

Military Mobilizes Against Obama's War Threat

by EIR staff

Nov. 21—With the Congress of the United States having demonstrated its inability to defend the nation, a number of spokesmen for the nation's military tradition, and the related institutions of the Presidency, are stepping forward and speaking out against the danger that President Obama and his British controllers will drag the United States into a new war. Such a war would likely begin as a regional conflict, possibly targeting Syria or Iran, but would not end there, as it rapidly escalated into World War III.

In addition to the exclusive interview in last week's *EIR* with former CENTCOM commander, Gen. Joseph P. Hoar (USMC-ret.), other military figures are making their voices heard, as well as others who have a long-time relationship to the defense establishment. They are taking responsibility for the nation's welfare, and clearly also acting behind the scenes.

Taken as a whole, these statements and others, represent an institutional intervention against Obama and the British war drive from the broader circle of institutions surrounding the U.S. Presidency, institutions which transcend partisan divisions, and which are capable of acting in the national interest—in this case pushing back against Obama and London's drive for an insane war.

Obama Defies His Generals

Besides these public warnings, a senior Pentagon source has informed *EIR* of a recent discussion between

two of the most senior generals and Obama, over the threat of a general war, triggered by an Israeli attack on Iran. According to the source, the generals conveyed personally to the President that it is the consensus of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, CENTCOM, and all of the other top military brass, that the Israelis must be told, in absolutely clear terms, that any military attack on Iran is thoroughly unacceptable and would likely lead to world war.

Obama was asked by the generals to convey this message to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, and the President reportedly refused. Obama responded that the U.S. has no control over Israeli policy and, if Israel is going to attack Iran, "it would be better for us not to know in advance."

This NerObama insanity puts the world that much closer to Armageddon. The generals reportedly told the President that if Israel attacks, there will be no more than a 72-hour window to force a ceasefire, or face general war.

A second source, who recently attended a meeting with high-level White House staff reported with horror, that the top Obama aides were railing against Russia, China, and the BRIC (the Brazil-Russia-India-China grouping), vowing to "smash the BRIC." It was this kind of NerObama madness that dominated the President's ongoing trip to Asia, in which he put confrontation with China on a front burner with his inflammatory rhetoric and his announcements of expanded American military power projection into the Asia-Pacific theater.



Human Rights First

Gen. John H. Johns (ret.) wrote a New York Times op-ed, in which he cites former Defense Secretary Robert Gates, among others, warning about the “unintended consequences” of an attack on Iran.

If there was any doubt that the only viable war avoidance is the immediate Constitutional removal of Obama from the Presidency, then these highly qualified reports should remove all lingering doubt.

Retired Military Speak Out

On Nov. 14, General John H. Johns, a retired Army officer who is a signator on a Human Rights First letter to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid warning against the police-state measures in the new defense bill, wrote a *New York Times* op-ed, titled “Before We Bomb Iran, Let’s Have a Serious Conversation.” In the article, Johns cites former Defense Secretary Robert Gates, retired Marine General Anthony Zinni, another former CENTCOM commander, and former Congressman, Adm. Joe Sestak, all warning about the “unintended consequences” of any attack on Iran.

“While rhetoric about military strikes may work as an applause line in Republican debates, there is little or no chance that military action would be quite so simple. Quite the contrary. Defense leaders agree that the military option would likely result in serious unintended consequences,” the general warned.

“Meir Dagan, the recently retired chief of Israel’s Mossad, shares the assessment of the Americans cited above. He noted earlier this year that attacking Iran would mean regional war and went on to say that arguments for military strikes were the ‘stupidest thing I have ever heard.’

“To be clear: everyone can agree that Iran is a seri-

ous problem. The development of Iranian missile technology is credible enough that NATO is (smartly) working with Russia to develop a defensive missile shield. And the most recent report from the International Atomic Energy Agency on Iran’s nuclear program should rally the international community to apply even more pressure.”

The General concluded with a warning to the Presidential candidates: “America ought not consider another war in the Middle East without a very serious discussion of the consequences. Political candidates should curb their jingoistic, chauvinistic emotions and temper their world view with a little reflective, rational thought.”

