are often propitious to Soviet disinformation and propaganda interests, there is no direct evidence that the Soviets are directing or funding LaRouche or his organization. It is entirely plausible, however, that the Soviets have developed or may be developing sources within the NCLC who are in a position to interject Soviet-inspired views into NCLC activities and publications. It is likely that the Soviets will attempt to capitalize on or exploit

NCLC sentiments that are parallel to or promote Soviet foreign policy objectives. At the same time, the Soviets will probably have to balance the advantages of exploiting the NCLC with the dangers of being associated with a bizarre and often unpredictable organization. For your information, under the domestic security guidelines set forth by the Attorney General, the FBI does not have an active investigation of Lyndon LaRouche or the NCLC.

As we shall see, this is the same British smear, in the same British speculative language, used to paint Donald Trump with the “Russian dupe” brush. That allegation, of LaRouche activity on behalf of a foreign power, the Russians, unleashed a full spectrum of intelligence agency weapons, free from Constitutional constraints under the Reagan Administration’s Executive Order 12333 and subsequent renditions governing classified counterintelligence activities, particularly the subsequent versions of E.O. 12333 put into place after September 11, 2001.

We document below some of what LaRouche was doing to provoke the British call for his head in 1982. His activities included back-channel negotiations with the Russians concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative on behalf of the CIA and National Security Council. He met with Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Mexico’s President José López Portillo, seeking a completely new monetary system, not controlled by the City of London, Wall Street and allied institutions, which would finance high technology development, completely transforming North-South relations. President López Portillo implemented LaRouche’s proposals during the Mexican debt crisis in 1982, sending the Anglo-Americans into rug-chewing fits.

This British demand to the FBI immediately followed a letter, on Aug. 19, 1982, from Henry Kissinger to FBI Director William Webster, demanding that LaRouche be investigated for “harassing” Kissinger. This is the same Henry Kissinger who, in a speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs on May 10, 1982, had openly declared himself to be a British agent of influence. While endorsing Churchill’s “rigid” anti-Soviet policies and British colonialism over “naïve” American idealists, Kissinger remarked on his service to the British while in the U.S. government:

The British were so matter of factly helpful that



C-SPAN

David Abshire



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Leo Cherne



Library of Congress

Edward Bennett Williams

they became a participant in internal American deliberations, to a degree never before practiced between sovereign nations. In my period in office, the British played a seminal role in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union. Indeed, they helped draft the key document. In my White House incarnation then [as National Security Adviser] I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department.



William Casey

What Kissinger called “harassment” by LaRouche, was widespread exposure of the British-agent aspect of his *curriculum vitae*, among other issues. These include Kissinger’s 1974 “NSSM 200” document calling for drastic population reduction in the Third World by any means necessary in order to conserve raw materials for colonialist looting, threats to Italy’s Prime Minister Aldo Moro shortly before his kidnapping and murder, contentions of similar action by the Bhutto family of Pakistan concerning the murder of former President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, and numerous documented war crimes.¹

On Jan. 12, 1983, the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, comprising David Abshire, Leo

Cherne, and Edward Bennett Williams, demanded that an FBI investigation, under Executive Order 12333, be opened on LaRouche, based on “harassment” of Henry Kissinger and possible foreign funding, *under the guidelines or otherwise*. The British demand was going to be implemented.

In April 1983 and thereafter, New York investment banker John Train convened a series of salons attended by nominally private organizations, prominent journalists living off intelligence community leaks, and government intelligence opera-

tives, to plan and implement a defamatory campaign against Lyndon LaRouche. The avowed aim of the meetings was to create the popular conditions for criminal prosecution.

In 1982, the Anglophilic CIA Director, William Casey, had tasked CIA psychological warfare and propaganda expert Walter Raymond to oversee a program of psychological warfare and “perception management” by the Reagan Administration, a program largely overseen by Vice President George H.W. Bush. Under provisions of the new executive order governing intelligence and counterintelligence operations, EO 12333, psy-ops and propaganda operations, formerly conducted on foreign targets by the CIA, were to be farmed out to private entities under such rubrics as Project Democracy, the National Endowment for Democracy, Freedom House, the League for Industrial Democracy,

1. Dr. Kissinger has recently appeared to play a useful role in arguing against war with Russia and China, against the mad Neo-Conservatives.

and similarly designated entities. psy-ops and “perception management” were also to be targetted domestically in counterintelligence operations. To start such counterintelligence operations, a credible allegation had to be presented that a domestic target was operating on behalf of a foreign power, such as the Russians.

John Train’s investment company partner, Thomas J. Devine, a former CIA employee, had partnered with George H.W. Bush in the Zapata Oil company, during Bush’s time as an oil man in Texas. Many believe that Zapata was a CIA proprietary. Train himself was the former editor of the Congress for Cultural Freedom’s *Paris Review*, and was engaged, at the time of his LaRouche salons, in running black propaganda operations for the CIA against the Russians during the war in Afghanistan. Train’s work in Afghanistan was coordinated with Walter Raymond.

Court testimony in the LaRouche cases and follow-up investigations revealed that the Train salons were attended by Roy Godson, a long-time British intelligence-connected operative deployed under the CIA’s Jay Lovestone and James Jesus Angleton, and, at that time, a consultant to PFIAB and the National Security Council; by John Rees, an FBI functionary; Mira Lansky Boland of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL); representatives of Freedom House, long a CIA proprietary associated with PFIAB’s Leo Cherne; financier Richard Mellon Scaife; Pat Lynch of NBC; reporters for *Reader’s Digest*, *Business Week*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the *New Republic*; “investigative reporter” Dennis King who was employed by the League for Industrial Democracy; Chip Berlet; neo-conservative colleagues of Train; and others described by participants as “gentlemen with government connections.” The representative from Freedom House provided the briefings on LaRouche to those assembled.

Train’s salons resulted in a barrage of articles portraying LaRouche as violent, a racist, megalomaniacal, and an authoritarian anti-Semitic extremist—calculated and horrific, poisonous lies designed to nullify any positive response to LaRouche’s actual ideas.



John Train

These ID-format lies are deliberately designed to create “cognitive dissonance,” as it is known in the psy-ops trade. President Trump has been consistently portrayed with similar psy-ops ID-format defamations.

Defamatory broadcasts and articles by the Train meeting participants were concocted, and entirely fake versions of LaRouche’s ideas and work were spewed to the public. *NBC News*, for example, presented a completely fake picture of *EIR*’s groundbreaking exposé of the drug trade, *Dope Inc.*, which had become a bible for DEA agents in the War on Drugs. *Dope Inc.* proved that the British were actively promoting

drug legalization for population pacification purposes, as they had done historically in the opium wars against China, and that British financial institutions, including banks and funds directly associated with the Royals, were dependent upon and subsisting on drug money-laundering proceeds. The book’s contentions have been ratified repeatedly over the years in such cases as that of the HongKong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC). NBC repeatedly broadcast, however, that LaRouche’s War on Drugs consisted of the claim that the Queen herself was out on the street corner peddling dime bags of heroin.

Even more astoundingly, NBC’s Patricia Lynch claimed, in a prominent NBC news feature, that LaRouche had ordered the assassination of President Jimmy Carter by remote controlled bomb. She admitted that she relied for this preposterous claim on a notorious FBI informant and other “non-public” information provided to her by former CIA counterintelligence chief James J. Angleton, other CIA sources, and sources in the FBI. In March 1986, a collaboration between Irwin Suall from the ADL and the East German Stasi, produced the sensational and completely fabricated claim that LaRouche had played a role in the assassination of Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme. Richard Mellon Scaife and the CIA’s Smith Richardson Foundation funded a book-length defamatory dossier by Dennis King as a result of the Train meetings, which became the central resource for a relentless anti-LaRouche hate campaign.

Do such wild, salacious assertions remind you, in any way, of the deliberately gross and fake dossier on President Trump, prepared by the highest levels of British intelligence for circulation to the American public? You know—the so-called “Pee Dossier” by MI6 agent Christopher Steele, that claims that the President cavorted with Russian prostitutes on a bed slept in by the Obamas?

What Did LaRouche Do?

The attachments to the British demand letter to the FBI include a published statement by LaRouche demanding that the Monroe Doctrine be enforced in support of Argentina with respect to the British-instigated Malvinas War. In the document, LaRouche contrasts British imperial looting policies with the “American System” as defined by Lincoln’s economist Henry C. Carey. Addressing those in Congress siding with Britain against Argentina during the Malvinas crisis, LaRouche said:

How shaken are these representatives at Britain’s plight, the same representatives who have sat by and let U.S. industrial power be destroyed by British system economics, watched millions of Third World children starve for lack of technology exports, and raved about the fascist oppressions of the only energy source, nuclear power, that could turn the situation around! ... The imposition of the Monroe Doctrine and reassertion of the commitment to republican sovereignty can put the United States back on the road to fulfilling our national mission. Kicking the British Tories out of the Senate should be followed within minutes with kicking Tory Volcker out of the Fed, and restarting American industry once again.

The second attachment to the British demand letter is a leaflet announcing an *EIR* forum focused on developing the economies of the Middle East, and exposing the role of British intelligence in creating and funding Muslim Brotherhood Islamic fundamentalism. The second topic for the *EIR* forum concerned an exposé of the role of the British Secret Services in the then ongoing Soviet succession struggle. Other attachments to the British demand letter to the FBI remain classified.

A review of LaRouche’s activities in 1982, the year the British called for his head, reveals that LaRouche’s



EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky

Mexico’s President José López Portillo addresses the UN General Assembly.

policies were gaining ground on every front and that he had developed a substantial following in U.S. intelligence and military circles in support of those policies, including in President Reagan’s National Security Council. He also posed a direct challenge to British control of the world’s economy, through the City of London, Wall Street, and aligned government institutions, and the hegemonic British economic nostrums of free trade and speculative capitalism.

