

LaRouche's Historic Role in Catalyzing Global Resistance to World War III

EIR Counterintelligence Editor Jeffrey Steinberg was interviewed on Dec. 6, by Matthew Ogden of LPAC-TV. The discussion centered on Lyndon LaRouche's key role today in catalyzing the resistance among leading figures from the U.S., and around the world, to British plans for thermonuclear World War III. Steinberg develops the history of the resistance to war inside Israel today; including, LaRouche's dialogues with leading Israeli patriots, including Abba Eban, stretching back to the early 1970s.

Ogden: Jeff, thank you for joining us in the studio today. I wanted you to come in to discuss the global resistance that Lyndon LaRouche has catalyzed to the British plans for thermonuclear war.

And as viewers of this web site know very well, we have covered the fact that there is a large resistance inside the top layers of the U.S. military and intelligence establishment, which has been catalyzed by LaRouche's actions. But this resistance also spreads worldwide, and very significantly, we're seeing a resistance inside Israel to the plans by [Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin] Netanyahu and others. And as LaRouche made the point, this resistance in Israel has a long history to it, which he has been intimately involved in. So maybe you could say a little on this resistance worldwide.

Steinberg: Well, any competent military, or intelligence official of any government—particularly the United States and Israel, because we're talking about a preemptive attack against Iran—any competent official knows that any such attack will very likely lead to counter-actions and an escalation that will very rapidly go up to a general war, drawing in the United States, Russia, China, other countries. And that the likelihood of this general war reaching the level of exchanges of thermonuclear weapons is great. So we're really talking about something that would potentially wipe out humanity in its entirety.



LPAC-TV

Jeffery Steinberg on LPAC-TV Dec. 6.

And so, from the standpoint of the U.S. military command, the opposition to any kind of action right now against Iran is enormous. You've had a number of very senior retired military people coming out publicly. We've published, for example, an interview with Gen. Joseph Hoar, the former head of the Central Command, who is very, very clear, very adamant against any military action (*EIR*, Nov. 18, 2011). And he speaks for himself, but also for a viewpoint shared by many people in the U.S. military, both retired and active duty.

We also interviewed Dr. Hans Blix, the former head of the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency], who said categorically, "absolutely no," when asked whether he thought the IAEA report warranted military action against Iran (*EIR*, Nov. 25, 2011).

The point is that, under no circumstances, does this make any sense to anybody who is not stark-raving insane and a genocidalist.

What you've got as well in Israel, is a tradition of certain people, who, while they are unquestionably ardent Zionists, they're also nationalists. They've de-

veloped a certain sense that they are part of a country that exists under very dangerous circumstances, in a really dangerous neighborhood, and the idea of Netanyahu and [Defense Minister Ehud] Barak launching a preemptive attack against Iran at this point, when everybody knows that Iran is nowhere close to having a nuclear bomb, would be the ultimate act of national suicide, on the part of Israel.

Two Pawns of the British Empire

The problem that you're dealing with, is, that between Benjamin Netanyahu in Israel, and President Barack Obama in the United States, you have two people who are not only mentally unbalanced, but are pawns of a very specific British imperial faction that does want to blow up the world, quite literally. Their agenda is massive population reduction, on a scale that's never before been seen in history. Prince Philip talks about eliminating 6 billion out of the present 7 billion population of this planet, and there are others in his circle who speak in these exact terms.

So, the point is, you've got a dangerous factor, in that you've got a British oligarchy that's desperate over the fact that a system that's been in place since the time of the Peloponnesian Wars, since the advent of the Roman Empire—that system has now reached a break-point, where it's one of those moments of absolute doom. And there are certain people who are even more insane than Netanyahu and Obama, who simply say, "If we can't run the world, then blow it all up." And there are some delusions that somehow or other, if you launch global thermonuclear war, that you can neatly put a stop at killing 6 billion people rather than 7. This is sheer madness, but it is a madness that is rampant in some very powerful and desperate political circles right at this very moment.

And so, that's what we're dealing with.

Now, as I said, within Israel, you have several different currents: You've got elements of Zionism that are more modernist, more secular, more nationalist—some of the roots of this go back to the early Zionist settlers who predate the founding of the state of Israel in 1948. So, you've got that sort of long tradition.

