

Thermonuclear War By October?

LaRouche warns of the conjuncture of terrorism and Mideast conflict

The following statement was issued on Aug. 22 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. It was first printed in the Aug. 25 issue of New Solidarity, the U.S. Labor Party's newspaper.

If the September Camp David "summit" meeting of President Jimmy Carter, President Anwar Al-Sadat and Prime Minister Menachem Begin were to fail, it is probable that the London-controlled warhawk-lunatic faction within Israel, currently in control of Israeli policy, would launch a war against Syria, and would also either bomb Saudi oil fields or collaborate with British intelligence to sponsor a Saudi coup by the National Guard forces under Prince Abdullah. In any combination built around such elements of policy, the Soviet Union must and will intervene by treaty-agreements to crush Israel in behalf of Syria.

According to the London press, this British-guided "scenario" could go into effect either immediately after, or during a Camp David summit failure, or might hang over the world as an escalating threat for some weeks before proceeding into an actual military operation. In either case, it would be probable that a thermonuclear showdown will develop between the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces. Among all the possible timings for such a confrontation which might fit such a scenario, the month of October 1978 is as probable as any other moment in sight at this time — while the U.S. government is still floundering in anticipation of the November elections.

Obviously, we must launch immediate actions on two main levels. First, we must act to the effect of ensuring a minimal risk of failure of the Camp David summit. Anyone who will not collaborate with us to that purpose is either some sort of lunatic or simply an ignorant fool. Second, we must act to create a "fall back" option, such that if the Camp David summit were to fail despite all noble efforts to the contrary, the United States has an operational alternative policy which ruthlessly enforces Middle East peace.

I do not argue that everything I have to report below is new to the leadership of the U.S. State Department. Most of the cited policy options are known to the U.S. government, either directly through our reports to appropriate government agencies and persons, or through other means known to us. However, not all of the essential elements of the package are presently

adopted by the U.S. government. Equally important, U.S. Middle East policy must be based in part on cold-blooded, credible threats, the kinds of threats which do not function unless they are offered as stated *public* policy of the U.S. government.

Most particularly, the gravest inner-governmental problem of the moment is centered in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This Committee, together with Vice-President Mondale and other complicit forces inside the Administration and Congress, have created a policy climate around the Camp David proceedings which effectively sabotages much of the Administration's efforts to secure a path toward Middle East peace. The chief threat being used to keep Congress and the Administration under control of the Mondale-Kissinger-Kennedy-Moynihan-Javits wrecking gang is the threat of that crew to use the muscle of the "Zionist Lobby" to wreck the electoral campaigns of any congressional candidate who does not stick to the Mondale-Kennedy-Javits line between now and the November elections.

However, if a significant portion of the U.S. electorate knew what is at stake in the Camp David proceedings, the present "blackmail" against the Administration and Congress would be nullified. No congressional candidate who supported the Mondale-Kennedy-Javits-Jackson line would have much of a chance of being elected in November. Under those circumstances, the Administration's options for securing Middle East peace would be enormously expanded.

Option for Middle East peace

The only general option for Middle East durable peace at this juncture is the new doctrine the U.S. Labor Party promulgated during Spring 1975. This policy is now widely accepted among key Arab forces — if not all Arab factions — and is also accepted among forces in Israel representing a majority of the Israeli electorate. In brief, this policy is as follows.

Point One: There can be no durable peace in the Middle East until Israel relinquishes the Arab territories conquered since 1967, and recognizes an Arab Palestinian sovereign state established in those territories, including recognition of the Palestine Libera-

Israel's government is presently at the mercy of the British monarchy.

tion Organization as the de jure, constituted and recognized representative government-in-exile of the Palestinian Arabs.

Point Two: However, no government of Israel can responsibly recognize such an Arab Palestinian state, in the sense of acting to aid in constituting its existence, if that new state becomes an ulcer of grinding poverty on Israel's borders. Economically-sick nations are politically and militarily unstable neighbors.

