

**Gå fremad for en fælles
fremtid for hele
menneskeheden.**

**LaRouche PAC Fireside Chat,
24. august, 2017**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche talte om den særdeles dystre og farlige situation i landet; det faktum, at kupoperationen er i højeste gear for at inddæmme præsident Trump til at gøre præcis det modsatte af, hvad han havde lovet (dette vil vi uddybe nærmere under den efterfølgende diskussion), og af hvilken grund han naturligvis vandt valget, nemlig, at genrejse økonomien, og specifikt at begynde med at genindføre Glass-Steagall, og dernæst at standse de forskellige krige; kort sagt, at gøre en ende på den britiske imperiepolitik.

Vært Lynne Speed: God aften. Jeg er Lynne Speed og vil være aftenens mødeleder. Det er torsdag, 24. august, 2017. Jeg vil gerne indlede aftenens telefonkonference med at citere en diskussion, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche havde i går med kolleger, og som blev yderligere understreget i deres diskussion med kolleger i dag.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche talte om den særdeles dystre og farlige situation i landet; det faktum, at kupoperationen er i højeste gear for at inddæmme præsident Trump til at gøre præcis det modsatte af, hvad han havde lovet (dette vil vi uddybe nærmere under den efterfølgende diskussion), og af hvilken grund han naturligvis vandt valget, nemlig, at genrejse økonomien, og specifikt at begynde med at genindføre Glass-Steagall, og dernæst at standse de forskellige krige; kort sagt, at gøre en ende på den britiske imperiepolitik.

Denne situation vil først og fremmest kræve vores energiske aktivitet. Og, som Helga udtrykte det, så er det afgørende spørgsmål fortsat at erstatte det gamle paradigme med det nye paradigme for udvikling og fred. Husk, at Donald Trumps valgsejr den 6. november, 2016, ikke var et nationalt spørgsmål, men derimod et internationalt spørgsmål af stor og historisk betydning. Man må se på nutidens spørgsmål ud fra menneskehedens lange, historiske bue. Faren for et Maidan II i USA er i slægt med faren i USA og Europa på Weimar-republikkens tid. Præsident Franklin Roosevelt fik USA ud af depressionen med sin New Deal, men Europa sank ned, og vi så fremkomsten af fascismen. Folk må lære af historien.

Lyndon LaRouche tilføjede følgende; han udstedte en opfordring til handling og sagde: *»Jeg er dybt bekymret over den situation, vi her diskuterer. Men pointen er, at vi må påtage os ansvaret for at bakke det op, vi har talt om, og som mine medarbejdere gør. Vi må vinde dette her. USA's fremtidige eksistens afhænger af, at vi gør vores job. Det drejer sig ikke om at komme med forslag, men om at vinde en sejr over de ting, der er i færd med at ødelægge USA og forhindre, at det udfører sin mission. Og held og lykke til os alle!«*

Så dette var aftenens indledning. Vores emne her i aften er »at tænke på det niveau, der kræves for at vinde«, og vores gæst i aften er Will Wertz. Mange, der er med os i aftenens telefonkonference, er bekendt med hans arbejde. For to uger siden gav han en fremragende præsentation på Manhattan Town Meeting.

(<https://larouchepac.com/20170805/manhattan-town-hall-event-will-wertz>)

Han har ligeledes talt på LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcasts og har givet en dybtgående fremlæggelse af briternes forræderiske rolle i deres forsøg på at underminere præsidentskabet og USA's Forfatning. (<https://larouchepac.com/20170818/charlottesville-was-staged-event>)

og

<https://larouchepac.com/20170811/larouchepac-friday-webcast-will-wertz>).

Jeg vil stoppe her, og hvis du er på, Will, så fortsæt herfra, og når du er færdig, vil vi fortsætte med spørgsmål og svar.

Will Wertz: Tak, Lynne. Jeg mener, at vi må se på dette historiske øjeblik sådan, som den tyske digter, skuespilforfatter og historiker, Friedrich Schiller, så på perioden med Den franske Revolution. Han skrev et kort digt med to linjer kort tid efter Den franske Revolution, med titlen, »Øjeblikket«; og det lyder som følger: »Århundredet har affødt et stort øjeblik. Men dette store øjeblik har fundet et lille folk.« Og det er netop den udfordring, der ligger foran os på dette historiske tidspunkt: at overvinde en småtskåren tankegang og ikke lade sig opsluge af infantile besættelser, for nu at udtrykke det således. Vi er i en situation, hvor vi har potentialet til at gå fremad for en fælles skæbne for hele menneskeheden. Valget af præsident Trump, især i visse afgørende områder, repræsenterer et potentiale for, at USA kan tilslutte sig denne storslåede strategi for menneskeheden. Og som Lynne Speed netop sagde, så er der især to områder, der er afgørende. For det første, så afviste han hele politikken med regimeskifte, som vi har været involveret i, med evindelige krige, hen over de seneste par årtier, især under George W. Bush og dernæst under præsident Obama. Han afviste krigen i Irak, han kritiserede stærkt indsatsen i Libyen, der resulterede i mordet på præsident Gaddafi; han har, om end langsomt pga. angrebet på ham for hans angivelige 'aftalte spil' med Rusland, satset på at arbejde sammen med Rusland for at besejre ISIS og al-Nusra i Syrien. Dette er meget positive udviklinger og det er selvfølgelig lydhørt over for det, præsident Putin foreslog tilbage i september 2015 på FN's Generalforsamling, og som er en forenet, international koalition for at bekæmpe terrorisme i lighed med den koalition, der voksede frem for at besejre

nazisterne under Anden Verdenskrig.

Det andet område har han i det mindste givet udtryk for sin forpligtelse til i løbet af kampagnen og siden. Det er at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, der, som de fleste mennesker ved, ville adskille legitim bankaktivitet, der er involveret i investering i reel produktion, reelle samfundstjenesteydelser, fra spekulativ bankaktivitet af kasino-typen, der har ødelagt vores økonomi. Han har ligeledes, siden han blev valgt, holdt en række taler, hvor han har krævet en tilbagevenden til det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, og han har i denne sammenhæng citeret Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay og Abraham Lincoln, blandt andre. Selv her i den seneste situation i Charlottesville kom han med en udtalelse, der sagde, at måden, hvorpå de menneskelige relationer, inklusive relationerne mellem racerne, kan forbedres i dette land, er en reel forhøjelse af levestandarden for alle mennesker i landet, og det forudsætter skabelsen af produktiv beskæftigelse til en højere løn, så folk ret faktisk har råd til at forsørge en familie og har råd til at forpligte sig til en lysere fremtid for den næste generation, der, når alt kommer til alt, er én af de afgørende ting i ethvert menneskes liv; nemlig gennem sit eget liv at bidrage til at forbedre vilkårene for ens børns liv, eller, hvis man ikke selv har børn, for alle børn, for de efterlevende. Dette er altså de to områder, der virkelig er afgørende.