Some of those people came out of the European Socialist movements, and fled Europe under the threat of pogroms, and the suppression of the left wing, and things like that. So you've got that tradition there. That's a whole other issue that we're not going to dis-

cuss today—i.e., whether there is a deep fundamental flaw that's rampant in all forms of Zionism. But for now, the crucial thing is that you've got a nationalist element. They're in the military, they're in the Mossad, they're in the Shin Bet, they're in other institutions of government and society in Israel. And they are coming forward, more aggressively than they've been in recent decades, precisely because they see an existential crisis—that this lunatic Netanyahu—and Barak has become quite as mad as Netanyahu, so much so, that he could literally launch an action that could lead to the destruction, extermination of Israel.

Now, Netanyahu comes from a different tradition. Netanyahu's father, who is still alive—he's 100 years old—was the personal secretary, and then the heir, to the revisionist Zionist movement of Vladimir Jabotinsky. Now, revisionism, Zionism, all of these terms are very euphemistic, because, two things about Jabotinsky: He was a British agent of a very particular sort, of the same variety we saw in another famous Russian, named Parvus, who was the person who developed the concept of "permanent war, permanent revolution." These were fanatical revolutionaries, radical jacobins, who operated as high-level, sophisticated British agents.

From Jabotinsky to Netanyahu

In the case of Alexander Helphand Parvus, it was Fredrick Engels who played a direct role as his sort of patron and case officer, for the British, Fabian imperial networks. Parvus worked closely with Jabotinsky, who was the founder of this messianic Zionist movement. They worked together for the Young Turks movement that was an insurgency, part of a British destabilization factor, that included young Europe, young America.

During World War I, Jabotinsky actually headed up a Zionist unit within the British army, fighting within the Middle East, on behalf of the British. So, there's a pedigree of Jabotinsky extended into Netanyahu—that these are not nationalist patriots. They are fanatical ideologues of the doctrine of permanent war, permanent revolution. And they are also, at the same time agents, agents very much under control of the British. So there's a revolt against that.

The people in Israel typified by the former Mossad director Meir Dagan, or the former head of the Israeli Defense Force—you have both Gen. [Gabi] Ashkenazi



Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs



www.cflu.org



Leading military and intelligence figures, such as (left to right) retired generals Shaul Mofaz, Meir Dagan, and Gabi Ashkenazi, see that their country is being led by a madman, Netanyahu, and that Israel is on the verge of launching an attack that could have deadly and irreversible consequences for the nation.

and Gen. [Shaul] Mofaz. Do these people understand the full scope of this permanent war, permanent revolution disease? Or do they understand that Netanyahu is functioning as a British agent in his madness and his drive for this war? I don't think they understand that. They have a much more rudimentary impulse, which is that they see that their country is being led by a madman, and that they're on the verge of launching an attack that could have deadly and irreversible consequences for Israel.

This existential crisis harkens back to an earlier period; and there was a period in the middle of the 1970s, and extended in the 1980s and beyond, where Lyndon LaRouche was in direct communication with a number of leading figures in the old Israeli nationalist orbit. And again, we're leaving aside the question of the pros and cons of Zionism as a movement in the first place.

But, back in the mid-1970s, LaRouche launched an initiative that actually took the form of proposed legislation; it was called the "Middle East Peace and Development Act of 1975." The essence of what LaRouche said was: The Middle East region has been basically a laboratory and playground for European, particularly British, colonial manipulation for more than 100 years. You have very, very deep scars; you've got hatreds that go back two, three, four generations. The idea that you're simply going to have a kiss-and-make-up agreement between the Arabs and Jews in Israel is very unlikely.

A War-Avoidance Policy

So the question is, how do you avoid war, how do you bring some level of peace and prosperity to this region? What LaRouche said at the time, was you've got really a perfect recipe for this area to become a prosperous and developing part of the world. We're talking about immediately after the great oil hoaxes, where you had the massive escalation in oil prices in the early- and mid-1970s.

What LaRouche said is: Why should Iran, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, all of these countries, simply, automatically turn over all of their oil profits to the City of London and Wall Street to use against their own interests? Why not create a Middle East development bank? Use that development bank to issue long-term credits for projects that will completely transform the area.

He said, under those circumstances, there are natural points of self-interest. You've got Israel, which at that time, still really did have a very advanced population, highly educated, technology-oriented. You had Israeli agricultural expertise, you had the nuclear energy and other high-technology capabilities.

