

Martin Luther King's American Presidency

by Dennis Speed

Since prior to Plato, the fundamental issue of law within globally extended European civilization, has continued to be the conflict between two axiomatically irreconcilable notions of law and government, between the Classical standpoint of natural law, as typified by Plato and the Christianity of the New Testament, and that opposing, pagan tradition known today as the Romantic school of law, whose precedents included the customs of ancient Babylon and the Delphi cult of the Pythian Apollo.

It is only from that standpoint respecting law, that the phenomena of racism in modern society can be competently diagnosed.

—Lyndon LaRouche,
“The Tragedy of Education:
Shrunk Heads in America
Today.”



Martin Luther King, Jr.

March 27—Often, probably always, it is better to ask an intelligent question, than to provide an inadequate or misleading answer, no matter how desirable or expedient that might be. So it is with almost every important process in current history. “Events” do not exist in themselves. There is, for example, no event termed “the Martin Luther King assassination” that is separate from “the Robert Kennedy assassination,” and neither of those two “events” is comprehensible without understanding the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963.

All three assassinations are one process, one “arc,” itself part of a longer-term assault on the United States Presidency




President John F. Kennedy.



LBJ Library/Yoichi R. Okamoto

Robert F. Kennedy, Jan. 28, 1964.



Alexander Gardiner portrait

President Abraham Lincoln.

from its historical enemy: the assassination-bureaus of British intelligence. The British kill American Presidents, as they killed Abraham Lincoln. *EIR* has published [much](#) on this matter in the past, and it is not necessary to review that material here. The latest British attack on United States, the 2015-2018 assault on the Trump Presidential candidacy and Presidency, is, in method, identical to the British assault on the Presidency of 1994-1999, called “the impeachment of Bill Clinton.” Today, the case officer is “former” MI6 agent Christopher Steele (and implicitly, “former” MI6 head Sir Richard Dearlove, of “Iraq has weapons of mass destruction” fame); then, the campaign’s British intelligence operative was named Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. Whether Republican or Democrat, the American Presidential system, and the American system of self-government in particular, is the mortal enemy of the City of London—whether the American people are aware of that, or not.

The Presidential system devised by Alexander Hamilton and George Washington, especially as expressed in Hamilton’s four great documents on manufactures, credit, the National Bank and the Constitutional basis for a National Bank, is anti-colonial, anti-imperial, and anti-Malthusian—that is, the “genetic opposite” of the predatory monetary culture which is London, at least from the global hegemony of the British East India Company, secured at the Treaty of Paris in 1763. East India Company apologists Thomas Malthus, John Locke, Adam Smith, David Hume, and precursors such as Thomas Hobbes, are not the philosophical founders of the American Revolution, but its mortal enemies. In Lyndon LaRouche’s essay, [“The Tragedy of Education: Shrunken Heads In America Today,”](#) he contends:

I say again, for emphasis, that the tradition of slaveholder interest, as defined by John Locke



oil portrait by Daniel Huntington, 1865
Alexander Hamilton

and his followers, has a vigorous reincarnation as the Locke doctrine of “shareholder interest” today. On today’s global scale, that Locke doctrine, deployed under the name of “shareholder interest,” has become as murderous and savage a pro-racist killer, as the old Locke doctrine of “slaveholder value” took pride in being. I shall not, and need not repeat here what is documented sufficiently elsewhere, on the relevant subject of the legacies of Jeremy Bentham’s Aaron Burr and Burr’s Martin van Buren, as by Anton Chaitkin’s *Treason in America*.

Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton’s economic revolution, documented in his four reports on Manufactures, the National Bank, Public Credit, and the Constitutionality of the National Bank, as expressed by his and George Washington’s Presidency, are the only true basis for the eradication of slavery, racism, poverty and war. That economic revolution has been adopted, albeit with Chinese and Russian characteristics, by the presidencies of Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin. Lyndon LaRouche’s Four Laws are a singular principle, expressed in the sovereign power of the free citizens of, not only the United States, but each nation, to promote the creativity of the human mind as the primary source of wealth in a free nation. That can be the only true meaning of the term, the American System, when used in opposition to the British Imperial System of monetarism.

