

As Obama Fiddles, British Plan Wars and Genocide

by Jeffrey Steinberg

“[B]ad times, you may say, are exceptional, and can be dealt with by exceptional methods. This has been more or less true during the honeymoon period of industrialism, but it will not remain true unless the increase of population can be enormously diminished. At present the population of the world is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued through each of the world wars. . . . War. . . has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. . . . The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other peoples’.

—Lord Bertrand Russell,
The Impact of Science on Society (1953)

“In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation.”

—Prince Philip,
Deutsche Presse-Agentur (August 1988)

July 19—These now infamous comments by the late Lord Bertrand Russell and by the current British Royal Consort and founder of the World Wildlife Fund, Prince Philip, are statements of intent on the part of the British

monarchy and the London-centered global financial oligarchy—today represented most clearly by the Rothschild-created Inter-Alpha Group of European banks—to reduce the world’s population to under 2 billion people.

It is from this standpoint alone, that the present global crisis, and the sudden emergence of a threat of otherwise unthinkable nuclear war, among other forms of planetary warfare, must be judged.

On July 12, Lyndon LaRouche issued a now widely circulated forecast, under the title, “End-Game Is On: Getting Out in Time!” (p. 4) in which he warned of a global worse-than-Weimar hyperinflationary blowout:

“We are now entering a phase of the present global situation at which we will soon hit the point at which a generations-long global, vastly genocidal breakdown of the entire planet will occur, unless we act to impose the sudden remedy, well before September 2010, of a global Glass-Steagall reform among most of the world’s leading powers, excepting such probably, presently incurable cases as the British Commonwealth system. . . .”

In declaring that the global breakdown crisis, under the present policy trajectory, will hit, full force, sometime between now and September of this year, LaRouche made clear that President Barack Obama must be safely removed from office, during this narrow time frame, before any meaningful policy shift away from a plunge into a new dark age can be averted. “Either

Obama goes, by Constitutional means, or we all go down,” LaRouche, in effect, declared.

Schachtian Genocide and War Provocations

Within leading policymaking circles in Washington, and in major world capitals, LaRouche’s dire forecast has been widely debated, and accepted by a significant number of serious persons. The stunning disintegration of the physical economy, and basic conditions of life for the overwhelming majority of Americans, since the start of the new U.S. fiscal year in 46 of 50 states, has driven LaRouche’s message home. While Congress and the Chicago gang in Obama’s dysfunctional White House continue to disassociate from this crushing reality, others are being forced by onrushing events to take LaRouche’s forecast and proposed solutions more seriously than ever. Furthermore, the fact that over 80% of the American people detest the Obama Presidency, and wish to see Obama removed from office, underscores the radical shift in dynamic, within the adult population of the United States.

Within the policymaking circles in London, typified by the British monarchy and the Inter-Alpha Group, which holds approximately 70% of the world’s hyperinflated bank assets, the reality of the collapse is also widely recognized. But, the presently dominant faction in the City of London would rather blow up the planet altogether, than allow the global Glass-Steagall framework and Four Powers concert, demanded by LaRouche.

They understand that LaRouche has correctly diagnosed Obama as a Nero-like narcissist, installed in the Presidency, through a combination of British orchestration, and treacherous stupidity, on the part of the Democratic Party leadership in Congress and at the Democratic National Committee, whose irrational hatred of the Clintons drove them into London puppet Obama’s arms.



HRH Prince Philip, who has expressed the wish to be reincarnated as a deadly virus.

In effect, a state of war exists between LaRouche and the British monarchy, with its financier appendages on Wall Street, in the Boston “Vault,” and Chicago Commodity Exchange.

In these “exceptional bad times,” to use Russell’s formulation, the British monarchy is pushing a global Schachtian dictatorship, and has set in motion the conditions for a new world war that could, on several fronts, involve the use of nuclear weapons.

According to a senior U.S. intelligence official, the recent G-20 heads of state summit meeting in Canada committed those nations to a suicidal policy of Schachtian austerity, at the same time that the central banks are largely agreed on a policy of monetary hyperinflation. “The fact that the heads of state of nations representing

over 80% of the world’s population have committed themselves to severe austerity, represents, itself, the greatest commitment to Malthusian population reduction in history,” the official observed, in a recent discussion with *EIR*.