Med hele operationen, der går ud på at udføre et kup imod præsident Trump, har han ikke fuldt ud handlet på disse spørgsmål, og har i visse områder faktisk handlet i modstrid med dette løfte. Det var tilfældet, da han, uden nogen beviser for, at Syrien rent faktisk var engageret i brugen af kemiske våben, som det blev påstået, bombede den syrisk luftbase. Den nylige tale, han holdt om Afghanistan, har tilknyttede farer, fordi der ikke findes en militær løsning i sig selv i Afghanistan, og vi har allerede været der i seksten år uden de store resultater; ja, faktisk er én ting, man har opnået i

Afghanistan, at verden er blevet oversvømmet med heroin fra opiumsafgrøden i dette land.

På hjemmefronten er der blevet skabt mange jobs gennem de forholdsregler, han hidtil har truffet, inklusive ikke at overholde frihandelsaftalerne, og andre lignende bestræbelser for at bringe jobs tilbage til USA, i modsætning til at outsource dem under disse frihandelsaftaler, men generelt er situationen ikke forbedret. For at gøre dette må vi vedtage Glass-Steagall, og vi må vedtage Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, der omfatter Glass-Steagall; som omfatter at udstede statskredit gennem en (statslig) Nationalbank, hvor vægten ligger på kapitalintensive former for varefremstilling, og det omfatter, at vi forpligter os til fremtiden ved at udvikle fusionskraft og ved at genoplive rumprogrammet (der, der i LaRouches Fire Love kaldes en videnskabsdrevet økonomi, -red.). Det er, hvad der er nødvendigt lige nu, og Helga og Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, at vi lancerer en hasteaktion i dette land for at sikre, at disse politikker rent faktisk nu bliver implementeret, for man er i færd med at inddæmme præsident Trump. Han er ganske bestemt kampklar over for sine fjender, men han bliver i stigende grad inddæmmet. Vi har vilkår i landet, som kineserne sammenligner med Kulturrevolutionen under Mao Zedong med hensyn til det tyranni, der etableres af nyhedsmedierne og af de tidligere efterretningsagenter som Clapper, Brennan, Comey, Mueller og hans stilling som særlig anklager, og af Demokrater og også modstandere af præsident Trump i det Republikanske Parti. Vi har betingelser som under McCarthy-perioden, der er i færd med at blive skabt i landet, og som er ekstraordinært farligt, og det forhindrer den form for samarbejde, der kræves, med især russerne og kineserne.

Vi har længe været fortalere for, at USA tilslutter sig BRIKS-nationerne, dvs., Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika, i forbindelse med det, der nu er blevet kendt som Kinas politik for Ét Bælte, én Vej, eller Silkevejen, eller

det, vi har kaldt Verdenslandbroen, og som blev initieret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche for årtier siden, og som kineserne har vedtaget. Vi må arbejde med på dette projekt, som er et projekt for fred, der er baseret på økonomisk udvikling. Vi ser, at der er mulighed for succes gennem de fremskridt, der nu gøres i Syrien som resultat af det faktum, at USA, efter præsident Trumps møde med præsident Putin, har aftalt at etablere en deeskaleringszone i det sydvestlige Syrien. Og vi har nu en situation, hvor der ganske vist ikke er direkte, fælles militæraktioner mellem USA og Rusland imod ISIS og al-Nusra, men ikke desto mindre, så, som den russiske forsvarsminister netop har udtalt, er borgerkrigen i Syrien *de facto* forbi. Og vi har nu en meget succesfuld indsats for at udslette ISIS, ikke alene i Irak, men også i Syrien.

Dette er altså et eksempel på, hvad der kan gøres. Tager vi andre områder i verden, Nordkorea, så kunne man få samarbejde mellem Kina, Rusland, Japan og Sydkorea for at løse denne situation, men man må aftale at gøre det, russerne og kineserne har krævet, og som tyskerne faktisk også har været fortalere for, og som er en dobbelt indefrysning, hvor nordkoreanerne indvilger i ikke at afholde flere missiltests, ikke flere atomraket-tests, og USA og Sydkorea indvilger i ikke at afholde flere militærøvelser, som i hvert fald før i tiden omfattede at fjerne den nordkoreanske regering. Dette er de tiltag, man må gennemføre. På samme måde i Afghanistan; se på situationen dér. I stedet for, at USA går sammen med NATO efter seksten års nederlag, så bør man i stedet gå i samarbejde med Rusland, Kina, Indien, Pakistan og Iran for at afgøre krisen i Afghanistan. Det er der en fremtrædende mulighed for at gøre, men det kræver, at man faktisk træffer beslutningen om at gøre det. Lignende kriser, som den i Ukraine, kan løses på samme måde.

Dette repræsenterer altså et Nyt Paradigme for tankegang, hvilket er, hvad Helga Zepp-LaRouche har refereret til. Man har det gamle paradigme, der bygger på geopolitik, bygger på

frihandelsøkonomi og en ganske bestemt form for selviskhed. Og så er der det Nye Paradigme, der bygger på det, kineserne kalder en »win-win«-fremgangsmåde. Dette er ikke kun en kinesisk opfindelse; det er faktisk den måde, hvorpå man fik en afslutning på Trediveårskrigen i Europa. Dette var en religionskrig mellem katolikker og protestanter, der lagde Europa øde i 30 år. Den blev afsluttet i den Westfalske Fredstraktat, i hvilken det princip, der afgjorde fredsprocessen, var, at man, når man handler, tager den andens fordel i betragtning. Det er den form for fremgangsmåde, vi må have. Det er en win-win-strategi.

