

Europe Is Asking: Is there Opposition to World War III Within the United States...Or Is it All Over?

by Robert Ingraham

I. Fear and Self-feeding Panic

The news from Europe is sobering. Current reports starkly portray an escalating process of social disintegration and desperation, as the effects of the Anglo-American military escalation against Russia continue to unfold. The recent dramatic worsening of the military conflict in and around Syria has raised the specter of general warfare into the consciousness of many thinking Europeans. Increasingly, the possibility of World War III is being discussed more and more openly. At the same time, the Obama-created refugee crisis has brought more than one million refugees to Europe, and more than 500,000 to Germany alone during the last two years. In August of this year, the German government announced that it expected to receive 800,000 applications for political asylum during 2015. The social tensions, the economic strains and the fear of new terrorist attacks, such as what occurred in Paris on November 13th, are driving Europe into a crisis, the likes of which have not been seen since 1945.

There are courageous leaders in Europe who recognize the danger of this current directionality, and more than a few of them are taking steps to sabotage the current British-American war drive against Russia. However, it is clear to most that any European-based opposition can not possibly succeed as long as a madman occupies the White House. The recent

decisions by Obama to deploy U.S. military forces into both Iraq and Syria, without the approval of either the United States Congress or the governments of those two nations, combined with the U.S. and British use of Turkey as their proxy in escalating the military conflict with Russia,—all of this presents European leaders with a very pessimistic scenario as to what to expect from the United States in the days ahead. The Obama-authorized drone killings have further driven home the point that Obama is a cold-blooded killer who will not be deterred from his current course of action by traditional diplomatic means.

For many in Europe, the growing likelihood of general war is beginning to appear unstoppable, and the fear generated by that analysis is bolstered by a view of



creative commons/Johan Viirik

Barack Obama speaking in NATO member Estonia, in September 2014.

the U.S. political situation as monolithic, one in which any real U.S.-based opposition to Obama seems feeble at best, if not near non-existent. Under these conditions many in Europe see no alternative but to submit to the blackmail and pressures emanating from the White House. Many in Europe are asking: “Is there anyone in the United States willing and capable of stopping the present insane policy emanating from Obama?”

II. LaRouche: A True Strategy For Victory

In a recent discussion with associates, after reviewing the current catastrophic world situation and the escalation toward world war, Lyndon LaRouche posed the following challenge:

How do you stop it, that’s the point. How do you stop it? How do you stop the current course of history? Because everything, every problem of mankind, is the failure to stop the bad history which is in the making....

And that’s my nightmare concern.

In truth, there is growing opposition—some of it courageous—to the Obama war drive within the United States, but, if one applies the necessary yardstick as demanded by LaRouche, almost all of the statements and actions taken so far in opposition to Obama fall far short of what is needed, and needed now. Most of the criticisms and warnings that have so far been uttered by American elected officials and other public figures are far too timid, far too cowardly, and simply represent a re-arranging of the deck chairs on the Titanic as the ship sinks. There is great fear and cultural degeneration throughout every layer of American society. Something greater, something historic is required if humanity is to successfully overcome this current test of its worthiness. In discussing the moral qualities needed to win the present desperate battle, Lyndon LaRouche had the following to say to a group of his associates on November 28th:

The problem is simply one of courage. But it’s not a matter of formal courage, it’s a matter of understanding what the issues of life for mankind and in nations represent. And, therefore, if you know what the facts are, and you have

knowledge of the evidence—and I have a certain amount of knowledge of these matters—you simply say, “We’re going to win that war.”

Now, that’s not just a simple declaration, that we are going to go out there and wave our arms, and so forth, and win this war. We’re going to have to understand exactly what this war means, and what the results would be if we caved in to the enemy. And therefore, if you cannot eliminate the enemy, defeat him, then you’re not going to have anything. So therefore, you have to mobilize yourselves, in order to motivate a larger population to recognize that what you’re doing is right and essential. There’s never been much of anything else in known history, the history of warfare, and history of struggle in general. That’s been the truth.

