

U.S. counterforce posture: calculated madness

Anyway you cut it, U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown's newly adopted military doctrine — the counterforce doctrine — is sheer lunacy. The change in the Carter Administration's policy was leaked by British journalist Richard Burt in the New York Times Feb. 10, just as Brown had arrived for his provocative tour of the Middle East.

The doctrine — which targets Soviet missile silos, military installations, and other military targets and concentrated forces — is, in reality, a nuclear-war-losing strategy. It would be wrong, however, not to recognize that there is an evil method to Brown's madness.

The real purpose of Brown's sudden adoption of counterforce doctrine in the present world crisis is not the actual preparation for a first strike against the Soviet Union or a refined deterrent in anticipation of a Soviet attack. Counterforce has nothing to do with a traditional military posture at all. The shift to counterforce is a signal to the Soviet Union that the United States has fully embarked on Henry Kissinger's political madness doctrine of psychological warfare, a doctrine devised at Harvard with Daniel Ellsberg in the 1950s. The object is to throw the opponent into a frenzied state of fear and passive nonaction.

"We're crazier than you are"

The question is why is the Carter Administration adopting this nuclear policy posture of madness and brinkmanship unpredictability? Because the central thrust of the British monarchy's International Monetary Fund and World Bank dictates that the United States be enabled to launch — with impunity — regional wars fought by surrogates and-or mercenaries and simultaneously break the back of the forces behind the European Monetary System. This is to be done in behalf of the looting rights of the IMF and Robert McNamara's World Bank.

According to the insane British geopolitical doctrine, of which the counterforce doctrine is merely an extension, any framework for world peace and development established through a series of agreements among France, West Germany, and the Soviet Union must be crushed if the British colonial, IMF-World Bank mechanisms and depopulation policies are to survive. The combination of Britain's genocidal policies and the British Round Table doctrines for a geopolitical encirclement of the Soviet Union would turn the entire developing sector and, shortly thereafter, the more advanced industrial nations into permanent regions of destabilization, where coups, riots, terrorism, and bloodbaths reign supreme.

In short, Brown and his Anglophile supporters — Kissinger, Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Turner — expect that the counterforce big-bluff madness — "we are crazier than you are and will do anything" — will enable them to pull off their plans to return the world to the Dark Ages. Counterforce, in the minds of these berzerkers, equals economic warfare against industrial and scientific progress.

In reality, as events are demonstrating daily, these goals contain an inherent miscalculation that leads to thermo-nuclear confrontation and a disastrous defeat for the

West Germany

- A close collaborator of the ELP within the Christian Democratic Party (CDU) reported that the U.S. Embassy in Bonn was calling CDU members to demand that they stop conferring with the party.
- A member of the CDU used a Russian name to refer to an Executive Intelligence Review correspondent when approached for comments.

Brussels

- An Arab official gave the ELP a copy of a slanderous report given to him by the International Documentation Center, in Washington, D.C.

Italy

- Leading Christian Democratic Party members have informed the ELP that they have been approached by the U.S. Embassy to warn them against collaborating with the ELP.
- A caller to the U.S. consulate in Milan got the following information from then vice-consul Mr. Whiteman Jan 25: "(the ELP) is a cult, like every cult, they recruit from the petit bourgeoisie in Italy and Europe" . . . The U.S. embassy in Rome claimed the ELP was a "bunch of crazies" and referred questioners to the Israeli embassy for more information.

United States in a nuclear war. Furthermore, the West European allies of the United States are making clear that they will not sacrifice their nations' existence to such insanity. The West German government of Helmut Schmidt, officially informed of the switch to counterforce in a note from the U.S. government, immediately held a series of extraordinary cabinet meetings on the Persian Gulf crisis, the oil flow problem, and the danger of Germany's being reduced to a *Trummerfeld* (field of rubble) as a result of the change from a nuclear deterrence policy to a counterforce doctrine. Social Democratic parliamentary leader Herbert Wehner, speaking for the West German government, warned that the counterforce doctrine would provoke nuclear war.

Undeterred, the British and their American puppets are proceeding with a policy to unleash regional wars throughout the globe. The Third World is rapidly being turned into the flashpoint for nuclear war. The most dangerous points of provocations include: Southeast Asia, the Persian Gulf, the Middle East, Africa, Central America, South America, and Korea.

The accumulated effect of the regional destabilizations is to lower the threshold for nuclear war. Given the fact that this policy will lead to a nuclear showdown and actual nuclear war-fighting, what does the counterforce doctrine mean for a U.S. nuclear war-fighting capability?

Particularly under today's exacerbated conditions, counterforce is a suicidal doctrine that ensures the devastation of the U.S. in an all-out war.

A game of chicken

In the most insane version of counterforce associated with such utopian war fanatics as Herman Kahn (see his book, *On Thermonuclear War*), counterforce is a strategy for fighting a controlled or "limited" nuclear war. This is a ludicrous impossibility.

Kahn, his cothinkers at the Rand Corporation, and including Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, present their scenarios for nuclear missile exchanges as taking place in a ladder-rung escalation, with the potential of each side agreeing to stop short of all-out nuclear war. The objective is to score a political psychological war victory in a game of nuclear chicken.

The absurd unreality of this chicken posture is demonstrated in Defense Secretary Brown's announcement that as part of the counterforce policy Soviet missile silos have been targeted. As any competent military strategist knows, the silos would be emptied before the U.S. missiles hit. All-out nuclear war would already be underway.

The objectives of war

This being the case, what if the United States were to launch an all-out counterforce first strike? In addition, what would be the political-military objective of such an action? War is not a case of simple destruction; if one is willing to fight an all-out war, the following objectives must be realized:

- 1) Destruction of the enemy's ability to continue to wage war after the initial fighting has begun;
- 2) Occupation of the enemy's territory;
- 3) Securing of the peace by winning the population of the defeated adversary over to a viable policy for future industrial and scientific development — the only rational purpose for which war is fought.

Since none of these necessary objectives could be obtained, or even more significantly, are even seriously contemplated by the utopian madmen who conform with McNamara's "cost benefit methods" for measuring military effectiveness, the U.S. has been placed into an impossible predicament. This predicament involves: a U.S. armed forces drugged and demoralized; the lack of an adequate civil defense system; the gutting of industrial capacity; the fact that a majority of the population in the United States does not support this lunacy; and, most significantly, an inferior nuclear war-fighting capability on air, land, and sea.

What would happen to the U.S. in a nuclear war? Unlike the Soviet Union, which has been forced to prepare to fight and win a nuclear war despite the horrible cost, within the first hours of full-scale ABC warfare, 160 million Americans would die. Given the remnants of a once-proud, progressive, but defeated population, the Soviet army would face little resistance when their troops land on the shores of the U.S. to occupy and reorganize the country.

As the Europeans acutely realize, the lunatic incompetence of "counterforce" is modeled on the Nazi Blitzkrieg doctrine of warfare. The Nazis lacked an in-depth, war-fighting capability for winning a sustained war, and their military policy was a quick one-punch effort in the false belief that the enemy could be subdued. However, after the Soviets absorbed the first lightning-quick attack, the in-depth war-fighting reserves and industrial capacity enabled the Soviets to overcome their initial temporary defeats. Eventually, the Nazi SS elite troops and the Wehrmacht were ground up by Marshal Zhukov's military machine. Today, the Soviets are more prepared and more capable of doing the same to any adversary. They have not forgotten the lessons of World War II — unlike the U.S. leadership.

—Robert Cohen and Paul Goldstein