På en vis måde har vi det fænomen, at størstedelen af resten af verden har vedtaget princippet fra den Westfalske Fredstraktat, og som vil sige, at man har en udenrigspolitik, der bygger på den andens fordel, og ikke på ens egen, snævert definerede egeninteresse. Vi har resten af verden, der er forpligtet over for en politik for fred og udvikling, hvilket var den politik, som nu afdøde Pave Poul VI (1963-1978) var fortaler for, i en encyklika ('pavebrev') med titlen *Populorum Progressio*, og som grundlæggende set sagde, at det nye navn for fred er økonomisk udvikling. Det er det nye paradigme, og hvis vi ikke gennemfører dette nye paradigme nu, og kæmper for det nu – det er et globalt paradigme, men det må gennemføres her i USA i form af LaRouches Fire Love – men det må være en del af en global strategi for at opnå succes. Det er, hvad vi må mobilisere det amerikanske folk for, for at de forstår, at enten, så gør vi dette, eller også står vi over for en fare for, at situationen vil udvikle sig ude af kontrol; faren for totalt kaos i USA, og fjernelen af en behørigt valgt præsident fra sit embede, af politiske årsager, ja faktisk af en udenlandsk regering, Det britiske Imperium. Og dét ville betyde faren for atomkrig.

Det er grunden til, at Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har sagt, at dette er en dyster situation, der kræver nødhandling. Og her vil jeg slutte, og vi vil sige mere om det i besvarelse af

jeres spørgsmål.

Speed: Fint. Mange tak. Vi går nu over til spørgsmål; folk trykker stjerne 6 for at komme i køen, og mens folk tænker over deres spørgsmål, mener jeg, at det, Will sagde, giver stof til eftertanke; vi må tænke 'ud over kassen'; det er det afgørende netop nu.

Herefter følger spørgsmål og svar i engelsk udskrift.

Telefonkonferencen kan høres her:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h_4ZjBMcgXk

SPEED: Okay, great. Thanks very much, Will. We will be moving to

the question portion of this. People hit star 6 to the queue and

while people are thinking of their questions, and I think what Will said gives a lot of food for thought, we have to think outside of the box; this is the key thing right now.

We have two important national meetings that are coming up which will emanate out of Manhattan, but which are really national and international meetings to address precisely the crises we have just been identifying. The first will be this Saturday and it's a meeting, "Revive Hamilton's American System

and the Presidency through LaRouche's Four Laws." That meeting will be keynoted by Helga LaRouche via video on Google Hangouts.

She'll be joined by Hal Cooper; she'll be joined by others who are leading construction managers and engineers in the area, as

well as by Jason Ross from the LaRouche Science Team. Everyone should tune in for that. And then, in two weeks, we will be hosting a very special meeting on September 9th, which is of course the weekend of 9/11, and since we first conceptualized this meeting the situation has changed rather dramatically. This

is the weekend where it would be very appropriate and lawful

to
mobilize people to crush the British Empire by implementing
LaRouche's Four Laws, and to implement the Four Laws by
crushing
the British Empire, so it's a self-reflexive idea. You can't
do
one without the other. We need everyone who is on the phone
this
evening and those who will be listening subsequently to decide
in
what way you can best expand the reach of particularly the
Saturday, September 9th webcast, that will be a live webcast.
Once again we will be joined and keynoted by Helga LaRouche, I
believe. Will Wertz, who is with us tonight, will be at that
meeting, and we will also have William Binney from the VIPS
organization and Raymond McGovern from the VIPS organization.
Let
me correct that, I don't know if Helga will be on that, but
we'll
have Will Wertz and the other two that I mentioned. We want to
have standing room only for the event, so any of you who can
come
into New York at that time should do that, but we also want to
look into holding a series of satellite meetings around the
country where we could have possibly tens of thousands of
people
watching the meeting in real time. And in this way we can
create
a kind of surprise effect. Between now and then one of the
ways
we could build this is through the gathering of the signatures
on
our petition demanding that Trump investigate the charges of
the
VIPS, that Russia-gate was not a hack, it was a hoax and to
get
many people to subscribe to our publications. So I think this

a
very appropriate period and opportunity right now to in fact
use
the crisis to wake people up, shake people up and many people
are
just disgusted with what is otherwise going on. They are
hungry
for solutions and this is certainly what we are seeing in a
lot
of our organizing in the field.
We are going to go to the questions that are lined up. Hit
Star 6 to get in the queue. Go ahead, can you hear me?

Q 1: This is Sarah from Indiana. And I just wanted to make
a comment, but I think it's very important in light of what
the
gentleman was talking [about], is that China has, within three
years raised up 700 million people out of poverty in only 3
years. There's a new article floating on the internet that in
the last 15 years, the United States has increased terrorism
by
6500%; so kind of a little bit of a difference there. The
fact
that 700 million is over twice the population of the United
States. So, it is so vital for people to realize that within
three years the United States could be totally out of deficit,
if
people choose it.

WERTZ: Well, I think the other thing to look at is that
China, under Mao Zedong and the Cultural Revolution, was a
horrendous, tyrannical society in which the population was
very
much oppressed; particularly intellectuals. People who
actually
thought, and not just the politically correct views of
Chairman

Mao and his Little Red Book. Now what you have is a situation where, not only – as you point out – over 700 million people have been lifted out of poverty, but China is playing a very positive role on a global scale, if you look at what they're doing. They're a member of the BRICS, which I mentioned earlier, which is Brazil, Russia, India, China, and the Union of South Africa; a very unique organization because it represents a wide range of countries in the world. They're committed to a policy of economic development. Now the BRICS will have, I think it's its 9th annual summit in China in early September; this will be the 3rd to the 5th of September. The title of the conference is "Stronger Partnership for a Brighter Future". Of course the Chinese have invited the United States to join this effort, which is involved with the One Belt, One Road – or the Silk Road – perspective. Obama, of course, refused. Obama put massive pressure on other countries, including Japan, Australia, South Korea, not to work with China in terms of the major development bank which they set up. On the other hand, after his meeting with President Xi, President Trump did send a delegation to the One Belt, One Road summit which occurred in Beijing earlier this year. So, the point here is that you've got – and this One Belt, One Road effort now includes something like 69 countries; and it's a conception of nations throughout the world working together to lift all of their populations out of poverty, and also to counter the tendency under conditions of poverty for people to be pitted against each other for racial, religious,

ethnic, tribal reasons. Not really good reasons, but to be manipulated against each other under conditions of poverty. So this, in a certain sense, is a model which we should absolutely join at this point; and see it along with the implementation of LaRouche's Four Laws in the United States as the means of actually accomplishing rates of growth in the range of 7%-8% per year, as they have achieved in China previously. That's the kind of thing that we have as a potential which we have to move with right now. Again, I stress, this is urgent; it's not something to be done in the distant future. It's urgent because it will also be a tremendous flank on the current effort to unseat the duly-elected President of the United States. If he moves with that, that will mobilize the entire population – the forgotten men and women of this country that he references, as did Franklin Roosevelt. It's the way to actually unite the country, as he said after Charlottesville. It's also something which Andy Young, who worked with Martin Luther King, emphasized this past Sunday. He said the biggest problem in the country is poverty, and that that's what you have to focus on, as opposed to turning everything into a race issue.

