
IV. The Struggle of Our Era

To Fulfill Humanity's Dreams, We Must Get Free of the British Empire!

by William F. Wertz

Mr. Wertz is President of the Schiller Institute USA and an EIR editorial board member. This edited transcript is adapted from his Nov. 25, 2017 presentation to the LaRouche PAC Manhattan Project Dialogue.

This week, Helga Zepp-LaRouche said we have made major progress but “we’re not in safe waters yet.” Today I want to give you a report on the progress the world has made towards a new, just economic order, and at the same time indicate some of the obstacles which still remain and which still must be overcome. On the one hand, progress has been made in the fight against terrorism—despite the inability of the United States and Russia to collaborate directly, due to the British-orchestrated campaign against President Trump for alleged “collusion” with Russia. As well, President Trump has taken initial steps in the direction of collaborating with China’s “One Belt, One Road” initiative.

On the other hand, the leadership once provided by Western Christian civilization in the fight for economic justice has in large part been silenced—and even worse, that leadership, in the form of the Roman Catholic Church, has abandoned the perspective of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II, and embraced the genocidal anti-human environmentalism of the British Empire. Moreover, the British Empire, which has been the enemy of the United States of America since its inception, has succeeded since World War II in reducing the United States of America to a virtual satrapy.

If we are to realize the dreams of humanity, it is absolutely necessary to revive the perspective of Popes Paul VI and John

Paul II in West European Christian civilization, and thus for the West to engage with China and Russia in a commitment to the common destiny of all humanity, as advocated by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

To accomplish this, we must first understand that the British Empire is the enemy of the United States of America, indeed all humanity. To this end, I will show that British geopolitics was responsible for the last two world wars, that the United States of America in the 1930s under President Franklin Roosevelt had plans to fight a two-front war—against Japan *and the British Empire*—and finally, that the British Empire colluded with the architects of its Saudi Arabian satrapy in the September 11, 2001 attack on the United States of America.

This last week, President Assad of Syria visited President Putin in Sochi, Russia. What they have ac-



Russian President Vladimir Putin receives Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in Russia.

kremlin.ru

complished in behalf of humanity is something which we should all applaud, because they have, in a very heroic way, outflanked the British Empire and its policy of regime change, and saved the nation of Syria. But much more than saving the nation of Syria, *per se*, they have saved the principle of national sovereignty, the principle of cooperation among nations for the benefit of all humanity.

Today, very positive developments are taking place in Syria. As you know, two years ago, the Russians intervened in Syria. This was a major flank carried out by President Putin at a point at which forces in the West, including President Obama and Hillary Clinton, through Victoria Nuland, had carried out a Nazi coup in Ukraine. President Putin outflanked that situation and intervened in Syria—before what happened in Libya, and what happened in Iraq, could be replicated in that nation as well.

ISIS and al-Qaeda have been defeated in Syria, and also in Iraq. That does not mean that there is not a continuing threat of terrorism; there is still a need, as President Putin has repeatedly proposed, for a united front internationally against terrorism, just we had a united front against Nazis in World War II. But even without a unified anti-terrorism organization, the fact of the matter is that since President Trump has been in office, and since President Putin has intervened in Syria, a major defeat has been registered against world terrorism and those who have supported that terrorism for their own geopolitical purposes. And that is something which is quite significant, and gives us hope for the future.

Just before this trip of Assad to Sochi, President Trump made an eleven-day trip throughout Asia, going to Japan and South Korea, meeting with President Xi in an historic visit in China, and attending the APEC summit in Vietnam and the ASEAN/East Asia summit in the Philippines. He did not have an official meeting with President Putin. However, after the APEC summit, he lashed out at the fake intelligence officers of former President Obama—Clapper, Comey, and Brennan—for their operation which had been designed on behalf of the British, to prevent President Trump from working with President Putin and with President Xi.

This exposure is something for which we have



Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche.

fought. The LaRouche PAC produced and distributed a dossier entitled “[Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him](#),” for the purpose of defeating the attempted *coup d'état* being carried out by British intelligence against the Presidency of the United States, so that President Trump could move forward with an alliance with President Xi, bring the United States into the “One Belt, One Road” initiative, and at the same time, work with President Putin in an international fight against terrorism. These are really one and the same fight.