Point Three: The Israeli economy itself is financially bankrupt, its civil economy subsisting on thin financial rations from abroad, and already subjecting the native Israeli population to forms of austerity directly imitating those imposed in 1930s Germany by Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht. Thus, as long as Israel depends upon financial largesse (in a manner of speaking) controlled by the British faction of the Maltese Order, and the Maltese Order's dominant faction in Zionist organizations, the Israeli state itself is a politically and militarily unstable nation, a menace to its neighbors — and to the peace of the world.

Therefore: Only an economic development package which simultaneously solves the indicated crucial problems of Israeli and Arab Palestinian states offers a sane approach to durable Middle East peace.

In broad terms, these points have been recognized long before 1975. Such approaches were incorporated in the Rogers Plan and have been the long-standing policy of "dovish" Zionists and UNO bodies toward a permanent solution to Arab-Israeli conflicts. However, following the events of 1964-67 in monetary developments, the old approaches were no longer workable in fact.

First, there were no adequate sources of continuing credits and grants adequate to meet the minimal requirements of such a program for both Israel and Palestinian Arabs. Second, since the 1967-1971 crisis in the monetary system, with accelerating depression of world-trade potentials and collapse of Third World import markets, the global climate needed for high-technology industrial and agricultural development of the Palestinian and adjoining regions has been evaporating.

Consequently, although the U.S. Labor Party's 1976 policy proposal intersected established, long-standing approaches to Middle East peace, the 1975 U.S. Labor Party proposal featured brand-new elements which were and remain indispensable to the success of any effort for peace in that region. The most crucial

element was the proposal for a new International Development Bank, to replace the bankrupt and counterproductive Bretton Woods system's relics.

The Bremen EEC agreements establishing the European Monetary System and European Monetary Fund are the keystones for a currently-emerging new world monetary system meeting the exact specifications of the International Development Bank proposal issued by the U.S. Labor Party during the Spring of 1975. In short, in practice, the only possibility for securing durable Middle East peace is subsumed under the successful implementation of the Bremen agreements.

The Washington, D.C. obstacles to this alternative are typified by Henry A. Kissinger, G. William Miller, James R. Schlesinger, W. Michael Blumenthal, and Senators Henry Jackson, Edward Kennedy, Jacob Javits, Patrick Moynihan, and others, including Vice-President Walter F. Mondale, of similar persuasions. If the British monarchy, the British faction of the Maltese Order, the City of London, and such Maltese branches of Zionism as the Jerusalem Foundation, succeed in wrecking the Bremen agreements, as they are presently dedicated to accomplishing in concert with Milton Friedman and the Heritage Foundation branch of British intelligence, then there will be war in the Middle East and probably an ensuing thermonuclear confrontation between the USA and Soviet Union.

The problem inside Israel is not that the dominant governing forces, based on a lunatic minority of the Israeli electorate, are lunatics — which is unfortunately the case. The key problem inside Israel is that Israel's government — and financial resources — are presently at the mercy of the British monarchy and its allies. Since the only path to Middle East peace demands success of the Bremen summit, and since the government of Israel is composed chiefly of witting puppets of the British monarchy, without collapsing the British pound and ensuring the success of the Bremen agreements, there is no basis for hope of avoiding a thermonuclear Armageddon in sight.

A temporary alternative

The only short-term, temporary alternatives to war in the Middle East — barring peace under terms of the Bremen agreements — involve very specific agreements between the governments of the USA and USSR. If the USA acts to penalize Israel for Israel's war crimes and violations of U.S.-Israel treaties in Lebanon, and if the USA announces that it will abandon Israel to the mercy of the Soviet-Syria alliance under conditions of an Israel war-strike, an Israel informed of such a firm policy-commitment by the U.S. government would withdraw from its crimes in Lebanon, dismantle provocative settlement programs in occupied Arab territories, and would absolutely not go to war.

