

Two Weapons Against Thermonuclear War

The following discussion occurred on the weekly LaRouche PAC web-cast on August 14. The [video](#) is available for viewing.

Jason Ross: Good evening. This is Aug. 14, 2015, and you're watching the regularly-scheduled Friday night webcast here at LaRouche PAC. My name is Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio tonight by Megan Beets and Benjamin Deniston of the LaRouche PAC Science Research Team, and by Jeff Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*.

We had a significant discussion with Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche earlier today about the topics that we'll be discussing tonight. The first topic we're going to take up is Obama and the 25th Amendment. The 25th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was adopted in 1967, in the aftermath of some of the uncertainty about succession that was revealed after the Kennedy assassination. One aspect of this Amendment, Section Four, entails the operation of the Executive Branch to remove an incapacitated President.

Now, any person who believes nuclear war is a potentially sensible policy, or believes nuclear war is winnable or even survivable, is clearly insane—and therefore a likely target for the use of the 25th Amendment. I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to start us off this evening, discussing the importance of the 25th Amendment with regards to Obama, particularly in light of the Congress being out of session at the moment.



White House/Pete Souza

From the moment he entered the Oval Office, President Obama pursued a policy of confrontation with Russian President Vladimir Putin. Here, their first meeting at Putin's dacha outside Moscow, July 7, 2009.

The 25th Amendment: The Precedents

Jeff Steinberg: Thanks, Jason. As Jason said, the 25th Amendment was drafted in 1965 by Senator Birch Bayh and Congressman Emmanuel Celler. It passed both Houses of Congress, and over the course of a two-year period and was ratified by the initially required 39 states. So, this is a relatively new development, and it was indeed provoked by the fact that there was tremendous uncertainty around the Kennedy assassination; largely over the question of what if President Kennedy had survived the assassination attempt, but was physi-

cally or mentally completely incapacitated.

This was something that was considered very seriously. There were earlier efforts in the 1960s to take this question up, right after Kennedy was killed; but eventually the Amendment was passed. Now, this is not something that is unprecedented; in fact, in the period following the formal ratification, the 25th Amendment was put into play on at least three occasions.

Nixon

First of all, during the final days of President Richard Nixon, when there was grave uncertainty about Nixon's mental stability. There was tremendous fear that he might order some kind of military action; whether a domestic coup-type action, or possibly instigating a war in order to hold on, to really to cling to his office. And at that time, the 25th Amendment was in play.

A number of members of the Nixon Cabinet, and the White House Chief of Staff, who at the time was Gen. Alexander Haig; you had Henry Kissinger in the dual role of National Security Advisor and Secretary of State. And you had James Rodney Schlesinger as Secretary of Defense. So, members of the Cabinet, under the terms of the 25th Amendment, were gauging whether or not Nixon—in his potential insanity—posed a dire threat to the national security of the United States and the world.

We have accounts directly from Schlesinger that he informed the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that if Nixon issued military orders, the Chiefs were not to implement them without first clearing it, with Schlesinger and other members of the Cabinet. That was not some kind of rogue action; it was an invoking of the 25th Amendment.

In fact, Nixon was presented with three options by leading members of his own party. He was presented with the option number one of facing certain impeachment, in the United States Senate. Sen. Howard Baker was one of the people, who directly went to Nixon and told him that there were enough Republican votes along with Democratic votes, that if he went to trial in the U.S. Senate, he would be impeached and convicted. The

second option was, of course, resignation; but the third option that was also there, was that if Nixon tried to take some kind of irrational action, the Cabinet was prepared to invoke the 25th Amendment; immediately remove him from office, and install Vice President Gerald Ford as the acting President.

Now, here we are in August of 2015; Congress is scattered all over the country and probably around the world. And so, we have a situation in which the danger, the imminent danger of a war provocation coming out of President Obama is such that it is incumbent on members of the Cabinet to carefully gauge his state of mind, and seriously put in play, the option of invoking the 25th Amendment.

As Jason said a few moments ago, what could be more insane than even contemplating provoking a war against Russia, knowing full well that Russia is prepared to retaliate with a massive second strike? Russia presently has an arsenal

of 4,000 active and mothballed nuclear weapons. So, this would be a war of annihilation. Nothing is more mad than that kind of consideration; and we're very, very close to that. We'll pick up that theme a bit later in this broadcast.

