

Editorial

Taking On the 'Inevitable'

An American invasion of Iraq which seemed “unstoppable” and more or less immediate, in late Summer of this year, was stopped as Lyndon LaRouche said—in his international webcast of Sept. 11, 2002—it could be stopped. His campaign’s months of mobilization, distributing 7 million leaflets and hundreds of thousands of reports exposing the Utopians behind the war drive, played the crucial role in voluntaristically taking on the “inevitable.” International forces opposed to the unconstitutional and illegal doctrine of “preventive pre-emptive war” were the other critical component of action.

Now again, from many quarters, and particularly throughout the U.S. and major international media, the cry is going up that war on Iraq is inevitable, and more or less immediately. These war cries, including the plaintive, fatalistic ones, have to be taken directly on for two reasons: because such a war would be disastrous for the Middle East and for all nations involved; and, because it will not happen if we can break the current desperate paralysis of economic policy, in the face of worsening depression.

On Dec. 17, Presidential pre-candidate LaRouche attacked the Iraq war fatalism. “Included in this morning’s dispatches from Wiesbaden,” LaRouche said, “is [Israeli military historian] Martin van Crefeld’s expressed fear that the attack on Iraq might, nevertheless occur.

“For political analysts, or bookmakers or bookkeepers steeped in the tradition of crap-shoots and Belmont Park ‘boat races,’ van Crefeld is obviously correct. However, in real world of thinkers, rather than gamblers, the relevant questions are two. First: Will those U.S. institutional forces which have blocked the war thus far, suddenly collapse at this stage? Second, instead of the psycho-sexually impotent: ‘Were those forces to collapse now, what are the statistical chances of war?’ rather: ‘Were President Bush, for example, to launch such a war, what would be the countervailing consequences of his launching such a wild-eyed act of folly?’

“The second question must be answered against the background of the first. The question is of the same class of implications as: If the German generals were to permit President Hindenburg to appoint Hitler Chancellor, would Hindenburg’s Germany, and its generals, benefit in the end?

“For people who actually think, such are the lines along which the lurking threat of a general outbreak of an Iraq war is considered by competent strategic thinkers now. The outbreak of such a war, would mean that the U.S.A. were on the road to its own self-destruction, that the relevant institutional forces of the U.S.A., like the German generals who failed to force Hindenburg not to appoint Hitler, had lost the required margin of moral fitness to survive. A July 1944 would be awaiting the military cadres who failed to stop the Hitler appointment already in January 1933.

“That is the forecast which all competent thinkers would be making, including van Crefeld if he thought through the warning attributed to him in today’s dispatches.

“The problem is, that all too many, including some among my associates, tend to think like fatalistic bookkeepers or social-democratic and kindred devotees of ‘historical materialism,’ rather than those true, adult human beings called ‘voluntarists.’ ”

In the aftermath of the Nov. 5 American elections, the Bush Administration necessarily turned to the question of the plunging economy, the urgency punctuated by the rapid-fire firings and resignations of “leaders” of the Executive and both parties. These dominoes are falling because the last 30 years’ economic policy axioms are now shattered, hopelessly wrong and of no effect. A thorough “Rooseveltian” shift must occur—by so far, the Administration does not allow it. That could change overnight in the crisis. All men and women of good will should throw all their efforts into that development, rather than fatalistically “predicting” war which will be averted if we achieve it.