From December 1981 through February 1983, LaRouche had been tasked first by the CIA and then by President Reagan’s National Security Council to conduct back-channel discussions with Soviet representatives on what became President Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative. Beginning as early as 1978, LaRouche had been calling for U.S.-Soviet collaboration in developing beam-weapon defenses to incoming thermonuclear missiles, replacing the insane Anglo-American doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction with one of Mutually Assured Survival. At the same time as he met secretly with Soviet representatives, LaRouche and his associates campaigned publicly for the concept. President Reagan announced adoption of the SDI in a surprise televised address on March 23, 1983.

In April 1982, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche traveled to India where they met with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, along with scientists, parliamentarians, industrialists, and economists. In his presentations, LaRouche stressed that the developing sector must band together, creating credit for large scale infrastructure

development along lines consistent with Hamilton's system of political economy. In this endeavor, the British system of Malthusian zero population growth, primitive "sustainable development," and debt slavery—the policies of the World Bank and the IMF—would be condemned as genocidal and abandoned. True human progress could be scientifically and reliably measured, LaRouche said, by the metric he had discovered, potential relative population density, ensuring continuous progressive economic development.

In May 1982, LaRouche met with Mexican President José López Portillo, and immediately followed that meeting with a document entitled "Operation Juarez," a battle plan for reorganizing the already bankrupt world financial system based on physical-economic development. LaRouche proposed that the nations of Ibero-America use their collective strategic leverage as debtor nations to unite in a common economic bloc and unilaterally declare a restructuring of their debts and the establishment of a new, just monetary order. The formation of an International Development Bank among these nations would serve as a coordinating agency for planning investments and trade expansion among the member republics. "If a sufficient portion of the Ibero-American nations enter into such an agreement, the result is the assembly of one of the most powerful economies in the world from an array of individually weak powers . . . the Ibero-American continent would rapidly emerge as a leading economic power of the world, an economic super-power."

In August, López Portillo tried to bring Argentina and Brazil on as partners in "Operation Juarez." Failing that, in September 1982, López Portillo acted on LaRouche's proposal, adopting credit controls on Mexico's currency, nationalizing the Mexican banking system, and announcing a debt moratorium on Mexican debt. Wall Street, the City of London, and allied intelligence agencies, having scrambled to prevent implementation of LaRouche's plan, now targeted LaRouche and López Portillo. Nonetheless, in October 1982, in a speech at the UN, López Portillo called for a new finan-



Reagan Presidential Library

LaRouche opponent Walter Raymond Smiles. The CIA's Walter Raymond, Jr., sits between President Reagan and his National Security Adviser, John Poindexter.

cial system essentially along the lines LaRouche had specified.

These proposals were all perfectly consistent with Franklin Delano Roosevelt's vision beyond World War II of ending British colonialism, and developing the world based upon reciprocally beneficial trade relationships among nation states, the "idealism" Henry Kissinger attacked in his Chatham House address.

Such were a few of Lyndon LaRouche's many activities in 1982.

1982-1983 were years of enormous battles within the Reagan Administration. On one side was National Security Adviser William Clark and his assistant Richard Morris, who continued to task LaRouche and his colleagues at *EIR* on national security issues. On the other were the Anglophiles controlled by Vice President Bush, who found LaRouche to be "the most dangerous man in America." Richard Morris testified in the LaRouche cases that Kenneth deGraffenreid, Walter Raymond, and Roy Godson were the three most vocal opponents of LaRouche inside the Reagan Administration. Raymond, along with Bush, deGraffenreid, and Margaret Thatcher, were the primary authors of Project Democracy, ceding perception-control and regime-change operations to private organizations and NGOs operating under CIA and MI6 direction.

Enter Mueller

In 1982, Robert Mueller joined the staff of U.S. Attorney William Weld in Boston, Massachusetts. He had previously been in private practice in San Francisco while waiting to be accepted into the U.S. Attorney's office there. His life's dream was to prosecute. Mueller and Weld concentrated on public corruption cases, targeting and taking down the administration of popular Boston Mayor Kevin White, in an investigation widely criticized for "gestapo tactics" and prosecutorial misconduct.

Following LaRouche's 1984 Presidential campaign and a public claim by Kissinger that LaRouche would be "dealt with" after the election, William Weld opened a criminal investigation of LaRouche's Presidential campaign committees, claiming that the campaign had engaged in credit card fraud. While there was a barrage of initial publicity, and companies associated with LaRouche suffered huge contempt fines because they refused to turn over to Weld's office information about their contributors, the investigation languished over the course of two years and two grand juries.

While the criminal investigation stalled, numerous classified counterintelligence investigations were launched, under Executive Order 12333, justifying surveillance prohibited by the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, infiltration, and classified counterintelligence "neutralization" tactics. These covert operations were used to create an otherwise non-existent criminal case. FOIA documents released over the years revealed a number of such classified operations based on fabricated assertions by government agents. Many of these operations remain classified to this day. In 1992 and 1993, investigators for LaRouche confirmed that the Leesburg offices of *EIR* and other LaRouche-associ-



Gage Skidmore

William Weld

succeeded William Weld as acting U.S. Attorney in 1986, after Weld decamped to Washington to head the Bush Justice Department's Criminal Division, brought in John J.E. Markham II to take the lead in the LaRouche investigation. Markham had been a member of the Process Church of the Final Judgment, a satanic cult tied to Charles Manson, during his early legal career. Plans for a search of offices associated with LaRouche in Leesburg and Boston were set into motion.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

John Markham

ated entities were subject to intense warrantless surveillance conducted through NSA hubs in Northern Virginia's AT&T offices, and that numerous black-bag burglaries had been conducted through the local sheriff's office and Deputy Donald Moore.

In March 1986, two LaRouche Democrats, Mark Fairchild and Janice Hart, won the Illinois Democratic Primary for Lieutenant Governor and Secretary of State. They were part of a slate of over 1,000 LaRouche Democrats who ran for office that year. A huge, daily, national media defamation campaign followed, using the John Train play-book and many of the Train salon participants. The Boston investigation was revamped. Mueller, who

There were two plans for the Leesburg raid, one buried in official FBI documents, and the other hidden in secret communications. One of the raid's principals, Donald Moore, told an FBI informant in 1992 that a plan was in circulation weeks before the assault, to provoke LaRouche's security guards into a shooting incident by staging a massive siege and provocation at Ibykus Farm where LaRouche stayed. According to Moore, he had provided detailed plans for the eventuality of entering the farm and killing LaRouche. FBI case agent Richard Egan corroborated Moore's account, stating in court testimony that his activity

under the warrant consisted of a frantic search for evidence justifying a second search warrant for Ibykus Farm and an arrest warrant for LaRouche.

Utilizing what he has come to call “shock and awe” tactics, Mueller employed a force of some 400 law enforcement agents and privately owned armored personnel carriers to raid two office buildings in Leesburg, Virginia, where *EIR* and other companies associated with LaRouche were located—this, for what former Attorney General Ramsey Clark accurately describes as “book people.” Ibykus Farm was surrounded by SWAT teams in black ninja gear, and helicopters flew overhead.

At 10 p.m., Fox News reported that authorities were about to enter Ibykus Farm to search for a “weapons cache.” No such weapons cache existed, and the FBI and ATF knew it. The plan to kill LaRouche was only aborted when his associates sent a telegram to President Reagan seeking his intervention.

Based on a classified mechanism with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, documents seized in the raid were taken to a military facility, Henderson Hall, where they were undoubtedly reviewed by intelligence officials for purposes of their continued classified operations. William Weld, now heading the Department of Justice Criminal Division, claimed that this extraordinary procedure was necessary to prevent the LaRouche people from breaking into a normal government facility and stealing back their documents!

On the day of the raid, Mueller and Markham targeted and arrested key personnel involved in LaRouche’s intelligence functions and security, charging them with obstruction of justice. To break them, the prosecutors sought lengthy periods of detention, which the Alexandria federal court granted based on the wave of poisonous publicity surrounding the raid, and numerous inflammatory and false statements to the court by John Markham. When those statements were later proved to be false, the defendants, now released, were without a real remedy except to call the Boston trial court’s attention to Markham’s lies.

At the same time, key prosecution witnesses underwent “deprogramming” by so-called cult experts to prepare for testimony, and were granted numerous benefits never disclosed to the defense. Markham and



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Raid on the Leesburg offices associated with Lyndon LaRouche, October 6, 1986.

Mueller employed the ADL for witness interviews, thus evading the requirements for disclosure required of government agents, used Dennis King as a consultant, and used inflammatory allegations which they knew to be false in television broadcasts aimed at poisoning the jury pool. Donald Moore, who had illegally burglarized *EIR*’s offices and mapped LaRouche’s assassination, was invited by Markham and Mueller to come to Boston to serve as their assistant on the criminal case.

The Boston case, in which LaRouche was indicted for obstruction of justice, fell apart when FOIA documents revealed small aspects of the secret covert operations being run parallel to the criminal prosecution—notably a document from Ollie North’s safe indicating extreme White House interest in players in the LaRouche case. As a result, Federal Judge Robert Keeton, following the classified trail, which he viewed in documents he ordered be presented to him *in camera*, or

dered a search of Vice President Bush's office for exculpatory evidence. During prosecutorial misconduct hearings conducted before Judge Keeton, it was also discovered that a national security informant had been infiltrated into the LaRouche security operation, and that John Markham had instructed him to advise the defendants to obstruct justice, in words dictated by Markham, knowing that the defendants would write the informant's words down in their notebooks. The fabricated and planted notebook quotes were then used by Markham in his opening statement to the jury, as proof that the defendants had conspired to obstruct justice.

The lengthy government misconduct hearings Judge Keeton conducted resulted in a mistrial due to juror hardship. More troublesome for Mueller and Markham, jurors told the *Boston Herald* that they would have voted not guilty if the case had ended at that point, following testimony on the credit card fraud counts of the indictment. Judge Keeton found that the government had engaged in "systemic and institutional prosecutorial misconduct" in the case. In a separate opinion, he opened the door to further discovery of classified operations in a retrial, in order to allow the defendants to show that they did not have the "corrupt motive" necessary for an obstruction of justice conviction.