Reagan

Now, you also had two instances with President Ronald Reagan, where there was consideration of the 25th Amendment. Obviously, the first occasion was in 1981, when Reagan was the target of an assassination attempt by Bush family friend John Hinckley. And at that time, Reagan was seriously injured, and there was an immediate question about whether or not he would sufficiently recover, to be able to resume his duties as President. Fortunately, he did recover, and so that issue was resolved, happily for the country and the world.

But in the mid-1980s, after the Iran-Contra Affair came to light, there was again movement, principally coming from the Bush circles, within the Administration, to claim that Reagan was no longer mentally fit to be President. Once again, former Sen. Howard Baker played a pivotal role in assessing the 25th Amendment's



Then-Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger invoked the 25th Amendment against Nixon. Here, he confers with fellow-cabinet member, NSC advisor and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

relevance. Baker had been appointed White House Chief of Staff, to clean up some of the mess that had been left by people like George Bush and Ollie North in the Iran-Contra Affair.

Baker recounted to several journalists soon afterwards, that he was told by members of the Reagan Cabinet—presumably also by Vice President Bush—that his first assignment on coming in as White House Chief of Staff was to evaluate and provide an assessment to the Cabinet, on whether President Reagan could still serve as President, or whether he was showing signs of diminished mental functioning.

And Baker reported that he was extraordinarily nervous, going into the first Cabinet meeting after he assumed the Chief of Staff post. He knew that he had to make a kind of evaluation on the spot of Reagan’s competence to continue to serve as President. He said Reagan walked into the room, sat down, and immediately cracked four or five very, very funny jokes, and Howard Baker breathed a sigh of relief that President Reagan had all of his marbles, and the issue was settled.

But the question right now is one of immediate urgency, because we could be hours, we could be days, we could be weeks away from an incident provoking a war which President Obama would readily and happily launch a nuclear attack against Russia, knowing full well that could be the trigger for a war of annihilation. So, the 25th Amendment has to be something that is being seriously considered by members of the Obama Cabinet. And it’s important for you, leading citizens of this republic, to be aware of, and to also come to grips with and face the reality of, precisely the kind of moment of danger that we’re living through right now.

2. ‘Unsurvivable’

Benjamin Deniston: So, I’m going to be posing the second question, but I would like to first stick on this same point that Jason introduced and Jeff just raised. Any world leader who by his actions is effectively threatening the use of thermonuclear weapons in an offensive manner, is mentally unfit to serve in office.

Now, the LaRouche PAC in 2012 treated this subject in a documentary produced under the direction of Lyndon LaRouche; a 35-minute feature documentary entitled, “Unsurvivable.” And today, given the events



Reagan Presidential Library

The assassination attempt against President Ronald Reagan was only one of the occasions for considering the application of the 25th Amendment.

that we are now living through, and fighting on right now, today, this week, this month, we highly recommend that our viewers watch, if you haven’t watched it before; or if you’ve seen it, re-watch, this feature 2012 production by LaRouche PAC—“[Unsurvivable.](#)” We’ve posted a link to the video in the description of this current broadcast today, so you can access it right there. But we highly recommend that you watch it, watch it again; circulate it.

This documentary provides a rather unnerving, but completely realistic, completely accurate, account of how quickly a thermonuclear war could break out and end civilization as we know it. And how close we’ve actually come, in 2012 and again today, to that horrific reality under the policies of Obama.

How many Americans actually know, have a real sense of, the level of thermonuclear firepower that has right now been placed into Obama’s hands? And how quickly that could be deployed?

For example, as we covered in this video, over something around half of the United States’ active inventory of thermonuclear warheads is currently being carried on a fleet of Ohio-class submarines. Now, each of these submarines is capable alone of deploying 24 Trident missiles. Each single missile can carry up to 8 individual thermonuclear warheads; 8 individual, distinct thermonuclear bombs—explosive devices—deployed from that one missile. So, if you take 24 missiles, 8 warheads per missile, that is a capacity of nearly 200 thermonuclear bombs, explosives, per submarine.

Now, each warhead, once released from its missile,



U.S. Navy/Rex Nelson

One single Ohio-class ballistic-missile submarine, like this USS Alaska, can carry the firepower to destroy up to 200 major cities in a matter of minutes.

upon the reentry process, can be directed to an individual, distinct target. And each warhead, depending on the size of device chosen for that warhead, can be somewhere between 6 and 30 times more powerful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima at the end of World War II.

