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 hjghly 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

by a blanket of uranium. These trapped neutrons induce secondary fission reactions, creating a far more destructive blast. In this way, the percentage of fissile fuel undergoing fission in an H-bomb explosion is substantially increased over that of a pure atomic bomb.

The neutron bomb, however, is constructed without the containing blanket built into the H-bomb. Because of this, a large proportion of the fast neutrons released in the neutron bomb's primary fission explosion can escape the fireball plasma of the explosion and do so without losing much of their energy. These fast neutrons move into the environment where they kill living organisms with irradiation but do little damage to non-living matter.

In order to produce efficient fusion H-bombs in the first place, the energy output of the fission bomb must be compressed and transformed into a form capable of accomplishing a special type of compression and heating of the fusion fuel, called isentropic compression. To do this the dynamics of energy dense plasmas must be mastered. The Rudakov disclosures of last July and Soviet work on the non-linear processes which dominate energy dense plasmas demonstrate that the USSR is far ahead of the U.S. in basic aspects of this research.

In fact, given that the British press announced in early 1976 that NATO was about to deploy the neutron bomb, a possible secondary motive for the Soviet's Rudakov disclosures could have been an effort to sidetrack U.S. military applications of neutron bomb research and direct it toward joint peaceful applications. As Soviet scientists have pointed out on several occasions, this research on energy dense plasmas constitutes the main frontier of scientific research.

— Charles Stevens

Touted Carter Cruise Missile: A Buzz Bomb Provocation

At first glance, Carter's decision to give the go-ahead to the deployment of the cruise missile seems utterly incomprehensible. From a military or technological standpoint, the cruise missile was obsolete 20 or more years ago. Unfortunately, the motivation behind the cruise missile, which is a purely political one, is even more insane than any strictly military aim. Like the simultaneously announced neutron bomb, the cruise missile is seen by the Trilateral government as a means of increasing the credibility of limited nuclear war tactics and as a direct preparation for a limited nuclear war. As such it is the most direct possible provocation of the Soviet Union, and its deployment would take the world a very long step towards a new general war.

Carter's Buzz Bomb

The cruise missile is technically ludicrous. It is a pilotless, subsonic jet plane which can be launched from the ground, an airplane, or (in another version) from a submarine. It travels toward its target at low altitude, about 200 feet, thereby flying under enemy radar screens, and then guides itself by the terrain into a "pinpoint" accuracy nuclear explosion. Except for its sophisticated guidance, and the nuclear warhead, it is an exact replica of the German buzz bomb, or V-1, of World War II. Like the buzz bomb, the cruise missile's extremely low speed makes it very vulnerable to being shot down by Soviet fighters, which typically travel three or more times faster. Its guidance system is more easily confused both by electronic countermeasures and simple misidentification of terrain features. One intelligence source commented that the main danger of the cruise would be to those sending it, since countermeasures could so confuse the guidance system as to turn the missile entirely around!

Compared to an ICBM which travels 30 times faster, the cruise has only disadvantages. So why was it ever proposed? The simplest answer, but only partially correct, is the SALT agreement. Unlimited production of U.S. ICBMs in an attempt to overwhelm by saturation any sophisticated Soviet defense is at present prohibited by the SALT treaty. For the Carter crew to abrogate the treaty and begin churning out missiles would be the plainest possible message to the Soviets to prepare for imminent war.

Warnke's Tricks

In the abortive Moscow SALT talks, U.S. Chief Negotiator Warnke tried to get around this by proposing that the cruise missile not be considered as a strategic weapon, thus allowing unlimited production in preparation for possible saturation bombing. Warnke's "suggestion" was one of the main reasons for his unceremonious leave-taking from Moscow. The Soviets of course did not buy such logic.

Subsequently, Warnke proposed a "compromise" — that the cruise missile's range be limited to such an extent that it could only be used in "theater" nuclear wars, such as to reach targets in Eastern Europe from airfields in Western Europe. This "compromise" gives away the real purpose of the cruise program as a whole. In a "tactical" engagement where the target is masses of Soviet tanks rolling into West Europe, the Carter-Schlesinger "strategists" reason, the cruise will act as heavy nuclear artillery for saturation-bombing of Soviet troop concentrations. In such a situation, a little lack of accuracy, or loss of half of the missiles under enemy defense fire would hardly matter. This, Schlesinger and Co. believe will be the counterweight against Soviet tank superiority and will make their long-planned theater nuclear wars in Europe and elsewhere feasible.

In real life, however, there is a small flaw in this logic. Theater nuclear wars will never happen. If a war breaks out in Europe, or nuclear weapons are used anywhere by the U.S or its allies, the Soviets unleash strategic strikes against the U.S. and West Europe as the beginning of a global, general war. By the time cruise missiles arrive at their targets, the U.S. will have ceased to exist as a nation.