The Justice Department quickly opened a new massive LaRouche case before Judge Albert V. Bryan Jr. in Alexandria, Virginia, this time based on a conspiracy to commit loan fraud and a conspiracy to prevent the IRS from assessing taxes. LaRouche was the sole defendant charged in both of the two counts, and all defendants were convicted. Bryan raced the case from indictment to trial, preventing adequate defense preparation; invited the government to conceal evidence by denying all motions for exculpatory evidence; and prevented the defense from introducing the fact that the government had bankrupted the companies taking political loans, preventing them from repaying the political loans, in a case in which the government claimed loan fraud based on non-repayment of the same political loans. Judge Bryan himself had signed the order initiating the unprecedented government-instigated bankruptcy. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Martin Bostetter later ruled that the bankruptcy was a "constructive fraud" on the court. Praising his railroad, Judge Bryan mocked Judge Keeton openly, saying Keeton "owed him a cigar" for "disposing" of the LaRouche matter.

Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who represented LaRouche on appeal, said that the La-

Rouche case represented "a broader range of deliberate cunning and systemic misconduct over a longer period of time, using the power of the federal government, than any other prosecution by the U.S. government in my time or to my knowledge." After reviewing the federal cases during hearings held in his Court, widely respected New York Supreme Court Justice Stephen G. Crane found that the "actions of federal prosecutors raised an inference of a conspiracy to lay low these defendants at any cost."

Needless to say, Robert Mueller does not feature the LaRouche case as a career highlight.

Ascending the Bush Family Ladder

In 1989, George H.W. Bush brought Robert Mueller to Main Justice to dispose of another nemesis, Panamanian President Manuel Noriega. Aside from supporting LaRouche's "Operation Juarez," Noriega had refused to go along with the cocaine financing of George H.W. Bush's Contra insurgency operations directed at El Salvador and Nicaragua. Based on his work for the CIA, Noriega just knew way too much about George H.W. Bush and cocaine. Following multiple unsuccessful coup attempts against Noriega, more than 28,000 U.S. troops invaded Panama on Dec. 20, 1989, killing hundreds of Panamanians, deposing Noriega's government and armed forces, and extracting Noriega for trial in the United States. The operation was dubbed "Operation Just Cause," an antonym if there ever was one.

Manuel Noriega was known in the CIA and DEA as a steadfast drug fighter, and DEA and CIA agents testified to that fact at his trial. To overcome this problem, Mueller dealt Latin America's most notorious drug gangs "get out of jail free" cards as bribes, if they would say that Noriega dealt drugs. According to reporter Glenn Garvin, Mueller plea bargained down a potential 1,435 years in prison for the lying narco-trafficker criminals testifying for him, to 81 years. These deals and bribes included a \$1.25 million bribe to members of the Cali Cartel (whose leaders Noriega had jailed) and a deal with self-avowed Hitler worshipper Carlos Lehder Rivas, leader of the Medellin Cartel. Once again, charges of prosecutorial misconduct flowed daily from Noriega's defense and appellate legal teams, but the media operations accompanying the prosecutions had turned Noriega into a devil whose claims did not deserve to be heard.

Having done the assignment on Noriega, Mueller ascended to head the Justice Department's Criminal Di-



EIRNS/Carlos Wesley

President of Panama Manuel Noriega, in Panama, April 1988.

vision. Here he successfully covered up the drug, weapons, and terrorism activities of two banks, BCCI and BNL. BCCI was the Anglo-American intelligence community's chosen vehicle to fund terrorism, launder drug money, and fund dark intelligence activities in Afghanistan, Central America, and throughout the Middle East. The highest levels of the British and European oligarchies were directly implicated in BCCI's activities. Both banks escaped with plea bargains and fines, protecting dirty state secrets on several continents from public disclosure. Mueller left the Justice Department in 1993 for private practice, a stint in Washington D.C.'s Homicide Division, and then a stint as U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California in San Francisco.

Based on family services rendered, President George W. Bush returned Mueller to Main Justice as acting Deputy Attorney General in the early days of his Administration, before appointing him, in July of 2001, to head the FBI. He assumed that office on Sept. 4, 2001, only days before Sept. 11. As we shall see, he played a commanding role in covering up for the perpetrators of the murder of nearly 3,000 Americans on that date, while overseeing the creation of the police state measures which followed that attack.

Aggressive Deception of the American People Concerning 9/11

There is a picture formerly available from the Bush Presidential Library which shows George W. Bush,

Dick Cheney, Condoleezza Rice, and Prince Bandar, Saudi Arabia's U.S. Ambassador, on the White House balcony two days after September 11, 2001. The men are smoking cigars. Reporters inquiring about the photo more recently have been told it is no longer available from the Bush Library.² Maybe the picture in this case says more than a thousand words ever could. Again, two days after almost 3,000 Americans were murdered by 19 hijackers, 15 of whom were Saudis, the Saudi Ambassador yucks it up with the President, Dick Cheney, and the National Security Adviser on the White House balcony.

Immediately after September 11, 2001, Bandar arranged for a mass exodus of Saudi royals, intelligence personnel, and other Saudi nationals from the United States, including members of the bin Laden family, with the full cooperation of the United States government. He placed them beyond the reach of any future inquiry.

It is obvious that the 9/11 terrorists did not emerge out of bat caves in Afghanistan. They lived here in the United States, training for a suicide mission which required massive logistical support. The immediate conclusion of anyone thinking through the plot, is that this had to be state-sponsored terrorism. The Bush Administration, however, immediately focused the nation on Iraq and took the nation to a disastrous war there, when even the most basic common sense told investigators to focus initially on the Saudis, following the evidence from there.

Congress convened a Joint Congressional Inquiry into the events of 9/11 in 2002, chaired by then U.S. Senator Bob Graham. Senator Graham says that he has stopped using the term "cover-up" in relation to 9/11. He instead uses the term "aggressive deception," and places Mueller, operating on behalf of the Bush family, at the center of obstructing his investigation and others. It was Mueller who angrily intervened to prevent Congressional investigators from visiting FBI offices in San Diego. They went anyway, and discovered troves of FBI documents concerning the Saudi hijackers' San Diego cell, and its support by Saudi royals and government officials, which Mueller's FBI never made available to the Congressional inquiry, despite their specific requests.

Prince Bandar, so close to the Bush family that he was called "Bandar Bush," is at the center of the sup-

2. The photo is available from History Commons.



Saudi Prince Bandar at the White House. From left, Dick Cheney, Prince Bandar, Condoleezza Rice, and President George W. Bush, Sept. 13, 2001.

port network for the San Diego hijackers. There were multiple documents in the San Diego FBI files referencing well-known sympathies for Al-Qaeda by employees of the Saudi embassy in D.C., including Osama Bin Laden's half-brother. There were records of checks paid to Saudis supporting the two San Diego hijackers from Bandar's wife. There was also a CIA memorandum carefully tracking Saudi government support for Al-Qaeda and other Saudi terrorist organizations.

Congressional investigators also discovered the identity of an FBI informant who was close to both San Diego hijackers and rented rooms to them, living in the same house. Rather than allowing investigators to interview the informant, Mueller placed him in an FBI safe-house for "his protection."

The results of the Joint Congressional Inquiry's review of Saudi government support of the 9/11 hijackers, 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Committee's report, were classified in the final report. They remained classified, despite the demands of the 9/11 families and an all-out national campaign for their release, until July 15, 2016. According to all concerned, the man who classified these 28 pages in 2003—and adamantly fought to ensure that they would never see the light of day—was FBI Director Robert Mueller. The 28 pages solely concern what Congressional investigators found in the San Diego FBI office, the discovery of which Robert Mueller actively sought to prevent.

In the summer of 2015, another document formerly classified, Document 17, was quietly declassified. It was authored by the same Congressional investigators who wrote the 28 pages, and revealed that two Saudi students, funded by the Saudi government, did a dry run

of the September 11, 2001 attack on an American West flight from Phoenix to Washington in 1999, an incident well-known to the FBI. After releasing the two Saudis from custody, the FBI subsequently learned, in 2000, that one of the students had been trained in Afghanistan's Al-Qaeda camps to conduct Khobar Towers type assaults, and the other was tied to terrorist elements as well.

Senator Graham has remarked that Mueller stone-walled his investigation at every turn. Undoubtedly, large volumes of documents concerning the Saudi role in 9/11 reside in still classified and undisclosed CIA, FBI, and other files.

This is not the place for a full review of the joint British and American responsibility for Salafist terrorism. From the U.S. side, Zbigniew Brzezinski deliberately created and supported an entire generation of such terrorists, including Osama bin Laden, in his geopolitical war game with the Soviet Union. He deliberately created a terrorist insurgency in Afghanistan in order to draw the Russians into a war there, and gloated about it until his recent death. Saudi Arabia has never been anything other than a satrapy of the British, and the second incubation point for the terrorist phenomena manifesting themselves in 9/11 lies in the mosques of "Londonistan." The CIA knew this. MI6 knew this. They had been using these terrorist networks for years for their own geopolitical purposes.

The FBI did not pay attention to the Saudis before 2001 because "they were an ally," according to testimony provided in the wake of the attacks. In August 2001, President Bush was handed a CIA briefing which explicitly warned that Al-Qaeda was about to launch a major attack on the United States using airplanes. The President did nothing. Earlier, Robert Mueller, serving as Deputy Attorney General in the days prior to 9/11, had blocked a major funding increase for the FBI's counter-terrorism division led by John O'Neill. O'Neill had moved his entire operation to New York because official Washington would not listen to his warnings about Al-Qaeda. The job to "aggressively deceive" the American people about this sordid history fell to Robert Swan Mueller III, and he obstructed a Congressional investigation to do precisely that.

Due to an act of Congress, JASTA, the 9/11 families are now proceeding with their lawsuit against the Saudis. But why should they have to endure years more of litiga-

tion? Why doesn't President Trump open the actual door on this process, assigning seasoned investigators, like Michael Jacobsen, who unearthed the San Diego FBI trove, to a full review and disclosure of the Saudi role in 9/11, the U.S. and British government role in creating and fostering Islamic terrorism, and the "aggressive deception" and obstruction of justice by Robert Mueller and others which resulted in this illegal coverup?