So, just to give you a sense, that's the power of thermonuclear weapons, thermonuclear war. *One single submarine*—one submarine can carry the firepower to destroy up to 200 major cities in a matter of minutes. Now, I would ask our audience if you can even name 200 major cities off the top of your head. Two hundred major cities, containing potentially hundreds of millions of people, at the mercy of the firepower contained in just one of these submarines.

Now, with 14 of these submarines as part of our nuclear capability in our Navy fleet, the total potential capacity is in the thousands of thermonuclear warheads. And as we covered in the video, all of this can be released in a matter of seconds. And with the ability to secretly position these submarines off the coast of a target nation, it could take less than 10 minutes—a matter of minutes—for the warheads to actually reach their targets.

Obviously, any attempt to make such a strike, would insure an immediate retaliatory strike; and the total effects would not just destroy the targeted sites. It wouldn't just destroy the military targets, or the cities, or the infrastructure targeted directly by the weapons;

but it would have catastrophic effects on the Earth's atmosphere, the climate system, creating what's been referred to as a nuclear winter effect, which would last years. So, this is truly a global catastrophe.

Now, this is just a taste of the capability that we're currently leaving right now in the hands of Barack Obama. And I think it's appropriate to highlight one of the closing points of emphasis in this 2012 LaRouche PAC documentary, "Unsurvivable." In August 1983, almost 32 years ago to the day, the third in a series of international seminars, dedicated to addressing and removing the threat of thermonuclear war was held in Erice, Italy. The subject of that 1983 conference was "The Technical

Basis for Peace." And that particular conference featured discussions of LaRouche's SDI program, including contributions from Dr. Edward Teller on the United States side, from Dr. Evgeny Velikhov from Russia, among many other leading figures.

But what was interesting was that the conference chairman, Antonino Zichichi, during his commencement address to that conference, noted very clearly that the threat of thermonuclear war doesn't simply come from the weapons themselves; but also, he emphasized the danger from the personalities of individuals who could come into a position of power where they would have the ability to deploy this potentially civilization-ending capability.

Just to read a small quote from Zichichi on this; he said: "In history fools have never been lacking. . . . Sooner or later—in 10, 20, or maybe 100 years—a fool will come forth. When the fool appears on the scene, mankind will find itself with hundreds of millions of dead, with the ozone layer destroyed by 50%, with the average temperature of the planet lowered by at least 7 degrees, with an enormous amount of radioactivity, and with mountains of ashes instead of the vast treasures accumulated in centuries of laborious and intelligent activity, in all parts of the world."

Now, that was stated 32 years ago, almost to the day; and now we find ourselves here now, for nearly seven years, the United States has been under the di-

rection of just such a fool—Barack Obama.

Ukrainian Nazis: Trigger for Nuclear War


Now, in our discussions with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he strongly emphasized that Mr. Obama's regime-change operation in Ukraine is a leading flashpoint which could start thermonuclear war. Obama's coup in Ukraine, which has created a military conflict directly on Russia's border, with Obama-backed, Nazi paramilitary groups, including the Right Sector, driving this conflict. Mr. LaRouche said, "This is Obama's Nazi policy in Ukraine. Obama's policies come with swastikas." And LaRouche emphasized that people have to take a look at the global strategic—and not just local—significance of this Obama-backed Nazi Right Sector operation in Ukraine.

So Jeff, we were discussing this with Mr. LaRouche this morning; and we are hoping you could provide an elaboration of Mr. LaRouche's remarks on the significance of this Ukraine operation as understood from this standpoint.

Steinberg: We've been warning on this broadcast for weeks now, that the gravest danger of a provocation leading to war, is in the immediate period that we're in right now, namely August, with the U.S. Congress out of session, and with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military institutions going through a major personnel transition. In our discussion earlier today, we reviewed the fact that over the course of this Summer, and going into the Fall, there has been a continuous series of NATO maneuvers in the area immediately adjacent to Russia: in the Black Sea region, in the Baltic Sea region, in other parts of Eastern and Southern Europe. In fact, there are major maneuvers that begin mid-September and will run through November—the largest NATO maneuvers directed at Russia, since the end of the Cold War.