It should be noted that representatives of Israeli political forces approached the U.S. Labor Party during 1976, proposing Israeli readiness to embrace the terms of negotiations offered by the U.S. Labor Party. Forces exist in Israel to turn to this option immediately, provided that the London-controlled warhawk policy and factional forces are ruthlessly humiliated.

USA-USSR policy should be absolute guarantees for a peaceful Israel's security within Israel's 1967 borders, on the sole added condition that Israel remedy its continuing violations of human rights against the approximately 10 percent Arab minority within Israel itself.

In dealing with a clinical paranoia of homicidal proclivities, which the Israeli government under London's influence represents at this juncture, the standard measure is a combination of "hard cop"- "soft cop." In peaceful containment efforts, as in the proper conduct of war, "unconditional surrender" and obliteration are tactics used only against absolute lunatics, such as today's international terrorists. With nations, such as Israel, in which the majority of the electorate are good human beings, despite their complicit offenses and other flaws, policy must provide conditions of acceptance of terms which are clearly more advantageous to the negotiations-adversary than the course of action against which ruthless containment efforts are addressed.

Such a policy would succeed, provided that both the Bremen agreements are actively supported by the USA and that both Israel and a new Palestinian state are offered the position of being immediate beneficiaries of such a new monetary system's development provisions.

The U.S. Labor Party acknowledges and respects the outstanding commitments to a Geneva conference on the Middle East. However, Geneva is not really a peace option in and of itself. It is not a peace option respecting relations between Arabs and Israelis, but rather a peace option respecting Middle East policy between the USA and Soviet Union. The only positive function of a Geneva conference is to establish an institutionalized framework for joint USA-USSR sponsorship of containment of war and pursuit of peace-initiatives for the Middle East.

The Carter Administration and State Department must not write off the Geneva summit option. However, in itself, the Geneva summit contains no intrinsic pathway to solution of Middle East problems. Any other view is a dangerous self-deception. On this point, Israel's criticism of Geneva has an element of merit. However, keeping the Geneva summit active in U.S. policy *keeps the door open between the USA and USSR* on Middle East policy. If the USA therefore says it desires an immediate Geneva summit, Israel is obliged to attend that summit promptly, and to behave well at it, out of obligatory concern for the vital strategic interests of Israel's principal protector.

The question is whether the State Department has the courage to ride roughshod over the "Zionist Lobby."

The only course which will succeed is the indicated, proposed settlement, within the context of the Bremen agreements. If Geneva provides needed delaying action against war in the interim, or if the Geneva conference performs a key role in implementing the proposed option, then Geneva is useful, and perhaps necessary. However, otherwise, Geneva is not an alternative itself, and only a fool could imagine otherwise.

The U.S. State Department

The U.S. State Department is fully informed of the proposed alternatives, and is, according to every indication, predominantly sympathetic to such solutions. Apart from some "bad apples" in the State Department, holdovers from the Kissinger and Kennedy machines predominantly, the problem does not lie within the State Department itself, but within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Blumenthal-Solomon Treasury, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and G. William Miller at the Federal Reserve.

The problem is not so much whether or not the leadership of the State Department can design a viable package for Camp David. It can. The question is whether it has the combined courage, ruthlessness, *and support* to ride roughshod over what Capitol Hill loosely describes as the "Zionist Lobby."

If State proposes an economic approach to a Middle East peace, including the development of a sovereign Arab Palestinian state, then that effort must be supported by every USA patriot, including pro-Zionist patriots. However, this can not occur without a matching U.S. total commitment to support of the new world monetary system being developed around the keystone of the Bremen agreements.

The Soviet predicament

If the Administration adopts an open posture of full support for the Bremen agreements — in opposition to such British agents as Henry A. Kissinger and the Heritage Foundation, and if that leverage is used to box Israel into accepting the indicated approach to durable Middle East peace, the problem will be solved.

However, on the contrary, if the USA does not immediately commit itself to open and full support of the

If the Soviet bloc is at any time "ringed" by NATO-ruled nations, this constitutes a war threat to the Soviets.