So in other words, you had a highly skilled potential labor force there that could work on projects beneficial to the entire region. In Egypt you still had a very large, relatively skilled population. Egypt today has 85 million people. It had to have had 60 million or so people during that period. They had a certain skill level as well.

Then, of course, you had tremendous needs. The big issue in the Middle East, the big crisis, always centered



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

There was a period in the middle of the 1970s, and extended in the 1980s and beyond, where Lyndon LaRouche was in direct communication with a number of leading figures in the old Israeli nationalist orbit.

on the question of water. So the potential of development of major water projects, that would again allow the region to become a breadbasket for the world. These were all the issues on the table. Now those ideas resonated with many of the old leaders who were still around and very active at that time.

LaRouche Goes to Iraq

In 1975, LaRouche was invited to Iraq. There was a celebration, an anniversary of the founding of the Ba'ath party. He was there; he had a chance to meet with many Arab diplomats, a scientist, government officials, economists; and this was right at the point that Henry Kissinger was launching a major destabilization of the same region, in the form of the civil war in Lebanon.

And at one point, LaRouche was brought to a kind of a private gathering outside of Baghdad, and a group of these diplomats wanted to get his assessment of what was going on. And he warned that there was about to be an eruption of an externally manipulated, a British-manipulated, civil war in Lebanon that was intended to destabilize the whole region.

So there was great interest in LaRouche's proposal for this economic development approach to

dealing with what otherwise seemed to be completely intractable problems.

There was, by the way, an invitation extended by the Iraqi ambassador to France, who offered to host a briefing in Europe, for Mr. LaRouche to go through this proposal, and during the same period, LaRouche had broadened the idea of a Middle East development bank, and proposed the creation of an International Development Bank, following a debt moratorium on the unpayable debt, even back then.

That meeting in Paris was cancelled as the result of a personal intervention

by Henry Kissinger, who basically threatened food war against Iraq and any other country that participated in this event with Mr. LaRouche.

But, interestingly, when he got back to New York City, Mr. LaRouche was contacted by Abba Eban, who was at that time a visiting professor at Columbia University; he was living in New York temporarily, but he had been a foreign minister of Israel; he would later go on to head up the Knesset Committee on Foreign Affairs and National Security; he was one of these prominent figures within the Israeli Zionist nationalist camp. And Abba Eban approached LaRouche, and they had a very candid series of discussions.

First of all, Eban was very much interested in what LaRouche was proposing, in terms of this very different approach, outside the framework of the IMF and World Bank, and all of this malthusian insanity. Remember this was the period where the big *au courant* idea was that there are limits to growth, the idea that everything had to be scaled back; population reduction, all of this insanity. So, LaRouche was proposing a very fresh idea, which is a deeply American idea, namely: We're going to build our way towards greater prosperity, towards mutual self-interest, and we're going to establish a community of principle among



The former Foreign Minister of Israel Abba Eban approached LaRouche in New York, where the two had a series of candid discussions about LaRouche's ideas for economic development of the Middle East region as a war avoidance strategy.

countries that have a deep history of animosity.

And what Abba Eban said to LaRouche in that context was, "Look, I'm very worried, because I see on the near horizon, that the right wing is about to come to power in Israel, and we have very little time to do something to stop it." And he also admitted that one of the worst mistakes that Israel had made, had been the 1967 War, in which they captured the West Bank and Gaza, and the Golan Heights, and took all of Jerusalem, because it created a much deeper fault line between Israel and all of her Arab neighbors. And it created an intractable conflict that he saw moving in a much more deadly and dangerous direction, with the fear that the Likud bloc, the Herut bloc, would come into power.

And of course in 1977, Menachem Begin was elected prime minister of Israel, and within a year, you had an Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon. You didn't have a *big* Middle East war, like 1948, 1967, 1973; but in a very real sense, we've been living in a prolonged period of permanent war throughout the region, low-intensity war that just is never-ending; and whether it's the '78 invasion of Lebanon, the 1982-83 invasion of Lebanon, Operation Cast Lead (the Israeli invasion of the Gaza Strip in the late Winter of 2008), the earlier invasion of the West Bank, there has been a permanent state of warfare and instability. And the region is now ready to blow.

And so, the revolt on the part of the more nationalist element in Israel, very much is reminiscent of the ear-

lier reflection of LaRouche's collaboration, first with Abba Eban; later it extended to a dialogue with Nahum Goldmann, and later, with Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg. It was a group of people who could agree to disagree with LaRouche on certain things, but who saw that his fundamental approach, with a strong anchor in economic justice, very much cohered with their deeply held views. And this collaboration is an important subtext of the history of the entire period.

