

II. Strategic

For America's 250th Birthday

Celebrate American Independence! End the U.S.-British Special Relationship!

This is a bulletin released by [The LaRouche Organization](#) Feb. 24.

Why is it in our national security interest, that President Donald Trump act now to curtail the “special relationship” that presently exists between British Imperial and Commonwealth intelligence services, and the United States military and military-intelligence agencies? This week’s visit by British Prime Minister Keir Starmer to Washington, D.C., undertaken in the vain hope of re-enlisting America as the financial and logistical “backstop” for further fruitless European posturing in an already-lost war in Ukraine, is the proper time to pose to the American people this question: What exact benefit does the United States gain from its so-called “special relationship” with Great Britain? Put more positively, should a swift, solemn end be brought to the British-U.S. “special relationship,” in preparation for the upcoming celebration of the 250th anniversary of the United States’ Declaration of Independence?

It is time—past time—to re-commit the United States to the original purpose of its 1776-1783 American Revolution. That purpose was, as it was clearly restated by President Franklin Roosevelt during World War Two to an apoplectic Winston Churchill, to remove the foot of Portuguese, Dutch, Belgian, French, and British colonialism from the throat of people all

over the world. Instead, the United States, founded on principles that were the opposite of those of the British Empire, has, especially in the “unipolar era” from 1990 until now, been acting against the interests of the

American people, and the American Revolution itself. It has been engaged in no-win wars and overthrowing governments—always in the name of democracy, but in reality, on behalf of an international financial elite, a trans-Atlantic “War Party,” a criminal syndicate operating under the code-name, “NATO.” Britain’s Keir Starmer visits Washington this week on behalf of that mission of war, and nothing else.

This is not to suggest that there are not sound, and even essential reasons for maintaining open and extensive connections to many intelligence services worldwide, including those of Great Britain. It is to state categorically, however, that the interests of the British Empire, are not those of the United States Republic. The differences are clearly illustrated by two passages from the Feb. 20 editorial pages of London’s *The*

Economist, “How Europe Must Respond as Trump and Putin Smash the Post-War Order.”

“Europe’s worst nightmare is bigger than Ukraine. Mr. Trump intends to rehabilitate Russia’s president, Vladimir Putin, ditching a long-standing policy to isolate him. Without any obvious geopolitical benefit to America, he is angling to restore diplomatic relations.



No 10 Downing Street/Kirsty O'Connor

British Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer.



State Department/Freddie Everett

States ever been the case, even at the height of the Cold War? Since the 1945 dropping of two atomic bombs, it has been self-evident that any breakdown in diplomacy between or among any nuclear weapons nations is suicidal. That will inevitably result in thermonuclear war by miscalculation or otherwise, at one point or another. Do the lunatics of Europe wish that war? Whatever is in their minds, what is clear is that they want the United States in the forefront of such a war, to continue to foot the bill, in money, materiel, and if necessary, in personnel.

Today's inferior leadership of Europe's shrunken-head nations, however, destroyed by the European Union's failed globalist schemes, including their "green" policies for industry and agriculture over the past three decades-plus, is so decadent that they are incapable of waging the very war they blood-thirstily call for. Britain's Starmer, France's President Emmanuel Macron, and the EU nations know they are, on the one hand, incapable of sustaining the present Ukraine no-win

He may soon be feted at a glitzy summit."

The Economist's writers and their City of London sponsors know exactly what the real reason for the Feb. 12 Trump-Putin phone call was and that it was not Ukraine. Russia and the United States are the two most lethally armed nations in human history, controlling fully 90% of the planet's nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. These two adversaries have just reversed—barely reversed—a downward spiral into civilization-ending total warfare—atomic, biological and chemical. The two-month period, from late November 2024, through Jan. 20, 2025, was as, or more dangerous than the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Many Americans fail to realize, or in some cases prefer not to know, how close the world came to World War Three during the late-November launching of long-range missiles by NATO, using its proxy, Ukraine, to attack the territory of pre-2014 Russia.

The subsequent U.S.-Russia meetings this month in Riyadh, consisting of delegations led by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and American Secretary of State Marco Rubio, were the first serious talks between the world's two thermonuclear giants in more than two years. When, before, had such a breakdown in diplomacy between Russia and the United

States ever been the case, even at the height of the Cold War? Since the 1945 dropping of two atomic bombs, it has been self-evident that any breakdown in diplomacy between or among any nuclear weapons nations is suicidal. That will inevitably result in thermonuclear war by miscalculation or otherwise, at one point or another. Do the lunatics of Europe wish that war? Whatever is in their minds, what is clear is that they want the United States in the forefront of such a war, to continue to foot the bill, in money, materiel, and if necessary, in personnel.



