
II. The Naysayers

War Party Leads Anti-Trump Drive

by Robert Ingraham

April 2—The paramount issue of our time is one of War or Peace. For sixteen years, under the regimes of George W. Bush and Barack Obama, the United States has been at war—ongoing colonial war, including regime change, color revolutions, mass drone killings, and assassinations; and then, increasingly under Obama, we witnessed a dramatic escalation toward a strategic military confrontation with both Russia and China.

At the time of his 90th birthday celebration, Lyndon LaRouche forcefully made the argument that the Republican/Democratic two-party system in the United States is dead. Such is the case. What we have today is two different political groupings: a War Party and a Peace Party. Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, John McCain, and George Soros belong to the former. It is the election of Donald Trump which has reinvigorated the latter.

Donald Trump is not a “Republican President.” He campaigned as an individual. He challenged sixteen other candidates in the Republican primaries, almost all of whom were tied to the previous Bush Administration. In the general election, he ran not only against

Hillary Clinton, but against the entrenched pro-war faction within the Republican Party itself. He ran against the eight year record of Barack Obama, but he also ran against the policies and outlook of the Bush/Cheney regime.

If one looks at the unholy alliance that today is seeking to topple the Trump Administration, it includes FBI Director James Comey, former CIA Director John Brennan, and other dirty elements within the covert intelligence community; it includes Democratic Party bagman George Soros and leading Congressional Democrats such as Sen. Charles Schumer; it includes former Vice-President Dick Cheney, Republican Senators John McCain and Lindsey Graham, and other neo-con riff-raff remnants from the Bush Administration. What all of these institutions and individuals have in common is their hysterical commitment to get the United States back on track for a military build-up against Russia and China.

At first glance, it seems self-evident that the core of the “get-Trump” apparatus is the right-wing “neo-conservative” crowd, or perhaps—as they are often re-



United States Congress
John McCain



Karen Ballard/White House
Dick Cheney



US Senate
Charles Schumer



Flickr/George Soros-World Economic
Forum Annual Meeting Davos 2010
George Soros



White House/Pete Souza
John Brennan (right), then head of Homeland Security, briefing Barack Obama on May 1, 2009.

I. John F. Kennedy— American University, June 10, 1963

Printed below are excerpts from President John Fitzgerald Kennedy's speech at American University, perhaps his greatest speech. A number of astute historians have opined that it was the content of this speech that sealed Kennedy's fate, that placed him in the cross-hairs of the assassin's rifle. For Americans today the question to be asked is, "Do you still believe in the vision outlined by that martyred President?" Hillary Clinton certainly doesn't. The FBI doesn't. Dick Cheney doesn't. Barack Obama doesn't. George Soros doesn't. This is what is at stake in the get-Trump conspiracy.

President Kennedy said:

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we

ferred to today—the “Deep State” phenomenon. Such a characterization, however, although accurate up to a point, is ultimately superficial, in the sense that it does not go to the inner nature of the organized evil that has dominated our national institutions increasingly since the murder of President Kennedy, and most specifically since the attack of September 11, 2001.

The actual nature of the beast that now threatens both constitutional government in the United States as well as world peace, is precisely defined by Barbara Boyd in her historic article [“The Insurrection Against the President, And Its British Controllers—Or, Who Really Is George Soros, Anyway?”](#), which appeared in the March 31 issue of *Executive Intelligence Review*. In that article, breathtaking in scope, Mrs. Boyd demonstrates that what we are really battling is the modern British Empire, an empire whose most precious geopolitical interests are threatened by the un-controlled independence of President Donald Trump, and by the initiatives already taken by the President to normalize relations with both Russia and China. It is a matter of great urgency that every literate American study and digest what is contained in that article.

can help them do it. But I also believe that we must re-examine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the Cold War and toward freedom and peace here at home...

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors...

