

A Time for Some Real Leadership: Is Fallujah a New Dien Bien Phu?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 14, 2004

At this moment of the most deadly turning-point in world history, most of the people who should be thinking as commanders-in-chief, are acting, instead, like a pack of whimpering job-applicants who just received news that they had, probably, lost the job. I see in them men and women who prefer, to whimper, like poorly trained actors who had just failed at try-outs for the part of Hamlet. We need better leadership, political leadership like that which General Douglas MacArthur showed at Inchon, for example.

The piteous wailing of professional political cry-babies and other opportunists to one side, absolutely nothing else about U.S. or world history was finally determined on the morning of November 3rd. President George W. Bush has actually won nothing as much as a pack of troubles beyond anything he had experienced thus far.

Each currently passing day, Fallujah, for example, is looking more and more like Dien Bien Phu. The dollar is sinking; the Federal debt-crisis is far worse than anything in 1994, while the idiots are babbling like the professional losers they seem to have become, "The economy was not the issue of the campaign." The worst mortgage-based securities bubbles in history are about to pop. A raw-materials bubble in financial derivatives is ripe to explode. The added effects of an onrushing new escalation of so-called Middle East crises could send the price of petroleum way beyond even \$100 a barrel, and blow out the entire "Middle East" region for decades to come. The onrushing collapse of the U.S. economy is worse than anything experienced, or even imagined during the Twentieth Century.

With the usual babblers' dubious proclamation of W's victory, we have thus entered a period of the greatest political

opportunities in history, as the Prussian military advisors of Czar Alexander I understood, at the moment the self-doomed Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte had just settled in for the occupation of Moscow. When I read the morning edition of the *Washington Post*, for example, I remember poor deluded Croesus, hearing the news from the babbling priestess of Delphi, thinking that he had actually been guaranteed a triumph.

Nothing else is settled about much of anything, except that the present Bush Administration has probably just achieved the rank of the most ill-fated, momentary, most delusory victory, in all U.S. history to date.

So, why are all those recent job-applicants for posts in the Presidency sitting around, mooning like dejected job-applicants, when the time for the most important intervention in the leadership of world affairs has just now begun? I remember how President Abraham Lincoln felt before he brought Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan into play. There is the most important battle in U.S. history needing to be fought and won right now, and the roster of applicants for leadership I see around me, are like cowards griping in the shadows, cautiously waiting to see "how it all turns out."

Amid all of the uncertainties I see clearly now, I am absolutely certain about one thing. What the so-called "news media" are implying the present situation to be, has no resemblance to the reality of what is about to burst loose on the landscape, most probably between now and Christmas, certainly before that intended Belshazzar's feast otherwise known as the coming January inauguration. All Hell is now about to bust loose, and there are powerful circles of people in the shadows, inside and outside the U.S.A., who know this, and who are positioning themselves to move accordingly. I do not know all the answers to my questions about what some of these folk are positioning themselves to do, but I see them

clearly positioning themselves, and I understand what the situation is which is impelling them to prepare for action to deal with what is already an impossible situation for both the U.S.A. and the world at large.

I have many important questions, which any competent political leader of our nation would be asking now. I do not yet have the answers to most of these questions, but I am way ahead of both most of my putative political rivals, in addition to the abundantly misinformed proverbial man-in-the-street, because, I, at least, have the right questions.

Seeing the sheer insanity of W's lunatic campaign stunt, his lunatic lurch, sending marines and others to die for no good purpose, in Fallujah, I know that only terrified cowards think that anything important was actually settled by the morning of November 3rd. If you wish to be the first, or, at worst, the second, to discover what is about to happen next, stay tuned to this channel. What is about to happen, is probably something most of you would never dream to be possible. As was formerly said in China, and perhaps along the China straits, again, just now, we are "living in interesting times."

'Victory' in Fallujah: A Political Disaster

by Carl Osgood

During a Nov. 16 interview on Philippines radio (*EIR*, Nov. 26), *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche reported that the U.S. military assault on Fallujah, launched on Nov. 9, one week after U.S. Election Day, has settled nothing in Iraq. "You have an impossible situation, and an impossible war," LaRouche said, "We have a general destabilization of the entire area of Southwest Asia. We have chain reaction effects around the world." A few days later, he commented, "They have made all of Iraq, greater Fallujah."

Lt. Gen. John Sattler, the U.S. Marine commander in Iraq, now has egg on his face. On Nov. 18, speaking to reporters at the Pentagon via video teleconference from just outside Fallujah, Sattler declared, "Based on some of the records . . . and ledgers we've been able to uncover, we feel right now that we have, as I mentioned, broken the back of the insurgency and we have taken away this safe haven." It did not take long for Sattler to be contradicted, both from within the military and by subsequent events. Only one day after Sattler's remarks, Lt. Gen. Lance Smith, the deputy commander of U.S. Central Command, when asked to respond specifically to Sattler's comment, said, "I think it's too early for me to say, given the broad perspective of Iraq, that the backbone of the insurgency is broken. We have certainly had a significant impact on the insurgency, but we know that the

important part is going to be to follow on with the success and not allow a safe haven to exist anyplace else, like Ramadi or Baqubah or some of those other cities where we know these folks go."

Other officers were reportedly even more pessimistic than Smith. The *New York Times* reported Nov. 17, that senior Marine intelligence officers under Sattler warned, in a seven-page report, that if American troop levels in the Fallujah area are significantly reduced, insurgents will "rebound from their defeat." The report says that rebels could thwart the retraining of Iraqi security forces, intimidate the local population, and derail the elections scheduled for January. It further warned that the insurgents, despite taking heavy casualties, will continue to grow, launch attacks, and try to foment unrest among Fallujah's returning residents. It says that if American forces do not remain in sufficient numbers for some time, "The enemy will be able to effectively defeat 1st Marine Expeditionary Force ability to accomplish its primary objectives of developing an effective Iraqi security force and setting the conditions for successful Iraqi elections." A very senior retired military intelligence contact, commenting to *EIR* about the *New York Times* report, said: "What this says is that the insurgencies are growing organically from the discontent of the Sunni Arab population, and that these insurgencies will continue to grow, recruiting new members and continuing to resist U.S. forces."

Nor is that sober view limited to the Marines. The BBC reported Nov. 29, that Army Brig. Gen. Carter Hamm, the U.S. commander in northern Iraq, warned that continued violence in Mosul could undermine election prospects in that city. "Without the numbers of Iraqi police that we would like to have, it significantly increases the level of difficulty of establishing the environment we need for the elections," he said. There are about 2,000 U.S. troops in Mosul, and Hamm insisted that there would be no more. "Clearly we need more Iraqi forces to counter the shortfall right now," he said. "But what we need more than forces is clear intelligence."

The pattern of the insurgency since Nov. 9 has been to increase its activities across a wider portion of the country, from Babylon and Babil provinces south of Baghdad (an area that U.S. military personnel call "the Triangle of Death"), all the way up to Mosul in the north, and west to Ramadi and the Syrian border. As the Fallujah assault was getting under way, insurgents launched a broad attack on Mosul, on police stations all over the city, and U.S. and Iraqi forces have been trying to regain control of this city of 1.7 million people ever since. Because of the unreliability of the police and Iraqi national guard, the Iraqi government has been forced to rely on Kurdish *peshmerga* militia, reportedly angering Arabs, to try to re-establish order in the city. Insurgent attacks have also hit Balad and Baquba, north of Baghdad and a half dozen cities south of Baghdad. The intensity of the fighting in other parts of Iraq is underscored by the fact that nearly half of the 138 deaths suffered by U.S. forces during the month of