

Richard Pipes' Dream — Another Utopian Nightmare

Richard Pipes' highly-touted article "Why the Soviet Union Thinks It Could Fight and Win a Nuclear War" run in the current issue of *Commentary* magazine has been picked up and generally favorably received in the "American Whigs" press, including the *Chicago Tribune*, the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, and the *Indianapolis Star*. These American Whigs, well aware of the fundamental fallacies of the Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) strategic doctrine, have been eagerly looking for a serious and honest assessment to appear on the actual Soviet military doctrine and war-winning preparedness strategy. They have been led to believe by all the hype that Pipes produces a rigorous analysis of the "Clausewitzian" Soviet strategic doctrine and a devastating critique of Fabian-linked stalwarts such as Paul Warnke, Henry Kissinger, and Robert MacNamara, who generally deny that it is possible to fight and win a nuclear war.

If Pipes' purported scholarly purpose were in fact fulfilled and this common superficial reading of his article correct, then indeed Pipes' *Commentary* piece would be a valuable contribution to the strategic debate now taking place in this country, being spearheaded by the U.S. Labor Party, Generals Keegan and Singlaub, circles at the American Security Council and others. But this reading is a pipe dream.

Monetarist Faction

In fact, *Commentary* magazine is the house organ of the financier-controlled Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), an outfit composed of monetarist lunatics. Included on its executive board are Goldman Sachs partner Henry Fowler, the unstable Eugene Rostow from Social Democrats USA, Dillon Read investment banker-turned arms negotiator Paul Nitze, banker C. Douglas Dillon, also of Dillon Read, and the discredited Democratic Party pro-dope hack Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, as well as Pipes, a Harvard Sovietologist, himself. It is well known that this faction collaborates behind the scenes with Jimmy Carter's National Security Council Director Zbigniew Brzezinski and Energy Czar James Schlesinger. The Pipes piece is in fact a factional document put out by a grouping of financiers with powerful connections at the top levels of the Carter Administration.

The fact of the matter is that Pipes and his CPD cohorts, under the cover of scholarly analysis, are retailing the *Big Lie line* that the Soviet Union as a matter of political policy, intends to launch and win a nuclear war that will destroy the United States.

Pipes strongly hints at the above formulation in his article, and left no room for doubt about his thesis in an interview with NSIPS. In his article he writes, "And insofar as military doctrine is indicative of intent, what

the Russians think to do with their nuclear arsenal is a matter of utmost importance that calls for close scrutiny... above all, however, looms the question of intent: mutual deterrence does not really exist. And, unilateral deterrence is feasible only if we understand the Soviet war-winning strategy and make it impossible for them to succeed." In the interview, Pipes confirmed, "In my article I am not at all talking about Soviet military capability. I am talking about their intent, their political and military intent."

Further, in the *Commentary* article, Pipes explicitly advocates that the U.S. adopt a brushed-up version of Herman Kahn's escalation (rung-ladder) nuclear war scenarios. Pipes excoriates the foolish Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) doctrine because it does not "deal in a considered way with the particular nuclear attack on hand so as to minimize further damage to the United States and maximize the possibility of an early settlement on reasonably acceptable terms..." He enthusiastically boasts "limited-response options," the "refinement introduced into U.S. doctrine by James R. Schlesinger."

He also strongly suggests, demonstrating either a shocking ignorance of the ABC's of modern nuclear war-fighting or simple duplicity, that a Soviet first-strike against the U.S. would *not* be a total, all-out attack against U.S. military capability and population centers to destroy the United States as a functioning nation and thereby eliminate NATO's in-depth war-fighting capability. "Soviet nuclear strategy is counterforce oriented. It targets for destruction — at any rate in the initial strike — not the enemy's cities but his military forces and their command and communication facilities." He then uses this falsification to sneak in his own suggestion that the U.S. assume a "mirroring" counterforce "preemptive strike" posture (not surprisingly the only "preemptive strike" posture the U.S. is potentially anywhere near capable of): "Any evidence that the U.S. may contemplate switching to a counterforce strategy such as occasionally crops up, throws Soviet generals into a tizzy of excitement. It clearly frightens them..."

When interviewed, Pipes frankly admitted favoring a massive civil defense program, quick deployment of the full assortment of utopian Nazi-style wunderwaffen weapons — including the cruise missile, the neutron bomb, the MX mobile missile, and the M-12A nuclear warhead — and improvements in U.S. missile targetting and MIRVing to give the U.S. what he called a "preemptive first strike" capability to meet "the Soviet war threat."

Why Now ?

The appearance of Pipes' CPD factional piece at this

particular time is extremely significant. What has the financier-controlled CPD faction terrorized is the fact that the Soviet Union is helping to bring down Lower Manhattan's bankrupt "American Century" world financial order — not with missiles and bombs, but with an aggressive political organizing drive to re-industrialize Europe and develop the Third World through economically sound transfer ruble-financed projects.