At the same time, London is committed to spreading wars throughout Eurasia.

Attack on Iran

On July 16, this author reported, under the headline, “Is Madman Obama Going To Bomb Iran?”:

“A flurry of propaganda has surfaced over the past 48 hours, indicating that, in the aftermath of the Obama-Netanyahu White House love-fest last week, the Obama Administration is seriously considering military action against Iran. If it were simply a matter of media black propaganda, the threat would be limited, at best, given U.S. military resistance to another Persian Gulf war. But, given the fact that the President is stark-raving mad, and given that several extremely well-informed Washington sources have confirmed a renewed consideration of an attack on Iran, coming di-

rectly from the White House, the matter has to be taken very seriously.

“On July 15, *Time* magazine prominently featured a story by Joe Klein, headlined ‘An Attack on Iran: Back on the Table,’ in which it was reported that the Pentagon, for the first time, considers military action against Iran’s nuclear program to be both feasible and possibly necessary. ‘Intelligence sources say that the U.S. Army’s Central Command, which is in charge of organizing military operations in the Middle East, has made some real progress in planning targeted air strikes—aided, in large part, by vastly improved human-intelligence operations in the region,’ Klein wrote.

He then quoted an Israeli military source telling him, ‘There really wasn’t a military option a year ago. But they’ve gotten serious about the planning and the option is now real.’ The source reported that the Israeli military has been consulted on the war planning, because the Obama Administration does not want Israel to act on its own, in attacking Iran. Klein added, ‘One other factor has brought the military option to a low boil: Iran’s Sunni neighbors really want the U.S. to do it. . . . Senior American officials who travel to the Gulf frequently say the Saudis, in particular, raise the issue with surprising ardor.’ Klein claimed that ‘For the moment, the White House remains as skeptical as ever about a military strike,’ but that, according to senior U.S. intelligence sources and one top Democrat, is no longer true. Reportedly, President Obama is personally talking about an attack on Iran, and views it as a potential boost for his 2012 reelection plans.

“On July 15, the same day that the Klein story was posted, *Spiegel* online published a similar story under the headline, ‘A Quiet Axis Forms Against Iran in the Middle East,’ by Alexander Smoltczyk and Bernhard Zand. They cited a strong push from Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, for an attack by the United States on Iran, regardless of the blowback. *Spiegel* noted the recent speech by U.A.E. Ambassador to the United States, Yousef Al Otaiba, at an Aspen, Colo. forum, in which he aggressively promoted American military action to knock out Iran’s nuclear capabilities. ‘A military attack on Iran by whomever would be a disaster,’ the ambassador said, ‘but Iran with a nuclear weapon would be a bigger disaster.’ While acknowledging that there would undoubtedly be a severe backlash, ‘If you ask me, am I willing to live with that, versus living with a nuclear Iran, my answer is still the same.

We cannot live with a nuclear Iran. I am willing to absorb that [it] takes place at the expense of the security of the U.A.E.’

“Even Arnaud de Borchgrave, who, in recent years, was a harsh critic of the Bush-Cheney preventive wars, and an opponent of military strikes on Iran, wrote on July 13 that, ‘Global Sentiment Builds To Attack Iran.’ Citing the same Saudi and U.A.E. statements that were reported by *Time* and *Spiegel*, de Borchgrave concluded: ‘The temptation for Obama to double down on Iran will grow rapidly as he concludes that Afghanistan will remain a festering sore as far as anyone can peer into a murky future, hardly a recipe for success at the polls in November. With a war in Afghanistan that is bound to get worse and a military theater in Iraq replete with sectarian violence, the bombing of Iran may give Obama a three-front war and a chance to retain both houses of Congress.’”

Ring Around Korea

In the aftermath of the Cheonan incident earlier this year, in which a South Korean Navy vessel was sunk, a precarious situation has developed on the Korean peninsula and throughout Northeast Asia, which is ripe for a British-orchestrated confrontation, that also could lead to the use of nuclear weapons.

The United States has beefed up its naval presence off the Korean coast, with the deployment of one aircraft carrier group, and an undisclosed number of nuclear submarines into those waters. According to senior U.S. national security officials, the objective of the U.S. deployment is to prevent an incident at sea from triggering a war in Northeast Asia.