Now we have hoped, we have hoped and hoped almost futilely, that we could bring about what we call peace. Now peace is not quiet. It’s not quietness. Peace is the progress of mankind. And let me emphasize one thing that I emphasize repeatedly, which most people tend not to attach themselves to. Mankind’s greatest prospect lies in people who have died. It lies there because they were better at science and society than anyone else. And what they did is, their very existence gave mankind the means to bring mankind into a higher level.

Now, for example, one of the greatest sources of corruption is the belief in being personally practical. People who think that life is based on being practical, are cowards, and because they are cowards, they are also idiots. The purpose of mankind has always been, as the case of Kepler, for example, or as the case of Nicholas of Cusa, models of this case, that if you stand for that, and you can convey the meaning of that, which is the future of mankind, a future which mankind has not heretofore achieved. And that is the highest goal of human achievement.

Now, people are going to die. Human people, historically, always die; except for a few people who made it so far, a handful of people. Everybody else dies. The question is under what condition do they die, and under what conditions do their circles of life represent? Do you represent, in your society, a power of creativity for the future of mankind, which mankind has never

achieved before? And it's only when you get to that point that you understand that principle, that you find yourself equipped with the ability to make the argument, and sustain the argument which has to be done.

This is not a sacrifice, because you're going to lose your life anyway. You don't live, you don't have a full life. Anybody who's 100 years of age, or even my age, that's not really the issue. The issue is what the future of mankind represents. And the future of mankind means, what can you do, for example, in schools? What can you do in educational systems, to make the population that you are supposedly educating, achieve a level of achievement in knowledge and effectiveness which mankind has never experienced before? Isn't that the great achievement?

When we look at the history of mankind, we study the history of mankind, as I've studied the history of mankind at some length in the course of my life, it's the people who create a *new* opportunity, a more advanced opportunity, a corrected opportunity, and it's those people who mean something.

People who work to get by and pass tests, and get rewards, they are not very important. The only very important people are those whose actions by themselves are a contribution to the improvement of humanity in general. And that's what we all have to concentrate on. That's the only thing that's really redeeming, in terms of the history of mankind. Can you produce an achievement for mankind as a whole which has never been achieved on that level before? And if you have a devotion to that goal, and understand the goal, then you are very powerful. Because the history has shown that it's human achievement, of that type, which has been the motive force by which mankind has survived and achieved....



LaRouche PAC

LaRouche PAC organizing in Manhattan.

III. Lyndon LaRouche's Manhattan Project

Actual leadership is required if Barack Obama is to be forced from office and the threat of global war averted. That leadership exists in the United States. It is courageous, and it is committed to victory. It is to be found in the Manhattan Project, the organizing initiative launched by Lyndon LaRouche in October of 2014.

Over the recent weeks, volunteers and organizers from that Project have unleashed an intervention into the cultural and political life of Manhattan with the uncompromising demand that Obama must be removed from office NOW if world war is to be prevented. Every component of the Manhattan-based establishment, from academia, to elected officials, to the diplomatic community is being confronted on a daily basis with the reality of Obama's war drive, confronted in a manner where there is no place for them to hide or to avoid the truth. People are being forced to face the consequences that it is only their own folly in tolerating Obama that allows this deadly progression toward war to escalate.

Growing numbers of New Yorkers are being recruited into this fight. The success in growing this

movement has been precisely because it is not a “practical” political movement. The Project-affiliated Community Chorus has been at the heart of aiding individuals to transform their own self-conception and to locate their activity as world-historical women and men acting on the future, acting to interrupt the deadly trajectory of present history. As in Lyndon LaRouche’s recent discussions of Filippo Brunelleschi, the question of a truly human identity has been at the heart of the choral work of the Project.

