Editorial

No U.S. Land War in Asia—Ever!

Lyndon LaRouche is in the process of completing an important strategic study, that will soon appear in the pages of this magazine. His essential point, which bears repeating, over and over again, is that, under no circumstances, should the United States be trapped in a land war in Asia, as our British imperial enemy demands. In the present context, this means a total repudiation of Gen. Stanley McChrystal's folly of a counterinsurgency war, involving hundreds of thousands of American and NATO forces, in Afghanistan.

Today, in the United States, the ghosts of the Vietnam War counterinsurgency dogmas are stalking the corridors of power. A new generation of counterinsurgency advocates, many of whom were barely alive during the Vietnam horrors, are preaching, with typical irrational hubris, that "this time," the United States can defy the lessons of Vietnam and conduct a successful counterinsurgency "nation-building" war in Afghanistan.

Senior national security and foreign policy figures inside the Obama Administration, according to our best information, are seeking a middle ground, denying Generals McChrystal and David Petraeus a massive force expansion, while accepting the underlying principle of a counterinsurgency "surge." This compromise approach is deadly, and those contemplating this option should take heed of President John F. Kennedy's wise decision, back in the Summer of 1961, to reject all such proposals with respect to an American ground war in Indo-China.

At that time, the young President Kennedy conferred with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and former President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Both men spoke in no uncertain terms: Under no circumstances should American soldiers be drawn into a land war in Asia. Despite immense pressure from his entire national security team and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, JFK actually cancelled an already planned deployment of 10,000 Marines into combat duty in Vietnam.

Today, the courageous decision of President Kennedy must be heeded, without any compromise, by the current Administration. President Obama's foolish declaration, that Afghanistan is "his war," and is a "war of necessity," aside, American leaders must strive to think strategically, and find an appropriate alternative to an American combat escalation in Afghanistan. Fortunately, there are some opportunities.

Recently, the foreign ministers of Russia, China, and India met. According to official statements, buttressed by reports delivered to this publication, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov proposed that the three Eurasian powers, along with the United States, meet to devise an alternative, regional strategy for stabilizing Afghanistan, without a U.S. combat or counterinsurgency presence. Given the certain folly of a U.S. land war in Asia, this proposal must be immediately fleshed out. Every nation in the region, bordering on Afghanistan and Pakistan, has a vested interest in a regional security arrangement, that particularly destroys the opium and heroin trafficking, that is funding the insurgency and fueling domestic crises throughout Eurasia and beyond.

The opportunity certainly exists to build an alternative strategy, based on a Four Power cooperation, to defeat the British Empire on the "Roof of the World." There is no viable alternative—certainly not the "McChrystal Folly" of endless counterinsurgency warfare. It is time to think strategically!