Contrary to Pipes, Soviet policy is to neutralize the war danger caused by the Carter Administration's debt collection and deindustrialization efforts which constitute the *propelling force* toward general war.

Pipes' CPD deployment is being undertaken with the full support and cooperation of Brzezinski and Schlesinger for a dual purpose. First, Brzezinski and Schlesinger are hoping that Pipes' call for a U.S. "pre-emptive first strike" posture will give desperately needed credibility to their "aura of power" confrontationist policy, and cow the Soviets into backing off from their economic strategic perspective.

In this regard, the CPD monetarist grouping and their associates are using Pipes to try to discredit "soft-liners" Paul Warnke and Henry Kissinger, who represent other monetarist groups whom Pipes specifically attacks, and with whom the CPDers have heretofore collaborated as part of a Mutt-and-Jeff psychological warfare game against the USSR. The CPD crowd now wants to cast off Warnke's British Fabian-style 18th century-like "ceremonial warfare" negotiations approach and Kissinger's neo-Metternichian balance of big power maneuvering, which they see as no longer effective in deceiving and intimidating the Soviets. The puppet Carter himself as well as Cyrus Vance and Paul Warnke are now moving into complete lock-step toward nuclear confrontation behind the Brzezinski and Schlesinger Utopian *wunderwaffen* push.

The CPD, which has strong ties into the AFL-CIO leadership through Lane Kirkland and some, if dwindling, influence in industrial and military layers, is also out to manipulate Whig layers — increasingly looking to the U.S. Labor Party for leadership — around their profiled paranoia about the Soviets and with the boondoggle bait of low-technology *wunderwaffen* "defense" production (the Cruise missile, neutron bomb, MX mobile missile, et al.). They are hoping that American Whigs will not concentrate their energies on maintaining high-technology industries, (like aerospace, through, for instance, prototype development of the B-1) and will not seek new military applications primarily as spin-offs from fusion and other high-technology development within the industrial-military complex.

Whose Peasant Mentality?

Richard Pipes reveals himself in his commentary piece to be a crude Social Darwinist and nominalist whose "analysis" of the Soviet Union and its leadership is largely projection. A leader in the Committee on the Present Danger and plant on the "outside" Team B evaluation group, Pipes is a Polish refugee who betrays an unmistakable "peasant mentality" with no comprehension of the American Whig industrial capitalist tradition.

For example, Pipes gives several paranoid reductionist arguments, to build his ridiculous case that the Soviet Union is *intending* a first strike against the United States as a matter of political policy. According to Pipes, "an extreme social Darwinist outlook on life" permeates the Russian elite as well as the Russian masses, which only (Brzezinski's very own) Russian "democratic intelligentsia and religious dissenters oppose to any significant extent." In Pipes' warped perspective, "the Communist revolution of 1917.. in effect installed in power the *muzhik*, the Russian peasant."

From there, Pipes argues that the Soviet Union has developed its "intent" to fight and win a nuclear war as the only means of controlling its own population — as he puts it, "to ensure internal stability"!

In the same vein, he argues, in language reminiscent of Nazi "blood and soil" jargon, that what he calls the "middle class, essentially Protestant ethos" of the United States, held by "the educated and affluent," regards fear — that is, "the organism's biological reaction to the threat of violence" — as inadmissible and therefore, unfortunately, does not feel threatened by the Soviets. He quotes fellow Utopian, flap-jawed Daniel Moynihan as scientific authority: "If you're not very educated, you're easily frightened. And not ever being frightened can be a formula for self-destruction."

Within Pipes' own "peasant mentality," science and technology are downgraded, if not actually despised. "When the Soviets launched Sputnik, which their propaganda hailed as a great contribution to the advancement of science, (it)...represented in fact a significant military demonstration." Pipes digs up a quotation from British strategist P.M.S. Blackett to emphasize this recurrent theme in criticizing U.S. strategists: "More chess playing and less nuclear physics might have instilled a greater sense of the realities."

In his interview, Pipes insisted that Darwin — in fact a Malthusian nominalist who categorically denied man's creative ability to alter nature — was "a humanist"!

On Clausewitz

Pipes, a self-proclaimed "Clausewitzian," correctly identifies that the Soviets' military doctrine is in the tradition of Clausewitz: "Clausewitz, buried in the United States, seems to be alive and prospering in the Soviet Union." Despite his quoting of Clausewitz's "war is the continuation of policy by other means," Pipes doesn't understand what Clausewitz meant by this idea. Nor does he really believe it. He asserts that the Soviets have the *political intention* of launching a thermonuclear war to destroy the United States, which he derives from the fact of their development of a war-winning military doctrine. Nowhere in his article does Pipes analyze Soviet political or economic program, their commitment to industrial progress at home and abroad, thereby reducing Soviet politics in a totally un-Clausewitzian manner to mere military considerations.

Pipes completely covers up, of course, that the Soviets developed a Clausewitzian war-winning military preparedness posture in response to decades of monetarist threats to destroy the Soviet Union's existence as a republic — and that the USSR doesn't want war but would go to war only if *forced* by extreme Carter-

Brzezinski provocations.

