



Will The British Decapitate The Presidency Before Independence Day?

A 'Decapitation Strike' Against Iran? It's A British Trap To 'Decapitate' the Trump Administration; So Is 'Signalgate'

April 1, 2025—As you are reading this, British Intelligence “influencers” embedded in the Trump Administration are attempting to force the resignation of one or more of the senior officials in his Presidency. Many people in Trump’s core “MAGA” electoral base, and even more among those that primarily voted for Trump against the “collective Biden–Harris zombie” White House because they wished to avoid World War Three, are asking, as in the words of filmmaker Oliver Stone on X, “What the hell is going on? Trump has turned into Biden? Mercilessly, relentlessly bombing Yemen and aggressively seeking a new war with Iran...”

Indeed, there has been a growing, orchestrated drumbeat around Washington urging the Trump administration to use the recent U.S. airstrikes against the Houthis in Yemen as a prelude and practice run for delivering a knock-out punch to Iran next. National Security Adviser Mike Waltz threatened, on March 23, that Iran had to change its foreign policy and “walk away completely” from its nuclear program, or “there will be consequences.” Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has reportedly been bending the Trump administration’s ear that Iran can be “decapitated” without a full-scale war, the way the IDF did with Hezbollah and the way the Assad government in Syria was toppled.

But the Trump Administration itself is as likely to be “decapitated” by an Iran confrontation as is Iran. This is not because of the war alone, but because of what such a war will also do to negotiations with Russia, the world’s most advanced military power, and impending negotiations with China. An Iran war will do exactly what British intelligence did with the first Trump Administration: permanently change its direction and route the Administration onto a highway to Hell.

Take the Three Stooges-like “SignalGate” caper. How did it actually happen? While many have commented on the sheer convoluted silliness of it all, and the circumstances by which the nefarious scribbler Jeffrey Goldberg was given “accidental access” to a clearly secret

impending military operation, it’s clear that “SignalGate” would not have happened if Yemen was not being bombed. Who induced that to happen? Netanyahu? Pentagon hotheads? Yes, but no.

Recall the report issued on Dec. 18, 2018 by the British House of Lords Select Committee on International Relations, titled “U.K. Foreign Policy in a Shifting World Order.” The “Lords” there pronounced that President Donald Trump was their number-one problem in the world, and openly stated that his removal was critical to their interests. Above all, they said, a second Trump Presidency had to be avoided at all costs, in order to preserve the U.S.–U.K. “Special Relationship” through which they intended to keep running the world:

“The U.S. [Trump] Administration has taken a number of high-profile unilateral foreign policy decisions that are contrary to the interests of the United Kingdom,” states the report. “How damaging this will be to what has hitherto been the U.K.’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 U.K./U.S. relations will be longer lasting.”

What does the “SignalGate” scandal that exploded on the political scene, seemingly out of nowhere, have to do with this? That’s exactly the question that should be asked, investigated, and answered. Already, some elementary facts are known.

1. The primary political target of the scandal is clearly President Trump’s chosen intelligence team: DNI Tulsi Gabbard, CIA Director John Ratcliffe, and FBI head Kash Patel, among others.

2. The British-led “Liars’ Bureau” did everything they could to prevent the Senate confirmation of Gabbard and Patel—and failed.

3. If you are planning to set a strategic trap for President Trump, to get him to self-destruct his own policy—such as by foolishly launching a “decapitation strike” against Iran—the first thing you need to do is blind him,

so that he doesn't receive accurate strategic intelligence.

While Trump's team was spending much the week of March 23–30 in distraction, twisting in the "SignalGate" wind, "Ukraine" (read: NATO) was violating the tenuous ceasefire against energy facilities that had been agreed upon with Russia in mid-March. Russian Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Maria Zhakarova reported on March 29 that France and Great Britain were the authors of a HIMARS missile attack on a pipeline in Sudzha, Russia. "There is reason to believe that the targeting and guidance for these strikes were conducted via French satellite systems, while the input of coordinates and launch procedures were managed by British specialists. The command was issued from London," she said.

Whether one agrees with that assessment or not, there is no question that Starmer of Britain and Macron of France oppose Trump's approach to resolving the "Ukraine" NATO/Russia war. And it is now being gradually admitted, through articles like the March 29 New York Times story "The Partnership: The Secret History of the War in Ukraine," that American, French, British and several other national "advisers," "contractors," "soldiers of fortune," and correlate intelligence interests, have been "boots on the ground" in Ukraine, even before the February 2022 "Special Military Operation" began. Further, in her March 8 memorandum, "Instead of Rearming for The Great War, We Need to Create A Global Security Architecture," Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointed out, "rather than congratulating Trump and supporting him, the European Union—which was, after all, the winner of the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize—as well as UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer, French President Emmanuel Macron and Merz are attempting to continue the war in Ukraine 'to the last Ukrainian,' even though experts estimate that it has already taken the lives of over one million Ukrainians and around 300,000 Russians."