Mr. LaRouche's point was that the danger is more immediate. If you look at September, October, November, you're perhaps missing the most obvious and most dangerous trigger: namely, the fact that the Victoria Nuland's Right Sector apparatus, is preparing an immediate second Maidan coup inside Kiev, with the objective of completely ripping up the Minsk accords, and

At the August 1983 Erice Conference, Conference Chairman Antonino Zichichi warned: "Sooner or later... a fool will come forth," and "mankind will find itself with hundreds of millions of dead, with the ozone layer destroyed by 50%, with the average temperature of the planet lowered by at least 7 degrees, with an enormous amount of radioactivity, and with mountains of ashes instead of the vast treasures accumulated in centuries of laborious and intelligent activity, in all parts of the world."



CC/Gabriella Clare Marino

Professor Antonino Zichichi

launching an immediate war against Russian-backed elements in Eastern Ukraine.

Now the Speaker of the Russian Duma, earlier this week, issued a very direct warning, echoing what Mr. LaRouche has been saying for weeks now. Namely, that we are facing an August war-provocation crisis, centered around Ukraine, but with the potential to immediately break out of any bounds of control.

We've talked in earlier broadcasts about the fact that the world was very fortunate back in 1962, at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, that there was already an ongoing, very personal and very cordial but tough dialogue underway between President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchov, because they were both concerned that they might one day be facing the horrible moment of decision, whether to order the use of nuclear weapons, and face the possible annihilation of mankind. Because that dialogue had been going on, for quite some time, for almost two years prior to the Cuban Missile Crisis, there was a meeting of the minds. An agreement could be worked out, despite the fact that many key advisors, both to Kennedy and Khrushchov, were arguing for confrontation.

There is no such personal rapport between President Obama, and Russian President Putin. If anything, President Obama has represented a provocation, a confrontation against Russia, against President Putin, at every turn. It began from the time of their very first meeting in 2009.

Now, where are we at this moment?

As I said, the Right Sector is on a rampage. In fact, an article that appears today in *The National Interest*, a widely-read online national security journal here in Washington, provides a very pointed warning. The real threat coming from Ukraine is not in the East, is not in

LaRouche warned: “If you look at September, October, November, you’re perhaps missing the most obvious and most dangerous trigger: namely, the fact that Victoria Nuland’s Right Sector apparatus, is preparing an immediate second Maidan coup inside Kiev, with the objective of completely ripping up the Minsk accords, and launching an immediate war against Russian-backed elements in Eastern Ukraine.”

the immediate issue, of the confrontation around the Eastern Republics bordering on Russia. The real danger, the real threat, is coming from Western Ukraine, which is the base of operation, of the Right Sector. These are outright Nazis. Their pedigree we have documented time and time again. These are the second and third generation followers of Stepan Bandera, who was an outright Nazi collaborator with Hitler during the Second World War, who carried out genocide against the populations of the Soviet Union, Poland, and other countries in the area.

And the fact of the matter is, that those networks were saved and protected by British and American intelligence in the early days of the Cold War. They were given protection; they were given financing; they nurtured second and third generations. And now what we see in the Right Sector, in the Azov Brigade and other military formations that are outright neo-Nazis, is the immediate danger and hair-trigger of war.

This is not something that happened organically. You had Victoria Nuland, the Assistant U.S. Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, openly flaunting the fact that the United States was backing these literal Nazis. The Obama Administration was backing a Nazi coup in Ukraine. Most of the American and European media have blacked this out, but the reality is unmistakable. And this is where you’ve got a potential immediate trigger for war.

Russians Deliver Some Warnings


The Russians have not only issued warnings about the Guns of August, but they’ve been taking a number of measures aimed at delivering an *unmistakable* message to Washington, and to European NATO capitals, that Russia has an unstoppable, second-strike retaliatory capability. Over the course of the Summer, you’ve had incidents in July where Russian strategic bombers, the Bear bombers, were flying directly off the coast of California. Where for periods of weeks at a time, Russian equivalents of the Ohio-class submarines, carrying nuclear weapons, potentially, were operating in waters of the Caribbean and right off Gulf of Mexico.

So, make no mistake about it. If an incident kicks off inside Ukraine, and leads to the kind of escalation where the arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons that the United States has deployed all over Eastern Europe, is used, Russia will respond with a massive retaliation that they’re absolutely capable of carrying out. And we will be facing an absolute condition of potential human annihilation.