SPEED: OK, very good. If you would like to ask a question, hit star 6. If you would like to get in the queue and ask a question, you have to call in from a line in which your number ID is registered. We do not take anonymous calls, and there's one caller in here now with an anonymous number, so maybe you

could

hang up and call back in on a line that can be seen; and then we

can call on you. So, it's star 6 to get into the queue, and we'll go to the next question. Go ahead.

Q 2: Hi, this is Sherry in New York. I'm very much aware of what's been going on. I have called into the White House probably about three times in the last six days. One young woman

with whom I spoke yesterday had never heard about the program of

what's been going on against Trump. What's wrong with the Congress; I think they all need Xanax, which is an anti-anxiety

drug. It's a joke, I don't mean it seriously.

SPEED: Sherry, we have a lot of people in the queue, so I'm going to ask you and everyone else to be succinct and get to your question.

Q 2 [cont'd]: Again, it is the problem that there is such a barrage against the President. The fact that he can function at

all is amazing. Outside of our street demonstrations and calling

the White House with encouraging words, I don't know what else to do.

WERTZ: Well, first on the anti-depression drugs. I know it's a joke, but really what's required is creativity. And an actual passion for the good, which is traditionally been identified with love for humanity, love for the truth. That which goes to the issue of the Treaty of Westphalia again; that

you act to the benefit of others. But the problem is, we've

got

a situation where the American people have to realize that they

also have to think out of the box in terms of how they've been conditioned. I want to give you just one example, which I find

very useful. It's the battle of Cannae, which occurred in 2016BC. This was in Italy, and it was fought between the Romans

and the Carthaginians. The Carthaginians were led by Hannibal, a

Carthaginian general. I'm citing this because it's a good example; it's a classical military example. Of course we're not

talking about a military implementation in terms of our action,

but we're talking about a state of mind. What he did was, he encircled the Roman troops. The Roman troops amounted to 85,000

total; Hannibal's forces were much less – 56,000. They had their backs to a river and the Romans were massing for a frontal

assault on Hannibal's forces. What he did was, he created like a

V, and he drew the Romans into a frontal assault, just marching

straight into this V. They actually became entrapped, and they

were so densely packed that they couldn't even use their own weapons. Then what he did was, he used his cavalry to encircle

the Roman forces and to strike them from the rear. It's an enveloping flanking operation. The Romans were completely devastated; Hannibal lost less than 6000 troops, and the Romans

– out of 85,000 – lost over 70,000 dead or captured.

What I'm getting at here is an encircling action; I'm

getting at getting outside of the box. You've got to actually encircle the enemy from the standpoint of the mind, the standpoint of being creative. That's why there are really two initiatives which we've been engaged in. One is the petition against the intervention in the United States by the British Empire to overthrow a duly-elected US President. Also, to get President Trump to move on the evidence presented by the VIPS –

the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity – that it wasn't a Russian hacking; that it was a leak. The whole thing is just a big lie, that's all this is. Just like Adolf Hitler, a big lie; that's what Mr. Binney said.

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

WERTZ: Right. And even Scott Ritter, the weapons inspector for Iraq said that having read this report, this borders on sedition against a duly-elected President of the United States.

Now, that's one initiative. The second initiative is to move to

get President Trump to realize that he has got to encircle the enemy and hit them from the rear. The best way to do that is to

go with LaRouche's Four Laws and to join the Silk Road; that's the policy that he needs to move on. So, that's the use of creativity, and you don't get boxed in, you don't operate on the

basis of the options which you think you're presented with; which

are not good options. They lead to self-destruction. So, you look for the flanking operation. And these are the two flanking

operations which Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have identified.

Q 2 [cont'd]: That's exactly the point I made when I called the White House. I think I call them two or three times a

week.

I find that the number I use, instead of the 1111, I call the 1414; that's 202 456-1414. I always get in on that line. They ask me if I want the comment line; I say yes, and I get heard.

SPEED: OK, that's good information, Sherry. We're going to go on, because we have a number of other callers, and we want to

get to a lot of people. It's star 6 to get into the queue. One

question I would certainly have for everyone is, what is happening on the petitioning? That's a major flank we had actually outlined last week. We got, while we were on the phone

and immediately subsequent to the conference call, we added about

50 signatures. It turned out that a number of the people who were on the call had not yet signed, and I don't know if that is

still the case. I see some new people on, so if you have not signed, go to the LaRouche PAC website. It is the approximately

third item down; "President Trump: Investigate British Subversion

of the US" and click on that and sign the petition. Also, once

you sign it, you should immediately send it out to others to sign

it. I believe we're at about 1381 signatures as of right now, so

it would be good if even during this phone call we can get over

1500. And then build from that. I think we certainly should take as a goal over the period between now and the weekend, of trying once again to get to 2500 as a basic plateau. So, people

should definitely sign on to that. OK, so we are going to go to the next caller right now.

Q 3: Hi, this is Dallas in Florida. Several things. On this petition, how many signatures are we looking for on the petition?

SPEED: I don't think we set a certain number, because we don't know what it will require to get Trump to move. He might move if we have, certainly I would say a plateau of 5-10,000 signatures. We should be able to do much better than that, but I think the idea would be to get to some sort of plateau like that as rapidly as possible and see if we can get some motion, even before the activities that we have that I mentioned a little bit earlier that we have coming up on the weekend of September 11th; that's the September 9th conference.

Q 3 [cont'd]: OK, I'd like to suggest, what I do is I put something up on Facebook, and I put something up on twitter, and something on Tumblr, and then something on LinkedIn, and then I'll put the links let's say on twitter. Then, there's a website called the 40billion.com; and they'll get your twitter out to 2.5 million for \$20 for a day. So, that's an inexpensive way to get that out there, get the tweets. I'm not real effective but I'm up to like 7000 hits on my tweets for the last month.

SPEED: That's great. Have you sent the petition out yet?

