

Why Americans Must Now Embrace The Initiatives of Vladimir Putin

by Robert Ingraham

If not for Vladimir Putin's intervention, humanity would be finished.

—Lyndon LaRouche

Oct. 25—Lyndon LaRouche speaks of discontinuities, of interruptions—of critical turning points—which have fundamentally altered the course and the potential directionality of human history, whether for the better or for the worse.

Such a negative turning point took place in the 1980s, when the 1981 attempted assassination of President Reagan, followed by the 1989 jailing of Lyndon LaRouche, destroyed the Reagan-LaRouche initiatives which had threatened to end the Malthusian post-1945 Cold War reign by the British Empire and their allies on Wall Street.

The subsequent eradication of the Strategic Defense Initiative and the LaRouche-Reagan collaboration did not merely kill the positive promise of those initiatives. Rather, by 1989, with Reagan out of office and LaRouche in prison, the stage was set, beginning with the London-manipulated re-unification of Germany, for a new, far worse escalated phase in the creation of a dictatorial London-centered world empire.

Through the 1990s, every effort was made by the British and her American stooges to economically destroy and subjugate the republics of the former Soviet Union, particularly Russia. The expansion of NATO into Eastern Europe, in violation of earlier promises to the contrary by U.S. and British officials, was intended to terrorize Russian leaders into military submission. With Russia neutralized, China would be alone, isolated as the only strategic force which posed a danger to trans-Atlantic interests.

The successful 1998-2000 British-directed destruction of the Clinton Presidency, the repeal of Glass-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The promise of the 1979-1983 discussions between Lyndon LaRouche and President Ronald Reagan's Presidency has now been revived. Here, LaRouche and Reagan discuss at a 1980 Presidential campaign forum in Concord, New Hampshire.

Steagall in the United States, and the Sept. 11, 2001 British-Saudi attacks on Manhattan then propelled the world into an “end-game” scenario, in which all opposition to London-Wall Street rule was targeted to be crushed, either through diplomatic, economic or military means. The intention: not simply a “unipolar” world, but a Malthusian, dictatorial London-Wall Street empire. It is this drive for global dictatorship that we have been living through during the past 15 years of the Bush and Obama presidencies.

Vladimir Putin Today

Between Oct. 19 and Oct. 22, a three-day meeting of the Valdai Discussion Club was held in Sochi, Russia, with participants from Russia, Europe, Asia, Africa, the United States, and South America. The topic of this year's event was “Societies Between War and Peace: Overcoming the Logic of Conflict in Tomorrow's

World.” The following paragraphs are excerpts from Vladimir Putin’s speech to that conference:

We have an open discussion here; this is an open intellectual platform for an exchange of views, assessments and forecasts that are very important for us here in Russia. I would like to thank all the Russian and foreign politicians, experts, public figures and journalists taking part in the work of this club. . . This year the discussion focuses on issues of war and peace. This topic has clearly been the concern of humanity throughout its history. Back in ancient times, in antiquity people argued about the nature, the causes of conflicts, about the fair and unfair use of force, of whether wars would always accompany the development of civilization, broken only by cease-fires, or would the time come when arguments and conflicts are resolved without war. . .

True, peace, a peaceful life, have always been humanity’s ideal. State figures, philosophers and lawyers have often come up with models for a peaceful interaction between nations. Various coalitions and alliances declared that their goal was to ensure strong, “lasting” peace as they used to say. However, the problem was that they often turned to war as a way to resolve the accumulated contradictions, while war itself served as a means for establishing new post-war hierarchies in the world. Meanwhile peace, as a state of world politics, has never been stable and did not come of itself. Periods of peace in both European and world history were always based on securing and maintaining the existing balance of forces. . .

With the appearance of nuclear weapons, it became clear that there could be no winner in a global conflict. There can be only one end—guaranteed mutual destruction. . .

No Winners in Nuclear War

Today, unfortunately, we have again come across similar situations. Attempts to promote a model of unilateral domination, as I have said on numerous occasions, have led to an imbalance in the system of international law and global regulation, which means there is a threat, and political, economic or military competition may get out of control.



Russian President Vladimir Putin addressed the Valdai International Discussion Club in Sochi, Oct. 22, 2015.

What, for instance, could such uncontrolled competition mean for international security? A growing number of regional conflicts, especially in “border” areas, where the interests of major nations or blocs meet. This can also lead to the probable downfall of the system of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (which I also consider to be very dangerous), which, in turn, would result in a new spiral of the arms race.