This is the specter that we’re dealing with. This is what happens when someone is allowed into the Presidency of the United States, who’s incapable of comprehending the awesome responsibility and the absolute danger represented by a conflict between the United States and Russia. And this is something here and now. It could happen tomorrow morning. It could happen a week from now. It could happen in early September. But we are in the zone, right now, with Congress out of town, spread out all across the United States; with no center of opposition as we saw in September of 2013, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others intervened forcefully to prevent the start of a U.S. bombing campaign against the Assad government in Syria, that would have, in all likelihood, led to an ISIS government being installed over the totality of Syria by now.

So, this is the reality.

Now, just to put a further punctuation on the point that Ben just made, about the 35 minute video-documentary, which all of you should really take the time to watch, or re-watch, right now: The fact of the matter is, when that “Unsurvivable” video was made public, we received a number of messages of gratitude from people directly involved in the strategic nuclear program of the United States government. They said: You’ve presented in a concise and highly accurate fashion, the reality that we live with every moment of every day. And it’s essential that the American people realize that the time-



The Azov Battalion underscores LaRouche's point: "This is Obama's Nazi policy in Ukraine. Obama's policies come with swastikas."

frame for making a decision, on whether or not to launch a nuclear strike, or launch a retaliatory strike based on the apparent launching of a first strike, is reduced to a matter of minutes.

And as Mr. LaRouche has warned, the totality of a thermonuclear exchange, a nuclear war on a global scale, will be over in a matter of hours, but the consequences may never be reversible.

3. Empire Rails Against Sanity

Ross: Let's take our institutional question of the evening: Tony Blair followed up his earlier denunciation of [candidate for head of the British Labour Party] Jeremy Corbyn and his supporters with an impassioned letter just printed in the *Guardian*. In his letter, Blair says the Labour Party risks "annihilation," according to him, if Jeremy Corbyn wins the party's leadership contest, and that the party was walking "over the cliff's edge," in his words.

And his comments come as another Labour Party leader candidate, Yvette Cooper, is set to criticize Corbyn as not having "credible policies."

So the question that came in to Mr. LaRouche was, "In your view, is Mr. Corbyn qualified to be the Labour Party's next leader?"

Steinberg: I brought some notes from that discus-

sion, because I want to be very precise in terms of what Mr. LaRouche had to say on this.

First of all, the policies that Tony Blair and Yvette Cooper are criticizing, as being the annihilation of the Labour Party, start with the fact that Jeremy Corbyn has said that one of his first priorities, in coming into office would be a full-blown Glass-Steagall policy for Britain: in other words, a total bank separation. The Bank of England, the House of Lords, have adopted a policy that's a kind of halfway measure

that they call "ring-fencing," and the later version was "electrified ring-fencing." It doesn't really break up the banks; it doesn't do what is required.

And so, Corbyn has said that the first order of business will be exactly to do that.

There's a very clear parallel between the fact that Martin O'Malley, one of the Democratic candidates for President, has said the very same thing: that Glass-Steagall is the defining issue for the 2016 Presidential elections. And because of that, O'Malley has been declared public enemy number one by Wall Street. And so, when Tony Blair speaks, the City of London is flapping his jaws. What you're dealing with here is a policy that would really represent the annihilation of those in the financial establishment, particularly those aligned with the British Monarchy, who want to keep the British people suppressed, looted, bankrupted, ignorant, for the sake of bailing out a bankrupt financial system.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said is that England is a very class-conscious place, and the privileged layers of society want to protect their own interests. Well, the situation has reached the point where unless you're prepared to sustain the whole of the people of the United Kingdom, which is not just England, but includes Scotland—which is obviously in a very restive mood right now, virtually in a state of secession from the United Kingdom; what happens in Scotland clearly spills over into Ireland and Wales.

So, you have a situation where what's urgently required is the principle of equity, where the interests of the common man and common woman of England, are clearly put in the category of priorities.

Right now the British system doesn't supply this kind of assistance, and this kind of policy, to benefit all. Average households need this kind of equitable protection, and this is a primary responsibility of government, to assure these kinds of equitable arrangements. In effect, Corbyn is proposing those kinds of policies, and therefore is eminently qualified to be able to actually take over charge of the Labour Party, and go beyond that to perhaps become, in the very near future, a Prime Minister.

Now, ballots for the Labour Party vote have gone out starting today, and the voting will take place, and will be completed by the 10th of September, and the results will be announced two days later. Right now, Corbyn is polling about 54% against three other candidates. So, we'll see what comes out of that.