Q 3 [cont'd]: Yeah, I put it on my Facebook, but I didn't cross link it. See, you know, internet kinda goes on about where you got it over here and over here and over here. It rises up in the hits categories, you know? The search engines.

SPEED: OK. The tweet thing sounds great, where you're saying you can get it to an additional 20,000.

Q 3 [cont'd]: No, 2.5 million for \$20!

SPEED: 2.5 million, OK! Sounds great. You should add to that, notify people now that they should tune in live on September 9th, where the authors of the VIPS memo, the leaders who submitted the report to the President, will be directly addressing a crowd in New York. We should see if we can create the kind of shock effect surprise that I was describing a few minutes ago; get something like 50,000 viewers all at one time. Cause it to go viral instantly, and cause all of the people that are tuning in to get more people to get involved. So, we will send out in the follow-up, a link to how people can tune in to the webcast and so on; and let's just really build that over the next couple of weeks and organize like Hell between now and then.

Q 3 [cont'd]: OK, that'd be good. Now one observation here, one real quick successful action is, I got friends in Panama, and there's a Colonel Prado[ph] down there in Colombia that took out that 100,000-strong rebel army down there; they call it the Colombian Miracle. So, thinking out of the box, you might call

Colonel Prado in, and see what he did down there and solve some things.

With the British, this is very good. The main thing that's caused me concern in the last 48 hours is this idea that it's a

civil war that we're having, and they're promoting that. I think

it's the Trojan Horse. Trump warned us about having a Trojan Horse with these immigrants coming in, and I think that's really

what it is. We don't have a civil war, but we have a Soros-funded mercenary army out there fighting with their baseball bats and whatnot. The situation, they upped the ante in

the last 24 hours by saying they're bringing in the UN, might come in to protect the anti-fa and the Black Lives Matter as a matter of human rights in case we got to having an armed conflict

with them, and it looks like they're going to lose. So, that's a

potential flare-up that needs to be squelched, and see what kind

of British influence is influencing the UN, when we're talking about getting the British influence out. Start squelching them

so we don't have that possibility of a UN invasion.

WERTZ: I wouldn't, I don't think it occurs on that level.

The level on which you've got to look at this is how this entire

operation against President Trump started. It was started by MI-6, which is the British equivalent of the CIA. A so-called "former" MI-6 agent, Christopher Steele, was paid to put together

a dossier of unverified material which he then circulated very widely to Obama's intelligence agency stooges like Brennan and

Comey and Clapper. This is the roadmap on which they're operating; so this is straight British intelligence MI-6. The second indication of this is something called the Government Communication Headquarters, which is a pretty dull name for what is the British equivalent of the NSA. They were the ones who, according to the published accounts – and the published accounts may not be completely true, but what the published accounts say is that the head of the GCHQ went directly to Brennan. In other words, they don't have to operate under the US Constitution, and the restraints of the US Constitution surveilling Trump associates, so they surveilled Trump associates all over the world. Then they go to Brennan, the head of the CIA, who's not supposed to operate domestically according to the charter; and he puts together a six-intelligence agency taskforce to begin to investigate Trump in the middle of the Presidential campaign. There are various reports as to when this occurred, some say it was in the Summer of 2016, which is the time of the Republican convention; others say it was before that. But the point is, once Trump was a serious threat to win the nomination, the GCHQ began to conduct what would be illegal surveillance in the United States against Trump and his associates. This is all done in collaboration with Obama and with Comey and with Clapper, and with Brennan in particular. And of course, we've gotten Wikileaks that Brennan put together a cyber warfare unit in the CIA of over 5000 employees; it rivals the NSA. So, this is what we're talking about. And you see how

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

Q 3 [cont'd]: What about Obama giving the internet to the UN?

WERTZ: Listen, the UN has got all sorts of problems; but frankly, it's not the primary problem in the world. It's basically an assembly of nations; it's as good as it's made. There are good things that are done at the UN when people collaborate. When they don't collaborate, and it's used for geopolitical purposes, including by the British, then it's a mess. For instance, the UN has backed all of the initiatives that have been taken – I mean, look at Syria. You've got Turkey and Iran working together with the Russians. A Sunni country, a

predominantly Shi'a country, and they're working with the Russians to defeat terrorism and to restore stability and sovereignty to Syria. That's a positive development which has been backed by the UN Security Council. The UN as a whole in a number of cases has actually positively responded to the Chinese Silk Road, or One Belt, One Road Initiative. So, it's really a question of, do the countries who are members of the UN change the way in which they function so they collaborate to solve problems and create a prosperous future for all of mankind? That's the real issue. It has nothing to do with the UN per se as an institution; it's as good or as bad as its members make it. But you have to look beyond the UN to the question of the British; and you look at it through the whole history. We're talking about two systems, and it goes back before the British. For instance, the German poet Friedrich Schiller, who I mentioned earlier, he wrote a piece called "On Solon and Lycurgus". Solon was the head of Athens; Lycurgus was the head of Sparta. They had two completely different systems. Under Solon, as Schiller wrote, he had respect for human nature and never sacrificed the people to the state. Never the ends to the means; rather he let the state serve the people, and all paths were open to genius. And the basic principle was, the progress of the mind should be the purpose of the state. So, that's [inaud; 53:07], that's like what our country was designed to be; it hasn't always been that, but that's what we would want it to be. That's what you would want other nations to be like that.

Lycurgus, on the other hand, the way Schiller characterizes it is as follows: The laws were iron chains which pulled down the mind. All industry was barred; all science neglected. His state could only persist under one condition – that the mind of the people stagnates. If you look at it, there's another Greek mythology. Zeus on the one hand, was a tyrannical, Olympic so-called "god". He wanted to suppress mankind; he was threatened by the idea that mankind might actually develop technology, develop science, educate themselves, learn languages and so forth. Prometheus gave man fire; that is, technology. He also gave him a Promethean method of thinking, which is the creative method of thinking. So, you have two systems. This is, in a certain sense, like when Helga LaRouche talks about the New Paradigm, she's talking about the paradigm of Solon, the paradigm of Prometheus; versus the imperial policy of depressing the mental creative capacity of the population in order to maintain political control. The British are like the Roman Empire, like the Venetian Empire; the British Empire has a policy of reducing the world's population and keeping people dumb in order to politically control them.

Q 3 [cont'd]: Exactly right.

SPEED: OK, great. We're going to go on to the next question here. Once again, hit star 6 to get into the queue. Just say your first name and what state you're calling in from.

