

U.S. Military's Efforts Alone Can't Stop Empire's War Drive

by an *EIR* Investigative Team

Feb. 20—We are on the very edge of the potential breakout of World War III, Lyndon LaRouche warned during a Feb. 18 broadcast on LPAC-TV, and we're looking at the month of March. Leading figures in the U.S. military, and others, have delayed this outbreak over the last months, but *as long as President Barack Obama remains in power*, there is a very real danger that such a war could occur. The British Empire and Obama are committed to it, so they must be stopped.

The leading triggers for the thermonuclear confrontation the British are seeking, of course, are Syria and Iran, but those are only triggers. Should attacks occur on these nations, these will only function as detonators for attacks on the real targets, Russia and China, which are well aware that this is the case.

LaRouche said that the month of March is shaping up to be a potentially critical point in this strategic battle. First, and of extreme concern to the British, comes the first round of the Russian Presidential elections on March 4, where Vladimir Putin, whom the British hate and fear, is the leading candidate. Second comes a scheduled issuance of a new report by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on Iran's nuclear capability, which the warhawks expect will support their cause. Third is the annual meeting of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), moved up to March 5, which will feature British puppet and warmonger Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, and provide the occasion for a major war rally,

attended up hundreds of members of Congress.

There is also the very real question of whether the bankrupt world financial system will even exist, into the month of March.

Thus, the British imperial circles have accelerated their war drive—only to be checkmated, so far, by determined efforts from the top levels of the U.S. military command, buttressed by Russian and Chinese officials. But the military cannot do it alone. Either leading political figures in the United States take the necessary *public* steps to get rid of the British-controlled madman in the White House immediately, or the chances of survival are bad, to nil.

General Dempsey Speaks Out

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey has been a consistent voice calling for restraint by Israel against Iran, over the last months, but his statements during a Feb. 19 interview with CNN's Fareed Zakaria were the strongest yet, on both the Iran and Syria questions:

"I think it's premature to take a decision to arm the opposition movement in Syria because I would challenge anyone to clearly identify for me the opposition movement in Syria at this point. And let me broaden the conversation a bit. Syria is an arena right now for all of the various interests to play out. And what I mean by that is you've got great power involvement. Turkey clearly has an interest, a very important interest.



DoD/Helene C. Stikkel

U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey urged against military action against either Syria or Iran.

Russia has a very important interest. Iran has an interest. And what we see playing out is that not just those countries, in fact, potentially not all of them in any case, but we see the various groups who might think that at issue is a Sunni-Shi'a competition for regional control."

On Syria, Dempsey added that the United States should *not* arm the opposition, adding that "there are indications that al-Qaeda is involved, and that they're interested in supporting the opposition."

Asked about a pre-emptive strike on Iran, he replied: "I think it would be premature to exclusively decide that the time for a military option was upon us. I think that the economic sanctions and the international cooperation that we've been able to gather around sanctions is beginning to have an effect. . . . I mean, fundamentally, we have to be prepared. And that includes, for the most part, at this point, being prepared defensively."

On Tehran's leadership: "I'll tell you that I've been confronting that question since I came into Central Command in 2008. And we are of the opinion that the Iranian regime is a rational actor. And it's for that reason, I think, that we think the current path we're on is the most prudent path at this point."

Dempsey emphasized that "we also know—or believe we know—that the Iranian regime has not decided

that they will embark on the effort to weaponize their nuclear capability."

When asked by Zakaria whether the Israelis understand that the United States is urging them not to strike Iran, and whether he thinks that Israel will be deterred from striking in the near future, Dempsey did not answer directly, but said that he is "confident that they understand our concerns, that a strike at this time would be destabilizing and wouldn't achieve their long-term objectives." He noted that he was in Israel three weeks ago engaging in dialogue on the matter.

Indeed, sources familiar with Dempsey's visit to Israel report that he delivered the most blunt and unequivocal message from the United States, perhaps since President Dwight Eisenhower ordered Israel, Great Britain, and France to withdraw from their invasion of the Suez Canal in 1956. His message to Tel Aviv was, in effect: "Don't you dare!"

In addition to calling for restraint with respect to the flashpoints around Syria and Iran—in stark contrast to Obama's British-scripted bellicosity—Dempsey stated that the U.S. military's strategic shift to the Pacific region provides an opportunity to improve U.S.-China relations. "I think this is more opportunity than liability to improve our relationship with China," Dempsey said, "and I am personally committed to having that as the outcome, rather than get into an arms race or into some kind of confrontation with China."

He's Not Alone

Dempsey's interview followed significant war-avoidance testimony given in the U.S. Congress on Feb. 15 by Director of National Intelligence (DNI) Gen. James Clapper and Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) head Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess. Both made several additional points against military intervention.

In response to questions from Sen. Jim Webb (D-Va.), Clapper described a Syrian opposition that is mostly based outside the country, and is torn by an internal feud over who is going to lead it. He noted that the recent suicide bombings were all targeted against security and intelligence facilities and "had all the earmarks of an al-Qaeda-like attack. And so we believe that al-Qaeda in Iraq is extending its reach into Syria."