The statements by Zinni to which Johns referred, were still-valid warnings made by Zinni during a 2009 interview on PBS’s Charlie Rose show; when asked about the consequences of an Israeli attack on Iran, Zinni gave a graphic answer:

“I think the problem with the strike is thinking through the consequences of Iranian reaction. One mine that hits a tanker, and you can imagine what is going to happen to the price of oil and economies around the world. One missile into a Gulf oil field or a natural gas processing field, you can imagine what’s going to happen. A missile attack on some of our troop formations in the Gulf or our bases in Iraq, activating sleeper cells, flushing out fast patrol boats and dowels that have mines that can go into the water in the Red Sea and elsewhere. You can see all these reactions that are problematic in so many ways. Economic impact, national security impact—it will drag us into a conflict. I think anybody that believes that it would be a clean strike and it would be over and there would be no reaction is foolish.”

Others Also Raise the Alarm

Other warnings are coming from individuals from the defense-intelligence community, a key element of the institution of the Presidency; we cite here three examples:

(1) Former CIA officer Philip Giraldi, who is now executive director of the Council for the National Interest, in an article published on antiwar.com Nov. 16, noting that although the U.S. now has a military and intelligence-agency presence of some kind in 175 countries, warned that “there is some evidence to suggest that the White House is looking for still more dominoes to tip over.”

The operation against Qaddafi raises the question of who is next for regime change. “Iran is a perennial fa-

vorite and could be attacked at any time, but it would be a tough nut to crack,” Giraldi writes, “so it looks like the answer might be Syria, where the United States, Turkey, and a number of Gulf Arab states are already supporting and providing assistance to the opposition.” Giraldi describes the war propaganda against Syria in the U.S., noting that these are the same types of arguments that were used against Saddam Hussein. What is going on in Syria is not America’s business, Giraldi says, noting that “Syria touches on no vital U.S. interest and does virtually no business with the United States, and if its government changes it will not have any negative impact on the American people.”

He concludes: “The notion that the United States should be in the business of fixing other governments that we regard as dysfunctional is a slippery slope indeed, unconstitutional in terms of war powers as it is carried out by executive fiat and also prone to result in messy endings, as we have seen in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Humanitarian intervention is a policy that ultimately produces only ruin both for the target of the intervention and for the American people.”

(2) Harlan Ullman, a senior advisor at the Atlantic

Council, to whom is attributed the “Shock and Awe” doctrine, wrote a commentary for UPI on Nov. 16, urging the U.S. and others not to panic over the recent IAEA report. Ullman argues that history shows that Iran’s obtaining nuclear weapons would not be an apocalypse, as some claim. When North Korea detonated a nuclear device, “the consequences were far less than expected.” Similar fears as those being voiced today about Iran, were also expressed about the Soviet Union in the 1940s and China in the 1960s. Again, no doomsday.

Instead of threatening “kinetic action,” the West ought to offer a grand bargain to Russia, Ullman writes. If Russia could convince the Iranians to give up their weapons programs, then the need for missile defenses would disappear. The U.S. could also explore containment and deterrent options with Britain and France, and possibly Russia and China. “But rather than panic, history sets a context,” Ullman concludes. “So does bold thinking. Let us exercise both.”

(3) Veteran investigative journalist Seymour Hersh, writing in the *New Yorker*, a reliable conduit for leaks from the military-industrial establishment, points out that he’s been reporting on Iran and U.S. covert operations against it, for the past decade, especially “on the repeated inability of the best and the brightest of the Joint Special Operations Command to find definitive evidence of a nuclear-weapons production program in Iran.”

“The goal of the high-risk American covert operations,” Hersh continues, “was to find something physical—a smoking cauldron, as a knowledgeable official once told me—to show the world that Iran was working on warheads at an undisclosed site, to make the evidence public, and then to attack and destroy the site.” But it was never found.

Additionally, Hersh cites Greg Thielmann, a former State Department intelligence analyst, who was one of the authors of the recent Arms Control Association assessment of the IAEA report, who says that “there is nothing that indicates that Iran is really building a bomb,” and that the IAEA report has been “aggressively misrepresented” by those who are trying to drum up support for a bombing attack on Iran. Hersh also cites Joseph Cirincione, a disarmament expert who serves on Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s International Security Advisory Board, who said, “I was briefed on most of this stuff several years ago at the IAEA headquarters in Vienna. There’s little new in the report. Most of this information is well known to experts who follow the issue.”



Sam Vaknin, author of *Malignant Self-Love*, is interviewed in a 46-minute LPAC-TV video, on President Obama’s narcissistic personality disorder, a condition which Vaknin says is increasingly controlling the President’s mental outlook. Agreeing with Lyndon

LaRouche, Vaknin believes that Obama poses a grave danger to the United States and the world, unless he is immediately removed from office.

<http://larouchepac.com/node/19464>