

THE ONLY THING OBAMA FEARS IS LYNDON LAROUCHE

By Debbie Freeman,

LaRouchePAC National Spokeswoman

House Democratic leaders' claim that they are inching closer to bludgeoning enough of their own members to pass Obama's deathcare bill, with a possible Sunday vote, has done little to alleviate Obama's self-destructive paranoia.

Although Obama's overall attitude and behavior has grown no less arrogant even as his approval ratings sink lower with each daily poll, what has grown is his fixation AND his terror every time Lyndon LaRouche opens his mouth, a fact that has led a number of Washington insiders to comment that the only thing Obama seems to fear IS LaRouche.

While there is little question that the March 2 landslide electoral victory of LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers in Texas' 22nd Congressional District Democratic primary kicked Obama's LaRouche fixation up a notch, it was reportedly LaRouche's March 13 webcast that turned that fixation into complete mania. And, at this point, Obama is PERSONALLY tagging any Democrat who opposes any element of his agenda as an agent of Lyndon LaRouche.

In the immediate aftermath of the Rogers victory, there were reports that Obama operative David Plouffe was involved in a frenzied effort to find some way to remove her from the November ballot, despite the fact that she garnered 54% of the vote in a 3-way race. Despite the willingness of some of the more rabid elements inside Texas' State Democratic Executive Committee to go along with Plouffe, leading national Democratic strategists, including some who are not necessarily friendly to LaRouche, saw the Plouffe effort not only as grossly illegal, but as suicidal.

They argued that a big factor in Rogers' support was her explicit demand to impeach Obama and that a move against would rightfully be perceived as a move by the White House to directly defy the expressed wish of the 22nd Congressional District's Democratic voters. And, that given the fact that dissatisfaction with Obama was rising fast, such a move would backfire, leading to even more recognition and support for the LaRouche Democrat.

Although it seemed that these saner voices had prevailed, it didn't stop Obama operatives

from approaching at least two members of Texas' congressional delegation, voicing suspicion that they were "in cohorts" with LaRouche.

Following LaRouche's Saturday webcast, in which he made his most aggressive and convincing argument for Barack Obama's removal from office, inside sources reported that all previous deals were off and those closest to the President, including Valerie Jarrett and David Axelrod, were insisting that something had to be done to stop LaRouche. Apparently, the result was an impotent and largely irrelevant resolution that the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee passed, "sanctioning" Kesha Rogers.

The anti-Rogers resolution says little about Kesha, and instead is a laundry list of long discredited lies and slanders about LaRouche. Ultimately, the only justification the resolution gives for the so-called sanctioning of Rogers is HER SUPPORT OF LAROUCHE.

If the blogosphere is any indication, those Democrats who warned that the tactic would backfire were right. One after another, voters posted that they had voted for Kesha Rogers precisely because they were sick and tired of the betrayal by what they repeatedly referred to as Democratic Party hacks. But, the greatest anger was reserved for Obama himself. One blogger who identified herself as an African American woman said that she, along with countless others, had wept with pride when Obama was inaugurated, only to see him sell her, and the vast majority of the American people, down the river to bail out Wall Street.

But the Texas blunder did little to put a lid on Obama's LaRouche mania. This week, a desperate Obama, whose own Nero-like proclivities caused him to define his presidency by his ability to pass his British authored Nazi healthcare, having exhausted all efforts, including outright thuggery, to garner enough votes to ensure the measure's passage, began to insist that the very fate of his presidency was on the line. It may be the closest Obama has come to reality since taking the oath of office. But, instead of recognizing his own actions as being responsible, he has apparently embraced the illusion that "it is all LaRouche's fault."

The week began with the sudden announce-

ment, as the President embarked on a hastily planned trip to Ohio to try to pressure Dennis Kucinich into reversing his intention to vote no on Obamacare, that the President's long-planned trip to Asia was being postponed "for several days." By today (Thursday), the Asia trip was canceled until some yet to be announced date, presumably in June. Even though Obama was successful in "persuading" Kucinich to reverse his previous emphatic opposition to the healthcare bill, it seems it has done little to alleviate his fear.