Clausewitz was a great humanist and German republican, greatly influenced by the American Revolution and the ideas of Franklin, Hamilton, and Washington. Confronted by Pipes, the "Clausewitzian," Clausewitz himself would doubtless exclaim: "I am not a 'Clausewitzian'!" Clausewitz would scoff at Pipes' assertion that Russian "peasants" are intending to fight and win a total war. As Clausewitz elucidates in *On War*: "Military genius depends on the general intellectual development of a given society... the most highly developed societies produce the most brilliant soldiers... the greatest military names do not appear before a high level of civilization has been reached. We will on the other hand never find a savage who is a truly great military commander... since this requires a degree of intellectual powers, beyond anything that a primitive society can develop..." The adoption by the Soviets of a

Clausewitzian military doctrine was made by the most advanced Soviet political and scientific cadre, a far cry from Pipes' muzhiks.

Pipes no more meets Clausewitz's dictum that "one should think through the full consequences of war to the end before starting a war," than do his incompetent opponents, Warnke, Kissinger, MacNamara, et al. Confronted by an interviewer with the three main purposes for which war is fought, given by Clausewitz, Pipes readily agreed to only one — "the destruction of the enemy's armed forces." He blanched at "the occupation of the enemy country," and hysterically denied altogether the validity of "the establishment of a viable and durable peace" as the ultimate *political* purpose of warfare.

— Bob Cohen
Paul Goldstein

Neutron Bomb: Back Door To Schlesinger Doctrine

The Carter Administration's announcement that it will move ahead with the development of the supposedly humane and "clean" atomic weapon, the neutron bomb — a weapon which, Carter officials are frank to say, they hope will increase the possibility of a limited, "theater" nuclear war in Western Europe — was promptly followed by a claim from NATO Supreme Commander U.S. General Alexander Haig, that the U.S.'s European allies are enthusiastic about the weapon.

From other quarters, however, including the Soviet Union, came sarcastic comments concerning the supposed "humanity" of a weapon which aims at killing people while leaving real estate untouched. And the Soviets underscored their continuing refusal to accept any "limited nuclear war" strategy by stating explicitly that if the U.S. uses neutron weapons, they will respond with all their available arsenal.

This all leaves room for serious doubt that the NATO allies — who fear above all any strategy that would attempt to make Europe the main battlefield of a nuclear war — will be pleased by the weapon's development.

The neutron bomb is touted in the press as the ideal battlefield weapon. Instead of exploding with the blast and fallout of a regular nuclear weapon, the neutron bomb saturates an area of about a square mile with penetrating neutron radiation. The idea, as stated by such proponents of the weapon as Sen. Stennis, is that such a weapon, with low yield in the region of a few kilotons TNT equivalent, could be used in "tactical" or "theater" nuclear wars without causing as much damage as regular nuclear weapons. Presumably this would be advantageous both for troops rapidly occupying the irradiated area and to "contain the level of violence" according to the theories of limited nuclear war.

This logic, like all such "theater" nuclear war garbage ignores the simple fact that no "theater" nuclear war or "limited" nuclear war — for example limited to Europe — will ever or could ever be fought. The Soviet Union has made it clear in statements and publications too numerous to list, and in their own military training and

deployments that the use of *any* nuclear weapons by the U.S. or its allies, no matter how small, clean, or well-behaved, would provoke a full-scale nuclear war, *beginning with* in-depth Soviet strategic strikes against the continental U.S. In such a full scale nuclear war, ground warfare in Europe or other "theaters" would be no more than the "mopping-up" operations following saturation nuclear bombing. In such a situation, regular old dirty nuclear weapons, with highly effective blast, will be far more useful than neutron bombs, whose effect could be eliminated by well-constructed bunkers.

The use of the N-bomb to back up U.S. claims that it holds military-technological superiority over the Soviets is about equally ludicrous. The fact is that the principle used in the bomb has been developed by the Soviets to a far more advanced level, as demonstrated by last summer's disclosures by Soviet fusion scientist L.I. Rudakov.

Most important, neutron bomb research has immediate scientific application to laser and electron beam fusion research. A low-blast, neutron-rich hydrogen bomb (that is, a neutron bomb) is ideal for the project PACER proposed by New Mexico's Los Alamos fusion laboratories, a program designed to produce cheap fissile fuel and energy from hydrogen bombs. The Carter Administration, however, has sabotaged the development of these peaceful applications of neutron bomb technology and is now dismantling the scientific research teams needed to do the job with cuts in the fusion research budget.

How the N-bomb Works

The conventional hydrogen bomb uses a nuclear fission or atomic-bomb explosion as the igniter for obtaining the high densities and temperatures needed to induce fusion reactions in large amounts of fusionable material (the heavy deuterium and tritium isotopes of hydrogen) contained in hydrogen bombs. The fusion explosion deposits over 80 percent of its energy in fast neutrons which are then trapped in the H-bomb assembly, usually