

Until Obama Is Removed, We Are on the Edge of War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Jan. 3—Lyndon LaRouche has again warned that the world is hovering on the brink of thermonuclear extinction, and that the sole source of that danger is the British Empire, with its control over the U.S. arsenal of nuclear weapons via their White House pawn, President Barack Obama.

The source of the war danger does not stem from Iran's quest for a nuclear bomb, or Syria's alleged crackdown on peaceful dissenters, or even Israel's obsession to remain the sole nuclear weapons state in the Middle East.

The British oligarchy is committed to preventing the Eurasian region, led by China, Russia, India, and other nations of the Asia-Pacific, from emerging from the collapse of the entire trans-Atlantic financial and economic system, as the new center of gravity of world political and economic power. To prevent this from happening, London is committed to starting a thermonuclear conflict pitting the United States against Russia and China. From the standpoint of the British oligarchy, a world of vastly reduced population—under 1 billion inhabitants—is preferable to a prospering world, in which the power of the private financier oligarchy is wiped out.

While the overwhelming majority of American citizens and even leading politicians are absolutely clueless about this reality, the same is not true of leading circles in Russia and China, who have made their voices heard, loudly, in recent weeks, in a war-avoidance effort

that has been joined by some leading American military and diplomatic circles.

But as LaRouche has repeatedly emphasized, dating back to his April 11, 2009 international webcast, the only true war-avoidance option that is sure to avert thermonuclear Armageddon is the immediate removal of President Obama from office—using the provisions of the U.S. Constitution to secure a stable transfer of power, and the launching of an unprecedented global economic recovery.

With Obama in office, unfettered by the threat of impeachment or removal under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, London maintains a precarious finger on the U.S. nuclear trigger. Furthermore, as LaRouche emphasized in a New Year's Day emergency message, if nuclear Armageddon is avoided, the world still faces a plunge into a New Dark Age of famine, disease, and perpetual war—unless the United States leads a fundamental revolution in policy, returning to the American System tradition of a credit system under national banking, and a science-driver program for global economic recovery.

Strategic Warnings

Both Russian and Chinese leaders are keenly aware of the danger of a thermonuclear war, triggered by an Israeli attack on Iran, or other provocations aimed at pitting the United States against the Eurasian superpowers. While Russian-Chinese relations have their



White House/Pete Souza

London's control of President Obama puts the British Imperial finger on the U.S. thermonuclear button. Here, Obama plays at being Commander-in-Chief with U.S. troops at Bagram Air Field in Afghanistan, March 2010.

own long history of friction, the two nations have reached a consensus that the war danger must be defeated, and have signaled, in a series of public statements and actions, that they are aware of the threats, and will work towards a common war-avoidance effort.

On Dec. 26, in one indicative action, Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin held a televised meeting with Dmitri Rogozin, until recently the Russian Ambassador to NATO. Rogozin was recently named deputy prime minister in charge of the defense sector, the nuclear power sector, and the space program. In the meeting, Rogozin pledged to lead a rapid “rebirth of the defense industry,” with “one of the most important aspects being, in effect, a new industrialization of the defense industry, which should function as a locomotive to pull the entire Russian economy.”

A month before his promotion to deputy prime minister, Rogozin had visited the restricted city of Krasnoznamensk to deliver an address before the Aerospace Forces, in which he clearly spelled out the war danger emanating from NATO’s pursuit of a missile defense shield in Europe, minus the earlier cooperation with Moscow on a joint defense shield.

Rogozin warned that “NATO continues to live by the principles set down by NATO Secretary-General Lord Ismay [1952-57]: ‘To keep the Russians out, the

Americans in, and the Germans down’.... They understand that the Germans may always develop into a force that will consolidate Europe around itself.”

Zeroing in on the recent agreement reached between the U.S. and Romania, where an important component of the anti-missile system will be installed on Russia’s southeastern tier, Rogozin told the Aerospace Forces assembled, “We have scrutinized the agreement the Americans have signed with the Romanians. The Romanians may think they are important interception missile operators, but even the base commander, a Romanian serviceman, has the right to enter only the lobby.” Rogozin warned that the Europeans have become “hostages and targets of a retaliatory attack.”

On Dec. 27, the Chinese also issued a clear warning that they understood the new threats coming from a London-controlled Obama Administration in Washington. In a lengthy article in *People’s Daily*, Lin Zhiyuan, an expert on U.S. policy, from the Department of World Military Research of the Academy of Military Sciences, warned that the Obama Administration has adopted a new “return to Asia” strategy, based on the British geopolitical doctrines of Halford Mackinder.