Lyndon and Helga LaRouche conceived of the World Land-Bridge back in the 1990s, long before China officially adopted this perspective in the fall of 2013. Today, this concept, this grand design, is on the verge of fruition. These two individuals have committed their lives to a love for the truth, a love for humanity, and they have fought over decades, for the benefit of the human race, to create a society which fosters that which distinguishes man from the beast, which is his creativity. And to bring together cultures throughout the world based on the fact that all human beings, as emphasized by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, the great theologian and scientist of the 1400s, are “created in the living image of the Creator.” That is, man is distinguished from the beasts by his capacity for creativity, and as a result of that, his mission is to be an instrument for the future development of the universe, created by the Creator.

One of the problems we face in the world today is that in Western civilization, the voices who previously spoke in behalf of this perspective, particularly in the

Roman Catholic Church, and the political circles influenced by it, have in large part been silenced, and we have a vacuum. In the past, the policies that are being implemented by President Xi, by Putin, potentially by President Trump, and advocated by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, were promoted by Pope Paul VI and also by Pope John Paul II.

Two Great Popes

On March 26, 1967, Pope Paul VI issued an encyclical called *On the Development of the Peoples* [*Populorum Progressio*], which we in the LaRouche movement very much endorsed. We held conferences all over the world promoting this idea, because it was completely coherent with the economic development perspective which Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche have fought for over decades, and which is now coming to fruition with the World Land-Bridge.

What Pope Paul VI said in this encyclical is completely coherent with the viewpoint of President Xi and President Putin, in terms of a “win-win” perspective. He defends national sovereignty, promotes economic development as the new name for peace, and calls for people with different cultures and religions to work together for the common destiny of mankind.

What Paul VI wrote in that encyclical was as follows:

He said that “unchecked liberal capitalism leads to dictatorship rightly ... denounced as producing the ‘international imperialism of money.’ ...

“There can be no progress towards the complete development of man without the simultaneous development of all humanity in the spirit of solidarity. ...

“The same duty of solidarity that rests on individuals, exists also for nations. ... Every nation must produce more and better quality goods to give to all its inhabitants a truly human standard of living and also to contribute to the common development of the

human race.”

He then goes on to say that under these conditions, “Developing countries will thus no longer risk being overwhelmed by debts whose repayment swallows up the greater part of their gains. Rates of interest and time for repayment of the loan could be so arranged as not to be too great a burden on either party, taking into account free gifts, interest-free or low-interest loans, and the time needed for liquidating the debts.”

He’s talking about the creation of a world fund, very similar to the International Development Bank proposed by Lyndon LaRouche in 1975, the New Development

Bank created by the BRICS, and other banks which have been created by the Chinese to facilitate the One Belt, One Road policy, which offer long-term credit at low interest rates to facilitate economic development.

Pope Paul VI continues: “The receiving countries could demand that there be no interference in their political life or subversion of their social structures. As sovereign states, they have the right to conduct their own affairs, to decide on their policies, and to move freely towards the kind of society they choose. What must be brought about, therefore, is a system of cooperation freely undertaken, an effective and mutual sharing, carried out with equal dig-

nity on either side, for the construction of a more human world.”

Rather than a clash of civilizations, he calls for a dialogue of civilizations, something which we in the Schiller Institute have advocated, for instance. He says, “Between civilizations, as between persons, sincere dialogue indeed creates brotherhood. The work of development will draw nations together in the attainment of goals pursued with a common effort if all ... are inspired by brotherly love and moved by the sincere desire to build a civilization founded on world solidarity.”

Twenty years later, in 1987, Pope John Paul II wrote



Pope Paul VI

an encyclical called *On Social Concern* [*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*] on the twentieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, stressing that we must mobilize for the common good of all humanity, and we must create a “civilization of love.” He stressed that the quality of creativity is something that has to be promoted, saying: “The right of economic initiative is often suppressed. . . . The denial of this right, . . . absolutely destroys the spirit of initiative, that is to say the creative subjectivity of the citizen. . . . It often happens that a nation is deprived of its subjectivity, that is to say the ‘sovereignty’ which is its right. . . .”