Martin Luther King’s and Robert Kennedy’s assassinations over the two-month period of April 4 through June 6, 1968, ultimately drowned the United States into a cultural pessimism from which it has yet to recover. That cultural weakness can now be summarily removed from American life, and in short order. All that is needed is the courage to do what Martin Luther King did: stand on the mountaintop of history.


Immortality

Like Lincoln, King gave two speeches that transformed American history. One was given under nearly optimal circumstances, “the best of times,” on August 28, 1963. The other was given in “the worst of times,” on April 3, 1968. The second is actually almost unknown, although many think they know it. They know the speech’s end,—“I’ve been to the mountaintop!... Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord!”—but the speech’s end cannot be understood without the beginning.

Between his April 4, 1967 Riverside Church speech opposing the war in Vietnam, and his April 4, 1968 assassination, King was nearly completely ostracized from liberal-Democratic America, except among those supporting Presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy. Polls asserted that 75 percent of America opposed his new direction. His fund-raising, infiltrated at the top of his organization, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, by FBI informants capable of affecting policy, not only collapsed; the collapse was blamed on his stand on the Vietnam war, and his insistence on continuing his highly controversial “non-civil rights” Poor People’s Campaign. King’s move to support the sanitation workers of Memphis, Tennessee, was also precisely the opposite of what almost all of his closest staff, and closest collaborators supported. King was the object of assassination threats, and had just experienced a bomb scare on the plane that flew him to Memphis. King had been termed “out of date” by those in the Black Power movement, and by most college youth, even many of those in the anti-war movement.

The exhausted King had not wanted to give the speech at the Masonic Hall that evening, but his closest friend, Ralph Abernathy, whom he had sent in his stead, insisted. When he arrived, after saying a few words about his friend Ralph, King began:

As you know, if I were standing at the beginning of time, with the possibility of general and panoramic view of the whole human history up to



U.S. Library of Congress/Dick DeMarsico
Martin Luther King, Jr.

now, and the Almighty said to me, “Martin Luther King, which age would you like to live in?”—I would take my mental flight by Egypt through, or rather across the Red Sea, through the wilderness on toward the promised land. And in spite of its magnificence, I wouldn’t stop there. I would move on by Greece, and take my mind to Mount Olympus. And I would see Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Euripides and Aristophanes assembled around the Parthenon as they discussed the great and eternal issues of reality.

But I wouldn’t stop there. I would go on, even to the great heyday of the Roman Empire. And I would see developments around there, through various emperors and leaders. But I wouldn’t stop there. I would even come up to the day of the Renaissance, and get a quick picture of all that the Renaissance did for the cultural and esthetic life of man. But I wouldn’t stop there. I would even go by the way that the man for whom I’m named had his habitat. And I would watch Martin Luther as he tacked his ninety-five theses on the door at the church in Wittenberg.

But I wouldn’t stop there. I would come on up even to 1863, and watch a vacillating president by the name of Abraham Lincoln finally come to the conclusion that he had to sign the Emancipation Proclamation. But I wouldn’t stop there. I would even come up to the early thirties, and see a man grappling with the problems of the bankruptcy of his nation. And come with an eloquent cry that we have nothing to fear but fear itself.

But I wouldn’t stop there. Strangely enough, I would turn to the Almighty, and say, “If you allow me to live just a few years in the second half of the twentieth century, I will be happy.” Now that’s a strange statement to make, because the world is all messed up. The nation is sick. Trouble is in the land. Confusion all around. That’s a strange statement. But I know, somehow, that only when it is dark enough, can you see

the stars. And I see God working in this period of the twentieth century in a way that men, in some strange way, are responding—something is happening in our world. The masses of people are rising up. And wherever they are assembled today, whether they are in Johannesburg, South Africa; Nairobi, Kenya; Accra, Ghana; New York City; Atlanta, Georgia; Jackson, Mississippi; or Memphis, Tennessee—the cry is always the same—“We want to be free.”

And another reason that I’m happy to live in this period is that we have been forced to a point where we’re going to have to grapple with the problems that men have been trying to grapple with through history, but the demand didn’t force them to do it. Survival demands that we grapple with them. Men, for years now, have been talking about war and peace. But now, no longer can they just talk about it. It is no longer a choice between violence and nonviolence in this world; it’s nonviolence or nonexistence.