“Some thinkers of the U.S. Navy are quite interested in the English geographer Halford Mackinder’s ‘Heartland theory,’ and believe that controlling the South China Sea will make the U.S. Air Force and Navy command East Asia, and consequently command the ‘World Island.’ Currently, the situation in Europe is under the American control, and the situation in the Middle East is beneficial to the United States. The world’s geographic center is transferring from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Asia-Pacific region has become the world’s political and economic center. The United States is eager to find a new way to consolidate its dominant position in this region.”

Lin concluded that, with President Obama facing a challenging reelection campaign, under conditions of serious economic crisis at home, “the Obama administration needs to be more aggressive in military and diplomacy in order to create favorable conditions to win

the presidency election. Therefore, the American global strategy shows a layout of stabilizing Europe, 'shrinking' appropriately in the Middle East, and 'expanding' in the Asia-Pacific region." As the Chinese are well aware, it was Mackinder's geopolitical doctrine of war between the Heartland and the Rimland that was the basis for Britain launching two world wars in the 20th Century.

Pre-War Deployments

Already on Dec. 15, the Russian government, in a clear recognition of the war danger coming from the Anglo-Americans, published a detailed report on the bolstering of Russian defenses along the southern tier. The article, by Sergei Konovalov, based on Defense Ministry briefings, was published both in the Russian-language daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* and in the English-language *Russia Today*. Konovalov began by bluntly stating that, "The geopolitical situation unfolding around Syria and Iran is prompting Russia to make its military structures in the South Caucasus and the Caspian, Mediterranean and Black Sea regions more efficient. *Nezavisimaya Gazeta's* Defense Ministry sources are saying that the Kremlin has been informed about an upcoming U.S.-supported Israeli strike against Iran's nuclear facilities. The strike will be sudden and take place on 'day X' in the near future. One could assume Iran's reaction will not be delayed. A full-scale war is possible, and its consequences could be unpredictable."

The article, not coincidentally, appeared the day that the Russia-European Union summit was underway in Brussels, and just one week after the NATO-Russia summit in the same city. Konovalov recounted a Russian warning delivered to the Europeans the day before the EU summit: "A day before the event, Russia's envoy to the EU, Vladimir Chizhov, relayed a message from the Kremlin, saying that an Israeli, or U.S. strike on Iran will lead to a 'catastrophic development of events.' The diplomat stressed that the negative consequences will not only be felt by the region, 'but also in a much broader context.'"

The article went on to detail all of the war-alert deployments of the Russian southern command, which



Moscow and Beijing are in agreement that the war danger must be defeated, and are working towards a war-avoidance strategy. Prime Minister Putin (left) has placed Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin (right) in charge of defense, nuclear power, and Russia's space program.

has been on a heightened alert status since Dec. 1, particularly Russian forces in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, who are aware of potential provocations from Georgia, in the event of an attack on Iran by Israel, the U.S., and NATO. The alert status includes coastal guided-missile battalions in Dagestan, and in the Caspian Flotilla.

The report also noted the deployment of the Russian aircraft carrier *Admiral Kuznetsov* into the eastern Mediterranean off the coast of Syria, noting that Ministry of Defense officials would neither confirm nor deny that the carrier was accompanied by Russian nuclear submarines from the Northern Fleet.

The Konovalov article concluded with a report on an assessment by Russian Col. Vladimir Popov (ret.), an expert on the Caspian Sea region, who told the paper that he "does not exclude the possibility of Russia's military involvement in the Iranian conflict. 'In the worst-case scenario, if Tehran is facing complete military defeat after a land invasion of the U.S. and NATO troops, Russia will provide it military support, at least on a military-technical level,' predicts Vladimir Popov."

At the United Nations

Russia's UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin brought the issue of the war danger before the UN Security Council during one of his final comments as Council president (he was replaced on Jan. 1, by the South Af-

rican ambassador). In a year-end interview with reporters, Churkin warned that Russia would not support any further sanctions against Iran, and also reported that his government was engaged in talks with both the Syrian government and opposition leaders to bring a peaceful end to the crisis there, which was being fueled by “violent extremists” who refused to negotiate. Churkin warned that the “greatest danger” in 2012 was a war between Iran and Western nations, and that his government would take measures to prevent such a war.