Kucinich's Wednesday announcement that he was reversing himself, and would vote "yes" on the Obama measure provides a rather vivid picture of just how Obama persuaded Kucinich to switch his vote. In an excruciatingly odd statement, Kucinich said "I have doubts about the bill. This is NOT the bill I wanted to support." Uh, then why support it?

Because, he said, he had been persuaded that a defeat on the legislation would destroy any potential left in Obama's presidency. "...the thing that has bothered me is that this (a defeat) would delegitimize his presidency. That hurts the nation when that happens," Kucinich reasoned. "We have to be very careful that President Obama's presidency not be destroyed... even though I have many differences with him on policy, there's something much bigger at stake here for America."

After viewing Kucinich's press conference, several members of Congress told this author that it was clear to them that Obama had accused Kucinich of "supporting Lyndon LaRouche's agenda" – most specifically, LaRouche's call for Obama's removal from office. When Kucinich was asked directly if this is, what in fact, had occurred, a distraught Kucinich refused to discuss it.

Kucinich's normally loyal base apparently responded badly to the flip. By Thursday, Kucinich called another press conference announcing that he would return all contributions that had been made by voters who did so believing he would oppose Obama on the measure.

As of this writing, members of both the Progressive and the Hispanic Caucuses continue to get personal calls from the President. Publicly,

they report Obama's pitch is that this bill has to be passed "for the health and strength" not only of HIS presidency, but of the presidency in general, and that the Democratic Party will be irreparably damaged, if not destroyed. Privately, one leader of the Hispanic Caucus admitted he was shocked when the President bluntly demanded

to know what his relationship was to Lyndon LaRouche.

According to the most recent report issued by the House Democratic Whip's office, Pelosi is still at least eight votes short of the 216 votes she needs to win passage. Ultimately, though, it is hardly the issue. Passage of the bill will NOT save Obama's

presidency. In reality, passage of the hated measure may actually hasten the end of Obama's presidency. And, in reality, the President is right to fear LaRouche. It is LaRouche's policy, as well as LaRouche's declaration of war on Obama's British controllers, that pose the greatest threat to Obama's treason.

Russia: What Comes Next?

By Lyndon LaRouche

The Executive Intelligence Review is a journal of what is, systemically, strategic planning, rather than the edifying commentary which lounge lizards would prefer. Therefore, the presently on-rushing world conflict, is to be recognized as an inseparable part of that same, presently continuing strategic history of the world as a whole, since that ouster of Germany's Chancellor Bismarck, which set two so-called "World Wars" and much more into motion, up to this present moment.

As I explain this point in other locations, all those who are, actually historians, rather than merely chroniclers, look at each present point in real history as I do, not from the past, but, a view of the present as being efficiently controlled from what can be estimated as an approaching critical point in the intended future. Thus, we have the relevant contrast between the confused, impotent outlook expressed by the romantic, reborn, statistically Keynesian follies of New York's Paul Krugman, as to be contrasted currently with the shamelessness expressed currently in Foreign Affairs and kindred locations, by Harvard's Scotsman Niall Campbell Ferguson.

Prize-winning liberal Paul Krugman dwells, in a dream-world of silly statistics, in contrast to a more realistically unpleasant Scotsman, Niall Campbell Ferguson. Ferguson, like Boito's creation of the soliloquy Othello's Iago from Othello, expresses the true spirit of a very wicked world, a world of characters out of the spirit of the perpetual evil which Shakespeare revealed, to similar effect, in the perpetual evil which is the world of MacBeth. It is a world of a clever Devil who is looking toward yesterday from tomorrow, looking toward intended, awful years, yet to come.

For that reason, here, in the March 23 international webcast, "The Ides of March," I created an EIR setting of that production which features the inclusion of crucial elements of contributor Rachel Douglas's detailed documentation on the subject of the presently continuing, "Trojan Horse" role of British-directed asset Chubais and

his confederates, such as Mikhail Gorbachev, which was to have been seen now as an echo of an evil already under way already during the early through closing years of the 1980s, and beyond.