State Dept. photo, JFK Library, Boston

President Kennedy meets with Soviet Chairman Nikita Khrushchev at the U.S. Embassy residence in Vienna, June 1961.

war against Russia without the United States. They are also so snidely condescending that they deeply resent even having to ask “the American deplorables” for assistance.

It is not only in the interest of the United States, but in the interest of humanity as a whole, that the Trump-Putin Feb. 12 initiative succeed, as it is beginning to do. There was no reason for Zelensky, for any other European leader or country, or any other nation whatsoever “to be at the table” in Riyadh. In October of 1962, though the world was involved, it was Kennedy and Khrushchev’s relationship that counted. Might the same financial and oligarchical forces that opposed what President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev did to stop World War III, be opposing the Trump-Putin normalization of relations today? Why would the prestigious magazine, *The Economist*, and City of London policy-formulators that use it to brief the bureaucracy of the Anglo-American intelligence establishment as to what to do next, be so apoplectic as to declare that Feb. 12 represents, as one columnist put it, “the end of days”?

The first sentences of *The Economist* article reveal a deep, and probably irreconcilable difference with the present Trump Administration on war, and stopping it: “The past week has been the bleakest in Europe since the fall of the Iron Curtain. Ukraine is being sold out, Russia is being rehabilitated, and, under Donald Trump, America can no longer be counted on to come to Europe’s aid in wartime.” Europe, the article seems to state, intends, despite having neither the manufacturing capability, energy resources, weapons production nor military personnel, to “support Ukraine fighting and winning for democracy.” That means the United States has to be their guarantee—but the United States is going in the opposite direction. The British policy establishment, instead, wants war. Why is war—which is no answer—their only answer?

The Great Game

The continuation of NATO after 1991 was necessary to continue the British policy known as the “Great Game.” Most people—unlike Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Kissinger, or Tony Blinken—still find the concept of real war as a “game” to be alien, and even disgusting, even despite decades of video war games being used to desensitize younger generations to killing and warfare. But this is not the case with the “War Party.” They seem to derive an erotic satisfaction, as well as financial and geopolitical benefit, from killing. In Oct. 2008, at a meeting in Bishkek, the American ambassador to Kyrgyzstan, Tatiana Gfoeller, found herself in a testy confrontation with Britain’s infamous Prince Andrew, when she protested against the idea that “Great Game” politics should be the template for policy in Central Asia. In a cable to Washington, Gfoeller wrote: “Prince Andrew then turned to regional politics. He stated baldly that ‘the United Kingdom, Western Europe (and by extension you Americans, too)’ were now back in the thick of playing the Great Game. More animated than



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Henry Kissinger

ever, he stated cockily: ‘And this time we aim to win!’”

British figures like Sir Alfred Milner, Halford Mackinder, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and earlier ones like Lord Palmerston and Benjamin Disraeli were 19th- and early 20th-Century “master players” of the Great Game. They wanted to conquer what they referred to as the “Eurasian Heartland,” for world power. Russia must be disintegrated for that to become a reality. But the “Great Game” is not just an idea from the past. The U.S. government’s Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), also known as the Helsinki Commission, held a live-streamed seminar June 23, 2022, called “Decolonizing Russia: A Moral and Strategic Imperative,” which advocated the piece-by-piece dismemberment of Russia, breaking it into ten (or more) regions.

Former American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in a speech delivered to London's Chatham House on May 10, 1982, admitted, "In my period in office, the British played a seminal part in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union—indeed, they helped draft the key document. In my White House incarnation then, I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department—a practice which, with all affection for things British, I would not recommend be made permanent. But it was symptomatic...." Kissinger was a willing actor in the British Great Game.

The idea—the truth—that the United States' involvement in wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Yemen, North-West Pakistan, and even into Africa (Somalia, Uganda, Niger), has all been in service, not of the American people, but of the Great Game, engineered by the neocon forces in the Republican and Democratic Parties, using the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on America as a pretext, is very bitter. But that realization must catalyze a full cleanout and reorganization of our intelligence capabilities, starting with ending the "special relationship" with the British intelligence agencies. They have practiced a corrupt policy, and corrupted Americans into assisting them to do that which is

against everything for which the American Revolution was fought.

In December of 2018, during the first Trump Administration, Great Britain's House of Lords issued a report, "UK Foreign Policy in a Shifting World Order." In paragraphs 37 and 39, that report states:

The U.S. Administration has taken a number of high-profile unilateral foreign policy decisions that are contrary to the interests of the United Kingdom....

However, the difficulty the UK and its allies have faced in trying to influence the U.S. demonstrates the challenge of working with the Administration. How damaging this will be to what has hitherto been the UK's most important international relationship will depend on whether the current approach is an enduring trend. Should President Trump win a second term, or a similar Administration succeed him, the damage to UK-U.S. relations will be longer lasting; and the Government will need to place less reliance on reaching a common U.S./UK approach to the main issues of the day than has often been the case in the past.

