

It's Obama Who Is Pushing Toward Thermonuclear War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Aug. 28—In the three years since Lyndon LaRouche's April 11, 2009 public warning that Barack Obama is a pathological narcissist in the image of Emperor Nero, the President has done everything in his power to prove that LaRouche was absolutely right. From the illegal regime-change war in Libya, ending with the gangland-style slaying of head of state Muammar Qaddafi; to the extra-judicial assassination of at least three American citizens in Yemen; to the drone killings in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia, President Obama has proven that his only credentials are those of a mass murderer, who will kill on an ever grander scale if he is allowed to remain in office any longer.

With his overt threat last week to launch yet another war involving U.S. air power, this time in Syria, the President is bringing the world to the very brink of thermonuclear conflict and potential extinction. It is transparently obvious to anyone who cares to think about it, that a U.S.-led replay of the Libya regime-change war in Syria, without even a fig leaf of UN Security Council support, will draw Russia and China directly into conflict with the United States, the United Kingdom, and anyone else, such as France, foolish enough to engage in this provocation.

The danger of thermonuclear World War III is staring us all in the face for one simple reason: President Obama is a mass killer, whose lust to murder makes him a perfect stooge for the faction of the British Empire that is committed, on the record, to the elimination of

80% of the human race. War avoidance means removing Obama from power.

Obama's Latest Escalation

President Obama on Aug. 20 issued the most direct threat yet to use U.S. military force to overthrow the Syrian government. In statements reminiscent of the lies told by then-Vice President Dick Cheney about "nuclear mushroom clouds" from Iraq, in the run-up to the March 2003 invasion of that country, President Obama declared that any evidence of Syrian chemical weapons being moved around the country would prompt him to fundamentally re-think U.S. policy towards Syria.

Obama's public comments followed a lengthy telephone discussion with British Prime Minister David Cameron, in which the two men agreed that the ouster of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad was a non-negotiable policy, regardless of the Russian and Chinese vetoes at the UN Security Council, and the fact that the rebels have been delivered significant defeats on the ground in Syria.

On Aug. 27, French President François Hollande, in an about-face, announced that he, too, would support the use of military force to oust Assad from power. Hollande's statements came just 24 hours after the former head of the French Air Force gave an interview to *Le Monde*, in which he adamantly opposed military action against Syria, warning that the Syrian Air Force was



White House Photo/Pete Souza

President Obama and British Prime Minister David Cameron (inset) agreed in a phone discussion last week that the ouster of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad was a non-negotiable demand. This signifies a march toward a thermonuclear World War III. Obama is shown here talking to Cameron last year, during the buildup to the war against Libya. With him are National Security Advisor Tom Donilon (left) and Chief of Staff Bill Daley (center).

twice as large and more combat-ready than that of France.

At the same time that Obama and Cameron threatened direct Western military action to create a no-fly zone and humanitarian corridor along the Turkey-Syria border, Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu escalated his threats to launch "preventive" military action (i.e., aggressive war) against Iran sometime in the coming weeks. Netanyahu's and Defense Minister Ehud Barak's continuing threats to launch unilateral military strikes against Iran continue to fuel a backlash among Israeli institutions that have been nearly unanimous in their opposition to the Prime Minister's reckless threats.

Late last week, Gen. Gabi Ashkenazi (ret.), until recently, the Chief of Staff of the Israeli Defense Forces, joined a growing legion of active and retired IDF, Mossad, Shin Bet, and Military Intelligence leaders who have come out publicly against Netanyahu's and Barak's threats to order a unilateral attack on Iran.

Obama Exposed

Increasingly, Israeli security specialists have taken note of the fact that, while Gen. Martin Dempsey (USA), Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has repeatedly warned Israel against unilateral military action against Iran, the one voice that would all-but-certainly force Netanyahu and Barak to back down—that of President Obama—has been silent.

The editor of the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, Aluf Benn, was quoted in an interview in the *National Interest* on Aug. 21, saying that Obama's silence is being widely viewed as a green light for Netanyahu and Barak to

launch their planned military strikes. "The conventional wisdom is that President Obama is opposed to an Israeli attack," Benn told journalist Leon Hadar. "But Obama has refrained from vetoing an Israeli action or threatening such a move with sanctions if Israel acts. . . . I believe that this is another example of Obama leading from behind, counting on Israel to do in Iran what the Brits and the French did in Libya."

As Benn implies, Obama's "leading from behind" was pure subterfuge, as the U.S. was the prime mover and actor in the Libya war.