If *Executive Intelligence Review* were to report in detail on all of the day-to-day political organizing of the Manhattan Project, the entirety of this current issue would be taken up by such reports. It is sufficient to say that this organizing is extensive; it is relentless; and it is bold. Only two examples of that organizing will be reported here, and those to provide tactical examples for any patriot, anywhere in the nation, who desires to act now:

On December 1st, in Manhattan’s upper west side, a team of Manhattan Project organizers confronted the anti-Putin chess grandmaster Garry Kasparov at a book-signing ceremony at the local Barnes and Noble. Kasparov was there to promote his latest screed “*Winter is Coming: Why Putin and the Other Enemies of Freedom Must Be Stopped.*” Kasparov is well known as a propagandist who equates Vladimir Putin with Josef Stalin and Adolph Hitler. The Manhattan Project organizers denounced Kasparov as a liar and as a pawn of the Obama war drive. *LaRouche PAC* leaflets, including “Put Obama Under Lock and Key to Avert Nuclear War,” and “Obama Wades Further into the Sea of Blood,” were distributed to the assembled crowd, amid a polarization of the audience and heated discussions on the reality that Obama is leading us into World War III.

On the very same day, another team of Manhattan Project organizers intervened into an event at New York University, sponsored by Indonesian experts who were gathered to discuss the hidden history of the massacres and mass slaughter which took place in Indonesia in 1965-1966. Three organizers intervened with separate briefings on the involvement of Obama’s step-father Lolo Soetero in that mass genocide, and the way in which this family heritage has shaped Barack Obama’s murderous personality. In the midst of freak-outs and great consternation from the podium, the Manhattan Project organizers forcefully made the urgent point, as

demanded by Lyndon LaRouche, that Obama’s character as a murderer and the use of murder by Obama as a policy, from kill lists to drones, to the threat of nuclear war, to Obama’s own self-description as someone who found that he was good at killing—that this was all linked to the role of Obama’s step-father in one of the biggest massacres in recent history. The point was driven home that in the present, perilous, global environment, it is insanity to have the power of the Presidency in the hands of someone with these kinds of psychological problems, and that clearly Obama must be removed from office.

IV. The Still Too-cowardly Institutional Opposition to Obama

During the last 30 days, opposition from among U.S. elected officials and other public figures to the Obama war drive has surfaced publicly within the United States in a way which is unprecedented when compared to the slavish subservience to Obama that has characterized most U.S. establishment leaders over the last six years. Some of this opposition, such as Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard’s challenge to Defense Secretary Ashton Carter at a hearing of the House Armed Services Committee on December 1, has been very courageous. Other criticisms of Obama, such as a recent speech by former Secretary of Defense William Perry and separate recent writings by *Washington Post* columnists Richard Cohen and Dana Milbank, have been very weak. Most of the anti-Obama interventions lie somewhere between those two poles. A few examples will provide a flavor of this activity:

On November 27th, Bruce Blair, a former nuclear launch officer and a co-founder of Global Zero, posted an article on the *Politico* website titled “Could US-Russia Tensions go Nuclear?” In the article, Blair warns that the current state of relations between the United States and Russia is at a hair-trigger for nuclear war. Specifically, Blair points to dramatic changes in military deployments and procedures that have been implemented over the last two years, since January of 2014, which have dramatically lowered the threshold for the launching of all-out war. Blair describes the current “launch-on-warning” insanity which has been forced on both Russia and the United States by the strategic doctrine of the Obama administration. As of this



Department of Defense/Glenn Fawcett

Former Secretary of Defense William Perry on Dec. 3 warned of an exacerbated “risk of nuclear war” with Russia. Here, he’s shown speaking at the Pentagon in March 2015.

moment, according to Blair, if either President Obama or President Putin are presented with a report of a “possible” attack on their nation, they would only have 2-6 minutes to decide on whether or not to launch a full strategic nuclear attack. In reality, as other analysts have shown, given the delays and real time difficulties involved in passing along such a warning, the actual time for the head of state to decide to unleash Armageddon would be 30 to 60 seconds... or less.

