
II. Stop the War: Remove Obama

In the Face of World War III

by Dave Christie

“We are not on the edge of World War III. We are in the middle of it. We are already there, and if we don’t stop it, civilization will no longer exist.”

May 13—Lyndon LaRouche issued the above statement during the May 6 LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, one day shy of the 71st year since the signing of the act of military surrender in Reims, France, marking the formal acceptance of Nazi Germany’s unconditional surrender of its armed forces, by the Allies of World War II. Over the weekend after LaRouche spoke, and into the following Monday, May 9, “Immortal Regiment” marches would move through cities around the United States with a mixture of part solemnity, and mostly joy, celebrating the end of World War II and the defeat of fascism.

Yet, these celebrations were notably lacking the citizens whose relatives played such a decisive role: Namely, the citizens of the United States. Russians, and Americans of Russian (and other former USSR) descent, took to the streets in cities across the United States, as well as cities in other nations of the world. In Moscow, and other cities and towns across Russia, these celebrations of the victory over Fascism drew tens of thousands of participants. But, where were the Americans?

Why do Russians, and those of Russian heritage, have such a visceral sense of honoring those who fought the “Great Patriotic War,” when most Americans can’t even remember that Russia and China were our greatest


allies in that war? Is it simply that the Soviet Union lost 27 million people in the war, while the United States only lost about half a million? Or, does it have something to do with the cultural difference between these nations?

Part of the answer lies in what Lyndon LaRouche has repeatedly identified as part of his personal experience after the war. While Lyndon LaRouche returned from World War II with a commitment to carry out Franklin D. Roosevelt’s mission to continue the fight against fascist slavery, and free the world of the British Monarchy’s “backward colonial policy,” most of LaRouche’s fellow veterans gave up the vision of FDR and capitulated to J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI and Allen Dulles’s CIA, which, together, ran a global assassination cartel to wipe out the leadership that shared Roosevelt’s commitment to end the British colonial system.

The other part of the answer lies in the fact that



U.S. News & World Report/Library of Congress/Marion S. Trikosko



Most of Lyndon LaRouche’s fellow military veterans capitulated to J. Edgar Hoover and Allen Dulles, and gave up FDR’s post-World War II vision.

Russians have a far more acute sense of LaRouche’s warning of the imminence of World War III. The Immortal Regiment is therefore not only a memorial for those who gave their lives in the past, but it is also a “living memorial” to honor that great mission to free the world from the grip of fascism. For many Russians now, there is a sense that fascism has returned. And whether it is in the form of Ukrainian Nazis or violent mercenaries under the cover of Islam, it has the same geopolitical intent, and the same sponsors: the British Monarchy.



kremlin.ru

President Vladimir Putin at the military parade in Red Square on May 9, 2016, marking the 71st anniversary of victory in the 1941-45 Great Patriotic War.

Putin Calls for a Non-Aligned System to Counter Terrorism

“Today our civilization has faced brutality and violence—terrorism has become a global threat,” President Putin said to crowds in Moscow prior to the parade dedicated to the 71st anniversary of victory in World War II. *“We must defeat this evil, and Russia is open to join forces with all countries and is ready to work on the creation of a modern, non-aligned system of international security.”*

According to the Russian leader, the lessons of the World War II showed that “double standards” and “short-sighted indulgence of those who are nurturing new criminal plans” are unacceptable.

“The lessons of history show that peace on our planet doesn’t establish itself, that you need to be on high alert,” he said.¹

At the 2015 United Nations General Assembly this past September, Putin had issued the call for a coalition, “similar to the anti-Hitler coalition,” to defeat the new fascist scourge of mercenary forces being deployed in the Southwest Asia:

What we actually propose is to be guided by common values and common interests rather than by ambitions. Relying on international law,

we must join efforts to address the problems that all of us are facing, and create a genuinely broad international coalition against terrorism. Similar to the anti-Hitler coalition, it could unite a broad range of parties willing to stand firm against those who, just like the Nazis, sow evil and hatred of humankind. And of course, Muslim nations should play a key role in such a coalition, since Islamic State not only poses a direct threat to them, but also tarnishes one of the greatest world religions with its atrocities. The ideologues of these extremists make a mockery of Islam and subvert its true humanist values.

Putin then asked, in an obvious reference to those who had signed the checks to these mercenaries:

*“I’m urged to ask those who created this situation: do you at least realize now what you’ve done? But I’m afraid that this question will remain unanswered, because they have never abandoned their policy, which is based on arrogance, exceptionalism and impunity.”*²

‘Islamic’ Mercenaries and the Great Game

The use of paid mercenaries to destroy nations and spread barbarism is not a new concept. In fact, the re-

1. <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/51890>

2. <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/50385>

vival of the British Empire’s *Great Game* of the Nineteenth Century was an instrumental feature of Winston Churchill’s Iron Curtain which launched the “Cold War” and pitted the allies of World War II against each other, under the classic imperial policy of “*divide et impera*.” Bernard Lewis, the British Foreign Office agent turned Princeton professor, trained a cadre of young naifs and fascists, many of whom became the inner core of the neo-conservatives working out of the U.S. Senate office of Lewis’s friend Scoop Jackson (D-Wash.). Lewis also indoctrinated Zbigniew Brzezinski in his “Arc of Crisis” Great Game program, which became the core of the foreign policy of the Carter Administration. Under Brzezinski, mercenaries called the Mujahedeen were deployed against the Soviet Union in a form of proxy war, led by Osama bin Laden.