Pope John Paul II stresses that at that time there were two “structures of sin.” He specifically referred to Marxist collectivism—this is in the period before the collapse of the Soviet Union—and on the other hand, liberal capitalism, which, as we know, was promoted by Adam Smith and the British school of economics:


“Each of the two blocs [the Soviets and the British] harbors in its own way a tendency towards imperialism, . . . or towards forms of new-colonialism. . . .” And in contrast to that, he advocates “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good. . . . What is hindering full development is that desire for profit and that thirst for power. . . . These . . . ‘structures of sin’ are only conquered . . . by a diametrically opposed attitude: a commitment to the good of one’s neighbor with the readiness . . . to ‘lose oneself’ for the sake of the other instead of exploiting him, and to ‘serve him’ instead of oppressing him for one’s own advantage.”

John Paul II concludes that world peace requires “the transformation of mutual distrust into collaboration.”

One of the things I stressed at an earlier Manhattan Project meeting, is that China is acting more on Christian principles, even though it’s a Confucian society, than Western European civilization is at this moment! I think that you see in these statements, from Pope Paul VI and from Pope John Paul II, a quality of thinking which is not expressed by leaders in Western Europe at

this moment, or even in the United States, although President Trump has certainly taken giant steps in that direction.

And that is the reality which we must change. We must create a situation in Western Europe and the United States in which we have leadership of this quality once again, as in the case of Lyn and Helga Zepp-LaRouche. *It is the responsibility of every single citizen.* Lyndon and Helga LaRouche were not born into royalty, they were not born into wealth. They are people who have devoted their entire lives to developing their minds, and have fought with a passion for humanity—and that’s what each of us should emulate.



UN/Evan Schneider

Pope John Paul II

Next, I want to discuss the long wave of British imperialism, which must be ended at this point in human history. Lyndon LaRouche at one point stressed that after the creation of the first nation-states, in France under Louis XI (reigned 1461-1483), and then later under Henry VII (1485-1509) in England, the problem was that the sovereign nation-state system did not become hegemonic throughout the world. Instead, they were forced into a symbiotic relationship with the still-dominant imperial system. Therefore, it was not possible to forge a community of principle among a family of sovereign nation-states throughout the globe. This is the problem identified by both Paul VI and John Paul II. After the “structure of sin” known as the Soviet imperial system collapsed in 1989-1991, there were those,

including Francis Fukuyama in his book, *The End of History*, who believed that history was over, because there had been a final victory for liberal capitalism, that we had a unipolar world, and this unipolar world was going to prevail from this point on.

But that has not happened. Instead, what we've seen is that the Chinese and the Russians, in particular, have begun to realize a policy on behalf of all humanity—not a geopolitical policy, not an imperial policy—but a policy that

offers hope to humanity in opposition to the British Empire, which has in large part captured the United States of America. The only way we're going to ensure we're in safe waters, is to the extent to which we eliminate the remaining “structure of sin,” the British Empire, altogether, and the United States and the rest of Western European civilization is liberated from the British Empire and joins with China, Russia and other countries in creating a new, truly human paradigm. That's the task before us.

The Disease of Geopolitics

I now want to deepen our understanding of the British imperial system. An imperial system is primarily a financial system which loots human beings and resources through what is called “primitive accumulation” out of a thirst for power on the part of a ruling oligarchy. It's a system of Zeus, who wanted to deny human beings hope in the future, deny scientific development and technology, in order to maintain dominance over all other human beings: That's the system of imperialism. And particularly after World War II, that imperial system has persisted through the financial control of the City of London and of Wall Street, which has functioned as a Trojan horse of the British system in the United States from its inception.

The British have had the intention of taking over the United States since they were thrown out during the American Revolution. As we know, they burned the



Map from Mackinder's *The Geographical Pivot of History*.

White House in 1814, during the War of 1812; they supported the Confederacy in order to balkanize the United States and destroy the Union.