The most in-depth Western media coverage of Churkin’s warnings appeared in the Dec. 31 *Daily Telegraph*. He asserted that “Moscow believes that there are no further sanctions at the UN Security Council against Iran regarding its nuclear program. The sanctions track at the Security Council has been exhausted.”

In an interview on Dec. 30 with *Russia Today*, Churkin had reiterated that the standoff between Iran and the West represents “a very dangerous scenario” for war, “but we do believe that a peaceful solution is possible. . . . Our consistent stand, our effort, is going to be targeted at doing whatever we can in order to prevent this scenario of regional catastrophe being carried out in 2012.” And while Russia is also concerned about Iran possibly developing nuclear weapons, Moscow does not “accept the proposition that the best way to prevent a war is to start a war.”

Churkin closed by restating the Russian government position that the Syrian situation can and must be resolved without resorting to outside force, as had been the case with Libya. He demanded the same degree of patience from the international community for Syria that has been shown in the case of Yemen. “I think there was more bloodshed over the past few months [in Yemen] than in Syria. We do not accept the premise that somehow the Assad regime cannot change, that there cannot be progress [through dialogue] under this regime.”

Indeed, Russia’s intervention has apparently temporarily pushed back the London-led war drive for regime change in Damascus. In the final days of 2011, leaders of the major Syrian opposition parties met in Cairo, and signed a formal decree, vowing to seek reform without outside military intervention, the use of violence, or the promotion of sectarian conflict. One of the signers of that document, National Coordinating Committee for Democratic Change (NCC) head Haitham Manna, publicly praised the Russian role in mediating a solution to

the Syrian crisis, noting that it was more worthwhile to look to Russia, China, and Iran for assistance than to rely on traditional Western allies like France and Great Britain and the United States.

American Voices

The war-avoidance campaign has not been restricted to Russia and China. In addition to LaRouche’s warnings, a number of leading American military and diplomatic voices have been sounded against the Iran trigger.

On Dec. 29, Paul Pillar, until recently the Middle East director of the National Intelligence Council at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, published a sharp attack on U.S. failed diplomacy towards Iran. In *The National Interest* journal, Pillar warned, “The United States has made it almost impossible for Iran to say ‘yes’ to whatever it is the United States is supposedly demanding of Iran.” Pillar noted that “Any feasible change in Iranian policies that could be the basis of a new understanding with the United States and the West would include a continuing Iranian nuclear program, very likely including the enrichment of uranium by Iran. Feasible arrangements that would provide the minimum assurances to both sides could be negotiated, but they are unexplored. They remain unexplored because the United States has abandoned negotiations and has made its policy toward Iran solely one of pressure and sanctions.”

Pillar went one step further, charging that many in the U.S. government do not want those sanctions to work. “They instead see them as a necessary preliminary to war that they really want. This is a tragedy in the making. It is being made largely because too many people in this country have lost sight both of U.S. interests and of the fundamental bargaining principle that if we want to solve a problem that involves someone else with whom we have differences, we should make it easier, not harder, for the other side to say yes.”

The next day, a similar chord was struck by former Amb. Thomas Pickering and William Luers, writing in the *Washington Post*. The authors warned that “Military action is becoming the seemingly fail-safe solution for the United States to deal with real and imagined security problems. The uncertain and intellectually demanding ways of diplomacy are seen as ‘unmanly’ and tedious, likely to involve compromise or even ‘appeasement.’”

U.S. policy, they lament, has become one of “an

unprecedented series of sanctions and ostracization. History teaches that engagement and diplomacy pay dividends that military threats do not. Deployment of military force can bring the immediate illusion of ‘success’ but always results in unforeseen consequences and collateral damage that complicate further the achievement of America’s main objectives. Deploying diplomats with a strategy while maintaining some pressure on Iran will lower Tehran’s urgency to build a bomb and reduce the danger of conflict.” Instead, the U.S. must set out on a “relentless search” for different ways to deal with Iran, without which “Washington will be stuck with a policy that will not change Iran’s practices or its regime and could lead to a catastrophic war.”

These U.S. institutional voices opposing a catastrophic war must themselves face the reality that it is only with the removal of President Obama from office, by legitimate Constitutional means already available, that war avoidance can be assured. Only by removing British control over the American nuclear arsenal can war be averted at this late moment.

That is the harsh reality that the world is facing, as the New Year begins.