In 1999, as the newly sworn-in Prime Minister under President Boris Yeltsin, Vladimir Putin faced his first challenge in the form of the Second Chechen War. Chechnya had become the home base for the mercenaries who had sharpened their teeth fighting the Soviets in Afghanistan under Osama bin Laden. This war against Russia was supported by the American Committee for Peace in Chechnya (ACPC), which included Brzezinski and a menagerie of neocons, including Robert Kagan, whose wife Victoria Nuland continues to play, from within the Obama administration, a key role in the irregular warfare against Russia after her instrumental role in orchestrating the coup in Ukraine. In 1997, Kagan would found the Project for a New American Century (PNAC), which included many of the neocons from the ACPC, to explicitly prevent the emergence of what would be-



Standard You Tube License

Bernard Lewis (left), former British Foreign Office operative turned professor, trained a cadre of agents in the neocon mold (Brzezinski, Kagan and Nuland) who played a prominent role in using mercenaries to carry out irregular warfare operations.



Zbigniew Brzezinski



CC/Mariusz Kubik

Victoria Nuland



Kleinschmidt/MSC

Robert Kagan

called the “multipolar” world by some foreign policy circles.

The Strategic Triangle & the BRICS

In October 2014, on the occasion of the 85th birthday of former Russian Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov emphasized the importance of Primakov’s role in creating the precursor to what is today known as the BRICS, which was the “Strategic Triangle” of Russia, India, and China, in the late 1990s. He said:



Russian artillery shelling mercenary fighters in Chechnya in January 2000.

Remember that Yevgeny Primakov first set forth the idea of strengthening cooperation in the Russia-India-China (RIC) troika format, which jump-started the evolution of geopolitical structures advocating multi-polarity and the formation of a polycentric world, where all positions and rights are distributed in line with a [country's] actual economic and financial weight, as well as political clout. RIC became a pioneer in this respect. Eventually, BRIC was formed when Russia, India and China were joined by Brazil, and now it is BRICS, with the participation of the Republic of South Africa. There is a growing number of countries lining up to join this organization as full-fledged members or as dialogue partners.³

Primakov's Strategic Triangle concept was an integral part of the fight being waged by Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche to create a new system to replace the collapsing trans-Atlantic

3. http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/B1EF6036BFC71092C3257D8000224D9D

British empire. In the early 1990s, while LaRouche was a political prisoner of the Bush Family and the "secret government" apparatus, his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche was creating and organizing the New Silk Road concept, which is now unifying the Russia-India-China core of the BRICS process. The neocons behind the Project for a New American Century intended to crush this emerging new paradigm by lighting fires along the relevant borders of Russia, China, and India, calling for regime change and war in a list of nations that included Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Syria.

In a 1999 video presentation called *Storm Over Asia*, Lyndon LaRouche issued the warning that these British Empire-directed forces would use mercenaries under the banner of Islam to light small fires of conflict, that would spread to regional war, and ultimately to world war using nuclear weapons. In the video presentation, LaRouche said:



U.S. Department of Defense/Robert D. Ward
Former Russian Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov played a key role in establishing the Strategic Triangle of Russia, China, and India, the precursor of today's BRICS.

This war, if continued, using mercenaries, can lead to nuclear general war. The major powers principally threatened today by this mercenary operation, are two of the world's largest nations: China and India; China on its western borders, India on its northern borders. Iran is also threatened; but, more notably, Russia. If these nations are pushed to the wall by a continuing escalation of a war which is modelled on the wars which the British ran against Russia, China, and so forth, during the Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century, this will lead to the point that Russia has to make the decision to accept the disinte-



EIR video grab

In a 1999 video, LaRouche warned that British Empire directed mercenaries, posing as Islamic, would ignite conflicts that would prevent collaboration of the Strategic Triangle nations, and ultimately lead to nuclear war.

gration of Russia as a nation, or to resort to the means it has, to exact terrible penalties on those who are attacking it, going closer and closer to the source, the forces behind the mercenaries—which include, of course, Turkey, which is a prime NATO asset being used as a cover for much of this mercenary operation in the North Caucasus and in Central Asia.⁴

LaRouche has stated that his policy approach was resonant with Putin’s approach at the time of the war in Chechnya. That resonance has continued in many forms to this day, but above all, LaRouche has repeatedly emphasized that the current strategic flanking operations now being carried out by Putin are the primary reason we have not already entered into World War III.