White House/Pete Souza

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper briefs the President in 2010. He told Congress last week: “We believe that al-Qaeda in Iraq is extending its reach into Syria.”

The next day, Clapper’s remarks about al-Qaeda involvement were picked up by the leading Russian online news outlet, Russia Today—a sharp contrast with the lack of coverage in the largely British-controlled mainstream news outlets in the U.S.

Clapper repeated his earlier testimony that the intelligence assessment of Iran’s nuclear program is that Iran is retaining the option of being able to build nuclear weapons, but has not yet decided to do so. “And we believe that the decision would be made by the Supreme Leader himself, and he would base that on a cost-benefit analysis in terms of—I don’t think he’d want a nuclear weapon at any price,” he said.

Clapper also expressed a certain disagreement with Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who told the same committee that if Iran decided to weaponize, “It would probably take them about a year to be able to produce a bomb, and then possibly another one or two years in order to put it on a deliverable vehicle of some sort in order to deliver that weapon.” Clapper said, with respect to the one-year perspective, that it was technically feasible, but not very likely. “There are all kinds of combinations and permutations that could affect how long it might take the Iranians to make a decision to pursue a nuclear weapon.”

In his testimony, DIA chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess stated what should be obvious, but is usually ignored by

the pro-war crowd: Iran is likely to respond if attacked, but “the Agency assesses Iran is unlikely to initiate or intentionally provoke a conflict.”

The Warmongers Can’t Wait

Provoking a conflict is precisely what the British Empire and its assets are anxious to do. And they are revving up the political environment precisely in this direction.

One of the major problems they face is that Iran has agreed to resume talks with the so-called P5+1 (the Permanent Five members of the UN Security Council—the U.S., Russia, Britain, France, China—plus Germany), which had been formed to discuss the nuclear issue. For months, the whining establishment line about Iran has been that Tehran has never responded to an October 2011 letter from EU Foreign Minister Lady Catherine Ashton, offering to start talks with preconditions such as Iran’s agreeing to stop uranium enrichment, as a basis for the talks. The Ashton letter was a provocation, aimed at guaranteeing that no talks would resume. That has now been trumped by Iran.

This is the setting for an escalation of measures against Iran which amount to a de facto embargo, in addition to the squeezing of Syria, an Iranian ally—both calculated to pressure Iran into retaliation. The British warmongers won’t take peace for an answer.

On Feb. 16, warhawk Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.), Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), and Lindsay Graham (R-S.C.) launched their effort to prevent any possible peaceful resolution to the conflict. Twenty-nine other Senators, including a number of “liberal” Democrats, signed on to S. 3112, a sense of the Senate resolution which tells President Obama that he will have strong bipartisan support in Congress if he launches a military attack on Iran. The resolution defies all sound military and intelligence judgment and declares that Iran must be prevented from obtaining a nuclear weapons *capability*, and rejects any policy of containment of a nuclear Iran.

The U.S. could have diplomacy and war avoidance with the nuclear-armed Soviet Union for four decades, but can’t contain Iran? The resolution is just a blatant push for war.

And Now Syria

Meanwhile, the Obama Administration, primarily through British-trained asset and UN Ambassador Susan Rice, is escalating against Syria, again ignoring

the U.S. military's warnings about al-Qaeda's role in the opposition, and it's being pressured to go even further along the Libyan path, specifically to set up a so-called "humanitarian corridor" that would serve as a base for the violent overthrow of President Bashar al-Assad.

On Feb. 17, fifty-six pro-British ass-kissing neoconservative liars and chickenhawks who brought the world the wars on Iraq and Afghanistan issued an open letter to Barack Obama, demanding an "immediate" U.S. intervention into Syria, in the name of "humanitarian" concerns. Sponsoring the letter is the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, the same group that La-RouchePAC fingered last week as a key promoter of the Mossad-funded and -trained Mujahideen e-Khalq (MEK) terrorists being deployed as assassins inside Iran. The signators' demands are a virtual carbon copy of a war plan put out earlier by the London-headquartered Henry Jackson Society: U.S. and other foreign forces must establish "safe zones within Syrian territory," and "no-go zones for the Assad regime's military and security forces," and work with Congress to impose "crippling" sanctions against Syria's energy supplies, banking, and shipping. Plus supplying military aid to the non-existent Free Syrian Army, and coordinating with and supplying communications technologies to the very "political opposition" that U.S. intelligence officers, including DNI Clapper, say is fragmented and infiltrated by al-Qaeda. The reality is that the armed opposition in Syria is al-Qaeda, with some equally odious Salafi fanatics thrown in for good measure.

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon is lining up behind the views of the interventionists, and in separate meetings in Europe on Feb. 16, informed the French and Russian foreign ministers that the UN's "top priority" is to establish "humanitarian access" for foreign forces inside Syria. So, too, like sheep lining up for their own slaughter, a majority of the nations of



Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess, head of the Defense Intelligence Agency told Congress bluntly: "Iran is unlikely to initiate or intentionally provoke a conflict."

DIA

the world then voted up, 135 to 12, with 17 abstentions, a non-binding UN General Assembly resolution demanding that the Syrian government allow such "humanitarian assistance."