We have already seen the appearance of the concept of the so-called disarming first strike, including one with the use of high-precision long-range non-nuclear weapons comparable in their effect to nuclear weapons.

The use of the threat of a nuclear missile attack from Iran as an excuse, as we know, has destroyed the fundamental basis of modern international security—the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The United States has unilaterally seceded from the treaty. Incidentally, today we have resolved the Iranian issue and there is no threat from Iran and never has been, just as we said.

The thing that seemed to have led our American partners to build an anti-missile defense system is gone. It would be reasonable to expect work to develop the U.S. anti-missile defense system to come to an end as well. What is actu-



State Department

The so-called Iran threat discredited: Secretary of State John Kerry bids farewell to Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif following the Vienna announcement of the P5+1 agreement on July 14, 2015.

ally happening? Nothing of the kind, or actually the opposite—everything continues. . .

To put it plainly, they (the Americans) were lying. It was not about the hypothetical Iranian threat, which never existed. It was about an attempt to destroy the strategic balance, to change the balance of forces in their favour not only to dominate, but to have the opportunity to dictate their will to all: to their geopolitical competition and, I believe, to their allies as well. This is a very dangerous scenario, harmful to all, including, in my opinion, to the United States.

The nuclear deterrent lost its value. Some probably even had the illusion that victory of one party in a world conflict was again possible—without irreversible, unacceptable, as experts say, consequences for the winner, if there ever is one.

In the past 25 years, the threshold for the use of force has gone down noticeably. The anti-war immunity we have acquired after two world wars, which we had on a subconscious, psychological level, has become weaker. The very perception of war has changed: for TV viewers it was becoming and has now become an entertaining media picture, as if nobody dies in combat, as if people do not suffer and cities and entire states are not destroyed. . .

The U.S. Sanctions War

Unfortunately, military terminology is becoming part of everyday life. Thus, trade and sanctions wars have become today's global economic reality—this has become a set phrase used by the media. The sanctions, meanwhile, are often used also as an instrument of unfair competition to put pressure on or completely “throw” competition out of the market. As an example, I could take the outright epidemic of fines imposed on companies, including European ones, by the United States. Flimsy pretexts are being used, and all those who dare violate the unilateral American sanctions are severely punished.

You know, this may not be Russia's business, but this is a discussion club, therefore I will ask: Is that the way one treats allies? No, this is how one treats vassals who dare act as they wish—they are punished for misbehaving.

Last year a fine was imposed on a French bank to a total of almost \$9 billion—\$8.9 billion, I believe. Toyota paid \$1.2 billion, while the German Commerzbank signed an agreement to pay \$1.7 billion into the American budget, and so forth.

We also see the development of the process to create non-transparent economic blocs, which is done following practically all the rules of conspiracy. The goal is obvious—to reformat the world economy in a way that would make it possible to extract a greater profit from domination and the spread of economic, trade and technological regulation standards.

The creation of economic blocs by imposing their terms on the strongest players would clearly not make the world safer, but would only create time bombs, conditions for future conflicts. . .

As you know, our approach is different. While creating the Eurasian Economic Union, we tried to develop relations with our partners, including relations within the Chinese Silk Road Economic Belt initiative. We are actively work-

ing on the basis of equality in BRICS, APEC and the G20.

On Syria: The Real Threat to Civilization

We see what is happening in the Middle East. For decades, maybe even centuries, inter-ethnic, religious and political conflicts and acute social issues have been accumulating here. In a word, a storm was brewing there, while attempts to forcefully rearrange the region became the match that led to a real blast, to the destruction of statehood, an outbreak of terrorism and, finally, to growing global risks.

A terrorist organization, the so-called Islamic State, took huge territories under control. Just think about it: if they occupied Damascus or Baghdad, the terrorist gangs could achieve the status of a practically official power, they would create a stronghold for global expansion. Is anyone considering this? It is time the entire international community realized what we are dealing with—it is, in fact, an enemy of civilization and world culture that is bringing with it an ideology of hatred and barbarity, trampling upon morals and world religious values, including those of Islam, thereby compromising it. . .

We do not need wordplay here; we should not break down the terrorists into moderate and immoderate ones. It would be good to know the difference. Probably, in the opinion of certain experts, it is that the so-called moderate militants behead people in limited numbers or in some delicate fashion.

