

WHY OBAMA HAS TO GO

To Risk Thermonuclear War Is Clinically Insane

by Nancy Spannaus

Dec. 5—“If we don’t act *now*, we’re going to find we’re in a thermonuclear war; it’s going to happen, if we don’t act now to get this President out of office. . . .

“Now, if we don’t have him out of office, don’t worry about anything—you’re all going to be dead anyway.”

That was the brutal reality presented by leading American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche, during an hour-long interview with Internet radio host Alex Jones on Nov. 30. It’s the reality that certain leading members of the U.S. military are trying to deal with, by moving to block Barack Obama’s express intention to carry out a confrontation with Russia and China, which will lead inexorably into thermonuclear war.

But such blocking action has not been taken, and cannot take the threat of thermonuclear war off the table. That requires a recognition by more members of the institution of the Presidency that the war dynamic comes from London—and that London is counting on its puppet, the clinically insane Obama, to carry it through.

Now, will you act to remove Obama from office, on the grounds that he reaches the level of mental incompetence as specified under the Constitution’s 25th Amendment, Section 4? Or are you prepared to jeopardize civilization itself, by sticking your head in the sand, and ignoring the threat that hangs over our heads at this very instant?

Not Local—Thermonuclear!

LaRouche laid out his evaluation at the outset of the interview with Jones:

“We’re right on the edge of thermonuclear war. As to whether that will happen or not, that’s another question. But the likelihood that it *could* happen, is great.

“What’s happened is, the U.S. forces in the Eastern Mediterranean, and in the Persian Gulf region, especially naval forces, in particular, are positioned for launching a thermonuclear war. The name of the game, of course, is what we’re going to do to Syria, what we’re going to Iran, but if you look at the forces in the area, that makes no sense. Then you look at other aspects of it, and you know that now the Russians are in on the thing, in defending Syria, in particular, against this atrocity, and you realize that we’re on the edge of actually going to thermonuclear war.

“What happened was, of course, and I don’t know how much, or how well this is known, but our leading general officers, advisors, and so forth, who advise us on our security, have opposed any action by Obama of this type. So therefore, that is, in that degree, tied up. *But*, what’s hanging out there, is, at any moment, a war could start.

“Now, this war will be a war with thermonuclear weapons. That’s the fact. The idea that this is only Syria and Iran is nonsense. What we have positioned in the Gulf area, and in the Eastern Mediterranean, is the ca-



White House/Pete Souza

Obama has turned his back on top military advisors and others, to follow the British imperial drive for war. Here, he manically announces the killing of Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011.

pability for thermonuclear war, and nothing else. Our allies, including the British, do not have the depth of weapons capability for doing something like this. Only the United States, and only the thermonuclear warfare capability of the United States, could actually conduct such a war. It would be a war against the entirety of Asia, and other places.”

Look at the Forces

In an accompanying article, our military correspondent Carl Osgood provides a sketch, from public sources, of exactly what LaRouche outlined in terms of the U.S. military deployment. Look at the overwhelming concentration of firepower, including nuclear firepower, in the Persian Gulf region, and the overall “new Balkans” of the Middle East. In your mind’s eye, visualize what this array of forces looks like from a Russian or Chinese commander’s standpoint.

Then put that strategic picture together with the Obama Administration’s insistence upon deploying anti-missile systems (which can easily be converted into offensive systems), into Eastern Europe *unilaterally*, on the very border of Russia. The Administration’s stance was reiterated in a most brash, arrogant fashion on Dec. 2 by its Ambassador to NATO, Ivo Daalder, when he told a meeting in Washington, D.C. that the U.S. is going ahead with ballistic-missile defense, “whether Russia likes it or not.”

The snotty Daalder then, according to the *New York Times*, said that the complaint of Russian President Dmitri Medvedev might be motivated by domestic politics!

The full text of Daalder’s remarks is not available, but *New York Times* and Reuters cited him constantly reiterating the point. “Our estimate of the threat has gone up, not down,” he said. “This is the Iranian ballistic-missile threat—and becoming more severe than even we thought two years ago.” (This, as *EIR* has documented, is a lie.)

“Whether Russia likes it or not, we are about defending NATO-European territory against a growing ballistic-missile threat.”

Those remarks amount to turning the U.S.’s back, if not worse, to the extraordinary speech and measures announced by President Medvedev on Nov. 23, when he urged the U.S. and NATO to negotiate and work out enforceable agreements on the planned ABM systems, or Russia would have to put into place a series of military responses. Daalder’s remarks also portend more conflict during the scheduled meeting between Russia and the NATO Council on Dec. 8 in Brussels—as clearly does the U.S. constant escalation against Syria and Iran.

The British Are Nuts!