While engaged in "aggressive deception" about the criminal conspiracy resulting in almost 3,000 American murders, Robert Mueller continued to railroad innocents. He personally directed the PENTBOM investigation which falsely accused Dr. Steven Hatfill of mailing the deadly Anthrax letters which killed five people in 2001. For years, Mueller harassed the innocent Dr. Hatfill, ordering the FBI to search his apartment multiple times, searching the apartment of his girlfriend, ensuring that Hatfill lost his job, and leaking continuously to the national news media about Hatfill's alleged perfidies. Once, when an FBI agent ran over Hatfill's foot with his car, it was arranged that Hatfill would get a ticket for impeding traffic. The Justice Department finally paid Hatfill \$5.8 million dollars to settle his Privacy Act lawsuit aimed at government leaks—a settlement, along with an exoneration, which only came when a federal judge insisted that reporters reveal their Justice Department and FBI sources for stories about Hatfill.

As part of the same PENTBOM 9/11 investigation which destroyed Hatfill's life, Mueller, with Attorney General John Ashcroft, rounded up 762 Muslims who had overstayed their visas, and were identified via tips to the FBI "tip line" from a hysterical public reacting to the events of 9/11. Remember, Prince Bandar had already moved the key Saudis involved with the hijackers out of the United States. These individuals were detained, without charges, in a special unit of New York's Metropolitan Detention Center. Their jail conditions were supervised by Mueller and a small group of other Washington officials, and amounted to torture. They were deprived of sleep and food, repeatedly strip searched, physically and verbally abused by guards, and denied basic hygiene items like soap, toilet paper, and towels, or any access to the outside world. Both the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York and the Second Circuit kept Mueller as a defendant in the subsequent civil rights suit brought by the detainees. This means, under the high standard of proof required of civil rights plaintiffs, that the judges were literally appalled by the allegations against Robert

Mueller in the complaint. In a 4-2 decision on June 18, 2017, however, the Supreme Court let the newly appointed Special Prosecutor out of the lawsuit. Here is what Justice Stephen Breyer said in his dissent:

The majority opinion well summarizes the particular claims that the plaintiffs make in this suit. All concern the conditions of their confinement, which began soon after the September 11, 2001 attacks and lasted for days and weeks, then stretching into months. At some point, *all the defendants knew that they had nothing to do with the September 11 attacks but continued to detain them anyway under harsh conditions.* Official government policy, both before and after the defendants became aware of the plaintiffs' innocence led to the plaintiffs being held in "tiny cells for over 23 hours a day, with lights continuously left on, shackled when moved, often strip searched, and denied access to most forms of communication with the outside world." The defendants detained the plaintiffs in these conditions on the basis of their race or religion and without justification.

Mueller is often touted by the Washington establishment for reorganizing the FBI to become an effective counterintelligence and counterterrorism organization in the wake of 9/11. This also is Washington D.C. public relations claptrap. The FBI under Mueller excelled at entrapping the otherwise innocent, and constructing a surveillance state strongly resembling that portrayed by George Orwell in the novel, *1984*. In the Newburgh Four case, for example, the presiding judge said the FBI, "came up with the crime, provided the means, and removed all relevant obstacles, making a terrorist out of a man whose buffoonery is positively Shakespearean in scope."

Studies have found that almost every domestic terrorist plot during Mueller's tenure, from 2001 to 2010, was in some way cooked up, assisted, and eventually busted by Mueller's FBI. The book, *The Terror Factory—Inside the FBI's Manufactured War on Terrorism* by Trevor Aaronson, documents this in chilling detail. J. Edgar Hoover's domestic security depravities seem pale in comparison.

The FBI now manages some 15,000 designated informants through a Linked-In type data base called Delta. It allows FBI agents to dial up informants to use



White House photo by Eric Draper

Robert Mueller and George W. Bush.

in stings anywhere in the country. Informants then travel to their assignments and can earn up to \$100,000 for entrapping and testifying against the unwary petty criminals, losers, and mentally-challenged individuals who inhabit the Bureau's terrorist case docket. Philip Mudd was brought over from the CIA by Mueller to lead this effort in the FBI's new National Security Division. Mudd, using a data-mining system called Domain Management, flooded immigrant communities, particularly Muslim communities, with informants to monitor and entrap those who expressed ideas favorable to radical Islam, whether or not those expressing the ideas had any real possibility of ever engaging in a terrorist plot. FBI agents referred to the Mudd-Mueller surveillance and entrapment tools as "battlefield management." In other words, entire communities in the United States have been targeted and treated to the methods of the East German Stasi. On Aug. 10, 2017, Mudd, now a CNN "analyst" who has raved repeatedly against President Donald Trump, told CNN analyst Jake Tapper, that the U.S. government "is going to kill this guy," meaning the President.

Then, there is the surveillance state. William Binney was the most senior-technical analyst at the NSA. He designed a system, "ThinThread," which would accurately track terrorist plots while preserving the civil liberties of American citizens. In the film, *The Good American*, Binney tells the story of how he did this, and how General Michael Hayden, then the Director of the

NSA, ditched Binney's program and spent millions of dollars with an outside contractor, SAIC, on an alternative system, Trailblazer, which mass-collected data on every American, in violation of the Fourth Amendment. Drowning in data under SAIC's alternative surveillance program, the NSA was unable to pinpoint actual terrorist plots. Binney and his collaborators demonstrated that under his program, ThinThread, all of the information necessary to stop the 9/11 hijackers was recorded by the NSA and readily available to investigators. For that, Robert Mueller sent the FBI to raid and harass Binney and his collaborators, bringing criminal charges against one of them, Thomas Drake, which were later dropped.

And then, of course, there is Enron, another notch in Mueller's prosecutorial belt.

Stretching the law on obstruction of justice, Mueller and his task force went after Arthur Andersen & Company, then one of the world's largest accounting firms, for the perfidies of Enron, charging the accountants with obstruction of justice. The U.S. Supreme Court found that Mueller and friends had stretched the obstruction statute beyond recognition to prevail in the case, a reversal which came too late for the company and the people who worked there. Arthur Andersen went out of business as a result of Mueller's prosecution.

The True Origins of the Coup Against the President

The coup against Donald Trump, in which Robert Mueller has been assigned to conduct the concluding acts, actually began in 2013-2014. The popular explanation for the perfidies and crimes against the President is that Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama employed their networks, including stay-behind loyalists in the government and in the intelligence community, to change the result of the U.S. election, to stage the ongoing coup. This explanation, focused primarily on events in 2016, while true in an immediate domestic sense, misses the larger picture. As we shall show, the British starting calling for Donald Trump's head, by their own account, in 2015 and meddled and meddled in the U.S. election and the coup to reverse its result every day thereafter. A recent book by Dick Morris and Ellen

McGann, *Rogue Spooks, the Intelligence War on Trump*, puts appropriate emphasis on the British origin of the war against the President, but assigns the wrong motive for the crimes committed.

Why, for example, did the FBI obtain a FISA warrant for Paul Manafort in 2014 based on his political consulting work in Ukraine? Why, according to accounts in the *Guardian*, did the British start demanding Trump's head in 2015, and warn that the DNC computers had been hacked in July of 2015, a full year before the DNC alleged it had been hacked? Why did the British keep pushing and pushing for Trump's removal by any means necessary? Why was Hillary Clinton's campaign working not only with British intelligence's Michael Steele and Sir Andrew Wood to develop dirt on Trump, but also with Ukrainian intelligence? Why was NATO intelligence, an appendage of the British, raving about Russian bots and Russian "hybrid warfare," leaking repeatedly to the London press in 2014 and 2015 about the purported evil emanating from the St. Petersburg Internet Research Agency and thousands of paid Internet trolls?

The Real Story: Issues of War, Peace, and the Future

Beginning with an announcement of President Xi Jinping, at a conference in Kazakhstan in July 2013, China has set into motion an entirely new dynamic in the world, a new paradigm of cooperation between nation states, to build vital modern infrastructure allowing nations in the former "developing sector" to reach their full economic potentials. Xi Jinping's vision of the New Silk Road or "One Belt, One Road" project has been endorsed by Russia's Vladimir Putin. Russia and China are joining in projects which will fully develop the Eurasian landmass, creating a "new financial architecture" in the Asia-Pacific region.

On July 16, 2014, the BRICS group of nations meeting in Fortaleza, Brazil, joined by the Latin American heads of state, agreed with Xi Jinping's proposal on the creation of an entirely new economic and financial system, representing a fundamental alternative to the casino economy of the present system of globalization. The Anglo-American globalist system is based on maximized profit of the few, and the impoverishment of billions of people. In the new paradigm, financing for joint great projects is to come from development banks, such as the newly created Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, ending dependence on such globalist institutions

as the IMF or World Bank. Globalization as administered by the IMF and World Bank is effectively a system of imperial debt slavery, keeping the nations dependent on their loans in primitive economic conditions, while their raw materials are looted.

As Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India remarked, "The BRICS is unique as an international institution. In this first instance, it unifies a group of nations, not on the basis of their existing prosperity or common identities, but rather their future potentials. The idea of the BRICS itself is thus aligned with the future." It is not incidental to this remark that Russia, China, and India have set future goals for space exploration, including most specifically exploration of the Moon and possible exploitation of Helium 3 on the Moon, which has the potential of finally realizing nuclear fusion power as a primary energy source powering the world.

China has made clear that no small part of this initiative is inspired by the work of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. Many of the envisioned projects reflect long-standing proposals by *Executive Intelligence Review* and the Schiller Institute. The methods employed echo the ideas of political economy first developed by Alexander Hamilton, and deployed by Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt—ideas uniquely developed and expanded by Lyndon LaRouche. Xi Jinping has asked the United States to join this great venture, which could produce thousands of productive jobs and jump-start infrastructure projects in this country. Obama adamantly refused Xi's offer, and did everything in his power to block and defeat the Chinese initiative. President Trump has indicated an openness to the proposition.