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us examine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives... Wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, State, and National—to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

II. When Democrats Once Possessed Moral Courage

There was a time, within the not-too-distant memory of living Americans, when many citizens—including a proud patriotic segment of the “liberal” and “progressive” tendency within the Democratic Party—stood firm against police-state operations hatched and promulgated within the U.S. Intelligence community. There was a time when FBI dirty tricks, NSA surveillance, CIA black-bag operations, and other covert operations were the subject of public outrage, courageous Congressional action and mass protest.

There was a time when President Franklin Roosevelt battled ferociously against Wall Street, and then, after FDR's death, when many of those loyal to him, including Lyndon LaRouche, fought tenaciously against Truman, against the FBI, and against the British efforts to destroy the Roosevelt legacy.

There was a time when hopeful Americans rallied to the vision of peace and international cooperation which President John Kennedy outlined in his American University Speech of 1963. A time when “progressives” yearned for an end to the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union and China, and the establishment of friendly relations among nations, which might lead to a better future for all.

There was a time when many Americans, including leaders within both of America's two major political parties, recognized that the covert operations of the FBI, CIA, et al., were a direct threat to that vision of peace enunciated by President Kennedy.

There was a time when the FBI targeting of Dr. Martin Luther King became a national scandal. And when J. Edgar Hoover's activities were held up to national contempt.

There was a time when a young Democratic Senator

from Alaska, in 1971, stood up to the ‘secret government’ and read, on the floor of Congress, from the classified “Pentagon Papers.” He then entered 4,100 pages from those Papers into the Congressional Record, so as to reveal the lies that the government was telling the American people.

There was a time, in the 1970s, when a veteran Democratic Congressman from New Jersey likened J. Edgar Hoover to Lavrentiy Beria, the head of the Soviet NKVD, and went toe-to-toe against the FBI, even when it resulted in FBI wiretaps and surveillance and in his eventual frame-up and imprisonment.


There was a time, in 1975 and 1976, when the Church and Pike Committees launched investigations into the FBI, CIA, NSA and other agencies engaged in covert activity, calling hundreds of witnesses and documenting a plethora of crimes, including blackmail, surveillance, and assassinations.

There was a time, in 1988, when a Democratic Congressman from southern California, the head of the Congressional Black Caucus, charged on the floor of Congress that the FBI had been carrying out a forty year-long targeting of black elected officials, under a policy named *Frühmenschen*. This was partially in response to the FBI opening investigations into more than half of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Such individuals and such actions characterize that which has been best—even heroic—in the living history of the Democratic Party. Will that proud legacy now be for naught?

III. The Intended Coup

On March 30, at a full hearing of the Senate Intelligence Committee, a disreputable batch of “Reds-under-the-beds” spooks were let loose as witnesses in



Congressman Cornelius Gallagher, Democrat-New Jersey, compared J. Edgar Hoover to Lavrentiy Beria.

the Senate—and onto the nation’s television screens. As the hearing progressed, “Cold War” rhetoric flew through the air. But the terrified, blackmailed Senators were worse lunatics than even their witnesses. The back-and-forth “dialogue” between the anti-Trump witnesses and the terrified Senators might have been scripted by Herbert “I Led Three Lives” Philbrick. The entire hearing could be characterized as American Kabuki Theater, or perhaps more accurately a Minstrel Show, composed of FBI and intelligence community barkers and appropriately servile but deranged and panicked Congressional performers.

As was vividly evident at the hearing, these members of Congress are both terrorized and terrified. The blackmail, surveillance, and even more sinister capabilities of the FBI and other covert agencies have these elected officials scared to death. One eyewitness to the March 30 hearing stated that “the Senators were so wild in their fears, that they often had to be constrained by the witnesses!”

Chaired and co-chaired by Richard Burr (R-NC), and Mark Warner (D-VA), the Senate Committee heard testimony from a number of witnesses, including the dirty spook Roy Godson, a British whore who worked with Ollie North in organizing the Nicaraguan Contras, helped organize the invasion of Iraq, and was a leader of the anti-LaRouche faction within the Reagan Administration. His testimony was riddled with anti-Russian denunciations, whom he kept referring to as “the Soviets.” Another witness was Clint Watts, representing FPRI, the so-called Foreign Policy Research Institute of Philadelphia, an ancient, evil red-baiting outfit.