On November 29th, Germany’s *Der Spiegel* magazine interviewed U.S. Lieutenant General (Ret.) Michael Flynn, the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, who was fired by Obama, and who then publicly accused Obama of knowingly pursuing policies which created and spread ISIS. In the interview, General Flynn laid the blame for the current spread of international terrorism squarely at the door of the White House, including both its previous occupant, George W. Bush, and current resident, Barack Obama, as the responsible parties for the creation of ISIS and the current crisis in the Mediterranean. In the interview the following exchange took place:

Spiegel: There would be no ISIS if the Ameri-

cans had not invaded Baghdad in 2003. Do you regret...

Flynn: Yes, absolutely.

Spiegel: ...the Iraq War?

Flynn: That was a colossal mistake.

In a December 2nd interview with *Russia Today*, Senator Richard Black of Virginia identified Obama’s pawn Turkey as the most loyal ally that ISIS has in the Middle East, and he described in detail the supplying and arming of ISIS through routes that pass through the Turkish-Syrian border, the same routes used to finance ISIS by means of oil tankers traveling from ISIS-controlled areas into Turkey.

In addition to those cited in the preceding paragraphs, other public figures have come forth in opposition to current Obama policy, including speeches or interviews by former U.S. Senator Mike Gravel, former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright, former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, Republican Congressman Dana Rohrabacher, and Republican Presidential candidates Ted Cruz and Mike Huckabee. All of these individuals have struck at some aspect of the Obama madness, ranging from Obama’s support for the ISIS terrorists to the danger that Obama’s military escalation against Russia is leading us to the brink of world war.

Additionally, there are the continuing efforts of former Senator Bob Graham, Congressman Walter Jones, and their allies to speak out and demand the release of the full 28 pages which were excised from the official report of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks, pages which will implicate the Presidencies of both George W. Bush and Barack Obama in covering up the role of Saudi Arabia in carrying out that attack.

Tulsi Gabbard

During a House Armed Services Committee hearing on December 1st, Representative Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI) confronted Defense Secretary Ashton Carter on the looming danger of a devastating thermonuclear war with Russia as a consequence of Barack Obama’s policies in Syria.¹ During the course of this exchange, Con-

1. For a full report on this exchange, see: <http://larouchepac.com/20151202/rep-gabbard-warns-nuclear-war-us-war-overthrow-assad>



CSPAN

Rep. Tulsi Gabbard, during her Dec. 1 confrontation with Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter.

gresswoman Gabbard peppered Carter with a series of questions, questions which made him increasingly defensive as they progressed.

Gabbard began by stating, “Since our policy to overthrow the Syrian government of Assad has brought us, essentially, into a direct head-to-head conflict with Russia, I have some important questions along this line. How many nuclear warheads does Russia have aimed at the U.S., and how many does the U.S. have aimed at Russia?”

After a non-response from Carter, Gabbard continued, “And it would be correct to say that both of our countries have the capacity to launch these nuclear weapons within minutes?”

Gabbard then proceeded to discuss the patrolling of the Turkey-Syria border by U.S. F-15s, and how this military deployment could have as its only purpose the targeting of Russian planes. Despite repeated attempts by Defense Secretary Carter to both change the subject and blatantly lie, Gabbard persisted, stating the obvious truth that the current U.S. military actions in and around Syria can only lead to head-to-head conflict, i.e., a shooting war, with Russia.

This personal “interruption” by Representative Gabbard is the first time that any sitting member of Congress, speaking within the Capital building, has identified that the recent military decisions taken by the Obama White House are propelling the us to the brink of world war. It is an heroic act, more so because other members of Congress, governed by their own fears of Obama, have been cowed into silence.