And, if we're going to avoid a cataclysmic war right now, then these forces are going to have to be encouraged and strengthened, and inspired. Because, right now, we're on the very edge: There is actually no guarantee that the efforts—the leading efforts by the U.S. military—to prevent this war are going to actually succeed.

Obama Must Be Removed

You've got a President Obama, whose strings are pulled from London, by the very faction that is desperate to literally blow up the world, if they see that there is a genuine danger that their entire imperial system, this latter-day Roman Empire known as the British Empire, is going to collapse. We're on the edge of a disintegration of the entire trans-Atlantic financial and monetary system. And that's been the anchor of the British Empire: the ability to exert private oligarchical control over Western finance.

And of course, they see that Asia, relative to the trans-Atlantic region, is surviving, and in some cases, even prospering. That's completely intolerable. And so that's why, suddenly, in the recent period, Obama has gone on a berserker attack against both Russia and China. It's caught people by surprise, but not LaRouche, not us, because we know that we're dealing with an Emperor Nero-type personality.

And in the case of Netanyahu, you not only have the personality, but you have the ideological history that goes back to his father, who, as I said, is still alive, and greatly influential on him. And the Parvus-Jabotinsky nexus that has a history of over 100 years, being an asset, a war-making asset, for British intelligence.

The key that LaRouche has been emphasizing for months, and something that more and more people in Washington are now beginning to grapple with, is that you have to, constitutionally, remove President Obama from office. There's no alternative to that. There's no way of tiptoeing around that issue. The British want to



White House/Lawrence Jackson

The British have two key assets in their drive for war: Barack Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu, shown here at the White House in May 2009.

start a massive war. You can't have a massive war without the United States being under the control of those would-be warmongers. And if you eliminate Obama—and there's ample reason to be able to do that already; there are grounds for his impeachment. There are grounds for the Vice President invoking the 25th Amendment, Section 4, for removing him because he's mentally unfit to serve. All of these things are right there on the table.

Our emphasis is that you've got to understand that we are facing this existential crisis, and that the problem is coming from London. And that the timing is absolutely essential. There have been many important steps taken, predominantly by leading U.S. military circles, to basically throw off the timetable and disrupt those British war plans. But they're going to regroup and keep coming back again and again.

And then they've got these two key assets: They've got Netanyahu, and they've got Obama. And they also

know that they've got people inside Iran, who can be predictably provoked into taking the kinds of actions that provide a pretext. You could have an incident that's a completely manufactured incident, like the Gulf of Tonkin incident, that got the United States dragged all the way into the war in Vietnam. There are many things right now that could be done that could bring us to the brink of thermonuclear extinction, in a matter of literally moments or hours.

And that's why you've got to do something that's definitive, that basically eliminates the potential for this to go any further. And the only option on the table to do that, is to invoke the Constitution, to begin impeachment proceedings against President Obama; or for members of the Cabinet to come to the conclusion that many of them are already mulling over: that the guy is crazy, and that it's a danger to the United States, and to mankind, every moment that he remains in office.

The 25th Amendment

That's why the 25th Amendment was developed in the first place. The two examples that were studied were: What would have happened if President Kennedy had survived, but had been completely rendered incapable of continuing to serve as President? There was no clearly defined mechanism for how to deal with a President who is alive, but incapable of serving. And they also had the example of Woodrow Wilson, who either had a stroke, or a mental breakdown, and for the last 18 months of his Presidency, he was a vegetable. He was kept hidden in the Oval Office, and other people, unelected, were making all of the decisions.

So the 25th Amendment was very carefully debated and crafted, and it's here, waiting to be used. It's the perfect instrument for moving with great speed to remove this President from office, before the nuclear warheads start flying.

I hated it when [former Secretary of State] Condi Rice used the fake images of mushroom clouds, when we knew that Saddam Hussein did not have the nuclear weapons capability. But, that's not the case with Israel. And it's not the case under these present circumstances. There's a very real danger, a very real specter of this situation careening very rapidly out of control.

So, the flank is: Get rid of Obama. The prospects for the future are very bright, but we've got to face the immediate and current reality, and if you try to avoid that question, then you're basically putting all of mankind at risk, at existential risk.