In actual fact, we now see a real mix of terrorist groups. True, at times militants from the Islamic State, Jabhat al-Nusra, and other Al-Qaeda heirs and splinters, fight each other, but they fight for money, for feeding grounds,—this is what they are fighting for. They are not fighting for ideological reasons, while their essence and methods remain the same: terror, murder, turning people into a timid, frightened, obedient mass.

In the past years the situation has been deteriorating, the terrorists' infrastructure has been growing, along with their numbers, while the weapons provided to the so-called moderate opposition eventually ended up in the hands of terrorist organizations. Moreover, sometimes entire



creative commons/campus of excellence

Martin Blessing, CEO of Commerzbank AG. Commerzbank is the head of one of many European institutions punished by the U.S. for violating sanctions against Russia.

bands would go over to their side, marching in with flying colours, as they say.

Why is it that the efforts of, say, our American partners and their allies in their struggle against the Islamic State have not produced any tangible results? Obviously, this is not about any lack of military equipment or potential. Clearly, the United States has a huge potential, the biggest military potential in the world; only double-crossing is never easy. You declare war on terrorists and simultaneously try to use some of them to arrange the figures on the Middle East board in your own interests, as you may think.

It is impossible to combat terrorism in general if some terrorists are used as a battering ram to overthrow the regimes that are not to one's liking. You cannot get rid of those terrorists; it is only an illusion to think you can get rid of them later, take power away from them, or reach some agreement with them. The situation in Libya is the best example here.

Let us hope that the new government will manage to stabilize the situation, though this is not a fact yet. However, we need to assist in this stabilization. . .

We currently need to develop a roadmap for the region's economic and social development, to restore basic infrastructure, housing, hospitals and schools. Only this kind of on-site creative



kremlin.ru

Russian President Putin greets Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in the Kremlin on Oct. 21, 2015.

work after eliminating terrorism and reaching a political settlement can stop the enormous flow of refugees to European nations and return those who left to their homelands.

It is clear that Syria will need massive financial, economic and humanitarian assistance in order to heal the wounds of war. We need to determine the format within which we could do this work, getting donor nations and international financial institutions involved. . .

Syria can become a model for partnership in the name of common interests, resolving problems that affect everyone, and developing an effective risk management system. We already had this opportunity after the end of the Cold War. Unfortunately, we did not take advantage of it. We also had the opportunity in the early 2000s, when Russia, the U.S., and many other nations were faced with terrorist aggression and unfortunately, we were unable to establish a good dynamic for cooperating then, either. I will not return to that and the reasons for why we were unable to do this. I think everyone knows already. Now, what's important is to draw the right lessons from what happened in the past and to move forward. . .

I am confident that the experience we acquired and today's situation will allow us to finally make the right choice—the choice in favour

of cooperation, mutual respect and trust, the choice in favour of peace. [*End excerpts*]

A Moment of Decision

Russia's decision at the end of September to intervene into the Syrian crisis has fundamentally changed the entire world. It has created a new opportunity to escape from the war dynamic of the last fifteen years. This is not about Putin "challenging Obama's leadership," as the lying news media puts it. It is about getting off the road to world war and depopulation. Taking a different path. It is about an opportunity for peace, economic development and friendly cooperation among nations. The mad Obama and

his backers are violently opposed to what Putin's Russia is doing because it threatens the very existence of their strategic intentions.

This is not the place for a more in-depth examination of the Putin Presidency, but it should be noted that Vladimir Putin's strategic leadership did not begin with Syria. It can be found in his response to the earlier terrorist attack on Russia, in Chechnya; it can be found in his response to the threat to Russia (and world peace) posed by the expansion of NATO; it can be found in his handling of the Ukraine crisis; it can be found in his role in the creation of the BRICS and the new cooperative economic development policies of that organization.

Now with the intervention into Syria, Putin has upset the strategic apple-cart. He has created a Potential which previously did not exist. Essentially, the promise which existed as a result of the 1979-1983 discussions between Lyndon LaRouche and the national security staff associated with the Reagan Presidency, has now been revived. This is another opportunity—at this very late date—to eliminate the power of London and Wall Street, and to create an entirely new potential for the future of the human race. Once Obama has been removed from office—and for the United States this is an absolute pre-condition—then the United States will be in a position to grasp that potential, to join with Russia, China, India and other friendly nations, and then we will truly have the hope for a new age for mankind.