Bremen agreements, the policies of Blumenthal, Henry Reuss, Mondale, Kennedy, G. William Miller, and other opponents of the Bremen agreements remain in effect. Under the latter condition, in which the U.S. permits Miller, et al. to continue to wreck the dollar and to plunge the U.S. into the depression which Miller and his allies propose, the entire developing sector and many other nations go under the neo-Schachtian policy rule of the "IMF conditions." In that case, USA capitulation before the "Zionist Lobby" within the USA leads directly toward a general thermonuclear war.

The problem is identical with that I outlined summarily in my November 1, 1976 half-hour, nationwide TV broadcast.

There are only two general conditions under which the Soviet Union will go to war with the United States.

One case is a direct confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Pact (including Cuba) forces. In this case, the following order of warfare follows.

If the Soviet Union elects to initiate warfighting or reacts to any assault in progress, its first act of war will be a total launch of its intercontinental ABC capability against the continental United States. Detection of such a Soviet launch would immediately send every intercontinental USA ABC capability into flight against the USSR. No sane commander would dedicate ICBMs to an adversary's missile silos, since by the time a missile silo or equivalent installation were struck by counter-missiles, the silo would have been emptied. The Soviet intercontinental strike is dedicated to eliminating the in-depth capabilities of the United States to continue warfare, its capability to act as a support base for continuing warfare. Military bases and cities of over 50,000 population are thus the primary targets of an initial Soviet intercontinental full strike.

During the first ten minutes of warfare, Kissinger's strategic doctrine and all the various versions of "theater-limited nuclear warfare" or other versions of "counterforce" and "flexible response" are inoperable — as discredited in fact as they should be discredited in knowledge by any competent strategist in advance of warfare.

The intercontinental strike is accompanied by naval warfare, especially targetting nuclear-armed naval craft. It is also accompanied by strategic strikes against every NATO and allied force-concentration in the world. In the European theater, the medium-and-short-range targets are simultaneously struck by ABC "artillery" bombardment in advance of any Warsaw

Pact troop movement. Along the Warsaw Pact borders, an entire frontal zone is "paved" in depth with ABC bombardment, to eliminate every resistance capability in preparation for a broad, mobile assault through heavily-ABC-contaminated terrain.

War begins with a level of warfare which Kissinger, Schlesinger, et al. view as a never-quite-approached upper limit of "maximum deterrent capability." Because of inherent "civil defense" and related advantages of the Warsaw Pact nations, upwards of 30 percent of Soviet population and logistics are lost during Day One, while upwards of 50 per cent or more of U.S. population and capabilities are lost as a result of Day One assault. *It is out of the radioactive-smoking ruins of such initial assaults that the forces of continued warfare assemble themselves to continue combat.*

"Deterrent," whose algebra and political content is adequately expressed by the foregoing summary, operates only as long as the political threshold for warfare is not reached. If either superpower engages in attack against the principal forces of the other, the force deeming itself so threatened must immediately accept either immediate surrender or must accept the full magnitude of penalties expressed by "maximum deterrent" and other capabilities of the adversary force. An actual attack or confrontation threatening such attack on the main forces of the Warsaw Pact territory or Cuba, represents a condition in which all deterrent effect is superseded and the Soviet forces launch total war as indicated.

It is the second condition for general war which I emphasized in the cited TV address.

If the Warsaw Pact and Cuba are at any time "ringed" by a "geopolitical" combination of NATO nations and developing nations under rule of SATO or similar pacts, this condition constitutes a threat of war against the Soviet Union equivalent to a direct assault against the main Warsaw Pact forces. In the case in which USA and NATO policy is committed to developing such a "geopolitical" condition, the Soviets must intervene in the developing sector and other regions to nullify the effectiveness of such a U.S.-NATO policy. At the point in such a process the USA and NATO forces commit themselves with force to the success of such a policy, to the point the policy can not be frustrated except by war against the USA-NATO forces, the Soviets will go to total war in the same way as for a direct assault on Cuba or Warsaw Pact forces. From their vantage-point, they have no choice but to do so.