Mr. LaRouche went further. He said, look, you've got other problems that are coming up in the British situation. You have a British Monarchy that is entering into a very, very clear and obvious senility factor, both Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip. You've got a stupefied monarchy, and don't kid yourself: the monarchy is the real center of power in Britain, and in the entire Commonwealth of nations, the 53 countries that are under the overall British Commonwealth umbrella.

So, vigorous reform is urgently needed. There's a brawl underway inside the Royal Family. We've discussed this in several recent shows. There is a move to dump the monarchy system altogether. And one of the weapons that's being used by proponents of this policy, is widespread exposure of the Nazi history of the British Royal Family, the House of Windsor.

What LaRouche said is: the Corbyn option, an equitable approach to the economics of the entirety of the United Kingdom, and take the senility factor out of the monarchy, in fact, dump the monarchy altogether; and this can be not only a very positive development from the standpoint of Britain, but can have a dramatic effect in Europe as a whole, where Britain is trying to renegotiate its entire relationship with the European Union. And where we saw, in August of 2013, that when the



creative commons/Jason

Jeremy Corbyn, shown here at an anti-austerity rally in London July 8, 2015, has proposed policies of equity for all Britons, and "is eminently qualified to be able to actually take over charge of the Labour Party. . . ."

British Parliament refused to go along with the idea of a war to overthrow the Assad government in Syria, the U.S. Congress felt a lot more comfortable resisting Obama, and, in fact, succeeded in stopping that war from happening.

4. Hillary Clinton: Tell the Truth about Benghazi

Megan Beets: So to bring things back to the situation in the United States: on July 28, LaRouche PAC released a mass circulation statement, entitled, "Hillary Clinton Must Tell the Truth about Benghazi, and Bring Down Obama Before He Unleashes the Guns of August." The statement has gained circulation nationwide.

The statement underscores the critical role that Hillary Clinton uniquely can and must play in getting President Obama's finger off the thermonuclear button, by telling the truth about what she knows actually happened on the evening of Sept. 11, 2012 in Benghazi, Libya; what she knows about the President's role in lying to cover up what actually happened; and in his ordering Hillary to lie as well, to cover up his crimes, which she did.

While coming clean in this way would obviously end Hillary's chances of becoming President, it's a very small price to pay to pull civilization back from the brink of thermonuclear war.

Given what has already been discussed this evening, regarding just how close civilization is to total annihilation if Obama is allowed to remain in office, in a moment I'd like to ask Jeff to come to the podium to address the situation inside the United States, around the process of the formation of a new Presidency.

The Democratic National Committee, for example, on behalf of Obama, is doing everything it can to shut down any debate or discussion of these kinds of issues during the campaign process, and to very rapidly "crown" Hillary the nominee, as long as she keeps her mouth shut. Now, Hillary's role in this Presidential process is critical, but, in the way that we've outlined it, even if it's not exactly the role she envisioned for herself in the Presidency.

So, Jeff, given that situation, and also looking more broadly at the long-term destruction of the U.S., at the complete corruption within the leadership of both parties, what must we deal with, in order to bring about a viable new Presidency?

Obama Supports Terrorists

Steinberg: Hillary Clinton is in possession of the second shoe, that could be brought down on President Obama. We discussed earlier in this show the prospect of the 25th Amendment, which puts an enormous amount of onus, on members of the Cabinet and the White House staff, to face the reality that you have a very dangerous man sitting in the Oval Office, who could make a decision that leads to the annihilation of mankind.

Hillary Clinton has it within *her* power to step forward now—not in October when she's scheduled, to testify under oath before the Select Committee on Benghazi—but *right now*, tomorrow morning, call a press conference, and just simply tell the American people what she knows, about President Obama's lying about Benghazi. If you put what Hillary Clinton knows, and *must say publicly*, in the first person, together with what came out in the past week from Gen. Michael Flynn, the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, you have a crushing indictment of President Obama.

What Flynn told Al Jazeera TV, in a 45 minute interview that was aired last week, is that he warned President Obama and others in the cabinet, in August of 2012, that if they persisted in continuing to provide arms to the so-called "Syrian rebels"—and a lot of that arms smuggling was going on out of Benghazi, Libya, that this



"Hillary Clinton has it within her power to step forward now—not in October when she's scheduled, to testify under oath before the Select Committee on Benghazi—but right now, tomorrow morning, call a press conference, and just simply tell the American people what she knows, about President Obama's lying about Benghazi." Here, Clinton at the January 23, 2013 Senate hearing on the subject.

would lead to the establishment, of an "Islamic Caliphate" a terrorist hub right on the eastern Mediterranean.