So, how can the United States, moving to create

Holes in a British 'Nuclear Umbrella'

British elites are so war-mad, that some among them have even proposed a British or Anglo-French "nuclear umbrella" over Europe, to replace the American nuclear backstop that they now expect to lose. The London *Economist*, the leading mouthpiece of the City of London, demanded in a recent issue that the UK and France "use their nuclear weapons to shield the continent" in the event that the U.S. under Trump makes a deal with Russia, and "abandons" Europe. Also, The London *Telegraph* reported Feb. 22 on how the UK should develop its own arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons to save Europe from Russia's war machine—the way that NATO nuclear weapons were positioned against massed Soviet tank formations during the Cold War!

One problem: Britain wouldn't even have a nu-

clear arsenal without the U.S. Yes, the British do have some capabilities in their fleet of four Vanguard-class nuclear ballistic missile submarines, and in their nuclear weapons laboratory at Aldermaston, but even those depend on agreements signed with the U.S. The 1958 Mutual Defense Agreement provides for the sharing of nuclear warhead design information and technologies, while the 1962 Polaris Sales Agreement allows the UK to "rent" submarine-launched ballistic missiles from the U.S. for use in British submarines. According to publicly-available information, this information sharing highly favors the UK, perhaps as much as 80% to 20%. So, were the British to undertake the development of tactical nuclear warheads, technical data from the U.S. would likely be crucial.

peace around the world, afford to trust, or even to continue the “special relationship”? And what is it that the House of Lords actually fears, not only from the “out of control” Trump Administration, but the American people?

The Real American System

The American Revolution’s system of economy, designed by Revolutionary War officer Alexander Hamilton, was an anti-colonial system, designed to replace slavery and subsistence agriculture with mining, manufacturing, and machine-powered agriculture. Hamilton’s was not the outlook of Britain’s Adam Smith, nor of the Royal Africa Company’s John Locke. Hamilton was a protégé of Benjamin Franklin’s American Revolutionary faction. Since those days of Hamilton’s American economic revolution, which consolidated our victory on the battlefield against the British Empire, it has been the failure to study his four Treasury reports, on Manufacturing, Public Credit, a National Bank, and the Constitutionality of the National Bank, and the work of those American System economists who followed, that has caused us great confusion.

Most Americans today, for example, do not believe what Hamilton and his best friend, Gouverneur Morris, the man who drafted the United States Constitution and authored its Preamble clause, knew—that an economy can be both just, as well as profitable, from the standpoint of real physical output. Lyndon LaRouche’s [Four Laws](#), involving re-regulating the banking system by returning to Glass-Steagall regulations; re-establishing the credit functions of a National Bank of the United States; issuing emergency federal public credit only for productive physical-economic activity (such as high-speed rail, water projects, etc.); and creating a science driver to transform the energy-throughput capabilities of industry, by increasing what is called their “energy-flux density,” are an efficient re-statement of Hamilton’s intent. (The LaRouche Four Laws are perfect for catalyzing a discussion about how American principles of economic development, not British methods of imperial subjugation, could define a new American foreign policy that starts with economic development to end war, whether in Ukraine, Gaza, Sudan, Libya, or elsewhere.)

Keir Starmer’s campaign to perpetuate war, should not only be rejected, along with the British-

‘Mr. President, What I Meant To Say Was ...’

The present British Prime Minister, Foreign Secretary, and Ambassador to the United States have each made these statements about the President of the United States in the recent past. So, what should our “special relationship” to them be?

Peter Mandelson, Britain’s Ambassador to the United States: “An American president who is little short of a white nationalist and racist.” (2019)

David Lammy, British Foreign Secretary: “Trump is not only a woman-hating, neo-Nazi-sympathizing sociopath. He is also a profound threat to the international order that has been the foundation of Western progress for so long.” (2018)

Keir Starmer, British Prime Minister: “Donald Trump’s approach is to stoke division, to pitch one group against another, and that’s not leadership—it’s the opposite of what any country needs.” (2020)

American “special relationship,” but in its place, let us deliberate directly with the citizens of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, to end the drive to war. In her “Urgent Appeal by Citizens and Institutions from all over the world, including the U.S., to the (next) President of the United States!” issued in 2023, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute, said, “Since Russia and the U.S. presently have 90% of all nuclear weapons directed against each other, which could destroy the world many times over, it is a question of urgent concern for every human being on Earth, that we must find a way out. The solution must be on a plane which overcomes geopolitics and takes the standpoint of the interest of the one humanity. We therefore express our hope, that the President of the U.S. finds the greatness in herself or himself to adopt the viewpoint which was expressed by President John F. Kennedy in his historic American University speech.”

So, in honor of the first successful anti-colonial revolution in history, we, the people of the United States, declare: KEIR STARMER, GO HOME!!