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

WERTZ: Yeah, sure. Here's the, the picture is just straightforward. Obama put Nazis in power in Kiev with the backing of the British and many of the members of the European Union. It's basically part of a strategy to move eastward to the borders of Russia. When the Soviet Union collapsed, it was agreed upon between George HW Bush and Gorbachev and other participants, that NATO would not move eastward. But that's precisely what they've done, which is part of a geopolitical strategy. So, they're basically moving to try to encircle Russia, and Ukraine was a critical aspect of that policy. So what they did was, they backed Nazi groups in Ukraine to take power. Now you had the duly-elected President – Yanukovych – in Ukraine; and under the Constitution of Ukraine, a President cannot be removed from office unless he's impeached. They never impeached him; they never brought impeachment. What they did was, the thugs in the street who were members of what is called the Right Sector, and these guys trace themselves back to an actual Nazi who worked with Hitler, named Stepan Bandera. During World War II, his organization was involved in killing tens of thousands of Poles and Jews, working with Hitler. That's what this group traces its background to. The US knows that, because after the war, people like Allen Dulles and MI-6 of Britain brought Bandera and his top aide to London and the United States. Because at that point, they wanted to use the Nazis against

the

Soviet Union, particularly in Ukraine. The Soviet Union fell, but nonetheless, that's the policy which they've continued to this day. So, they carried out a coup against the duly-elected

President, and among the things that they were going to do, is outlaw the use of the Russian language as a second official language in Ukraine. So, the people of Crimea voted in a referendum, called self-determination under the UN Charter, to sever themselves from Ukraine where a coup d'État had been carried out by Nazis, and to join Russia. So, Russia acknowledged that democratic vote, based on the principle of self-determination in the face of a Nazi coup. See, here you've

got people in the United States up in arms against Nazi KKK white

supremacists; but in fact, Obama put Nazis in power in Ukraine.

John McCain backed Nazis in power in Ukraine. The political establishment in Washington DC is backing Nazis in Ukraine; white

supremacists in Ukraine. These people who support Nazis then get

upset about a staged incident in Charlottesville, which was staged probably with provocateurs both among the Nazis and KKK,

and also within the anti-fa – the anti-fascist organization – the guys with the black masks, black helmets, and black uniforms

who carry out violence in all of these events.

So, this thing was set up. If you look at the people involved on the Democratic Party side in Charlottesville, they're

all former employees of the State Department, they're all funded

by George Soros. This is the mayor, Michael Signer; it is the guy who took the video of the deranged guy who mowed the

protester and injured others – his name is Brennan Gilmore; and another guy, Tom Periello. They are all funded by, they all worked with John Podesta's Center for American Progress; which is the center of the so-called Resist movement against Trump in the United States. And they were all there, along with McAuliffe, who's a longstanding supporter of the Clintons. They basically immediately used this to go after Trump; it was like you put two chemicals together which you know will react with an explosion. You don't separate the demonstrators, and then you prepare to use the incident – whether you planned the specific incident or not – you use the incident to go after the President of the United States. These are the same guys who backed Nazis in Ukraine. That's the hypocritical irony of this entire operation.

SPEED: OK, excellent.

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

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

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

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

Q 5: This is Greg from St. Louis. Just wanted to make a couple of points for the question out there. One, obviously the analysis of the regime change. The same thing is happening that's attacking the Trump administration, is an attempt to have a regime change, if you will. We simply call it an

administration change. So we know all the tools and all the games that they play are related to that. My real issue becomes for me, is the psychosis of Donald Trump himself. I mean, we're putting a lot of marbles in this guy's basket, so to speak. We know he's a wild card; we really didn't know, but for me, it's important that we say what's happening with him as well. It's not like he's not aware of the VIPS report; not like he's not aware of many of these things. My question is, how do we really get him to understand the need to push that VIPS report and get that out there so that we can get at the crux of the Deep State that's attacking him, as well as pushing for this whole war issue, not only within the United States, but across the world?

WERTZ: Well, that's – it's not like there's some particular series of tactics that will do this. What we've talked about is two flanks in terms of what he needs to do. In terms of going with the VIPS, going after the British, and on the other hand, going with LaRouche's Four Laws and the Silk Road. But what you've got to do is, you've got to reach a certain threshold of activity in the country, including among those who support President Trump; but you've also in the process got to create a situation where it becomes much more difficult as the truth gets out, for certain Democrats and certain Republicans who ran against Trump from carrying out the kind of insanity that they're engaged in. So, that's the only way you can do this. You have to mobilize people who support Trump to demand that

he

take action on these, and that they will support him if he does

that. And similarly, you've got to create an environment in which these people like Clapper and Brennan and Comey or Mueller,

that they're not actually – you've got to box them in. That's why I raised this battle of Cannae in terms of encirclement.

The

VIPS boxes in Mueller, it boxes in Comey and Brennan and Clapper.

But you've also got to box in the Democrats; these people say they're for Glass-Steagall – many of them. They say they're for

working people, some of them; not all that many of them.

Certainly Clinton wasn't too interested in working people.

But

the point is, that is the party of FDR, the party of Kennedy; or

it used to be. So, you've got to really create the situation in

which you basically make it clear to them that if Trump takes the

initiative on this, that calls the bluff on these Democrats, who

are running around. They say they're for Glass-Steagall, and yet

they're calling for the impeachment of a President who's for Glass-Steagall when Obama was absolutely opposed to

Glass-Steagall; as was Hillary Clinton. And they know that.

So, they're engaged in a certain kind of fraud, which needs to be exposed by calling their bluff. If they're real human beings – and you hope that they are on some level – then

they'll respond. So you've got to basically do both things by a

mobilization of the population.

Q 5 [cont'd]: How do we box in Trump? I understand boxing in some of those people around him, but Trump himself? His own psychosis is, you're not sure what you're going to get out of this guy at any given time, so you have to force the office of the President to do what you want it to do. So what is that that

has to box in Trump, so to speak? I know we've talked about boxing in all these other folks, but he's going to be the head at

the head of the arrow; so what are we doing to box him in?

WERTZ: We're mobilizing in these two respects; which includes "OK, you said you're for Glass-Steagall. You say that

the best way to actually improve human relations, but specifically race relations in this country, is to create jobs."