But after Lincoln's assassination in 1865, they realized that they had to use other methods to reassert their control, and that entailed defeating the American System of economics of Alexander Hamilton, arguing falsely that the American system of economics is that of Adam Smith. It entailed a direct attack on creativity by people such as Bertrand Russell. It entailed the attack on sovereignty by H.G. Wells in his *Open Conspiracy*. What the British feared most was that the United States would begin to work with other nations throughout the world, and create a combination which would defeat the British Empire as a whole. To prevent that from happening, the British imperialists launched an operation to gain control of, and to destroy the United States of America, and other nations which dared to adopt American System methods as pioneered by Alexander Hamilton, to develop their peoples and to defend their sovereignty. Geopolitics was a means by which British imperial circles attempted to prevent the emergence of a combination of sovereign nations, led by the United States, which would be capable of destroying their power. Halford Mackinder, who is known as the father of British geopolitics, gave a [speech](#) to the Royal Geographical Society, published in April 1904, in which he and his interlocutors revealed their cult of geopolitical insanity, from behind whose screen the British Empire

has connived to produce the catastrophe which has been the past century of world history. The basic idea of Mackinder's geopolitical cult, is that Russia is the geographical "pivot area" of history in Eurasia. It's surrounded by an inner marginal crescent, and then there's an outer, or insular crescent. Mackinder's obsession was to target Russia by controlling the marginal, inner crescent from the outer, or insular area, the islands lying off the Eurasian continent. This lunacy was used to justify the unleashing of two world wars. It was modified after World War II by Bernard Lewis, into the form of an "arc of crisis" surrounding the Soviet Union. The madness has now been continued after the collapse of the Soviet Union, in order to justify the attempt to maintain a unipolar world.

Mackinder saw the development of transcontinental railroads on the Eurasian continent as an existential threat to continuing imperial control. The formation of an Anglo-Japanese alliance was justified as preventing it. In 1894, the British Empire signed a treaty with Japan, called the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Commerce and Navigation. Within two weeks of signing that treaty—which was only supposed to go into effect after five years, in 1899—on Aug. 1, 1894, the Japanese launched the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95. Then, in 1902, the Anglo-Japanese alliance was formed, and on Feb. 8, 1904, the Japanese launched the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05.

Mackinder delivered his speech in 1904 just as Japan launched war against Russia.

In his speech Mackinder says: "The Russian railways have a clear run of 6,000 miles from Wirballen" which today is Virbalis, Lithuania "in the west to Vladivostok in the east. The Russian army in Manchuria is as significant evidence of mobile land-power as the British army in South Africa was of sea-power. True, the Trans-Siberian railway is still a single and precarious line of communication, but the century will not be old before all Asia is covered with railways."

He continues: "Is not the pivot region of the world's politics that vast area of Euro-Asia which is inaccessible to ships, but in antiquity lay open to the horse-riding nomads, and is to-day about to be covered with a network of railways? The full development of her modern railway mobility is merely a matter of time."

He continues: "The oversetting of the balance of power in favor of the pivot state [i.e., Russia], resulting in its expansion over the marginal lands of Euro-Asia,

would permit of the use of vast continental resources for fleet-building, and the empire of the world would then be in sight. This might happen if Germany were to ally herself with Russia." That statement has provided a justification for one of the policy objectives of the British Empire up until the present day, that is, to prevent any alliance between Germany and Russia.

He goes on: "May not this in the end prove to be the strategical function of India in the British Imperial system? Is not this the idea underlying Mr. [Leo] Amery's conception that the British military front stretches from the Cape [of Good Hope] through India to Japan?"

Later in the ensuing discussion, one of the participants says: "My own belief is that an island state like our own, can, if it maintains its naval power, hold the balance between the divided forces which work on this continental area, and I believe that has been the historical function of Great Britain, since Great Britain was the United Kingdom. Now we find a smaller island state rising on the opposite side of the Eurasian continent, and I see no reason at all to suppose that that state should not be able to exercise on the eastern fringe of the Asiatic continent, a power as decisive and as influential as that which the British Isles, with a smaller population, has exercised over here."


Mackinder responded to this by saying: "I agree that the function of Britain and Japan is to act on the marginal region, maintaining the balance of power there against the expanse of inner forces. I believe that the future of the world depends on the maintenance of this balance of power."

This discussion seeks to justify an Anglo-Japanese imperial alliance in order to maintain control over the globe. That alliance was a deadly enemy not only of Russia and China, but also of the United States, which suffered the consequences of the British promotion of Japanese imperialists at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

War Plan Red

This British strategy was understood by American patriots, who developed plans to wage a simultaneous war against Great Britain and its allies (War Plan Red) and Japan (War Plan Orange).