In the interview with Jones, LaRouche stressed that it is *British* oligarchical policy which is behind the war-provoking posture of the Obama Administration and NATO, and that the only kind of war possible under the current circumstances would be thermonuclear.

“The British policy—and they’ve said, the British royal family, the extended family, the whole blue-blooded crowd, have said repeatedly, they are now committed to the immediate objective of reducing the world’s population from 7 billion people, to 1, or less. That is the policy of the British monarchy. The British monarchy controls all of Europe, from the Atlantic into Central Europe, directly. They control the euro system, control it, totally.

“They control the forces, including our stupid forces themselves, who are working under Obama’s direction, under British direction, for a war in the Middle East, that will be a thermonuclear war. Because it will not be limited to Iran; it will not be limited to Syria. It will go to the entirety of Asia, and that’s what’s at stake.”

The British push for nuclear confrontation between

their would-be puppet, the United States, and Russia goes back, on record, to at least 1946, with the public advocacy by Lord Bertrand Russell of a nuclear first strike against the Soviet Union, if it did not agree to Western terms. Forced to retreat from this stance by the Soviets' development of thermonuclear weapons, the Anglo-American establishment in the early 1950s developed the Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) strategic policy, as an alleged deterrent to global war. It were best called the "balance of terror" policy, as shown in the recurrent stand-offs, such as the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the Carter Administration's provocations of the late 1970s, and the European missiles showdown of the early 1980s.

By 1977, LaRouche and a grouping within the military-intelligence establishment in the United States had concluded that this balance of terror could be ended in only one way: through developing a war-avoidance policy by *joint* superpower development of anti-ballistic missile defenses based on new physical principles, defenses LaRouche dubbed "relativistic beam weapons." President Ronald Reagan initiated this program as the Strategic Defense Initiative.

As LaRouche emphasized to Jones, "a conventional war is not possible. . . . Actually since the time that I was launching what became known as the SDI, and the SDI principle, even though the circumstances are modified today by time, nonetheless the same principle is crucial. There can be no major war on this planet—that is, that's involving major powers—that does not lead to thermonuclear war."

That reality was already clear in the 1970s, LaRouche said, when he, his associates, and highly placed collaborators on both sides of the Atlantic had looked extensively into the implications of such a war. He described it this way in his 1982 pamphlet "Only Beam-Weapons Could Bring to an End the Kissingerian Age of Mutual Thermonuclear Terror: A Proposed Modern Military Policy of the United States":

"The general best estimate is that the first thermonuclear assaults upon the mainland United States will kill between 160-180 million residents (and unlucky visitors). In a study prepared for a NATO government by a leading European scientific center, it has been estimated that if only 10 percent of the superpowers' thermonuclear arsenals were exploded, the long-lived radioactive cesium produced would eliminate all higher forms of life throughout this planet within two years of the barrage." (See article in this section on nuclear and

thermonuclear weapons for more on their destructive power.)

LaRouche also took apart the fallacy of assuming that such a reality was an absolute deterrent to nuclear war. Either insanity, or a conviction that assured destruction is looming, could indeed lead a nation to launch this level of civilization-destroying holocaust.

Yet, in the face of the well-worked-out program for strategic defense, presented by LaRouche, Reagan, and allies, the British oligarchy and its tools deployed full bore to prevent its implementation. Russian British agents Yuri Andropov and Mikhail Gorbachov rejected Reagan's offers for joint work on the SDI, and British political tools globally, especially in the United States, went on a witchhunt against its advocates, and its initiator, LaRouche, ultimately sending him to prison. The interest of the British Empire, committed to depriving mankind of a pathway to increasing mastery over nature and the ultimate overthrow of its oligarchical system, prevailed—as it has done to this day.

The Time for War Is Over

If launching war between the major nuclear powers would have been catastrophic in the early 1980s, it would, if possible, be more disastrous now. All the disarmament talks in the world, as LaRouche stressed then, have not made the world safer, because the ultimate cause for provoking war lies in the British-dominated oligarchical system itself, which pits nation against nation in Roman imperial style, to maintain global power. Under the Empire, the world is condemned to permanent war, and depopulation.

The alternative, which was clearly visible among those who rallied around the SDI war avoidance strategy in the 1980s, is collaboration among nations for what the so-called father of the H-bomb, Edward Teller, called the "common aims of mankind," both here on Earth, and in the expansion of man's role into becoming a space-faring people.

LaRouche outlined his vision in discussion with associates on Dec. 3:

"The situation is desperate, but not hopeless. We're on the edge of the extinction of the human species, or something tantamount to that, right now. But it's not something which is hopeless. And we find people, like those in the military, at high ranks in the United States, who do understand this.