Look at the drug plague. If you don't have decent jobs, which we

used to have in urban areas. Baltimore used to have shipbuilding; we used to have steel building, steelworks in Baltimore. Now they've got a tourist harbor, and that's it. You

don't have the high-paying jobs that you need, so that people aren't prey to drugs and sales of drugs and so forth, and to gangs – which are related to drugs. So, that's what you've got

to actually get him to move on that, but in a certain sense, I think you've just got to convince him that he's combative, but he's not really being combative on the level that he needs to be.

He clearly thinks that he is under complete fire; and you can't

deny that. They called for his assassination. I put together a

list for a webcast last Friday, of the calls for his assassination, impeachment, or forced resignation, or the use

of
the 25th Amendment against him. This started with the
{Spectator}, which is a British paper, started out saying
“Will
Donald Trump be assassinated, impeached, or forced to resign?”
That was on January 21st. You know the other cases: Johnny
Depp, Madonna, Kathy Griffin. You can go through the list.
So,
you know that this guy really feels that he is under siege.
So,
he is combative with his tweets and so forth, but the issue
here
is, if you put this out on the table, if you get this spread
widely enough, and he sees that there is support for taking
these
kinds of actions; and sees that this is an effective flanking
operation against those who would destroy this country, then
you’ve got a shot at actually getting him to move on it.
That’s
the only thing I can say.

SPEED: Yeah, and if I could just add to that. That is
precisely what the meeting we’re holding this Saturday is all
about. You may have gotten on a little after I went through
this, Greg. This Saturday, we’re having a major meeting on
Hamilton and LaRouche’s Four Laws as a solution for this
crisis.

The only way you’re going to be able to crush the British
Empire
is with the added flank of the Four Laws and the solution.
Conversely, the only way you’re going to actually get the Four
Laws is by crushing the British Empire. So, the two things
really work hand-in-glove. What we have to do, is – and this
is
really, we’ve got to go out and we’ve got to just get to the
American population. The support for Trump from Trump’s base
up

until now has been completely inadequate. People might come out,
but very often these people have to be educated. They'll come out, and they're talking about a wall or monument; they really should be talking about Trump joining the One Belt, One Road; the
Silk Road perspective. That's what we've got to have; and going
after the British. So, that's a matter of us educating people.
But similarly, we talked about the Democrats. Frankly, the Bernie Sanders supporters, which may have been greater than the
Hillary supporters; let's bear in mind if anybody stole anybody's
votes and manipulated the election, it was some things that were
going on around that campaign. Which, by the way, when that came
out, they've never said, "Oh, gee, that's not true." They said,
"Oh, well, the Russians did that." So, therefore, yeah, it might
be true, but we can't listen to it, because it was the Russians.
Why aren't the Sanders supporters up in arms? I'm not really asking that rhetorically; I think that's a matter of us really organizing and drawing this out.
Now, that is what we have been doing increasingly in the streets in New York City; and we should expand this, and also somewhat in the Midwest. But I'll just give you a sense of some
of the results. On Monday, we had three teams out in Manhattan,
Staten Island, and Long Island which raised \$1400; which is extremely good. We got out about 500 copies of the {Hamiltonian}; we collected a number of petition signatures.

What was interesting is that one of these deployments was in the middle of Manhattan, which obviously did not go overwhelmingly for Trump; in fact, it went overwhelmingly for Hillary. So, we were deployed in front of the Fox News building in midtown; and pretty much everyone who considered themselves a Trump supporter who came up to our table had already come to the conclusion that Russia-gate and Charlottesville were part of the same operation. We were expecting far more hostility than what existed, and there were several African-Americans who signed on to the petition. Some of them had voted for Trump, some people had not, and so on. And then you got a certain amount of confusion that existed. We had another deployment, I think this was out in Queens yesterday, where we actually had a gaggle of these women – literally witches; they had everything but the black skirts and broomsticks with them. They came out with signs and so on. It was a very interesting deployment; it was about 10 or 12 of them who rotated through the day, attempting to yell at people, dissuade them from signing up, signing the petition and so on. Their polemic – and this is how you could see it was really organized – it was not around Trump, it was not around Charlottesville; it was actually “Oh, Lyndon LaRouche. You don’t want to sign up with LaRouche; that’s a cult. Stop signing up.” The response by and large from people coming up was basically, “Get out of my face! I don’t want to talk with you; I’m

signing

up with these people” and so on. So, we ended up, I believe on

that deployment, getting something like six or seven people got

memberships; lots and lots of people giving their names – over 25 contacts – and so forth and so on.

So, that’s what’s out there, and I think part of it is that we’ve got to out and tell the population themselves they’re not

doing enough. That’s how you box in Trump. We’ve got to mobilize more of the population; they’ve got to be organized around a strategic objective. Stop these wars, and go with the

economic policy. That’s what Trump was voted in for, that’s what

he’s got to do, and that’s what the American people have got to

demand. That’s what was put so beautifully and clearly by Andy

Young in his statement on “Meet the Press”. Everybody should really read that, and I think that can be very useful in our organizing. So, that’s just what I would add to what Will said.

WERTZ: It’s a very principled issue. The countries are destroyed to the extent to which citizens of the countries don’t

take responsibility for the republic, for their Constitution. That’s why the basic concept expressed in the Declaration of Independence is the principle of government by the consent of the

governed. Similarly, what Lincoln said – government of, for, and by the people. The basic point is, don’t depend on Congress;

don’t depend on a President. As good as the President may be, they very often are going to operate upon pragmatic

conceptions,
or what they think is opportune, or what they think is possible
for them to do. For instance, the Civil Rights movement had a force. They had a force with Eisenhower, they had a force with Kennedy, they had a force with Johnson to take action. That's the way you have to really look at this. The point is, if you are operating from the standpoint of the vital interests of the nation and of humanity as a whole, you're operating on the basis of principle and of reason; then you have authority within yourself as a citizen of a country – and also the responsibility as a citizen of a country, and as a citizen of the world – to take action and see that those actions which are required are acted upon by an elected official. They're supposed to represent us; they get elected by us, and they're supposed to represent our best interests. I think that's really the issue. And you have to educate yourself so that you know for certain with scientific certainty, that what you're advocating is actually a policy which is required and must be implemented.

So, what we've defined is a policy that must be implemented. Take the Four Laws. You have Democrats who say they're for Glass-Steagall, but they're brainwashed in terms of Green ideology. The rest of the Four Laws that Lyndon LaRouche has put forward, put an emphasis on capital intensive forms of investment, including nuclear energy, nuclear desalination, the development of fusion, the expansion of the space program.