These 2013-2014 events were and are a direct challenge to the British imperial system. They directly challenge the monetary system which is the source of Anglo-American domination of the world. They directly challenge fundamental British strategic policy extant since the days of Halford Mackinder. Under the "One Belt, One Road" initiative, joined with Russia's Eurasian Union, Mackinder's "world island" of Eurasia and Africa will be developed, crisscrossed with new high-speed rail links, new cities, and vital modern infrastructure, based on the mutual benefit of all of the nation states existing there. Under the British geopolitical model, this area of the world has been subjected to endless instability, war, and raw materials looting. Xi Jinping has also attacked the geopolitical axioms by which the United States and the British have operated. He proposes instead a model of "win-win" cooperation



Victoria Nuland, of President Obama's State Department, hands out cookies to ground troops of the color revolution in Kiev, 2014.

in which nation states collaborate for development based on the common aims of mankind.

The Anglo-American response to this development can be seen in the events in Ukraine, where Obama, the British, and the National Endowment for Democracy staged a coup in February 2014, overthrowing the government of the duly elected President, Victor Yanukovich, because he refused to turn his country into a western satrapy to be wielded against Putin's Russia. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Victoria Nuland, who helped oversee the coup from her perch at Hillary Clinton's State Department, was famously caught on tape dictating the Ukraine succession, after bands of murderous neo-Nazis did the scut-work for the coup. According to Nuland, the price for this handiwork was some \$5 billion.

The actual "swamp" of the British and their accomplices in the U.S. intelligence community and aligned trans-Atlantic institutions, like NATO, have viewed themselves as being in a state of war against Russia and China since the 2013-2014 events. Think about former DNI Clapper's unhinged speech of June 7, 2017 in Australia. Clapper ranted that it was in Putin's and Russia's "genes" to attack the United States. Since Trump pursues better relations and shared intelligence with Russia on terrorism, Clapper ranted, Watergate (where Richard

Nixon committed proven crimes) paled in comparison to Russia-gate (where both Clapper and Comey have testified that, to date, the President has committed no crimes). In addition, Clapper told the Aussies to target China, accusing the Chinese, without any offer of proof, of meddling in Australia's elections. Former FBI Director James Comey backed Clapper in his testimony on June 8, 2017, attempting to wax eloquent in response to Senator Joe Manchin, about how Putin exists with one purpose in mind—to shred and dismember the United States.

But China and Russia have completely outflanked these cretins, and the new paradigm is rapidly coming to life with "shovels in the ground" every-

where. In response, the Anglo-American elites have absolutely nothing to offer the world except the same dying, decadent globalist "order." This explains why many in official Washington let loose their inner alien monster every time the President mentions a desire for better relations with Russia, or evinces his friendship with President Xi Jinping of China. This is why Hillary Clinton has literally gone insane, raving like Lady Macbeth, and obsessing about Putin's "man-spreading." That is why, also, they would risk World War III rather than see the "Belt and Road," the New Silk Road, go forward with its "community of principle" idea of relations among nations.

What Did Trump Do?

Like LaRouche, Trump represents an existential challenge to the post-War British-dictated monetarist and imperial order. In his campaign platform he called for the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall banking separation. This would end the casino economy which is about to blow up again—the real economy never having recovered from the collapse of 2008. He wants to build huge modern infrastructure and revitalize the manufacturing sector of the economy with modern manufacturing techniques. He wants to return the United States to space exploration and the funding of fundamental sci-

ence, recognizing the optimistic national morale which will result from that.

In his public speeches, Trump has repeatedly invoked what he understands as “The American System” of political economy, a concept developed and elaborated in recent history by only one man, Lyndon LaRouche. This centers economic systems in nation states, rather than global institutions, and calls for harnessing the resources of the nation state to develop the economy to higher and higher levels of physical productivity and human culture. While Trump has features in his version of the American System which LaRouche would not endorse as historically accurate or politically wise, even the use of the term, invoking Alexander Hamilton and Lincoln’s economist Henry Carey, is a direct challenge to the free trade, small-government nostrums foisted on the United States by a parade of British agents during the Twentieth Century.

The British, up to this point, have been largely successful in burying the actual ideas of Alexander Hamilton and Franklin Roosevelt, and burying the fundamental advances in these ideas resulting from original discoveries by LaRouche. Through deliberate miseducation of Americans, the British have made their economic theories and systems, against which Americans explicitly fought in our Revolution, appear to be universal laws of human behavior.

As his Sept. 19 speech to the United Nations emphasized, Trump envisions a system of sovereign nations, each striving to develop and enrich their populations, engaged in cooperative trade relationships, reciprocal in nature and targeted for the benefit of each party. His U.N. speech echoed the foreign policy of John Quincy Adams, a policy which forbade our nation from “going abroad, seeking monsters to destroy.” This is the very opposite of the imperial-gendarme, perpetual-war policy long favored by the British for the United States. Trump’s positive vision, under present circumstances, requires active collaboration with Russia and China.

To stop the coup, the President’s team and his supporters must stop reacting defensively. He must act on the aspects of his program—Glass-Steagall, large scale infrastructure development funded by national banking mechanisms devoted to that purpose, space exploration, fusion power development, and joining the “One Belt, One Road” program with China, which can actually save the economy and produce high paying jobs. At



UN Photo/Cia Pak

U.S. President Donald Trump addresses the UN General Assembly, Sept. 19, 2017.

the same time, they should look at the actual crimes involved in the coup which are already on the public record, investigate them—including in the Congress—and prosecute them. With respect to Mueller, they should investigate his obstruction of the investigation into the crimes committed on 9/11, together with a full public unveiling of the Saudi and British role in international terrorism. In aid of such an effort we present seven crimes implicated in the events in the coup against the President to date.

Seven Actual Crimes

The seven crimes outlined below make clear that a Special Counsel, not Robert Swan Mueller III, should be investigating the events prior to June 2016. The subject of the investigation is that a foreign power has been instigating an insurrection in the U.S.

In the British account of the 2016 American election, largely published in pieces in the *Guardian*, they began warning their American counterparts about the dangers of Donald Trump’s accommodating views toward Putin and Russia in 2015. These warnings were followed by

the specific claim that the Democratic National Committee's servers had been hacked by the Russians as of July 2015. According to the British account, their American counterparts were slow to respond, although the FBI says it notified the DNC, which did nothing about the alleged Russian hack until June 2016.

The obvious should be stated here. If the British were developing dossiers on Trump and his associates as early as 2015, Trump and his associates were under surveillance as of that date or sooner by British GCHQ and/or the NSA. We know that Paul Manafort was considered practically an enemy combatant in Anglo-American swamp circles by 2014, because of his Ukraine work with Yanukovich and the Party of the Regions. He apparently chose the wrong side by fighting against a Nazi coup. The same was true even of Democratic consultants such as Tony Podesta, who worked with Manafort on Ukraine and were subject to the same reported 2014 FISA surveillance warrant. What was the FBI affidavit which justified the 2014 Manafort and Podesta FISA court surveillance warrant, and what was the British role in obtaining it? What role did the British play, including GCHQ and MI6, in the Manafort counterintelligence investigation? What were the British "concerns" about Trump communicated to U.S. intelligence as early as 2015? What was the specific British warning about hacks of the DNC computer in July 2015?

By December 2015, according to James Clapper's dodgy January 2017 report on alleged Russian meddling in the election, hundreds of paid Russian trolls associated with the St. Petersburg, Russia, Internet Research Agency had begun to advocate for Trump's election. At the same time, Michael Flynn attended a dinner at *RT* in Russia, sitting across the table from Putin. Flynn had already driven Obama crazy by proposing a determined U.S.-Russian collaboration in the war on terror, and going after the Administration's policy aimed at dismembering Syria. Obama had fired him. Is this the date when surveillance on Flynn actually began, or did it begin sooner? What was the British role in this surveillance?

Carter Page has also been a subject in Mueller's Russiagate hysteria. He apparently walked in to volunteer for the Trump campaign without any prior association with the President, and was disavowed by the campaign soon after. He went to school in London, had a variety of business dealings in Russia, and had volunteered for the Trump campaign as a foreign policy advi-

sor by simply walking in the door. Page had already functioned as an FBI informant in a major 2013 New York City FBI case against Russian organized crime figures, and stated on CNN that he briefed both the CIA and FBI regularly on these business dealings in Russia. Was he used as a front to get a FISA warrant directed at the Trump campaign? Was he a spy sent by the FBI both to Russia and into the Trump campaign?

The targeting of the alleged activities of the St. Petersburg Internet Research Agency (IRA) in DNI Clapper's January report, again points to the heavy British hand in the coup against the President. According to French journalist Thierry Meyssan, in September 2014, the British government created the 77th Brigade, a unit tasked with countering foreign propaganda, which worked with the U.S. military in Europe *to interfere* with websites considered to be distributing Russian propaganda. This project ultimately morphed into NATO's Strategic Communications Service, tasked with suppressing any news or person favorable to the Russian position concerning strategic topics, but particularly Ukraine. From its inception, the NATO Strategic Communications Service incorporated a service of the Atlantic Council, the Digital Forensics Service. CrowdStrike's Dmitri Alperovitch—the person with sole access to the DNC's allegedly "hacked" computers, whose forensic analysis was adopted wholesale by James Comey's FBI and the U.S. intelligence community—is a senior fellow in the Atlantic Council's Digital Forensic Service.

News about Russian trolls operating out of the IRA and poisoning the Western mind filled the British press in 2015. In line with this NATO project is the Information Warfare Initiative in the U.S., centered at the Washington Center for European Policy Analysis and founded by *Washington Post* neo-con Anne Applebaum. It is a pseudopod of the National Endowment for Democracy and the U.S. intelligence community, and has concentrated its attacks on the Russian broadcasters *RT* and *Sputnik*.³

3. Russian trolls and IRA became a hot topic in Washington for the first time as a result of Clapper's reference to them in his January 2017 Assessment of Russian meddling, and a nationally embarrassing Senate Select Committee on Intelligence hearing in March 2017. There, full grown U.S. Senators listened in seemingly amazed wonder and without any challenge, as Thomas Rid, of King's College London and NATO, Roy Godson, and other British schooled intelligence experts wove a fantastic fairy tale. They told the Senators that thousands of paid Russian trolls using sophisticated bots had infiltrated the American mind with Russian generated conspiracy theories and swung the election to



World Economic Forum/Benedict von Loeffel
Dmitri Alperovitch, co-founder and chief technology officer of CrowdStrike.