That view of immortality, and nothing else, is the true reason that Martin Luther King was marked for assassination. It was not the King that enjoyed triumph, but the King that “studied adversity” which expresses the greatest period in the life of Martin Luther King—that final year. The capacity of mind and soul to step outside of the cacophony of one’s time, to point mankind, not merely a part of it, toward its higher purpose, is what the assassins of Martin Luther King hated. There was no way to remove King from the mountaintop. His qualification for the Presidency was his choice to live in immortality, rather than to live afraid. (See the video: “[The Immortal Talent of Dr. King](#),” of Lyndon LaRouche speaking to the MLK Prayer Breakfast of the Talladega County (Alabama) Democratic Conference, January 19, 2014.

Humanity and Inhumanity

The promotion, through “reputable” British and British-dominated educational institutions, of the myth



portrait by Joseph Siffred Duplessis, 1785
Benjamin Franklin



Gouverneur Morris

that slave trader and Royal Africa Company founder John Locke was “the ideological father of the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution,” rather than Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and the Constitution’s *Preamble*’s author, Gouverneur Morris, is used to prevent Americans from understanding that the true intellectual leadership of the American Revolution was for the complete destruction of slavery. The three men cited were the precise moral opposite of John Locke. Franklin was the head of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, Hamilton successfully organized for an African-American troop presence in the revolution, and Morris proposed the abolition of slavery to the 1787 Constitutional Convention. Their espoused notion of economics was opposite to that of Locke as well. The new United States had to be brought “up from slavery,” however, to that higher idea of mankind.

The principles underlying the conceptions of economy and law that prevailed in the 1787-89 battle to establish a unified federal government, sovereign over any and all of the states, were later forcefully and nearly perfectly personified by Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln’s personal evolution in the course of his 1861-1865 Presidency, particularly expressed in his relationship with the extraordinary Frederick Douglass, was inseparable from the evolution of the United States itself. And Lincoln’s creation of the Transcontinental Railroad, in the course of his collaboration with Czar Alexander II of Russia, and even a still-British-colonized China, against the British and French-sponsored Confederacy, is an American gift to those nations that have now returned it in the form of the World Land-

Bridge policy proposed today to the United States by China's President Xi Jinping.

Martin Luther King's 1967-68 evolution was similar to that of Abraham Lincoln. King insisted, despite all warnings and all consequences, that he would assume responsibility for the nation as a whole, in order to change the nation in any part. He believed that "racism, poverty and war," all stemmed from one source: man's inhumanity to man. He knew, because he had already proven it, that holding political office was not a prerequisite to exercising the Constitutional powers guaranteed to all American citizens. Economic justice, he believed, was an inalienable right. Creative nonviolent direct action was his chosen way to incorporate increasingly larger numbers of people, who believed themselves to be powerless, into a living, comprehensive, continuous Constitutional Convention distinguished by improvement through changing the axioms of social practice of a far-less-than-perfect United States.

Let The Trumpet Sound

That "more perfect Union," the United States of the future, was precisely that to which Martin Luther King spoke on August 28, 1963. The speech he gave that day, at least in part, was intended by King as a speech to be delivered by President John Kennedy on January 1, 1963's 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Kennedy, however, declined. It was called "the American Dream." King spoke about it several times that year, including in an appearance in Detroit's Cobo Hall before an estimated 25,000 people. In Washington, however, in the shadow of Daniel Chester French's seated Lincoln, King added something. He did it at the instigation of singer Mahalia Jackson, who had noticed that the 250,000 people assembled, though moved, needed to be elevated past the present, to see the complex domain of the future in the present. This extraordinary gathering, the largest at that time in American history, was no longer about civil rights; it was about the nature and purpose of man, from whence are derived the inalienable rights expressed in the Declaration of



National Park Service

Martin Luther King, Jr., addressing a crowd from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, where he delivered his "I have a dream" speech during the Aug. 28, 1963 march on Washington, D.C.

Independence. "Behold, I tell you a mystery. We shall not die, but we shall all be changed. . . For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, incorruptible."

That is what Mahalia Jackson called upon Martin to do—not to preach, but to do: raise the dead. "Tell 'em about the dream, Martin!"