Three days prior to the Senate hearing, former U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney issued his own personal declaration of war against President Trump. Speaking at a business summit in New Delhi sponsored by the *Economic Times*, Cheney stated that, “There’s no ques-

tion there was a very serious effort made by [Russian President Vladimir] Putin and his government, his organization, to interfere in major ways with our basic fundamental democratic processes. In some quarters, that would be considered an act of war. I think it's a kind of conduct and activity we will see going forward... I would not underestimate the weight that we, as Americans, assign to the Russian attempts to interfere with our internal political processes."

IV. Will Cowardice Lead to War?

To their everlasting shame, many leading Democrats—as well as Republicans—now find themselves in bed with the worst scum of the FBI and the intelligence community. Or, to be even less forgiving, these individuals find themselves in the intimate embrace of the assassins of John F. Kennedy. Do not sympathize with them. They are not the helpless victims of the *Laocoön*; rather, the reality that their choice is self-made only increases the depth of their sin.

Perhaps some Democrats or "liberals" take solace in the anti-Trump role of the "progressive" George Soros as evidence that they are somehow on the side of the angels; but as Barbara Boyd has demonstrated, Soros is nothing but an asset of the British-Deep State faction now pushing for war. The anti-Trump rhetoric which oozes from his orifices is all scripted by the war faction in London. When Dick Cheney and George Soros join hands to bring down a duly elected President, one might hope that this would be sufficient to cause even the most deluded anti-Trump protester to stop and question. The real issue here is not "party politics" but gnawing fear in the hearts of our elected officials.

Rep. Bonnie Watson Coleman (D-N.J.), at a recent hearing of the House Homeland Security Committee, stated, "I think this attack that we've experienced [from Russia] is a form of war, a form of war on our fundamental democratic principles."

Sen. Ben Cardin of Maryland, the ranking Democratic member of that chamber's Foreign Relations Committee, has claimed that the alleged Russian actions amounted to a "political Pearl Harbor."

Rep. Jackie Speier (D-CA) recently stated, "I actually think that their engagement was an act of war, an act of hybrid warfare, and I think that's why the

American people should be concerned about it."

Rep. Eric Swalwell (D-CA), has charged, "This past election, our country was attacked. We were attacked by Russia. I see this as an opportunity for everyone on this committee, Republicans and Democrats, to not look in the rear-view window but to look forward and do everything we can to make sure that our country never again allows a foreign adversary to attack us."

This behavior is all fear-driven, within the context of a state apparatus where there are no secrets; where, as Edward Snowden and others have shown, every misdeed, every transgression, of every member of Congress is now an open book to the National Security Agency and their allies. Blackmail, or worse, is the order of the day.

The recent performance of leading Democrats—including Maxine Waters who has already called for President Trump's impeachment—would have all of the farcical makings of an *Opéra bouffe* but for two things. One is that they are all being used: they are the window dressing—albeit a necessary political cover—for the ongoing coup against this President. As such, their cowardice at a time of all out assault on the nation's constitutional government by elements of the "Deep State" amounts to near or actual treason. Second, and of even greater importance, is the determination by elements within the British Empire apparatus to re-start the war drive against Russia and China, an eventuality—were it to be realized—which would render all of these Congressmen as accomplices.

Where is the courage of a Cornelius Gallagher? Where is the courage of a Mike Gravel? Where is the courage of a Hale Boggs? Where is the courage of a Mervyn Dymally? Nowhere to be found in the halls of Congress.

James Comey committed treason on Monday, March 20, when he testified to his participation in a coup against the legitimate government of the United States. The entire investigation on Russia is a fraud. The real crime is the intended coup against a legitimate President of the United States, and the threat to force a world war against Russia and China, which would result in a likely nuclear holocaust. And all of this, simply to mask the dire bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic financial system and the failed political establishment.

Shall we take up President Kennedy's vision of June, 1963, or shall we succumb to our fears?