Nevertheless, the buildup of these American naval forces is destabilizing in itself. Top officials of the Chinese Peoples Liberation Army have accused the United States of a naval buildup aimed against China, a charge that U.S. national security officials, including Defense Secretary Robert Gates and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, have strenuously denied. Both senior Obama Administration officials have now deployed to Seoul, to meet with South Korean officials, in what one senior U.S. intelligence official described to *EIR* as an effort to reduce the tensions and danger of “accidental” confrontation. Gates and Clinton have directly spoken to Chinese and Japanese officials, in an effort to head off a further confrontation.

Left to their own devices, the U.S., South Korea, Japan, and China could avoid an escalation which could

lead to war. But the British factor, particularly if it is ignored or underestimated, could set off a new chain of events, on top of the Cheonan sinking itself, to blow up Northeast Asia.

In the 1920s, American war planners always had contingency plans for confrontation with Great Britain, in recognition of the axiomatic differences between U.S. and British strategic interests. To the extent that such historical understanding is now lacking, the danger that London will once again engineer a world war, at the moment when the global financial system is reaching end-game, is very great.

When Bertrand Russell issued his 1953 call for a “Black Death once in every generation,” the Soviet Union had just succeeded in detonating a thermonuclear hydrogen bomb, thus ending Russell’s earlier 1946 pursuit of a pre-emptive nuclear bombardment of the Soviet Union, to create world government. Now, with the Soviet Union gone, the would-be genocidalists in London, typified by Prince Philip, may once again attempt the unthinkable.

Pakistan Is a Victim of Obama’s Afghan War

by Ramtanu Maitra

July 17—On April 22, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton warned in her testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that Pakistan was in danger of falling into terrorist hands: “I think that we cannot underscore enough the seriousness of the existential threat posed to the state of Pakistan by continuing advances, now within hours of Islamabad, that are being made by a loosely confederated group of terrorists and others who are seeking the overthrow of the Pakistani state, a nuclear-armed state.”

One year later, while the Obama Administration continued its mindless Afghan policy, which no one within the Administration can define, the dynamics within Pakistan have worsened further. There is evidence that Pakistan just might be caught in a whirlpool of violence which could result in an eventual breakup of the country.

To prevent such a catastrophe, most Pakistanis have come to the conclusion that what is needed is an imme-

diately withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. Recent polls have shown that support in Pakistan for the Taliban has dropped dramatically, as violence has exploded. An opinion poll by the International Republican Institute conducted last Summer found that 80% of Pakistanis believed the country should not cooperate with America in the war on terror. Another poll, conducted by Gallup last December, shows that no more than 5% of the population in any of the country’s four provinces believes that the Taliban has a positive influence on their lives, including a meager 1% in the North-West Frontier Province, bordering the troubled Afghanistan.

This became evident following a twin suicide attack on July 1, that killed 42 at Pakistan’s most important Sufi shrine in the Punjab city of Lahore. The attack was organized by the militant Deobandis—a small minority in Pakistan that works hand-in-glove with the Wahhabis funded by the Saudis. The majority of Pakistanis, particularly in the provinces of Punjab and Sindh, are moderate Barelvis, imbued with a tinge of Sufi traditions. The anger among the Pakistani population against the United States and its role in Afghanistan has been increased by the killing of civilians, by drone attacks carried out by the International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF), from across the border.

The killings, which have multiplied during President Obama’s reign in the White House, are being construed in Pakistan as a punishment dealt to it by the United States.

Ahmed Humayun’s article in the July 9 *Foreign Policy* magazine, “Pakistan’s Suspicious Public,” cited Pakistan’s Geo-TV interview, in which a Pakistani said: “America is killing Muslims in Afghanistan and in our tribal areas. Militants are attacking Pakistan to express anger against the government for supporting America.” One laborer in the northwest city of Peshawar, which is subjected to daily violence, pointed out that, “since America’s arrival in Afghanistan, terrorism has come to Pakistan. As soon as it quits, peace will come to this region.”

Pakistani anger against the foreign troops has now spilled over to include both the military, and the civilian government. Many Pakistanis express their belief that the United States, in particular, is waging this war to create a pretext for seizing the country’s nuclear weapons. And, the Pakistani establishment has taken to waging war against its own citizens, under pressure