Putin’s Flanks

Within days of Putin’s speech at last year’s United Nations General Assembly, the Syrian Government formally approached Russia to ask for its help in combatting ISIS, al-Qaeda, and the other mercenaries that

4. <http://archive.larouchepac.com/node/21709>

were seeking to overthrow the government of Syria. On Sept. 30, 2015, the upper house of the Russian Federal Assembly granted the request by Putin to deploy the Russian Air Force in Syria. For the next five and a half months, the Russian Air Force would conduct over 5,200 sorties to back up the ground forces of the Syrian government, and turn the tide in favor of the nation of Syria in the fight against the British-Saudi sponsored terrorists. The operation, which was formally ended March 14, 2016, cost \$464 million, according to the Kremlin. This price tag is less than the \$500 million paid for the failed program of Obama to train the “moderate” rebels in Syria to supposedly fight against ISIS, and orders of magnitude less than the trillions of dollars (estimated somewhere between \$1 and 6 trillion) pumped into Obama’s fraudulent

“War on Terror.”

On May 5, 2016, Putin launched another brilliant flank in Palmyra, with a concert performed by the St. Petersburg-based Mariinsky Theater Orchestra, led by world renowned conductor Valery Gergiev. The price tag of flying an orchestra into the middle of a war zone is unknown to this author, but could or should the effect of this concert be measured in mere monetary terms? How would you measure the value of the moralizing effect of bringing the beauty of Bach’s Chaconne for Solo Violin into an ancient amphitheater, where just recently ISIS had carried out its barbaric beheadings?

Over the weekend following this historic cultural intervention in Palmyra, Immortal Regiment marches took place in forty-two countries, with over two million people participating around the world. As he had done in 2015, Putin again marched with a picture of his father, who had been severely wounded in World War II. LaRouche’s associates were invited to march, sing, and speak at various locations around the United States, as well as in other countries. Long-time LaRouche PAC activist Al Korby, a veteran of World War II, was interviewed by the Russian news service TASS. In that interview, Korby stated, “We don’t need any more wars,

and for that we must cooperate to develop space and new lands, and make scientific discoveries. . . . Americans should unite with Russians, both physically and spiritually, in ideas, and only then will there be no more wars.”

The Ability to Create

Whether it is the march of the Immortal Regiment, or bringing beauty to the war-torn desert in a “Prayer for Palmyra,” these actions represent a “living memorial,” not simply to honor those who have sacrificed in the past, but as a living commitment to their posterity by continuing to fight now, for the future. Moreover, as flanking actions, they represent a quality of real power, with the potential to shift what might become possible in the days ahead. Lyndon LaRouche discussed the nature of this kind of power with some of his associates on May 10, and said that winning the war is not about killing people, but rather it is about developing the humanity of the individuals in your nation. LaRouche stated:

And that’s what the recent experience of Putin comes in. He has worked on a continuous drive to win the global war. And it’s not to win the war in the sense of killing people; that was not the way he functioned in his recent activities. *Not at all!* It’s the *development of the individual* within the nation—that is the key to power. The ability to create something *better* than mankind has known and experienced beforehand.

Obama does not understand the nature of this power. He only understands the power of the British Empire that he is subservient to, which grants him the power to kill and murder. In a recent *New York Times* article about Ben Rhodes, “The Aspiring Novelist Who Became Obama’s Foreign Policy Guru,” Rhodes provided a crucial psychological insight into how power is understood within the Obama Administration. To understand Obama, Rhodes said, one must grasp the critical influence of his upbringing and how that shaped his approach to “power” and “killings”:

Indonesia was a place where your interaction at that time with power was very intimate, right? Tens or hundreds of thousands of people had just been killed. Power was not some abstract

thing. . . . When we sit in Washington and debate foreign policy, it’s like a “Risk” game, or it’s all about us, or the human beings disappear from the decisions. But he [Obama] lived in a place where he was surrounded by people who had either perpetrated those acts—and by the way, may not have felt great about that—or else knew someone who was a victim. I don’t think there’s ever been an American president who had an experience like that at a young age of what power is.

The parts of Obama’s foreign policy that disturb some of his friends on the left, like drone strikes. . . are a result of Obama’s particular kind of globalism, which understands the hard and at times absolute necessity of killing.

In this epic moment of human history, with a global financial collapse exacerbating the desperation of the British Empire, we don’t have the time to wait and see whether someone who understands the “absolute necessity of killing,” will follow orders or not. Obama must be removed, or thermonuclear war will follow.

EIR Special Report


Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two

The Real Story Behind Benghazi

EIR Special Report

NEW UPDATED EDITION

Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two



February 2013

Price **\$100** (Paperback or PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax)

Order from **EIR News Service** 1-800-278-3135

Or online: **store.larouchepub.com**