V. The Necessary Method

In recent discussions, both public and private, Lyndon LaRouche has stressed the importance of learning the true lessons of history. Not the “facts,” not the names, dates, *et al.* Rather, the true revolutionary way in which real human history is made.

In these discussions, LaRouche has repeatedly returned to two themes—the first being the concept of “placement,” and the second being the personage of Filippo Brunelleschi. This present article is not the place for an in-depth examination of either of those themes.² Nevertheless, it is important to state here that when LaRouche raises the issue of “placement,” he is not discussing it as a mere musical methodology; nor, when LaRouche discusses Brunelleschi is he simply raising the issue of Brunelleschi’s architectural or engineering skills. Rather, LaRouche is proposing a challenge to every individual to discover the actual nature of the human identity, and thus to discover the way whereby our current historical trajectory—our real-life tragedy—might be changed.

In a recent discussion, LaRouche stated that he now fears the collapse of history, the end of history; that we are at the edge of the extermination of the human species. He asked, what do we have to do?

How do you stop it, that’s the point. How do you stop it? How do you stop the current course of history? Because everything, every problem of mankind is the failure to stop the bad history which is in the making. And that’s where most of our own people are screwed up. They say, what’s a practical solution to this problem? And if you’re not influencing the *future* thinking of the population, you ain’t doing nothing. You’re not doing anything important. The idea that, you know, history will tell you what the future is,—history does *not* tell you what the future is! Mankind’s development determines what the future is.

And Brunelleschi is a good example of this. His work is an excellent model, because he was

2. For a more in-depth presentation by Lyndon LaRouche on the significance of Brunelleschi, see: <https://larouchepac.com/20151207/lpac-policy-committee-show-december-7-2015>

a leading figure in a crucial period of the Renaissance. His work was absolutely magnificent. And that's where you have to *generate* the future, not react against it: generate the future.

A deductive notion of mankind's future is for idiots. You have to create the future, and you don't derive the future from the past. You free mankind *of* the past. You don't learn from the past, you learn to get out of it.

And that's exactly what is not happening since the beginning of the Twentieth Century, with Bertrand Russell's operation in particular,—what's the direction in which mankind is going? Down! *Down!*

These are the problems, and the fact is that we're not intelligent enough, and we haven't learned from history. I spent most of my activity in learning history, ancient history, all kinds of history. And you're looking for the change, which *is* history. And it's not something that happened to you; it's something that you pushed, and made happen.

And if you don't have that sense of pushing, to make something happen which must be made to be caused to happen, then you're a failure, and your opinions are a failure.³

An egregious example which shows a failure to rise to the level of identity that LaRouche states is required, a failure to overthrow the normal “go along to get along” mind-set of the American establishment, can be seen in a recent article, one critical of Obama's anti-Russia policy, authored by Stephen Cohen and his wife Katrina vanden Heuvel. Cohen is a well-known author, professor, and Russia expert. Vanden Heuvel is the publisher and editor of *Nation* magazine. Together, on December 2nd, they published a piece titled “Coalition or Cold War with Russia?” After detailing the dangers inherent in the current situation, the “deterioration” of U.S.-Russia relations, and the failures of current American foreign policy, the two authors offer no options and no alternatives to the current disaster. They end the piece by issuing an appeal (plea) to Obama to “transcend (his) own political biography.”

This article is particularly cowardly because Stephen Cohen is a long-time critic of U.S. policy toward

Russia, having warned, specifically during the Bush-Cheney years, that U.S. policy was leading to military confrontation with Russia. Cohen is well aware that the danger of war with Russia is far greater today than at any time during the Bush Presidency, yet we see this milquetoast piece of garbage urging “transcendence” upon Obama, rather than identifying Obama as the killer he is, and demanding his removal from office.