A Greek playwright, such as the young Aeschylus of 495 B.C.E., would have recognized what King actually did in that speech's conclusion immediately. He employed the principle of the Greek chorus. It was not Martin Luther King that now spoke, but the resurrected Lincoln, in the form of the actor Martin Luther King. Then, the Founders of the United States, the prophet Isaiah and the composer G.W.F. Handel were brought in rapid succession onto the stage now being created in the mind of the audience. Next, the audience involuntarily and silently sang, in their minds, "My Country, 'Tis of Thee," while King shifted from the refrain, "I have a dream," to the refrain "Let Freedom Ring." The Classical training in what is sometimes called elocution—not the same thing as rhetoric, with which it is sometimes confused—had never been witnessed by so many people of such diverse backgrounds at all, let alone from an African-American preacher not yet old enough to be President.

Clarence Jones, who had worked on a draft of the speech with King, recounted in an interview:


Mahalia Jackson, his favorite gospel singer, yells out to him, “Tell ’em about the dream, Martin! Tell ’em about the dream!” Now, I’m standing behind him, and I see what he does when he hears her shout back to him—he then takes the papers on the lectern, and he moves them to the left. And he grabs the lectern podium, and I turn to some unknown person, and I said to them: “These people don’t know it, but they are getting ready to go to church!”

(Note: King had begun his speech as the voice of the Lincoln seated behind him: “Five score years ago, a great American in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation.” He had ended that speech as the voice of Frederick Douglass and the African-American Spiritual: “Free At Last.”)

The Targeting of King

The head of the FBI’s domestic intelligence division, William Sullivan, was not moved by the spirit. He wrote in a memo that the speech solidified King “as the most dangerous Negro of the future in this Nation from the standpoint of communism, the Negro and national security.” President Kennedy, as author Taylor Branch recounts in *Parting The Waters: America In The King Years*, “was watching a complete King speech for the first time. ‘He’s damn good,’ the President remarked to his aides at the White House. . . . As the principal leaders filed into the Cabinet Room from the march, he greeted King with a smiling ‘I have a dream’...” J. Edgar Hoover, the informal but de facto successor to Albert Pike, the 19th Century judicial officer of the Ku Klux Klan, now escalated his already-existent surveillance and slander campaign against King.

Martin Luther King, from the time of the 1963 “March on Washington,” was now a part of the American Presidential System. This became clearer with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Such an inclusion, however, just as in the case of Lyndon LaRouche’s inclusion in the Presidential System from the late 1970s, does not mean that one is



National Archives/George K. Warren
Frederick Douglass, ca. 1879.

necessarily accepted. In fact, it may signal the onset of vicious harassment, leading to financial ruin, destruction of family life, illegal arrest and physical assault. John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Ronald Reagan were presidents or presidential aspirants who were shot. Why would private citizens operating on the principle of the General Welfare, but on the level of the Presidency, necessarily fare better, especially if they are effective?

Being included, in the case of King, meant taking a walk with President Kennedy outside of the Oval Office, about two months prior to the March on Washington.

In his book, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.*, David

Garrow describes the meeting:

That afternoon, after a meeting of the assembled civil rights leadership with the president, John Kennedy himself took King out into the Rose Garden. Kennedy, according to an account that King later gave three close friends, asked King, “you’ve read about Profumo in the papers?” King had. Kennedy went on, “that was an example of friendship and loyalty carried too far. Macmillan is likely to lose his government because he has been loyal to his friend. You must take care not to lose your cause for the same reason.” Kennedy then named Levison and O’Dell. [Stanley Levison and Jack O’Dell, two key allies of Martin



Stanley Levison, an ally of Martin Luther King in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Luther King in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.] “They are communists. You’ve got to get rid of them.” He pointed out that public exposure of the Levison and O’Dell allegations would affect not only King but the entire civil rights effort and the administration’s civil rights bill as well. “If they shoot you down, they’ll shoot us down too—so we’re asking you to be careful.” The president went on to warn King that these opponents of civil rights would have him under very close surveillance. King should keep this in mind. King indicated that he appreciated that, and he did not quarrel

with the president about O’Dell. But about Levison he felt differently. “I know Stanley,” he told John Kennedy, “and I can’t believe this. You will have to prove it.” The president paused, and then said that he would arrange for Burke Marshall to give proof of the matter to King. With that the brief stroll and conversation ended.