In the interview with Al Jazeera, General Flynn was asked: Well, what you're saying is that President Obama ignored the warnings?

And General Flynn said: No, I did say that, it was worse than that. The warnings were well-received. They were clear, they were concise. And the President decided willfully to go ahead with the policy of arming the Syrian rebels, in spite of the fact that he was accurately told what the consequences would be. (See accompanying article.)

This is the same President who, at 10 o'clock at night on Sept. 11, 2012, ordered Hillary Clinton to lie to the American people, to put out a false press release, talking about a video slandering the Prophet Muhammed, a spontaneous protest demonstration, none of which happened. And this was *fully known* by Secretary Clinton, by President Obama, and by all of the national security officials of the Administration at the time. So this is something that Hillary Clinton considers to be an albatross hanging around her neck, but in reality, it is a weapon, that must be invoked, right now, to get this President out of office.

We have the 25th Amendment ready to be enacted, ready to be activated, and we have Hillary Clinton with

the responsibility to the American people and the world, to tell the truth about what she knows.

Options for Survival

Now, it so happens that this has been a very, very bad week, for Secretary Clinton, in her quest for the Democratic Party nomination. Many of you are undoubtedly

So now, more than ever, is the moment for the betterment of mankind, to bring an end to the danger of nuclear war, to bring this President down. And she's in a position to exactly that.

following the details of the allegations that her private e-mail server that she used in her four years as Secretary of State contained classified material, and that this is a crime. And so, you've got two tracks of attacks, coming down on Hillary Clinton right now. One, very obviously, is coming from the Republicans, as one would expect.

But, the other line of attack, probably the more

deadly line of attack, is coming from people inside the Obama White House itself; whether President Obama is personally involved in this is irrelevant. Valerie Jarrett, Michelle Obama, Susan Rice, all of these top people, the people who have been the inner circle advisors, to President Obama from Day One, are running an operation in tandem with the Republicans, to sink Hillary Clinton. They're floating the name of Vice President Joe Biden, as the Wall Street-acceptable alternative to Hillary Clinton, because Hillary has come out openly saying that she does not support the idea that Glass-Steagall needs to be reinstated, when in fact, that's exactly what must be done.

So you've got the White House, once again—no surprise to us—teaming up with the Republicans, in a nasty political operation. Jarrett, Michelle Obama, the people at the White House don't trust Hillary Clinton. They know that Hillary Clinton has it in her capacity, to tell the truth about Benghazi and bring down President Obama, and they are not confident that she won't do exactly that.

So all the more reason for Hillary to step forward and tell the truth, *right now*. You've already got the knives out against her, not just from the Republicans, but directly from the people who've been her enemies since the time of the 2008 Democratic primaries, who now happen to reside at the White House. Why would Hillary Clinton go *one inch* out of her way, to protect people who are her avowed, deadly enemies?

So now, more than ever, is the moment for the betterment of mankind, to bring an end to the danger of nuclear war, to bring this President down. And she's in a position to exactly that.

Ultimately, President Obama is a stooge for the British Empire, for a faction of the British Empire that is so desperate over their imminent loss of power, between the collapse of the trans-Atlantic financial system and the mental disintegration of the British Monarchy, that they're desperate. But, their desperation is irrelevant if Obama is removed from office. If you no longer have the President of the United States, with his finger on the nuclear button, under British control, the war danger is greatly reduced, virtually eliminated.

So we have two options on the table: The 25th Amendment can be invoked by a select group of members of the current Cabinet, along with the Vice President. And, Hillary Clinton, on her own, can bring about the circumstances where the danger of thermonuclear annihilation is eliminated: There's no reason in the world why she does not do that immediately.

**REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL
Now!**

LaRouchePAC is now leading a nationwide effort to push through legislation for Glass-Steagall
(www.larouchepac.com).

WATCH the LaRouchePAC video:
'Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution'

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online
www.larouchepub.com/eiw
toll-free: 1-800-278-3135
e-mail: fulfillment@larouchepub.com

"The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that's our only insurance to save the nation.... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don't get Glass-Steagall in first, we're in a mess!"
—Lyndon LaRouche, Feb. 11, 2013