Nov. 21—Seeking to counter the poisonous effects of pragmatism upon his Chinese countrymen, Dr. Sun Yat-Sen—the great revolutionary who so deeply admired Abraham Lincoln and his Trans-Continental Railway system, that he reproduced that concept and design in his own 1921 book, The Industrialization of China—insisted: “Doing is easy; thinking is hard.” In that vein, if Americans wish to figure out what to do to extricate ourselves from the greatest crisis to face this country since the death of Franklin Roosevelt in 1945, they should listen to these wise words. “Doing is easy; thinking is hard.”

A dialogue was convened in Manhattan on Sunday, Nov. 12, immediately after the showing of the film, A Good American, a documentary about National Security Agency (NSA) whistleblower and master code-breaker, William Binney. That the symposium, moderated by journalist Sean Stone, also included several opponents of the Russiagate hoax, including Binney himself, was important in its own right. Beyond exposing that hoax, the panelists struggled to answer the question of why, apart from the well-documented corruption, Constitutional violations, and malfeasance by the NSA and other intelligence agencies, Russiagate was actually occurring—other than “to impeach the President.” Helga Zepp-LaRouche, upon being briefed on the meeting, observed that what must be supplied for the participants in such discussions, is an explanation of why the Russiagate attack against the President is being pursued in the first place.

In a statement now circulating in the United States,
both in the streets and through social media, entitled “Americans Must Discover What Really Happened on Trump’s China Trip,” Zepp-LaRouche makes the following appeal: “I appeal to your reason not to be fooled by the media, not to fall into the trap of Cold War propaganda. The opposite of what the media is saying is happening. Please, dear listeners and viewers—meaning you—take the time to inform yourself; build your own judgement.” An accurate evaluation of President Trump’s recently concluded trip, and its actual accomplishments, including his “informal discussions” with Vladimir Putin, requires deep thinking, free of “Big Brother’s” snap judgements and suggestions that are too readily supplied by the “Wikipedia social media pop culture.”

President Trump’s visit to China dwarfs that of Nixon’s 1972 trip in its potential importance to the United States, to China, and to the world. It is of a completely different nature, in no small measure affected by the role of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche in China during the past 25 years. China’s 1972 condition, and that of the United States, when compared to 2017, are now, while not reversed, certainly opposite in impulse-tendency. Optimism characterizes China’s 1.4 billion population, while a “no future” outlook dominates the people of the United States. President Trump seeks to change that, but the opposition to his doing so is being manifest in many quarters. Russiagate is its most noxious, as well as its most vulnerable expression.

Crisis of the Presidency

When, in mid-October, President Trump insisted that CIA Director Mike Pompeo meet with William Binney in order to find out “what really happened with Russiagate,” everyone familiar with Binney’s notorious battle with the NSA, going back to the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center, recognized the implications of this implicit endorsement by the President of Binney’s competence. Prior to that, on Sept. 9, Executive Intelligence Review had hosted a New York City meeting at which Binney had appeared and had discussed the Russiagate matter thoroughly.

A few days before that Manhattan meeting, Binney was covered on CBS News, CNN, RT (formerly Russia Today), and in various printed media, which only later, after Nov. 7—beginning with Glenn Greenwald’s publication The Intercept—reported the Pompeo-Binney meeting, which itself had actually taken place on Oct. 24. Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS) founder and former CIA analyst Ray McGovern—part of a panel that included former House Intelligence Committee staffer Diane Roark and William Binney—told the 350 people assembled Nov. 12 at Symphony Space, “never in my life did I expect that the President of the United States would call the head of the CIA and say, ‘Hey, I got this memo from Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, and I want you to go talk to the guy who wrote it, Bill Binney.’”

Trump’s single-minded and almost single-handed crusade to avoid a new Cold War with Russia, despite opposition in his own administration, was noted by Stephen F. Cohen, professor emeritus of Russian Studies at New York University and Princeton University, in a piece entitled, “Russiagate Zealots (Mainly Democrats) Have Become a Major Threat to U.S. National Security,” published in The Nation magazine, Nov. 15.

This was a “watershed” piece for Cohen, considered by most to be a prototypical “New York liberal,” inclusively in his role as a contributing editor of The Nation. Cohen has contended that the present “crisis of the American Presidency” is far worse than that which occurred around Nixon and Watergate: “unlike Trump, President Nixon was never accused of ‘collusion with
the Kremlin’ or faced reckless, and preposterous, allegations that the Kremlin had abetted his election by an ‘attack on American democracy.’”