The "IMF conditions" policy, if supported by NATO countries, is a policy which leads quickly and directly to such a state of war. "IMF conditions" for developing nations mean measures of "austerity" which immediately cause economic genocide in the least-developed nations, and which can not be implemented without hideously totalitarian measures — and total-

itarian regimes — in any developing nation. The fascist RSS forces in India—recently endorsed by Senator Patrick Moynihan, and hailed by messages from Senator Kennedy and Vice-President Mondale — is one of the forces waiting to impose fascist horror-regimes in developing nations in behalf of the “IMF conditions” and “Brandt Commission” proposals.

The circumstances of coup, countercoup and endemic guerrilla warfare engendered throughout the developing sector by such policies and regimes leads either to general, Thirty-Years-War types of “chaos and confusion,” or collection of IMF and World Bank and Eurodollar-bank debts must be secured by regional military forces integrated with NATO forces and aided by the currently profascist ruling forces of Peking. Such a state of affairs establishes exactly the sort of order in the developing sector generally which provokes the Soviet Union to thermonuclear war against the USA and NATO.

Soviet policy is therefore to respond to any further spread of “IMF conditions” imposition on the developing sector with support of guerrilla and other armed resistance to regimes and nations which attempt to enforce such “IMF conditions.” For the moment this is not *actively* Soviet policy, as an anti-USA policy, solely because of May 1978 agreements with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, agreements with France’s Giscard d’Estaing, and because of Soviet policy of affording Giscard, Schmidt, et al., the opportunity to implement the Bremen agreements as keystones of a new world monetary system nullifying the International Monetary Fund and Eurodollar market. However, if at any point it becomes clear to the Soviets that the Bremen agreements have been decisively sabotaged by London and its allies, Soviet policy is obliged to shift immediately to the alternative of active promotion of “wars of liberation” throughout the developing sector. From the Soviet standpoint, under those conditions they have no alternate rational choice.

Since the launching of an Israeli attack on Syria, especially if this includes either a Saudi coup by Prince Abdulla or an attack against Saudi oilfields, is itself a direct wrecking of the Bremen agreements, such an Israeli assault presents the Soviets with the immediate geometry of *preconditions* for general thermonuclear war.

The case of Israeli attack

The Soviet Union has effected a mutual defense treaty with Syria. It entered into that treaty with full foreknowledge of the strategic implications of such a military alliance, and has emphasized its determination to enforce the treaty in case of an Israeli war with Syria.

That military agreement has now assumed a life of its own. Having made the treaty, the Soviets must ruthlessly implement it, on condition of otherwise

An Israeli attack on Syria is a direct wrecking of the Bremen agreements.

losing all Soviet credibility throughout the developing sector. This means that an Israeli attack on Syria must be matched with Soviet assistance to effect at least an equivalent damage to Israel, and to bring Israel to such a state of combined damage and terms of surrender that Israel’s war-making potential in the Middle East is ended for the medium term. If the Israelis intervene by coup or assault into Saudi Arabia, causing disaster for Western European and Japanese economies, then Israel will be attacked at least to the point of placing Israel under military occupation by its conquerors.

The Soviets can not back down from such attacks upon Israel, *unless the United States intervenes preemptively with force against Israel to effect the same general result.*

An Israeli attack on Syrian forces would not occur as a direct act of a U.S. ally. Israel will act under the cover of the Rand Corporation’s “breakaway-ally” scenario. It would repudiate “U.S. pressure” and act on its own in direct opposition to U.S. warnings and other rebukes. Then, at the point the Soviet-aided Syrian forces were at the point of defeating Israel, or under conditions in which such a development was in sight, Israel would expect the U.S. to intervene against the Soviets in defense of Israel.

Since the Soviets could not back down under those circumstances, either the Soviets go immediately to a thermonuclear showdown with the USA — or make a temporary retreat into a propaganda phase preparatory to launching general war.