King had found the experiences of that day both troubling and amusing. He joked to Andrew Young that the president must be worried about someone bugging him as well. Why else would he have taken King into the Rose Garden to talk? The conversations had not created doubt within him about Levison, or, for that matter, O’Dell. But King was troubled by the great consternation that the Kennedy brothers and Marshall were exhibiting. He made no move to sever ties with either or doubt Levison, however. . . .

This past October, when some final portions of the up-to-now unclassified papers on the Kennedy assassination were released, a 27-page memo entitled “Martin Luther King Jr., A Current Analysis,” was found contained in them. Some contended that this was some sort of filing error, until it was pointed out that the FBI memo, dated March 12, 1968, a mere three weeks before King’s assassination, had been re-classified on May 8, 1994! That is, it had been read, or at least reviewed, and had been re-classified, and not even under



U.S. Library of Congress

Demonstrators participating in the Poor People’s March in Washington, D.C., 1968.

King’s name, but under JFK. Nothing in the memo’s contents links King to any “business” with Kennedy whatsoever. What it does make clear, is how dangerous the upcoming Poor People’s campaign was seen to be by the FBI. One section of the memo states:

King has referred to this campaign as the “Washington spring project” and the “poor peoples march,” which is reportedly being staged to pressure Congress into passing legislation favorable to the Negro. It is King’s contention that the government of the United States does not move until it is confronted dramatically. To add to the dramatic confrontation, King has boasted he and his entourage are coming to Washington to stay; that his followers will conduct sit-ins, camp-ins, and sleep-ins at every government facility available including the lawn of the White House. He has bragged that he will fill up the jails of Washington and surrounding towns. . . .

The Real Presidential Assassins

While there is no question that the FBI’s role was nefarious, it was because of King’s evolution after the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to him in 1964, and after the successful Selma Campaign of 1965, that he became marked for death. Samuel P. Huntington, of “Clash of Civilizations” notoriety, argued in his book, *The Crisis of Democracy*, that there must remain a

“Chinese Wall” between the functions of “electoral advocacy” and “governance” to allow modern society to be “orderly.” Governing had now to be left to an elite managerial class of reliable civil servants, British style. Anyone could be allowed to advocate whatever they wished, and limited change within policy-making circles in governments could be tolerated or even encouraged. Under no circumstances, however, should common citizens, or even uncommon citizens, be allowed to bring the powerless into the corridors of power, except as tourists. If one allowed that, then “democracy” would undergo the crisis that the bureaucracy that perpetually actually rules, would no longer be allowed to do so. Nothing would get done, because accountability would be demanded. King’s threat to combine the common self-interest of poor whites, poor African-Americans, poor Mexicans and immigrants, with those of students, trade unionists and others, would pose that risk. His movement had succeeded in forcing through the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which dissolved the Southern segregationist Democratic Party, actively in power since 1876. What would happen if, now, he turned his attention to international questions, like the war in Vietnam, or the elimination of poverty worldwide? What would become of the neo-Malthusian agenda to which British imperial policy was devoted?

The King movement had to be disrupted from the inside—both inside the African-American community, and inside his own organization. It had to be handled as ruthlessly as the way that the State Department was trying to handle the people of Vietnam—“Vietnamization.” McGeorge Bundy, sometimes referred to as the acting head of the Anglo-American Establishment, deployed away from the National Security Council, where he had prosecuted and escalated the Johnson Administration’s war on Vietnam, to become the president of the Ford Foundation, then the largest foundation in the United States. He took charge of what was referred to as the “Black Power project,” once he



JFK Library

McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to President Kennedy for National Security.

assumed leadership of the Ford Foundation in the Summer of 1966. In an Aug. 2, 1966 speech in Philadelphia to the National Urban League, Bundy said, “We believe that equality for all American Negroes is now the most urgent domestic concern of this country. We believe that the Ford Foundation must play its part in this field because it is dedicated by its charter to human welfare.” What Bundy was in fact after, was the dismantling of King’s movement, utilizing “radical black nationalism” as a battering ram against it, while also buying off the debt-strapped SCLC.