What exactly was the relationship of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, CNN, and the other black propagandists operating against the President, together with their reporters, with the NED, the Information Warfare Initiative, NATO's Strategic Communications Service, and The Institute for Modern Russia in New York City, or other British or U.S. intelligence agencies during the Obama Administration and subsequently? Like the John Train meetings targetting LaRouche, the media attacks on the President are not organic. They are organized, and on a much larger scale than anything ever experienced in this country. What is the relationship of various Washington D.C. lobby shops, such as Orion Strategies, long associated with Senator John McCain, to the organized media campaign against Donald Trump? *Have our intelligence agencies actually instigated an Active Measures counterintelligence program illegally and against a sitting President?* What is the overlap of offices, personnel, and entities assigned by Obama to Russian, Chinese, and Eurasian intelligence functions, including the coup activities in Ukraine, with the illegal leaks of classified information to the news media?

Donald Trump. Godson repeatedly had to correct himself, substituting the current "Russia" for his constant reference to the Soviet Union. According to the same dubious sources, a second evil front opened by the crafty Russians consisted of purchase of Facebook ads meant to sow discord throughout our land.

The Cardinal Events of June-July 2016

1. The Conspiracy Against the President Takes Off

Sometime in June 2016, Hillary Clinton's campaign took over an opposition research project on Donald Trump which had previously been funded by Trump's Republican opponents. The contract was with a D.C. firm called Fusion GPS, which, in turn, employed a British firm, Orbis, and Orbis' founder Christopher Steele. Steele ran the Russia desk for MI6 until 2009; Sir Andrew Wood, an "associate" at Steele's company, was the British Ambassador to Moscow between 1995 and 2000, a "Russia" adviser to Tony Blair, and is an associate fellow of the Russia and Eurasia program at the Royal Institute of International Affairs at Chatham House. Christopher Burrows, Steele's partner in Orbis, lists himself as a long-time, high-ranking British foreign service officer, although news accounts also place him in British intelligence.


Christopher Steele has also acknowledged a long-standing relationship with the FBI, centered in the FBI's Eurasian Organized Crime Strike Force in New York City, which media reports date to 2010, the same time the relationship with Fusion GPS went into effect. Andrew McCabe, the ethically challenged FBI Assistant Director now being investigated for Hatch Act and other violations concerning the Clinton sponsorship of his wife's campaign against Virginia Senator Richard Black, led the Eurasian task force early in his career, and has maintained contacts ever since. Many believe that McCabe was Steele's FBI handler and contact.

In court filings in a London libel suit against them, Steele and Orbis state that they briefed reporters from the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *New Yorker*, Yahoo News, and CNN about Christopher Steele's reports on Trump and Russia in September 2016, and participated in further briefings with the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and Yahoo News in October 2016. In late October, Steele briefed a reporter from *Mother Jones* via Skype. Senator John McCain and David Kramer, who was McCain's agent, were briefed on the pre-election Steele memoranda in December 2016. Sixteen memoranda smearing Trump, based on paid and anonymous Russian sources, were produced prior to the election. It is clear that the FBI was also a recipient of all of these memoranda dating back to June 2016, if not earlier.



linkedin.com

Christopher Burrows (above), Christopher Steele's partner in Orbis, is a high-ranking British foreign service officer. FBI Assistant Director Andrew McCabe (right) is believed to be Steele's handler.



FBI.gov

United States to sway the result. Most certainly this raises questions about the applicability of election laws which bar foreign funding for exactly the reason that United States elections should be decided by United States citizens. Most certainly, once this sequence of events is fully investigated, it will become clear that all government participants intended to sway the election unlawfully, using the powers of a state to vanquish the will of the voters.

2. The Russian Hack That Wasn't—False Reporting of a Crime

Steele and Orbis claim that the 17th memo, produced in December 2016, which referenced the salacious and disgusting claim that Trump engaged in perverse sexual activities at a Russian hotel, was solely produced to one David Kramer as a representative of John McCain, Senator John McCain himself, and a representative of the British security services. The December memo was the product of a collaboration between Steele, Sir Andrew Wood, Kramer, and a representative of the British security services, which began on November 18, 2016, that is, almost immediately following Trump's election as President. It has been widely reported that James Comey's FBI was also offering Steele and Orbis \$50,000 or more at this point to corroborate aspects of the dodgy dossier smearing the President-elect.

David Kramer is the former President of the CIA and NED quango, Freedom House, was a fellow of the neo-conservative Project for a New American Century, held State Department positions dedicated to Project Democracy and soft power coups in Russia and the former East Bloc, and presently serves as Senior Director for Human Rights and Human Freedoms at Senator McCain's Institute for International Leadership in Arizona.

Hillary Clinton used the Steele dossier to paint Trump as a Russian dupe throughout her general election campaign against him. James Comey used it to justify his FBI counterintelligence probe of the Trump campaign which began in July 2016, and has continued.

Thus, we have the British government and, in all probability, NATO, intervening in an election in the

On June 12, 2016, WikiLeaks announced that it was in possession of emails damaging to Hillary Clinton, and would soon be publishing them. June 14, 2016 marks the announcement by the Democratic National Committee that its computers had been hacked by the Russians, the subject apparently of the initial Christopher Steele memorandum prepared for the Clinton campaign. The purloined DNC emails showed, definitively, that the DNC, which should have been neutral in the primaries, was trying to destroy the rising campaign of Bernie Sanders. The emails were published by WikiLeaks on the eve of the Democratic National Convention. The claim that the WikiLeaks emails were the result of a Russian hack of DNC servers was authored by Dmitri Alperovitch of the security firm, Crowd Strike. Alperovitch, a Russian-American who demonizes Putin, is, as previously referenced, a fellow at the Atlantic Council's Digital Forensics Project, deeply involved in NATO's Strategic Communications Service.

The FBI's James Comey accepted Alperovitch's forensic analysis without ever accessing the DNC computers in question. It is probable that Comey was already operating on the basis of the British Christopher Steele memoranda asserting that the Russians were responsible for the DNC hack.

On July 24, 2017, the Veterans Intelligence Professionals for Sanity released a Memo to the President demonstrating that there was no Russian hack of the DNC. Rather, the WikiLeaks document trove was produced by a leak from inside the DNC, not a hack. According to this memorandum, the leaked treasure trove from the DNC was altered in a "cut and paste" job to



Gage Skidmore

Congressman Dana Rohrabacher recently met with Julian Assange of WikiLeaks.

make it look like it was the product of a very crude Russian hack. The VIPS are veterans of U.S. intelligence agencies, and include William Binney, the former technical director of the NSA. Their group first formed to oppose the fabricated reasons for the Iraq War. You can see the full interview of former CIA Officer Ray McGovern about the VIPS report [here](#).

William Binney has insisted, from the first reference to Russian hacking as the source of the WikiLeaks Podesta/DNC documents, that if such an event had occurred, the NSA would have traced it and could say so with certainty. In their report, the VIPS point out that the CIA's Marble Framework program can obfuscate the source of cyberattacks and create false flag attribution to other state actors.

WikiLeaks has consistently claimed that the source of its dossier was an inside leak from the DNC, implying that Seth Rich, a DNC data management staffer who supported Bernie Sanders, was one of its sources. Rich was murdered in July 2016 in Washington, D.C., in a crime which remains unsolved at this date. Congressman Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA) recently met with Julian Assange of WikiLeaks, and states that Assange has evidence confirming that the WikiLeaks DNC/John Podesta email trove was the result of a leak, not a Russian hack.

3. The Trump Tower Meeting—Entrapping a Presidential Campaign

On June 9, 2016, a meeting took place in Trump Tower involving Donald Trump, Jr.; Paul Manafort, at

the time the campaign manager for the Trump Presidential campaign; Jared Kushner, the President's son-in-law; and five other people. As opposed to media accounts, only one of the participants in the Trump Tower meeting was a Russian, the lawyer Natalia Veselnitskaya. By all accounts provided by participants, the meeting was very short, and involved the Magnitsky Act sanctions imposed by the U.S. Congress on certain Russians. Many consider these 2012 sanctions to be the opening shot of the New Cold War. This meeting has attracted extensive attention from Special Counsel Mueller, as the media have painted it as a "smoking gun."

The emails setting up the meeting do not reflect what actually happened at the meeting. Instead, they bear all the marks of an intelligence-agency entrapment attempt against Donald Trump, Jr., designed to fix the "Manchurian candidate" label on Trump early in the general election campaign. The emails setting up the meeting specifically offered "dirt" on Hillary Clinton to be provided by the Russian government itself.

On July 15, 2016, at the same time as the FBI was opening an investigation of the Russians for interfering in the U.S. election and of the Trump campaign for colluding with them, another British intelligence operative, Bill Browder, was filing a complaint with the U.S. Department of Justice concerning four participants in the Trump Tower meeting and others for failure to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Browder's complaint claimed that these people were engaged in unregistered Russian lobbying activities, namely, attempting to overturn the Magnitsky Act. Browder renounced his American citizenship in 1989 to become a British subject and has operated at the highest levels of British finance and intelligence.

Undoubtedly, by the time of the June 9, 2016 Trump Tower meeting, the British government's Trump file already included a full history of Donald Trump's sponsorship of the 2013 Miss Universe pageant in Moscow and its players, Trump's real estate dealings with Russians anywhere in the world, all of candidate Trump's conciliatory statements toward Russia, and complaints that campaign advisor Michael Flynn was soft on Russia and a rebel against the U.S. intelligence establishment from within that establishment. The file also included surveillance of Trump's campaign manager, Paul Manafort, who was considered an outright enemy of Anglo-American interests given his political work for the former President of Ukraine, Victor Yanukovich and his Party of the Regions, and Trump's relationship with Felix Sater, a

Russian-American and high level FBI informant.⁴

So, even before the Trump Tower meeting, we find the following intelligence services in motion and attempting to concoct illicit dirt about Trump and Putin: British intelligence, Ukrainian intelligence, the DNI and the CIA in the United States, the FBI, and NATO's Strategic Communications Service and its U.S. offshoots. But wait, as they say in commercial sales, that's not even close to all involved.