On Aug. 27, *Ha'aretz* commentator Chemi Shalev took up the issue by way of countering the frequent wishful argument that Obama would not want to have a war against Israel in the pre-election period. To the contrary, Shalev insists, giving his own opinion and citing that of a host of pundits including top Republican Party consultant Karl Rove, who, he said, in a recent appearance on Fox News, opined that any flare-up with Iran would only serve Obama's interests. Americans, he said, would instinctively rally around their Commander in Chief, and that Obama's standing in the polls would immediately improve.

Shalev writes that "most people who know Obama

maintain that if his hand is forced, either by Iran or by Israel, the President would not hesitate to send the American bombers on their way, elections or no elections, not only if Iran attacks American targets directly but also to help Israel, if it turns out that it cannot fend for itself. At the height of an election campaign, such a crisis would doubtlessly entail the fringe benefit of forcing Republican candidates Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan to support the President and to put aside their criticism while guns are blazing and American lives are in danger. . . . In fact, the very foundations of a theory that a war before elections would hurt Obama's chances in the elections are so far-fetched that it is actually unreasonable to believe that a seasoned Americanologist such as Netanyahu would subscribe to it. . . ."

No Local Wars

What these Israeli commentators neglect to say is the crucial point: Any war against Iran or Syria, will lead toward a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S., and Russia and China. This view has been forcefully spelled out by Lyndon LaRouche, who warned this week that President Obama is committed to provoking thermonuclear war with Russia and China, using the Syrian and Iranian situations as pretexts.

Indeed, spokesmen for the Russian and Syrian governments have already denounced Obama's statement about "chemical weapons" as just a pretext for U.S. military intervention. A source in the Russian Foreign Ministry told *Kommersant* daily on Aug. 21 that this scenario is considered highly probable. "Our Western partners and Israel have recently made such statements," the source said. "We believe they can follow up on these threats."

Syrian Deputy Prime Minister Qadri Jamil, in Moscow for talks on finding a peaceful way out of the impasse, told reporters: "The West is looking for an excuse for direct intervention. If this excuse does not work, it will look for another excuse." Jamil also spoke against Western military intervention, warning that it could ignite a regional conflict. "Those who are contemplating this, evidently want to see the crisis expand beyond Syria's borders," he said.

An article in the Aug. 23 edition of the Russian military paper *Red Star* warned of the high probability of a conflict in the Persian Gulf. It begins with the deployment of U.S. and British minesweepers and carrier groups in the Gulf. It also reports on the maneuvers planned for Sept. 26-27, involving 20 nations and con-

centrating on mine-sweeping, with the deployment of Special Forces reportedly also equipped to disarm mines.

The article takes special note, however, of efforts of General Dempsey to tamp down the irrational exuberance of the Israeli whackos by stating that an Israeli military strike would *not* end Iran's nuclear program. It also notes that, in addition to the inflamed rhetoric of Israeli Prime Minister Netan-Yahoo and Defense Minister Barak, there are significant voices of opposition within the Israeli Cabinet, including IDF chief Benny Gantz and the head of the Mossad, to a strike against Iran.

The Chinese government, as reflected in statements in its press outlets, is aware of hostile U.S. intentions. In an Aug. 25 *China Daily* article, the American strategic drive toward "missile defense" in Asia (allegedly against the North Korean threat) is described, its "not against China" pretenses discounted, and high-levels talks are requested. *China Daily* says that "military experts in both the United States and China questioned the U.S. intentions, saying the expensive system, which is well beyond Pyongyang's military capability, is actually 'looking at China.'"

Stop Him Now

EIR's Washington, D.C. sources stress that Obama, in league with Cameron and others, is in a flight-forward mode, determined to pursue his confrontation course. Some may hope Russia and China will back down; they won't.

Meanwhile, Obama is escalating primarily in Syria, with aid being provided to the "rebels," even as it is widely reported that they are dominated by ruthless killer jihadis. The British establishment's *Economist* weekly even admitted on Aug. 25 that the Syrian armed rebels have been delivered a series of devastating military defeats in Damascus and Aleppo, the country's two largest cities. The Sunni middle class, concentrated in those two cities, has rejected the rebels, as more and more Saudi-funded neo-Salafists carry out atrocities against civilians.

Despite the continuing flow of money and weapons to the Syrian armed opposition, it is becoming clearer by the day that the Assad regime will remain in power for a long time, unless there is a major foreign military invasion, starting with the imposition of a no-fly zone. And this is precisely what Obama and Cameron threatened last week.