Many

of these Democrats say they're for Glass-Steagall, but what do they mean by Glass-Steagall if they're Green? Then on the Republican side, many of them are not Greenies, in the sense of

being opposed to technological progress, but they've been brainwashed in respect to a balanced budget or merely reducing a

deficit. So, they have no conception of the idea of public credit, and no conception of what Hamilton put forward with a National Bank, or what Lincoln put forward with greenbacks, or what Franklin Roosevelt put forward with the bank that he used to

actually engage in investment in the economy – it was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. After the war in Germany, they had the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, which is the Credit

Institution for Reconstruction; same principle. But the idea is

that the government can extend credit as a sovereign nation, can

extend credit for productive investment. The problem here is that many Republicans have no conception of that.

So, you've got to educate both Democrats and Republicans to understand a scientific conception of economics; which they don't

have. It's not clear exactly whether Trump has it; he may reference Hamilton and Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln, but it's

not clear from his actions so far that he has those conceptions.

So, it's a question of educating, it's a question of mobilizing

your fellow citizens to ensure that the policies the nation needs

– the world needs – are enacted. It's a very basic principle that the power of government to govern derives from the

people;

but it has to be an educated people, not a mob.

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

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

WERTZ: You have to go back to World War II and the aftermath of World War II. The British Empire backed Hitler, and they wanted him to go east against the Soviet Union; but Hitler at a certain point decided that he was going to go west. Churchill knew he couldn't defeat Hitler on the continent, so he needed to bring the US into the war. Roosevelt certainly wanted to defeat fascism, but the British actually set up covert operations of British intelligence, MI-6, MI-5, in the United States and Rockefeller Center. They worked closely with Allen Dulles who became Deputy CIA Director and then later CIA Director after Roosevelt died. So, the point is, in 1946 there was an agreement signed which was called the UK-USA Agreement. Then later it became what's called the Five Eyes, which is Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Britain, and the United States. Basically

the problem here is that our intelligence agencies here in the United States are working directly with British intelligence and

with other members of the British Empire, or what's called now the Commonwealth.

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

British have subverted US intelligence.

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

Q 7: This is Steve from Pennsylvania. What I've noticed with the different organizations I've worked with – I work with

several different patriot organizations, including the Oath Keepers and the Three Percenters and some militia that were there

in Charlottesville the day of that event. From my different sources, I understand that these groups on both sides were all hooked in with State Department and Obama appointees and employees and Occupy Wall Street and those groups. Could Charlottesville be considered like a false flag to try to push this narrative of this race card thing, since the Russia thing completely failed and they now want to push the 25th Amendment thing and they want to push that Trump somehow has dementia?

WERTZ: You're right; it's a false flag operation. For instance, one of the things that came out is that one of the organizers of the demonstrators – a guy named Kessler was basically, I think it was Charles Grassley who asked the question, or another Senator – this guy was involved in Occupy Wall Street. He was apparently a supporter of Obama. Then all

of a sudden, you're expected to believe that there was this transformation, and he ends up being an organizer of this

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

SPEED: OK, great. So, we are going to go to the next and

final

question. We have a few more people in the queue, but unfortunately we're running out of time. So, OK, go ahead.

Q 8: Hi, it's June from New York. My question has to do with the two petitions and whether or not there's been an effort to contact the distribution list for Trump's PAC from either Eric or Don Trump? Maybe you could go through that way to get to them to get it communicated out to the people who actually support Trump?

WERTZ: I can't answer specifically who we've contacted with this. I know that we are trying to get the petition into the hands of people who are close to Trump. But I can't really say whether we've gotten to those specific individuals either ourselves directly, or indirectly through other people who are supporters of Trump. But certainly, if anybody knows members of the Trump family, they should be encouraged to speak to them; to get this material to them. In general, we do want to get to supporters of Trump to really give them a strategic conception of what needs to be done right now.

SPEED: We've reached out to a lot of groups that are working closely with Trump. I think there are people on the call who are involved in that; who are involved in various networks. So, if you have such networks, reach out; get in contact with them, and try to come yourself if you're based in New York. Come to the meeting on Saturday at the Beacon Hotel; we can talk

more

about this. We also are generally out in mid-Manhattan in the vicinity of the Trump headquarters at least once a week. A number of people affiliated and who are very active in his campaign come by regularly there. So that's another good way of

reaching out to people. We should expand this as much as possible. We are doing that, we're reaching out; and we would urge anybody else with contacts to do that.

Also, again, I'll just emphasize, we are just as interested in those who oppose Trump; because we have to neutralize – or better, win this group of people over. They should be fighting

against these foreign wars; they should be working for economic

development. Therefore, we want to free this President up to do

exactly that. I think there are a number of these people who can

be approached and recruited. Certainly the Veterans Intelligence

Professionals for Sanity give us a way that they can understand

this and act on it. But join us! Get people to sign the petition. Let's call people out.

Q 8 [cont'd]: Another question real quick. Is there a way, or a contact list that you have for people that are located within your area? I'm up in northern, up in Dutchess County, and

I don't know if there are any other people who are members that

are up in Dutchess County that you could coordinate with to do stuff up in this region. Is there some sort of list, or some way

you could get in contact with them?

SPEED: Yes, sure. That's not too far away, June. What we'll do is, you can contact me; I will text you my cell phone when we get off of this call, and we can be in touch in terms of

reaching out and contacting other people. We'll also put that out in the email, and other people on the call that have this same number can contact various people in their regional offices

for further direction in terms of how we can get groupings of people together.

So, Will, I wanted to invite you to make some final remarks. This has clearly been an exciting phone call; we couldn't even get to all the callers. Those of you whom we could not get to, I

want to urge you to get on on Monday night. We're doing these activists' calls now twice a week, on Monday and Thursday nights.

I want to urge everyone on to try to get additional people on the calls. But Will, why don't you give us some concluding remarks?

WERTZ: I just want to go back to the remarks that you cited from Lyndon LaRouche at the very beginning to underscore the urgency of the situation. Again, what he said is that we have to

win now; if we lose, we are finished because we will be destroyed

by the people opposed to what he is doing in terms of the initiatives we're taking. The existence of the United States depends upon doing the job. It's not making suggestions; it's getting victory against the causes of the things that are destroying the ability of the United States to express itself properly.

So, I just wanted to end with that. I thought the questions tonight were very responsive and showed that people have a sense

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

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