That case, of those circles of Gorbachev, Chubais, et al., then, as now, presents us here with a view of the same kind of evil seem among those exact-same British agents from the 1980s, an evil which was to become the crescendo of treasonous economic rape of Russia since even before the advent of the actual break-up of the former Soviet Union.

Against that backdrop, British strategist Ferguson's writings, present an echo of the immediate future, for the world of today, an echo of what the British intelligence services of the 1980s have done to wreck both Russia and the economies of western and central continental Europe since the imposition of the "Euro" policy of the trio of Britain's Margaret Thatcher, France's President Francois Mitterand, and the U.S.A.'s President George H.W. Bush, during 1990 and beyond.

On that account, Ferguson's forecasting, with all its included flaws, is useful in the respect that he presents a credible representation of a British imperialist's foresight into what that the ruling oligarchy of the Inter-Alpha combination threatens to do to immediate future of the world, especially the Trans-Atlantic world, as during the course of the weeks and months presently coming upon us now. Any treatment of the problems of Russia at this moment, are to be recognized as problems to be understood as being chiefly products of the state of mind of the British imperialism perceived by such wits as Ferguson today.

The question to be posed, must therefore be: To what Hell, and where, is Ferguson's perceived forecast for the presently onrushing, intended to lead the bringing down of the world upon us all today?

What Ferguson's efforts represent, should be summed up here in the following terms.

Although the British imperialists pretend that they actual believe in the version of history and strategy which they have copied from both their

creator, Paolo Sarpi, and his lying prophet Adam Smith, actually, the class of actually competent British imperialist policy-shapers, like Boito's Iago, believe in a fully witting, evil God. Adam Smith was written to confuse the befuddled silly wits of their credulous believers. It is by inducing the hapless to believe Sarpi's fable, that those in the Delphic tradition of of high priest Plutarch, delude the believers in Liberalism, such as our befuddled Paul Krugman, into assisting in the destruction of their own nation.

So, it is the essence of the strategic study presented as the main feature of this edition of EIR, "The Ides of March," that Ferguson's portrait of the future he presents set before us, has a certain, authentically prophetic resonance, coinciding with a certain, crucial, central strategic feature contained within that webcast.

I emphasize that treatment of the subject of the crucial quality of the strategic impact which new developments inside Russia will have, and that for a long time to come, on the immediate future's fate of the planet as a whole.

However, it must be understood, that Ferguson does not disclose an estimate of the choice of strategic doctrine to be adopted by the British empire; rather, he presents the nature of the situation now being created as a product of British imperial intention, without specifying the actual intention itself.

What remains to be seen, is the choice of strategic options which the British empire would select as an optional strategy under a condition of world affairs such as that which H.G. Wells follower Ferguson presents today. To find the truth of the matter, consider how, the stated British facts of the matter lie. In any case, British policy is likely to attempt to create the impression of British strategic intention's reliance upon an intended double-envelopment, a belief intended for dumb leading Americans to believe, whereas, actually, a triple envelopment is intended. Those details, however, are for another day.

FOR FULL ARTICLES & VIDEOS, VISIT LAROCHEPAC.COM

For More Information Call:
Toll-Free: 1-800-929-7566

Northern Virginia 703-779-2150
Washington, D.C. 202-393-1470
Baltimore, MD 410-747-3817
Boston, MA 617-350-0040

Chicago, IL 773-404-4848
Detroit, MI 248-232-6981
Hackensack, NJ 201-880-8765
Houston, TX 713-541-2907

Los Angeles, CA 323-259-1860
Oakland, CA 510-395-4766
Philadelphia, PA 610-734-7070
Seattle, WA 206-417-2363

Paid for by the LaRouche PAC, P.O. Box 6157 Leesburg, VA 20178, www.larouchepac.com
and Not Authorized by Any Candidate or Candidate's Committee