The thesis of War Plan Red was that Great Britain would try to invade the United States through Canada. Under the plan, the United States forces, which were "Blue," would capture the port city of Halifax, in Nova



Kevin Lippert's book, War Plan Red.

Scotia, which would cut off the Canadians from their British allies, because Halifax is Canada's main East Coast port. The idea was to seize Canadian power plants near Niagara Falls, followed by a full-scale invasion on three fronts: from Vermont to take Montreal and Quebec; from North Dakota, to take over the railhead in Winnipeg; and from the Midwest to capture the strategic nickel mines in Ontario. And then there would be another operation, by the Navy, to seize the Great Lakes and blockade Canada's Atlantic and Pacific ports. An invasion of Canada's West Coast would go straight up through Bellingham, Washington into Vancouver.

This was not an on-paper war plan. There were actual actions taken in the 1930s when Franklin Roosevelt was President. In 1935, the War Department arranged a Congressional appropriation of \$57 million to build three border air-bases disguised as civilian airfields for the purpose of preemptive surprise attacks on Canadian airfields. With these airfields, the United States would be capable of dominating the industrial

heart of Canada. This appropriation became public knowledge when it was reported in a front-page article in the *New York Times* on May 1, 1935.

In August 1935, in furtherance of this plan, we also held our largest peacetime military maneuvers in history, as 36,000 troops converged at the Canadian border south of Ottawa, with another 15,000 held in reserve in Pennsylvania. The war-game scenario was a motorized invasion of Canada, where defending forces initially repulsed the invading Blue forces, but eventually lost, being outnumbered and outgunned when Blue reinforcements arrived.

This was the *official policy* of the United States through 1939, and the only reason it changed, was because Hitler, who in large part had been supported and brought to power by the British oligarchy in order to attack east against the Soviet Union, unexpectedly attacked west into France, and also attacked Britain. At that point, Prime Minister Churchill realized that he could not defeat the Nazis and preserve the British Empire, unless he could win over the United States to fight with Britain against the Nazis. The perfidious British thus shifted sides at that moment, for pragmatic reasons, to preserve their Empire.

After Roosevelt's untimely death, the very same "Red" countries that War Plan Red was designed to combat, became our intelligence allies in what's now called the Five Eyes—Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Britain, and the United States.

London and 9/11

Let's now turn to the current situation, especially 9/11. After the passage of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, JASTA, and the override of Obama's veto of JASTA, the families of the victims of 9/11 amended their suit to include the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. From a legal standpoint, the complaint is tailored to take advantage of JASTA to sue the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia directly. And insofar as it does that, the suit is truthful in going after the Saudi role in the 9/11 attacks. What it doesn't do, is to identify the true nature of 9/11, which entailed the British involvement in the 9/11 attack.

The way the suit operates is to say that the various charities and religious organizations which supported al-Qaeda are run by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and therefore the financial and other support by the charities and religious organizations to al-Qaeda was in fact au-


thorized by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia at the highest level.

I want to focus on one individual featured in the suit, Abdullah Omar Naseef: He was the head of the Muslim World League, and also a member of the Kingdom's Majlis al Shura (government consultative council). He personally met with Osama bin Laden and other founding members of al-Qaeda at the time of al-Qaeda's formation, and agreed that Muslim World League offices would be used as a platform for the new jihad organization, and that attacks would be launched from Muslim World League offices. At the same time, he appointed known founders of al-Qaeda to positions in various organizations in crucial locations where al-Qaeda

was to be active. He appointed Wael Hamza Julaidan, a founding member of al-Qaeda, whom the United States designated as a terrorist after 9/11, because he was directing organizations that had provided financial and logistical support to al-Qaeda. In 1989, Wael Hamza Julaidan had been appointed to serve as the head of the Peshawar, Pakistan, office of the Muslim World League.

Naseef also appointed Mohammed Jamal Khalifa, another founding member of al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden's brother-in-law, to serve as director of the International Islamic Relief Organization (IIRO) in the Far East, which was a major opportunity for al-Qaeda to expand its operations and recruit in that area.