According to *Foreign Policy Magazine* and others, on July 11, 2017, a hacker going by the name of "Johnnie Walker" published a trove of emails from the private account of Lieutenant Robert J. Otto, who is tasked to a secretive unit in the U.S. State Department focused on Russia. *Newsweek* magazine states that Otto is the nation's "foremost" intelligence guy concerning Russia. The emails have not been authenticated. However, they include an email purported to have been written on the day of the Trump Tower meeting between Otto and Kyle Parker, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, featuring a picture of Russian attorney Natalia Veselnitskaya's house in Russia. Parker credits himself as the actual author of the Magnitsky Act sanctions against Russia, and a close friend of Bill Browder. Veselnitskaya claims that her children have been threatened as a result of her participation in a legal case questioning the bona fides of Bill Browder and the factual foundations of the Magnitsky Act. The picture of her house in this context suggests another level of intense surveillance directed at Trump Tower on the day of the meeting, and the possibility that threats to her family were actually governing Veselnitskaya's behavior.


The Set-Up

On June 3, Trump Jr. was emailed by publicist Ron Goldstone, a British national who operates out of the

4. The official British government file also probably included surveillance of apartments at Trump Tower associated with a then ongoing investigation of a Russian organized crime ring said to operate there and figures involved in the FIFA corruption investigation who also lived there. The FIFA investigation was worked by the FBI Eurasian Organized Crime Strike Force and Christopher Steele.



nataliaveselnitskaya/facebook
Natalia Veselnitskaya



CC/Hudson Institute
British intelligence operative William Browder.

U.S., whose first career was as a British tabloid journalist. Goldstone's Facebook account appears to indicate that he is presently on a break from his businesses and on a world tour of gay bathhouses in which the proudly obese Goldstone takes pictures of himself wearing various strange hats and shirts in the company of young men. Who is financing this tour apparently outside the reach of Grand Jury subpoenas? Goldstone has also been photographed with Kathy Griffin, who famously posted a picture of herself with President Trump's severed head.

Goldstone emailed Donald Trump, Jr. that Aras Agalarov wanted Goldstone to set up a meeting with Trump, Jr. in which sensitive Russian government files about Hillary Clinton's dealings with Russia would be provided to the Trump campaign as a gesture of official Russian government support of the campaign. Trump Jr. agreed to the meeting.

Goldstone is the publicist for Emin Agalarov, an Azerbarjani pop star. Aras Agalarov and his son Emin partnered with Trump for the 2013 Miss Universe pageant in Moscow. The base of operations for the Agalarov family is the Moscow regional government, not Putin's Kremlin.

The actual twenty-minute meeting involved Russian attorney Natalia Veselnitskaya, who did most of the speaking by all accounts; Rinat Akhmetshin, a well-known Washington D.C.-based lobbyist and American citizen; Ike Kaveladze, a U.S. citizen and vice-presi-

dent at one of the Agalarov's companies; Ron Goldstone; and the translator for Natalia Veselnitskaya, Anatoli Samochornov. Samochornov is also an American citizen who worked with Veselnitskaya frequently, since she does not speak English. He has also worked extensively for the FBI and the U.S. State Department. Although Akhmetshin has been linked to Russian counterintelligence repeatedly in the news media, that all appears to be based on his bragging about his two-year stint in the Russian military as a young man. The topic addressed by Veselnitskaya was the Magnitsky Act sanctions against Russia, which resulted from a campaign conducted by violently anti-Putin British operative William Browder, allied with Senator John McCain and the D.C. public relations firm Ashcroft and Glover.

Any sound investigation about this meeting would focus on who, out of the small army of intelligence operatives watching this meeting, designed and implemented the clear entrapment attempt against Donald Trump, Jr. for later use. Since it was surveilled and recorded by multiple intelligence agencies tripping all over one another at the time, (you get the image of Keystone cops), why was it only surfaced as the "smoking gun" recently?

Natalia Veselnitskaya had been paroled into the United States to serve as the Russian lawyer in a legal case in the Southern District of New York based solely on money-laundering allegations made by Bill Browder against her Russian clients. At the time of the Trump Tower meeting, however, Veselnitskaya was traveling on a business visa issued by the U.S. Department of State after having been previously denied such a visa, and after efforts by the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York to prevent any free travel by her in the U.S. at all. Immigration attorneys I have spoken to describe this situation as extremely strange.

4. Obama's Final Days In Office— Insurrection Against the President-Elect, Felonious Leaks

In an apparent effort to influence the Electoral College vote following the election, the Obama Administration leaked a preliminary intelligence community "assessment" that the Russians had hacked the Democrats' computers and otherwise intervened to swing the election to Donald Trump. According to the *New York Times* of March 1, 2017, Obama and his national security colleagues additionally spent the months after the election and prior to President Trump's inauguration

dropping a trail of "leads" in official documents and leaking information, in the effort to delegitimize Trump and to continue their policies against Russia and China.

Certainly, there is a document trail on this process which appears to be confined to a period of a little over two months. Evelyn Farkas, formerly of the Defense Department's Russia, Ukraine, Eurasia Desk and the Atlantic Council, virtually admitted to MSNBC in March that she had participated in this process. This is where the illegal unmasking of names in FISA and E.O. 12333 surveillance occurred, when these crimes were committed. Samantha Power, the U.N. Ambassador, was reportedly involved in 260 unmasking requests bearing little relationship to her function. Other targets of the House Intelligence Committee concerning illegal unmasking and leaks include Susan Rice, John Brennan, and Ben Rhodes.

On Dec. 15, 2016, DNI James Clapper signed new procedures allowing the NSA to distribute raw intercept data throughout the entire intelligence community. These procedures became official on Jan. 3, 2017 when Attorney General Loretta Lynch signed off on them.

At issue is modification of secret procedures under E.O. 12333, deemed by Edward Snowden and others as the most significant authority for our present, completely unconstitutional surveillance state. Previously, the NSA was required to filter and redact information regarding U.S. citizens monitored in foreign counterintelligence activities. DNI Clapper had also implemented a cloud intelligence data platform accessible by all intelligence agencies, and obliterating many paper and digital access trails and safeguards. Were these new procedures implemented in any way based on a desire to facilitate leaks and obscure their origin to future investigators?

5. The January Blackmail/Extortion Attempt

On Jan. 6, 2017, according to James Comey's June 8th Congressional testimony, the intelligence chiefs went to Trump Tower to present the Obama Administration's report on Russian hacking, hoping to convince the skeptical President-elect to abandon his campaign promise for better relations with Putin and Russia. Following that briefing, in a pre-arranged move with the rest of Obama's intelligence directors, Comey cleared the room of everyone but himself and Trump. He presented Trump with the Steele dossier's most salacious allegations, namely that Trump had engaged in sexually perverse acts with Russian prostitutes while visiting

Moscow, and Putin had taped it. This is exactly what the infamous J. Edgar Hoover did—blackmail Washington politicians with FBI dossiers, assuring them that he could protect them so long as they did as Hoover wished. In fact, Comey described this as a “J. Edgar Hoover moment” in answers to questions by Senator Susan Collins on June 8. Dick Morris describes the entire affair as “just about as close as you can get to a political assassination without holding a gun to the President’s head.”

Trump appears to have demanded that the entirely fake dossier be investigated, and refused to back down, in efforts to achieve better relations with Russia. In fact, Trump denounced the intelligence community publicly as acting like Nazis. He also denounced the McCarthyite hysteria they were generating. While Comey recorded the President-elect’s responses on a classified computer moments after leaving him, BuzzFeed, which had frequently published raw Clinton/Obama “oppo” stories, published the December 2016 British/Clinton dodgy dossier in full. The U.S. intelligence community, particularly Obama’s ghoulish grand inquisitor, CIA head John Brennan, proceeded to give it credibility by leaking that both President-elect Trump and President Obama had been briefed on its contents.

Publication of the Trump Russian sex allegations accompanied James Clapper’s factless “official intelligence community assessment” that the Russians hacked the DNC and Podesta, and that they did so to influence the election in favor of Donald Trump. Put together by analysts hand-picked by the CIA’s John Brennan, that assessment was backed by no actual evidence. It has now been thoroughly debunked as “the hack that wasn’t” by the analysis presented by the Veteran’s Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. John Brennan subsequently explained to Congress and the public that he does not “do evidence.”

The Democrats, the news media, and their Republican allies led by John McCain and Lindsay Graham, went berserk over the factless Obama Administration



Senate Intelligence Committee

Left to right: former FBI director James Comey, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, and John Brennan, former head of the CIA.

“assessment,” demanding special prosecutors and Congressional investigations, and sneering that “other shoes” were about to drop. The *New York Times*’ Thomas Friedman, having clearly lost it, claimed that Russia had committed an “act of war,” presumably seeking to invoke Article 5 of the NATO treaty.

6. The President Calls Out Comey, Brennan et al. for Wiretapping Him: They Lie About It To Congress

On March 4, 2017, after General Flynn was fired, and after a deluge of leaks of classified surveillance of members of Trump’s transition and national defense teams, President Trump interrupted the entire fake media narrative by tweeting what had become obvious: that Obama had him “wiretapped” in Trump Tower prior to the election, and that what was happening to him reeked of McCarthyism. The media, which had been publishing allegations about FISA warrants and intercepts of Trump or his associates for months, erupted in what has to be one the most shameless demonstrations of the Big Lie ever known. They declared that Trump was offering wild claims with no evidence, essentially circling back on their very own reporting and labeling it, “fake news.”

Now it has been revealed that FISA warrants existed on Paul Manafort from 2014 through some period in 2016, and from some period in 2016 through this year, conveniently omitting the period when he was Trump’s campaign manager. Manafort lives in Trump Tower,

and was originally investigated under the Foreign Agents Registration Act for his Ukraine activities. It is fairly obvious that the June 2016 meeting at Trump Tower was the subject of massive surveillance. It is also abundantly clear from the leaks which occurred concerning contacts with the Russians by Trump's campaign officials and supporters, that the Trump Tower offices of his transition were subject to massive surveillance, either as the result of extant FISA warrants or under E.O. 12333.