Not to be left out, Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) on Feb. 16 introduced Senate Resolution 379, "Condemning Violence by the Government of Syria Against the Syrian People," which promises that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will immediately schedule a hearing to assess "international options available" to be taken against Syria. Like his neocon allies, Kerry's resolution singles out Russia and China for refusing to capitulate to this demanded new war. It cannot be forgotten

that Kerry's similar treasonous defense of Barack Obama's unconstitutional Libya War was crucial in bringing the world to the brink of the global thermonuclear war which the now-demanded action against Syria may well trigger.

Documentation

Russian Spokesmen See Threat of Nuclear War

Sergei Markov, a public policy expert with close ties to Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, said the Kremlin sees the U.S./NATO goal of overthrowing Syrian President Hafez al-Assad as a first step to war against Iran, the *Christian Science Monitor* reported on **Feb. 13**. "We've been deceived over and over again," Markov said. "We consider the claims that Assad is massacring people are falsifications, basically a pretext to introduce troops and start a war there. We saw the U.S. invade Iraq on false pretenses. Then they lied about the humanitarian situation in Libya, and per-

sueded Russia to allow a UN resolution on a no-fly zone to protect civilians. Why should we believe them now? [Russia thinks] the purpose of the West is not peace but war in Syria. They have their own goals which they are cynically pursuing.”

Gen. Nikolai Makarov, Russia’s Chief of the General Staff, told reporters on **Feb. 14** that an attack from the West against Iran could take place as early as this Summer. The RIA News Agency said that Makarov “expects Iran’s enemies to decide in the next few months how to deal with a nuclear program that the United States and Israel have said they might attack.”

“Iran, of course, is a sore spot,” Makarov said. “. . . There has to be some kind of decision about it now. It will be made, probably, closer to Summer.”

He also spoke, according to the Chinese news agency Xinhua, against the U.S./NATO forward-basing of missile defense installations in Eastern Europe, which the U.S. claims is to counter potential missile threats from Iran. “By 2018,” Xinhua reported, “an entirely different generation of those missiles would be ‘capable of shooting down strategic missiles over our territory,’ Makarov said.”

Russia’s highest military official also warned of the prospect of the United States deploying warships in the Black Sea or in the Arctic. “In a case where [Aegis anti-missile system-equipped] ships appear in the Barents Sea, or in the Black Sea, for instance, we will likely take special measures in the frame of the state rearmament program,” Makarov told reporters. “But we would not like to use these measures, as they increase the financial burden for us.”

On **Feb. 15**, **General Makarov** told the Russian Public Chamber that “the possibility of local armed conflicts virtually along the entire perimeter of [Russia’s] border has grown dramatically. I cannot rule out that, in certain circumstances, local and regional armed conflicts could grow into a large-scale war, possibly even with nuclear weapons.”

Russia Today news service quoted him saying that “almost all countries formerly belonging to the Warsaw Pact have become NATO members, and the Baltic States that were earlier a part of the U.S.S.R. have also joined the alliance.”

The online news service noted an earlier statement by **Prime Minister Putin**, that “at time of the withdrawal from Eastern Europe, the NATO Secretary General promised the U.S.S.R. it could be confident that

NATO would not expand beyond its current boundaries. So where is it now? I asked them [the NATO officials]. They have nothing to say. They deceived us in the rudest way.”

Then on **Feb. 16**, radio Ekho Moskvyy interviewed **General Makarov**, who warned that Russia has the right to use nuclear weapons if its sovereignty is threatened.

Expanding on a theme he had developed in November of last year, when he warned of the danger of nuclear war, Makarov said: “We are certainly not planning to fight against the whole of NATO, but if there is a threat to the integrity of the Russian Federation, we have the right to use nuclear weapons, and we will.”

The general said that Russia’s nuclear deterrent is the cornerstone of strategic stability, and serious efforts are being taken by the Russian government to modernize the country’s nuclear triad. These include adding ten Borey-class strategic nuclear submarines, bringing its Tu-160 Blackjack and Tu-95 Bear strategic bombers up to date, and adding Yars mobile ballistic missile systems.

Makarov stressed that the country should also maintain efficient conventional forces: “Unfortunately, we are facing threats from a number of unstable states, where no nuclear weapons, but well-trained, strong, and mobile armed forces are required to resolve any conflict situation.”

On **Feb. 16**, Russian Security Council head **Nikolai Patrushev** was quoted by the daily *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, citing comments made this week at a hearing by Gen. James Clapper, the U.S. Director of National Intelligence, about Russia’s nuclear arsenal. Patrushev said that Russia has no intention of attacking the NATO alliance or any other countries.

But, he added, “our Army must fulfill its deterrent function and maintain the country’s sovereignty and peaceful life. And if the United States ignores our proposals regarding a missile defense system in Europe, we will be forced to prepare an asymmetric response. That global system is clearly aimed at Russia. And at China. Earlier the irritant was Moscow. Now it’s Beijing, although the theme of the break-up of Russia is still a current one for them. In certain circles, they sleep and dream about how to get the resources of Siberia and the Far East. And gain access to the Caspian and to the transportation corridor of Central Asia.”