According to the suit: "Shortly after assuming the post, Khalifa used International Islamic Relief Organization funds and resources to support a terrorist cell in the Philippines, which included 9/11 masterminds Khalid Sheikh Mohammad and Ramzi Yousef, in relation to the development of an aviation-based terrorist plot involving the planned simultaneous in-flight deto-



Lawsuit against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

nations of twelve U.S.-flag commercial airline planes. That very plot, often referred to as 'Operation Bojinka,' was adapted by Khalid Sheikh Mohammad, using the knowledge he had acquired during its development about vulnerabilities in the aviation security system, into the September 11th plot."

Now, what is "Operation Bojinka"? This was run in the Philippines, and involved three phases: In Phase I, al-Qaeda operatives intended to assassinate Pope John Paul II at World Youth Day in the Philippines on Jan. 15, 1995. In Phase II, between January 21 and 22, they planned to place bombs on eleven U.S.-bound airplanes. U.S. government investigators estimated that

4,000 people would have been killed had they had gone ahead with this—more than were killed on September 11, 2001. Phase III was to hijack an airplane and crash it into the CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia.

Investigators also reported that al-Qaeda had an alternative plot, which it felt it was not in a position to carry out at that time, because it would have had to recruit more people, and probably because it would entail greater technical resources than it had at that time. This particular plot, which was discovered during the investigation of Operation Bojinka, was to hijack commercial planes and fly them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, the U.S. Capitol, the White House, the Sears Tower in Chicago, and the U.S. Bank Tower in Los Angeles.

The cell that hatched the Bojinka plot included Khalid Sheikh Mohammad (KSM), the reported mastermind of 9/11, and his nephew Ramzi Yousef, who was the mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. The plot was funded by the Philippine branch



Abdullah Omar Naseef founded the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies.

of the IIRO headed by bin Laden’s brother-in-law, who was appointed to the position by Dr. Abdullah Omar Naseef, then Secretary General (from 1983-93) of the Muslim World League.

Now let’s look at the relationship between our ever-loving British Royal allies, and the key Saudi who facilitated the creation of the cell which plotted 9/11, and who is being sued by American citizens whose family members were killed on 9/11.

In 1985, Abdullah Omar Naseef founded the Oxford Center for Islamic Studies (OCIS) in Great Britain. In 1990, Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan Al Saud gave somewhere between \$13 and \$24 million to the OCIS. In 1993, Britain’s Prince Charles became the Patron of OCIS.

As the amended complaint against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia makes clear, Bandar’s wife, Princess Haifa, who is also Prince Turki bin Abdullah Al Saud’s sister sent funds beginning in 2000, ultimately totaling \$150,000, which were channeled to two of the 9/11 hijackers.

In 2012, Queen Elizabeth II granted the OCIS a Royal Charter. The bin Laden family has endowed the Mohammad bin Laden Chair at the OCIS, named after Osama bin Laden’s father.

To this day, the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Oxford Center for Islamic Studies is none other than its

founder, Abdullah Omar Naseef!

The co-chair of the Board of Trustees is Prince Turki, the former director general (1977-2000) of Saudi intelligence, who recruited Osama bin Laden to form al-Qaeda in Afghanistan as part of the British geopolitical “arc of crisis” policy of encircling and dismembering Russia.

As documented in “Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him,” it was the British who initiated the persecution of Lyndon LaRouche back in the 1980s; the role of the British in 9/11 has been de-

liberately covered up; but now British intelligence has been caught red-handed in an attempted *coup d’état* against President Trump. For over two centuries the British Empire has been our enemy. If the world is going to fulfill the dream of mankind, that British Empire *must* be destroyed. Americans must rid themselves of their illusions about the British Empire and our alleged special relationship with Great Britain.

The problem is not Russia; the problem is not China. The problem is the British Empire. Neither China nor Russia is an empire. We only have one “structure of sin” remaining after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and that is British liberal capitalism as we see it on Wall Street and in the City of London today. And if we’re going to be able to move forward with a new, just world economic order, it’s going to be based upon eliminating the British Empire, getting Americans especially, to understand that the British Empire *is* the enemy and must be destroyed if we are going to have a future in this country, and throughout the world. The New Paradigm which is now emerging requires that the symbiotic relationship between sovereign nation-states and empire is finally broken. This is the decisive point in all human history, and it’s crucial that people understand exactly the actual history of the British Empire’s ongoing campaign to destroy the United States of America.