James Comey and James Clapper were both asked directly in their appearances before Congressional Committees whether there was any evidence at all to substantiate the President's wiretapping claims. Both of them gave emphatic answers that there was not, and went out of their respective ways to paint the President as a paranoid wacko.

So now, Robert Mueller is investigating the President of the United States for obstruction of justice, because he fired an FBI Director who lied to Congress. Really?

7. The Comey Firing-Attempted Entrapment of the President

On March 20, 2017, former FBI Director Comey breathed new life into what was, by then, an insurrection which had run out of steam. People were simply tired of Democrats, like Adam Schiff,⁵ trying on McCarthyite tinfoil hats before TV cameras and pontificating about the outrage *du jour*. Comey, in testimony before the House Select Committee on Intelligence, made it officially public, for the first time, that the FBI had been investigating collusion between the Trump campaign and Russian interference in the election since July of 2016. He opined that the FBI counterintelligence investigation (which had been leaking like a sieve since its instigation in July, without producing any verifiable facts about either Russian interference or Trump campaign collusion) could continue for many more months, if not years. He refused to say whether the President himself was under investigation, despite the fact that he had told the President that he was not, and had told Congress the same thing behind closed doors.

5. Schiff has a watermelon face combining features of the comic Charlie Brown and a Conehead; his personality is like the grasping and crazy personality of Peanuts cartoon character, Lucy Van Pelt. As a prosecutor it took him three tries to convict the hapless former FBI agent Richard Miller of espionage despite overwhelming and salacious evidence.

Despite the daily press instructions about events which the public must view as scandalous (why scandalous was never explained), and highly publicized Congressional hearings concerning "Russia! Russia! Russia!" all of President Obama's men, at this late date, had only managed to arrange the human sacrifice of Michael Flynn for lying to the Vice-President about his conversations with the Russian ambassador in December.⁶ They had also generated ethics, foreign intelligence registration, and tax questions about their other Trump campaign targets—typical of what happens when an entire life is put under a microscope, in a dedicated search for something, anything, that could be construed feasibly as wrongdoing.

Ask yourself, what have any of these people allegedly done? Spoken with the Russians? Talked about lifting sanctions imposed because Putin reacted to a coup Obama ran against the duly elected government of Ukraine? Lobbied on behalf of foreign governments? Really?

The actual testimony of Obama's intelligence officials before Congressional Committees, shorn of the media hype surrounding it, was that there was absolutely no evidence of any Trump campaign collusion with alleged Russian efforts to interfere in the U.S. elections. In fact, on March 15, 2017, Comey himself had told Senators Chuck Grassley and Diane Feinstein behind closed doors, that the President was not a target of his investigations, despite planted press stories to the contrary. Comey had otherwise continually stonewalled Grassley concerning the Senator's persistent questions about the FBI's relationship to British operative Christopher Steele.

While unable to produce any saleable legal goods, the illicit investigations had significantly bogged down the President's political agenda, while fostering an increasingly toxic and divisive national political environment. The strategy of official Washington, the Republicans who opposed the President's election, the Obama/Clinton Democratic establishment, and the intelligence

6. Flynn's scalping itself was the result of the unmasking of Flynn's name and illegal leaks of the same to the press as a result of classified surveillance. This fact was obliterated by sensational press coverage of the hyperventilated visit of Obama Assistant Attorney General Sally Yates to the White House to warn, nonsensically, that Flynn had been "compromised" by the Russians because he lied to the Vice-President. Exactly how this makes any sense at all we have not been told. Shakespeare's Macbeth intoned, "it is a tale, told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

agencies operating on behalf of British strategic policies and axioms is clear—use complicit Republicans to trap the President in failed and obnoxious policies, such as the healthcare bill; hope that the President’s silent majority remains exactly that—silent; hope that some of the smelly stuff they are throwing up against the wall actually sticks; distract, distract, distract the President, and prevent him from working with Russia and China to develop the world, end wars, and implement the massive infrastructure and space exploration projects which will actually save our economy.

On May 3, 2017, Comey followed his March drama-queen performance before the House, with even more theatrical speechifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He bloviated that despite the fact that his unprecedented disclosures and handling of the Clinton email investigation may have impacted the election, and it made him nauseous, he, Mr. Eagle Scout and True Crime Detective rolled into one, would do the same thing all over again. He exaggerated the significance of the Anthony Weiner computer discovery by stating that it contained thousands of new Clinton emails, not previously produced, some of which were classified—a statement the FBI had to subsequently correct. As Assistant Attorney General Rod Rosenstein rightly argued, Comey violated numerous Justice Department regulations and ethical norms in his outrageous actions in the Clinton email investigation. It is the Attorney General’s job to prosecute cases—to open and close them—not that of the FBI.

At the same Senate Judiciary hearing, Comey refused to state publicly that President Trump was not under investigation, despite repeatedly assuring the President of that fact privately. He knew this allowed the media and Democratic party “color revolution” to continue. He refused to confirm that there was any investigation into the torrent of illegal classified leaks at the center of the media campaign.

On May 9, President Trump fired Comey, setting the stage for Robert Mueller’s appointment as Special Prosecutor. At the center of Mueller’s inquiry will be a conspiracy to obstruct justice charge against the President for firing James Comey, along with any so-called process crimes he can find during his investigation—registration offenses under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, tax offenses, or false statements to FBI agents or Congress. As he builds his case, Mueller will follow his standard playbook, putting unrelenting psychological pressure on those Trump loyalists he can im-

plicate in the process crimes. He will continue to target and investigate the President’s family for similar offenses in order to destabilize the President himself. He will continue the relentless demonization of the President, in order to ensure that neutral officials in Washington who witnessed key events will testify not according to the truth, but according to what they see as future career prospects.

Following his firing, Comey and friends leaked to the press notes which he had allegedly taken following most of his encounters with the President. With each encounter, Comey’s leaked account says, he returned to discuss what was said and its implications with a close circle of his FBI comrades. He prepared for each encounter with the President based on “murder boards” conducted by his FBI colleagues. In the course of their meetings, Comey says, the President asked for his loyalty, which Comey portrayed like the request of some mafia don in a bad Hollywood movie. If it happened, such a request, in the context of what appeared to be an open insurrection against the President by the intelligence community, is hardly surprising. The President denies that it happened.

On the day after the President fired Flynn, according to Comey, the President cleared the room and went one on one with him, expressing the “hope” that Comey could let the matter of Michael Flynn go. Comey whines that he took the President’s “hope” as an “order,” giving rise to concerns about possible obstruction of justice. This line of reasoning was thoroughly eviscerated by Senator James Risch in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on June 8, 2017. Senator Risch forced Comey to admit that Trump never ordered him to let the Flynn matter go, but only expressed a “hope” that he would do so, and no prosecution that Comey knew of ever went forward, based on someone expressing “hope” for something. While the President denies he ever asked Comey to let the Flynn matter go, Harvard Law Professor Emeritus and famed trial lawyer Alan Dershowitz writes that the President would be fully within his legal and constitutional prerogatives to order Comey to back off Flynn. He could have simply told Comey, I am going to pardon Flynn.

So, it is clear by James Comey’s own account that he was trying to set the President up, to entrap him—an escapade which was “crudely” interrupted when the President fired him. Again, confirming this, Comey told Senator Susan Collins in his testimony, that the reason why he did not stop the President from improper inter-



White House

Former FBI director James Comey (left), and prosecutor Robert Mueller (right).

actions, if he thought they were such, the reason he concealed the alleged improper and possibly illegal conduct from his superiors at the Justice Department, and the reason he did not resign, was because his encounters with the President were of “investigative interest” to the FBI. Otherwise, Comey’s leaks reveal a man so leery of even shaking the President’s hand (or being photographed doing it) that once in January he tried to hide himself in the White House drapes in the hopes that Trump would not see him.

The problem for Robert Mueller’s obstruction case, among others, is that both Comey and his Assistant Andrew McCabe have previously testified, under oath, to Congress that there was no pressure to end the FBI’s investigations from anyone in the Trump Administration. And, Comey confirmed in his testimony that prior to his firing, Trump was not under investigation for collusion with Russia, obstruction, or any other offense. Further, Comey has proved that he is willing to violate professional norms and Justice Department regulations, if not laws, by leaking government documents. The question is, what else was leaked by Comey and his FBI circle? Finally, we now know that Comey lied to or misled Congress about the “wiretaps” on Trump Tower—the Manafort FISA warrants prove the case. Senator Grassley has asked the FBI: Why, if you were wiretapping a close associate of the President, wouldn’t you warn the President about him as is customarily done? The true answer is that the President himself was and is the target of an unprecedented and

illegal coup-attempt conducted by those sworn to uphold the Constitution and the nation’s laws.

Those familiar with the relationship between Comey and Robert Mueller describe them as “joined at the hip,” “cut from the same cloth” (can’t help thinking of the Union Jack), close personal friends, and mentor (Mueller) to mentee (Comey). The problem with this relationship is that Department of Justice conflict guidelines specifically bar prosecutors (Mueller) from investigating issues where close friends (Comey) have a significant

role, such as material witnesses. Official Washington knows all of this and yet touts this investigation as somehow “independent,” “apolitical,” and “unconflicted.”

Will You Help Us End This Coup?

So, now you know. Since the election and before, we have been stuck in a very elaborate and dangerous British hoax, gambling the future of our nation in a cold coup against an elected president. Actual crimes have been committed—not by the President—but against the President and the Constitution. What has happened is that political differences, ideas, have been criminalized, the very danger most provisions of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights were explicitly designed to guard against.

We have shown you the prosecutorial robot named Robert Mueller, whom others have always pointed to shoot, and why he has been deployed to take out the President of the United States. We have told you the real reasons why the President has been attacked by a foreign power, the British and their allies in our country. We have shown you that many of the same people and methods were deployed on a smaller scale to deprive the world of the beautiful ideas of Lyndon LaRouche. Now, at a point where this President, freed of Mueller and adequately advised, could join with China’s Belt and Road and usher in a new renaissance for mankind, shouldn’t we really, finally, win our future, this time?