The City Of London, and its attached intelligence apparatus, have been on the Trump case since the fall of 2015. It was the head of Britain's Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), Robert Hannigan, who in June 2016, briefed then-CIA head John Brennan on "concerning" findings based on surveillance that had been conducted on Trump's associates from the fall of 2015. That was the same exact time, June 2016, that "former" British Military Intelligence (MI6) agent Christopher Steele issued the first of 16 memos that would constitute the feeder manure for the RussiaGate hoax. As RussiaGate heated up, Steele was defended by former MI6 head Sir Richard Dearlove, who, as far back as 2014, had been going after Michael Flynn as a "Russian agent"—the same Michael Flynn who would, in 2017, be forced out as

"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)

Donald Trump's National Security Advisor, after assuming that office in the first Trump Administration. Are the British now trying the same thing with Gabbard, Witkoff, Patel and Ratcliffe?

In much the same way that Gen. Michael Flynn was knocked out as National Security Adviser to the first Trump administration after being in office only 22 days—an operation which gave us John Bolton, Mike Pompeo, and others—so today are the same networks, led by the British, trying the same play for a second time.

The British Establishment has made it clear what they think the outcome of "SignalGate" should be. A March 26 article in London's The Economist magazine quotes two unnamed U.S. defense officials: "They put people at risk. Had any of us done the same, our careers would be over at best and we would face jail time at worst." Americans should not fall for this British trap, and they should make sure that their President does not either. The viable alternative policy, so viscerally despised by the British, is to press forward with the organization of a new international security and development architecture, involving the U.S., Russia, China, and the nations of the Global South in general.

The opening summary of the 2018 House of Lords report states: "We conclude, for instance, that the UK's

'bedrock' relationship with its key ally of past decades, the US, is under disturbing pressure. The US Administration has taken a number of unilateral foreign policy decisions on high-profile issues, such as the Iran nuclear deal and trade policy, which undermine the UK's interests. The UK has struggled to influence the Administration, which is, in part, a reflection of a broader shift in the US towards a more inward-looking 'America First' stance, with less focus on the transatlantic alliance or multilateralism. In future the Government will need to place less reliance on reaching a common US/UK approach to the main issues of the day than has often been the case in the past."

To be clear: the British government considers it outrageous that America's Trump Administration seeks to take "unilateral" foreign policy actions, as though it were

independent of British influence or policy-control. Is that the real reason for King Charles's renewal of the late Queen Elizabeth's invitation to President Trump to visit the United Kingdom, this time coupled with the invitation for the United States, even as it celebrates its 250th birthday, to join the British Commonwealth? That's the way of perfidious Albion. Without a radical policy shift, the Trump Administration may learn the hard way that if you bow to His/Her Majesty, whether in Gaza, Yemen, Iran or Ukraine, the next time you try to lift your head, it will fall into the royal lap.

The United States should not lose its head and go to war with Iran, or anyone else. Don't let the British decapitate the Presidency!!

MI6 Fraudster Sir Richard Dearlove

Iraq 2003, Trump 2016, and now Iran 2025?

Sir Richard Dearlove should be better known to Americans. He was the head of British Intelligence MI6 when it supplied to 10 Downing Street and Tony Blair the phony assessment that goosed the hapless George Bush into uttering, in his "Axis of Evil" 2003 special address to the United States Congress, the "sixteen words" that launched the criminal enterprise known as the Second Iraq War: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." Iraq, it was later admitted, had no weapons of mass destruction—but only after the "Coalition of the Willing" had destroyed and occupied that nation, killing as many as a million Iraqis in the process.

Dearlove, moreover, deems Donald Trump's second term a potential national security threat to Great Britain, whatever he may choose to say about that at the moment. On January, 14, 2024, the "former" head of MI6 was asked, in an interview with Trevor Phillips of SkyNews, "What are the two big threats that we ought to be paying attention to in 2024?" After describing his views on Ukraine and China, Dearlove volunteered a "third threat": "But ... you have to add a political threat, which I'm worried about, which is Trump's reelection, which I think for the UK's national security is problematic. Because if Trump, as it were, acts hastily, and damages the Atlantic alliance, that is a big deal for the UK. We've put all our eggs, in defense terms, in the NATO basket. If Trump really is serious, about, as it were, changing the balance... The American nuclear umbrella for Europe, is in my view essential to Europe's security and defense."



Dearlove should therefore be evaluated as "armed and dangerous" to the Trump Administration. He has been the most insistent voice on a joint U.S-Israel mission to start war with Iran. ("Iran Is a 'Threat' to British Jews, Cautions Former MI6 Chief" blared an article The Jewish Chronicle on May 21.)

Given the way that British intelligence roped an earlier Administration into a war in Iraq, now costing between \$2 trillion and \$8 trillion, not to mention the millions of lives lost and destroyed, why would Washington trust Dearlove's view of the "merits" of going to war with Iran now? Remember, this is the same Richard Dearlove who said of Christopher Steele's now wholly discredited RussiaGate dossier in 2017, "I think that there is probably some credibility to the content" and "I don't think there's any question that (Russia) got involved in the U.S. election." Is that the voice the United States should listen to on Iran, as we did in Iraq, 2003? Is that the voice to heed, as leader-to-leader negotiations to back away from war, and form a new security architecture, proceed with Russia?