In short, in that scenario, up to 80 percent of the U.S. population would die in service of the folly of supporting London’s Israeli-puppets’ venture.

Would the USA be so stupid?

The question is, whether the U.S. government, including the Congress, would be stupid enough to back up Israel in such a situation? If not, this ought to be stated publicly at this time by the Carter Administration. If the Carter Administration will not commit itself, to its NATO allies and to Israel, to a policy of abandoning Israel to Soviet mercies under such conditions, then it is improbable that the U.S. government would do anything but wander blindly and insanely into World War III under actual developments. Worse, the best chance to stop Israeli lunacy at this juncture is to openly state exactly such a policy.

The "neutron bomb" lunacy is consistent with the far greater lunacy of "flexible response".

I firmly believe the U.S. government and Congress are presently capable of committing the indicated stupidity.

Military stupidity

The case of the professional military spokesmen who campaigned for the "neutron warhead" is exemplary of the reasons the USA is capable of committing such a stupidity. The officers who took that posture did in fact speak for the sentiments shared more discreetly by many others of the same peer-groups.

As I have indicated in earlier published statements, the posture of placing the "neutron warhead" up front as a centerpiece of NATO capabilities is a piece of military-professional incompetence. Granted, the officers who endorsed this incompetence are not otherwise incompetent military professionals in general. Nonetheless, their policy of this issue of the "neutron warhead" was lunacy.

The "neutron warhead" could have uses in situations *other than those of a NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation*. Were I President, I would tend to develop it and place it *quietly* in the inventory against the possibility such special situations might develop. Against main assaults between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces in central Europe, such a weapon, deployed as a centerpiece of theater policy, is a piece of worthless garbage from a strategic standpoint.

The issue here is not that professional military men and others adopted such a stupid posture, but the background-policy reasons by which they were led to such a posture.

The "neutron warhead" does not work to NATO strategic advantage in any real warfighting situation between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces, but it does represent hypothetical advantage in a kind of NATO-Warsaw Pact warfighting which could never occur in reality. The deployment of the neutron warhead as a key weapon in NATO European theater capabilities depends entirely on the assumptions of NATO MC 14-4 and related doctrines of "flexible response."

The incompetence shown by professional military men in defending the "neutron warhead" as a key weapon of NATO capabilities is minor compared with the deeper reasons for that particular incompetence. The U.S. military-strategic policy as a whole is incompetent lunacy. *The professional military men accepted the lunatic conception of the neutron*

warhead because that conception is consistent with the far greater lunacy of "flexible response" in general.

The general situation in the Pentagon is monstrous. Since the assimilation of the so-called Kissinger doctrine by the Council on Foreign Relations during the 1950s, the acceptance of Maxwell Taylor's "cabinet warfare" lunacies during the early 1960s, the wrecking of the Pentagon by Robert McNamara's "body count" and "cost-benefit" approaches to warfare and strategic capabilities, and the swallowing of those versions of "flexible response" associated with the lunatic James R. Schlesinger, the Pentagon and Congress have collaborated in giving the U.S. a strategic-military capability specifically designed to lose World War III with the Soviet Union. For such realities, the term "lunacy" is no hyperbole, but a term which gropes for a condition of judgment so degraded as to exceed the powers of the language.

Under those conditions, military professionals, acting out of fear of being seen as less than "dedicated anticommunist cold warriors," are zealously associating themselves with the American Conservative Union and similar entities in proposing early showdowns with a Soviet military capability, showdowns which the 1960s and 1970s developments in U.S. military thinking and capability ensure the USA would lose.

If one stands back from the "trees" of Pentagon and related deliberations, and looks at the present U.S. military-strategic policy and capability as a whole, applying the most fundamental doctrines and lessons accumulated in military history to date, the judgment to be made is absolutely clear and irrefutable. The Pentagon budgets and related policy institutions define the U.S. strategic and subsumed capabilities vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in terms of first-line warfare within the context of escalation toward a never-quite reached asymptote of "maximum deterrent capabilities." All equations of "cost-benefit" analysis and correlated rules of thumb are adapted to the "geometry" of that indicated assumption.