In his work, *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*, Robert L. Allen put it this way:

From his years in working in the U.S. power structure, Bundy had nurtured a keen appreciation for the complexities involved in political manipulation and the seemingly contradictory policies which often must be pursued simultaneously in order to obtain a given end. Bundy learned that it is necessary to work both sides of the street. . . . Hence he was a strong supporter of Kennedy’s and Johnson’s war policies in Vietnam, while at the same time stressing the necessity of keeping channels open to the Soviet Union. Such a man was perfectly suited to work with black groups, including black power advocates, while at the same time local governments were arming and preparing to use force to suppress the black communities. The seeming contradiction here, to use Bundy’s word, was only a “surface” manifestation.

Bundy recruited two contacts recommended to him either directly by King or his close associates. These persons then influenced the SCLC and King, including by writing a “report on poverty” that King delivered as SCLC’s own at a United States Senate hearing. A nervous Stanley Levison said to Andrew Young, “I don’t want



Stokely Carmichael, former associate of Martin Luther King, speaking in London, 1990.

five million dollars. I want less. Five million dollars could destroy us,” not recognizing that taking any money from the Ford Foundation at all, was the problem.

Meanwhile, British Intelligence—generally deployed against the United States on the cultural flank through Aldous Huxley’s 30-plus year presence in California, and the promotion of various forms of “the British Invasion” in culture—studied “the African-American Black Power specimen” in London, in the course of two weeks (July 15-30, 1967), at something called “To Free A Generation: The Dialectics of Liberation Conference.” Stokely Carmichael, formerly associated with King through his involvement in the Alabama Voting Rights Project, and the primary figure selected by the American media as “the voice of Black Power” replacing the *passé* Dr. King, attended. Carmichael was selected as the center of attention by Gregory Bateson, Margaret Meade, R.D. Laing, D.G. Cooper, and Herbert Marcuse—a Tavistock Institute/Frankfurt School “Dream Team” of brainwashers, against whom only a Malcolm X could contend. They calmly, each in his or her peculiar way—allowing Stokely to speak often—analyzed the Black Power phenomenon, which the Ford Foundation had partially created, from their psycho-surgical vantage point, without wishing to alert or upset either the victim or his associates. (The same exercise had been done, and would again later be done,

by American brainwasher Kenneth Clark and the same “Dame” Margaret Mead on the much tougher James Baldwin, in their search to make sure, if possible, that the “Malcolm X/Martin Luther King syndrome” would never occur again.)

King’s April 4, 1967 denunciation of the predatory population war in Vietnam, and his additional rise above civil rights in the form of the Poor People’s campaign—organized on behalf of all poor Americans, not merely African-Americans—derailed the Ford Foundation and the brainwashers completely. He refused to go “back in the Black box.” Robert Kennedy’s entry into the Presidential race, although belated, now meant that a Kennedy Presidency—a Kennedy Presidency implicitly backed by even a non-committed King in the form of his months-long

Poor People’s Campaign—would activate untold numbers of new voters. These voters came from families that had been kept away from the polls since at least the time of Franklin Roosevelt’s Presidency, if indeed they had ever voted at all. That “crisis of democracy” could not be allowed. Both Kennedy and King had to die. The British, and their Anglo-American counterparts agreed: “We did it in November, 1963. We can do it again.”

China, Russia, and other nations yearn to see the return of the United States that once produced Martin Luther King, and to collaborate with the America for which King gave his last full measure of devotion. Now, fifty years later, the American Presidency is again poised to be unleashed. Earth’s next fifty years begins now. If this American Presidency is to lead this country to again adopt its original revolutionary, anti-colonial, sovereign self-governing system—the true system of the “American” Revolution—it will be the result of creative direct action taken by each committed American citizen on behalf of that objective. The Presidency must be free to function in the interest of the United States as a whole. The clean-out of the treasonous factions of British intelligence inside of the FBI and other agencies, and the energetic advocacy of the World Land-Bridge by those who love mankind, will help bend the arc of King’s moral universe ever more sharply and quickly toward justice, sooner than we might have hoped—or dreamed.