**Mark of the British Beast**

While this is formally true, it does not take into account the deployment of “public diplomacy,” that is, “grey” and “black” propaganda, by sectors of the intelligence community, against the President of the United States. Trump’s intention to clean out the intelligence agencies, announced in the first days of his Presidency, has not endeared him to those Obama-era holdovers who are adept at deploying the more refined “psychological warfare” interagency capabilities that were established by the Reagan-era National Security Decision Directive 77, authored by Walter Raymond. Also, Cohen is perhaps unfamiliar with the historical role of the Congress for Cultural Freedom’s (CCF’s) cultivation of what is sometimes called “right-wing social democracy,” actually neoliberalism, and its (in fact, though not in form) nearly identical twin, neocorporatism. While the CCF is typically and mistakenly identified as a CIA-based “arts and literature” operation of the Soviet Union era, the roots of the CCF, as with the roots of Russiagate, are British. The British Information Research Department, a successor organization to its war-time Political Warfare Executive (PWE), founded in 1948, was the true controlling agency of the Congress. This “special relationship” did not end in 1967, with the “exposure and shutdown” of the CCF. The Christopher Steele dossier in the Russiagate case, as with the “Downing Street Memo” in the lead-up to the 2003 Iraq War, is the paw-print which—unlike the traces of Cyrillic that were left by the mythical “Guccifer 2.0 hack”—actually identifies the “mark of the British Beast.”

Donald Trump’s “so much for the special relationship” remarks addressed to visiting British Prime Minister Theresa May in March, less than two months after his inauguration, and his insistence that he “would not be lectured to” on climate change and other British imperialist schemes by the daffy Prince Charles, have produced the most pronounced rift with Britain since the Eisenhower and Kennedy eras. Trump has yet to visit London. His personal relationships with Xi Jinping, and with Vladimir Putin, are—as with the relationship established between Lyndon LaRouche and Ronald Reagan from their encounter in New Hampshire in 1980—of paramount importance. Therein is contained the promise of the future of humanity in our time. The President of the United States, when prepared and inclined to do so, can overcome the control and power of British intelligence over American foreign policy and domestic policy, and assert not merely national self-interest, but the General Welfare of humanity as a whole. The Preamble of the Constitution of the United States, in its General Welfare clause, gives him or her not only the right, but the sworn responsibility to do so.

To this point, Cohen was right to observe, What Trump did in Vietnam last week was therefore vitally important and courageous, though uniformly misrepresented by the American mainstream media. Despite unrelenting “Russiagate” attempts led by Democrats to impeach him for “collusion with the Kremlin” (still without any meaningful evidence), and perhaps even opposition by high-level members of his own administration, Trump met several times, informally and briefly, with Russian President Vladimir Putin. Presumably dissuaded or prevented...
by some of his own top advisors from having a formal, lengthy meeting, Trump was nonetheless prepared. He and Putin issued a joint statement urging cooperation in Syria, where the prospects of a U.S.-Russian war had been mounting. And both leaders later said they had serious talks about cooperating on the crises in North Korea and Ukraine.

What the President said in Vietnam about the relationship between that nation and the United States was of particular note as well. He defined a commonality of outlook between the United States and Vietnam as best expressed in the two countries’ fierce commitment to independence:

In America, like every nation that has won and defended its sovereignty, we understand that we have nothing so precious as our birthright, our treasured independence, and our freedom. . . . As an old man, just before his death, [Founding Father John Adams] was asked to offer his thoughts on the 50th anniversary of glorious American freedom. He replied with the words: “Independence Forever.”

It’s a sentiment that burns in the heart of every patriot and every nation. Our hosts here in Vietnam have known this sentiment not just for 200 years, but for nearly 2,000 years. [Applause] . . . Today, the patriots and heroes—[applause]—of our histories hold the answers to the great questions of our future and our time. They remind us of who we are and what we are called to do.

In acknowledging Vietnam’s 2,000-year struggle for sovereignty, in the same breath as his invocation of the American Revolution, Trump showed the people of that nation a willingness to reconcile the horrific mistakes of the past in favor of a new harmony of interests—including harmony between Vietnam and its 2,000-year adversary, China.

One of America’s Finest Moments

The actions taken by President Donald Trump since mid-October, his “on the plane” discussions with the press on Putin’s insistence that there was no Russia hack, and his insistently repeated idea that a relationship with Russia was “a good thing, not a bad thing,” may be one of the few things preserving this nation’s security and preventing the outbreak of global war, including thermonuclear war. Trump’s intuition was correct, that his own institutional intelligence capabilities, including the CIA and NSA, were hopelessly politically compromised and unreliable, and must be immediately corrected and upgraded. That view prompted the President’s personal intervention to employ competent patriotic “mavericks,” such as William Binney, who in turn has deployed other members of the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). These individuals, putting aside partisanship, are once again serving their country, not as adversaries to it, but as fierce opponents of those who would betray it, and its President, for the greater glory of the British empire.

The decision to do this—to both keep Trump’s Presidency alive, and to keep his breakthrough policy of alliance with China and Russia moving forward, even in the face of the terror campaign being carried out by Special Executioner Robert Mueller—will be seen in the future, despite all present indications to the contrary, as one of America’s finest moments.