The situation is that the NATO forces have presently "rough parity" with Warsaw Pact forces *up to the point of mutual deployment of maximum strategic ABC-bombardment capabilities at first stroke of war*. In short, the NATO forces have "rough parity" in "Blitzkrieg" capability for a form of general war which would never occur.

If the Kissinger-Taylor-McNamara-Schlesinger "geometry" is discarded, in favor of the order of warfare I have indicated above, the following transformation of evaluations occurs automatically. What appears under the prevailing Pentagon policies to be either a margin of NATO advantage or "rough parity" for Blitzkrieg warfare is immediately redefined as a decisive margin of *in-depth war-losing capability*.

In short, the prevailing doctrine of "patriotically

anticommunist" military professionals and other relevant persons combines a determination to seek a strategic confrontation with an acceptance of a war-losing doctrine of strategic capability.

Vietnam

The follies dinned into U.S. professional military strata during the War in Vietnam illustrates the point and casts useful light on the way U.S. military capabilities were destroyed during the post-Eisenhower period.

Under British manipulation of U.S. policy, the U.S. under Eisenhower declined a "land war in Asia" for the Indo-China region, but compromised, through the Dulles brothers and others, in establishing the preconditions for future U.S. embroilment in just such a war.

U.S. Policy for 1953-1954 should have been to recognize the government of Ho Chi Minh — who had been a U.S. protégé during World War II! — and to have taken Vietnam totally under U.S. protection in cooperation with the developing economy of Japan. Instead, at the end of the war, under the easily-manipulated Harry Truman and the British manipulators, we "gave" Indochina to the British monarchy's Fourth-Republic French colonialist puppets, and submitted to British influence in the course of French withdrawal.

As the situation in South Vietnam inevitably deteriorated during the late 1960s, the USA was manipulated into launching a "counterinsurgency" operation foredoomed to fail, a British-designed U.S. intervention modeled on Mountbatten's rigged insurgency-counterinsurgency game in postwar Malaya. The most-visible 1960 military spokesman for this bit of British eighteenth-century folly was General Maxwell Taylor, who acted as the official oracle for a broad transmission of this radical change in U.S. military doctrine into the Kennedy Administration.

Forgetting that "special forces" operations in a context of civil war are at best only a useful auxiliary to regular warfare, the U.S. pursued a colonialist "special forces" warfare in Vietnam, and found itself obliged to either withdraw its special forces effort or to make those forces effective by creating the conditions of general warfare under which "special forces" operations work.

Might the USA have "won" the War in Vietnam? In one sense, it could have.

It could not have engaged in "obliterating" North Vietnam. Such a resort would have had political consequences beyond the calculations of the misguided fellows who argue that that might have been done. The Vietnam War was posed strategically as a form of "surrogate" warfare against the Soviet Union and China, and also against "national liberation movements" generally. The kind of military thinking which attempted to treat the Vietnam War as a war

U.S. policy toward Israel's fanatics must be based in part on cold-blooded credible public threats.

isolable from other wars, or which accompanied such postures by the emotionalist nonsense of "showing the Soviets how tough we can be" is political strategic infantilism.

It could have been won by the USA if the USA had made the Atoms-For-Peace policy the model basis for a peace-settlement.

Vietnam was neither Malaysia, nor Kenya of the Mau-Mau period. The forces allied with Ho Chi Minh and General Giap had the same general order of capability as the Yugoslav resistance to the Nazis during World War II. Either the USA escaped that problem by obliterating the country — which could not be considered strategically, or it adopted war-aims leading to peace — which the USA could not do without repudiating the Kennedy and Johnson policies, or the USA became bogged down in an unwinnable war — which it did.