Compare the cowardly inadequate actions of Cohen and many others to what LaRouche stated at a recent meeting:

Look, we're on the edge of the extermination of the human species; don't worry about who's talking about what, what kind of weapons and so forth. It doesn't make any damn difference. In less than 20 minutes, you're dead; and your death will have been announced and reported throughout the planet. How long does it take for a full-scale thermonuclear blast against a great nation? And what will remain as a result of that blast? Possibly, absolutely nothing; except waste.

And therefore, what do we have to do? Well, the simple thing is we say, “If we get rid of Obama, if we throw him out of office, this is a new story.” And people say they're going to negotiate with Obama, that is real stupidity. If you're negotiating with Obama, you're a traitor to mankind.

I don't think our people really understand how deadly the present moment is. I mean, you have to take a measurement of what is the charge that is going to launch the war? How much? How many? What's Obama doing? What's the effect of his existence?

In another presentation, this one before a recent Manhattan Town Hall Meeting, LaRouche stated that the current challenge all comes down to personal responsibility, personal courage:

And that's how it works. And I don't worry about anybody except me. I'm responsible for me, and what I can contribute to any around me. That's it! And I don't have any other standard. I appreciate people who achieve things. I'm happy when I meet it. I'm happy when they are intelli-

3. More on this theme can be found at: <https://larouchepac.com/20151127/you-have-very-little-time-change-your-thinking>

gent, and I'm miserable when they are not. But I try to get over that.


So the point is, in this point, every individual human being, in the final analysis, is totally responsible to themselves for the future of mankind. And when people understand that, as I do, that's the best. You have to have a standard of your own life, which is defined for the benefit for all mankind. And you will not compromise that for *anything*. And otherwise, if don't do that, you become a failure. And I don't intend to be a failure. They may kill me, but I won't be a failure.

The True Lesson from History

If one is to understand how to change history, one must understand how this has been done in the past. This requires an understanding of what history is not. History is not a chronology. History is not a linear progression of events. History is not evolutionary. In one sense, the history of the human species has been one of degeneration and cultural decay, degenerations which have been *stopped* and *reversed* by revolutionary *interruptions*, interruptions which have often saved humanity from catastrophe, and at times resulted in a profound upsurge in human culture and the human identity, as seen in the European Renaissance.

It has been those interruptions, those interventions, which have had long-lasting effects on human society, and it is very useful to ponder the reality that the founding of the American Republic and what has been positive in American society down to the present day has all been a product of those still existing, if weakening over time, reverberations from that Renaissance of more than a half millennium ago.

In American history, the greatest insight into this scientific principle of creative human intervention is to be found in the personage of Alexander Hamilton. What is crucial in understanding the issue involved is not the simple details of Hamilton's program, but the concept of the human identity and human creativity which inhabits his life's work. Hamilton was able to elevate a bunch of rag-tag colonies to something historic, something profoundly greater than any of the competing parts. Everything good in American history flows from Hamilton's courage and from this intervention. Later, other individuals in their own way acted to defend and



Founding Father Alexander Hamilton. One of his mottos, taken from Demosthenes, was: "As a general marches at the head of his troops, so ought wise politicians if I dare use the expression, march at the head of affairs; insomuch that they ought not to await the event, to know what measures to take; but the measures which they have taken, ought to produce the event."

promulgate this idea, a few with great success. Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, in particular, rose above the practical and political concerns of their time to save and revive the universal mission of the American Republic. Much of this has now been lost. For example, the reverence with which most American's once held Lincoln's poetic Gettysburg Address is now almost faded from memory.

As LaRouche has insisted, we as a species have oftentimes in the past tolerated long periods of decay. The current worsening degeneracy of the Trans-Atlantic community threatens mankind with not simply a catastrophe but with actual human extinction. A new interruption, a new creative human intervention is required. Yet this absolutely can not be achieved through "practical" means, nor if one is held back by fear to "go along to get along." Furthermore, although boldness and courage are absolute necessities for victory, the change needed now requires a more profound change in one's own sense of personal identity. Before trying to change anyone else, you have to change yourself.