"Look the other side of this thing: We've come to a



U.S. Navy/Mass Communication Specialist 1st Class Brianna K. Dandridge

LaRouche and others have pointed to the concentration of firepower in the Persian Gulf region. Shown: The USS Nimitz (CVN 68, a nuclear-powered multimission aircraft carrier), one of the largest warships in the world, in Bahrain, where it has deployed with the U.S. 5th Fleet.

point, you talk about war. There is no legitimate reason for seeking war. Because what started me on what became the SDI was the fact that it was obvious to me, from what I knew then in the 1970s, that it's impossible to have general warfare in the age of nuclear warfare. You couldn't do it!

We demonstrated this, in the whole case of the SDI; what we demonstrated, going into the 1980s, was based on showing exactly what a thermonuclear war would be like! What we're faced with now—and we knew, and argued, and we had Soviet leaders who agreed with us on this—was that we can not have a nuclear war on this planet! Because a thermonuclear war would mean the extinction of humanity, or virtual extinction of humanity.

“So the time for war is past! War itself is now the enemy, per se! And the British are the enemy, because they are the factor of war.

“But you can not have a war on this planet, now, except at the price of the extinction of the human species. Or at least that's what the expectation must be, taken into account. We have gone to the point, where war is no longer possible! Which tells us something about mankind.

*“Now, what happened with what's come out of Russia, with this amplified version of SDI [the Strategic Defense of Earth proposal—see *EIR*, Nov. 25], is a rec-*

ognition of this: Our war is a war for the development of space, for dealing with the threats to humanity, of all kinds, especially those which come from space, or space areas; that's the issue. The issue here is not just stopping a war, or objecting to a war, because it's a war, a bad war. It's not a bad war: All wars, general wars, are bad wars from the inception. There is no moral justification for such war. Not possible.

“The access to thermo-nuclear capabilities and things that are comparable to that, make it impossible to put war on the agenda. And now, what the Russian formulation was actually goes

to the exact point of SDI: In formulating the SDI, we went through all these options, because we were looking at every kind of nuclear attack, every kind of nuclear assault and related assaults. We looked at these from the standpoint of what the effect of trying to defeat these things were. And it was demonstrated to us that we had reached a limit, at which there was no possibility of tolerating any such form of war!

“The time for war has come to an end.”

Why Obama Must Go

Which brings us back to the Obama issue.

As this publication and many others have documented exhaustively, Barack Obama is not only a British puppet, but he is clinically insane, with a narcissistic personality of the same type as Emperor Nero. He has consistently acted against the U.S. national interest, at home and abroad, and is presently seeking war confrontations with Russia and China, which more and more observers are noting could lead to World War III.

So far, he has met with resistance from the U.S. military establishment, whose most influential representatives insist that he draw back from confrontation with Russia in particular—but also China—around Syria and Iran, by controlling Israel, among other things. Reliable sources report that the President has outright declined a request by the top military brass to read the riot

act to Israel, going so far as to insist that “he’d rather not know” beforehand if the Israelis were going to attack Iran.

A Dec. 4 entry from the blog of retired Army combat officer and retired top defense intelligence officer W. Patrick Lang, gives some insight into the discussion.

“On GPS [a talk show] today [Sunday] Gideon Rose, the editor of *Foreign Affairs*, stated that ‘now we are all Israelis.’ He based this on conversations with officials in Washington who indicated to him that a nuclear Iran was ‘intolerable.’ He further stated that this reflects his view that Iranian progress on nuclear weapons will soon require air attacks on that country.

“In listening to him it became clear that either he does not know what would be involved in an air campaign to damage the Iranian nuclear program or else he does not care to tell us.

“In fact such a campaign in order to be effective would involve at least 500 strike sorties and at least that many support sorties. One must ask what is the game here? I am quite certain that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Gen. Mattis of the Marine Corps have counseled the president that they feel it would be most

unwise to launch such a campaign. Their reasoning has to do with actual consideration of available resources and space/time factors. What is Mr. Rose’s statement based on?”

One can also point to the Dec. 2 posting on the National Interest website by Paul Pillar, a retired CIA official whose last position was National Intelligence Officer for the Near East and South Asia, who ripped into the oft-used Israeli attempt to justify a hit on Iran by comparing that nation to Hitler’s Germany. Pillar says that’s bunk, but dangerous, because the analogy is being used to drag the U.S. into another war, “with calamitous effects on U.S. interests.”

He could have said, on U.S. survival.

But there is no way the military can count on being able to control the insane Obama, whose strings are pulled in London. This Nero has already rolled right over military opposition to such operations as the illegal war in Libya, and torture policy, among others. He marches to a different drummer: the British Queen.

Before he realizes the British monarchy’s long-term goal of destroying the United States, and most of civilization itself, he’s got to go.

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary “NAWAPA 1964” is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early ‘70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it
... until now.

NAWAPA 1964

PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 16, 1962

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>