Every section of the U.S. military establishment became "brainwashed" in that prolonged war. The U.S. came out of the war minus a citizen army, and totally indoctrinated, by conditioning under an incompetent doctrine, into the British "cabinet warfare" method of strategic thinking. In general, the doctrine was defined: "Total war is so terrible that alternative options for war-fighting at a reduced level must be defined" — "flexible response."

So, defining U.S. military-strategic capabilities against a force who prepares to fight thermonuclear war as Stalin and Marshal Zhukov counterattacked against the Nazi Blitzkrieg capability during World War II, no professional military spokesman of the U.S. can express or apply competent military doctrines without thus denouncing the most fundamental strategic thinking of his government and breaking with the doctrines which he is now obliged to embrace as a serving or retired officer.

Where was the military-professional force which prevented us from getting into and staying in Vietnam? Who said, "From a military-strategic standpoint, this is insanity?" Granted, there were practical reasons no group of professionals so objected. The same kind of "practical reasons" apply now, and the number of professionals with the qualifications to reach the appropriate judgment has been sharply reduced since 1960.

Administration and Congress

If the military professionals can not denounce the essential folly of U.S. strategic-military policy and

To avoid war, the Soviet leadership must publicly corroborate the strategic picture I have outlined.

capabilities, and if most serving officers have apparently lost the capability for effective public judgment on this account, from whom, then, does the rationality come to prevent the United States from plunging into a war it would lose?

From the Congress? Not—under present moods—between now and November — lest the “Zionist Lobby” deprive the candidate and his friends of funds and votes.

From the White House and Administration generally? The Carter Administration has shown more “guts” against British and “Zionist Lobby” pressures than any administration since Eisenhower’s, yet it is currently running scared under “Zionist Lobby” pressure. At the moment, if Camp David fails, and if London pushes the lunatics in Israel into a war with Syria, it is probable that the United States will either enter or come very close to a general war the United States would lose. All the facts indicating that are knowable in advance, and yet — for “fear of the Zionist Lobby” — at the present moment, the best calculation is that that is exactly what would occur.

There are only two visible alternatives, only two courses of action which might give the reader reasonable assurance he and his family might be alive by Thanksgiving or Christmas. Granted, we might be “just plain lucky” and avoid these dangers “through no fault of our own,” but only an imbecile would take such a chance. We must act to prevent this sort of scenario from occurring.

The first course of action requires ruthless Administration action simultaneously in support of the Bremen agreements and in instructing Mr. Begin

and Mr. Dayan that the U.S. will neither tolerate Israeli adventures against Lebanon, Syria, or Saudi oil fields, nor come to Israel’s rescue if Israel faces Soviet power in consequence of adventures.

The second course of action must come from the Soviet leadership. The Soviet leadership must publicly corroborate the strategic picture I have outlined above — in advance of a confrontation. If the Soviet leadership were to do just that in terms and under both public and diplomatic auspices which could not be covered over by the lying anglophile press, sufficient forces in Western Europe, the United States and Israel itself would abandon their foolish delusions, and appropriate negotiations could then proceed.

If events are permitted to play themselves out down to the wire of a thermonuclear confrontation, it is probable that the U.S. government would, at this juncture, foolishly embroil the world in World War III, in defense of Israel and the “IMF conditions.” The world would discover afterward how wrong that decision had been — but at what a price. The world needs to savor the shock of what World War III means now, before the point of headlong confrontation is reached.

There may exist modifications of the approaches I have recommended on these two counts, but the basic approaches I have outlined here are the only courses of action which can be reasonably prescribed to prevent the human race from plunging into Hell. Whoever disagrees with me is a person who lacks the moral qualifications of combined guts and brains to survive.

If you disagree with me, I say this. Perhaps, because of the qualities which you, dear reader, are exhibiting by failing to join with me openly in these matters, we are witnessing the fact that the majority of the people of our nation and of other nations are lacking the moral qualifications of fitness to continue surviving. Perhaps, the United States will die in radioactive ruins, as the judgment of Armageddon on the moral imbecility you, dear reader, share in common with too many other fellow citizens.