

# Peace-Through-Strength Group Disoriented

*LaRouche scores 'limited nuclear war' delusions of conservatives*

*"Coalition for Peace Through Strength" is a "congressional" coalition of a couple of dozen groups put together by the American Security Council, the conservative think tank. The Coalition is taking the Carter Administration to task over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and defense issues in general.*

*Citing the superiority of the Soviets over the U.S. in almost every sector of defense and an eroding U.S. defense capacity over the next ten years, the Coalition is organizing a drive to see that the SALT treaty is not approved at this time, and that nuclear arms research continues. The Coalition has called for a national strategy to aim for military superiority over the Soviet Union, a large civil defense program, and "the use of positive non-military means to roll back the growth of Communism." "Non-military" means are "economic sanctions, restraint of trade, and restrictions on technology transfer." The Soviets are sensitive to this kind of pressure, according to a spokesman in the office of Senator Dole, one of the co-chairmen.*

*While being described by the New York Times circuit as a congressional coalition, the Peace through Strength group was apparently organized first from lobbying groups, and only then were conservative congressmen of both parties approached to join in, through a "Dear Colleague" letter that was sent around. A few senators, like Dole, were called upon to play a leading role. Most offices of congressmen contacted knew little of the group, but responded primarily on the basis of its strong "pro-defense line."*

*In addition to various congressmen, the Coalition claims as members former Treasury Secretary William Simon, Major General John Singlaub, and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Thomas Moorer and Lyman Lemnitzer.*

*The following commentary on the strategic implications of the Peace Through Strength formation was released Aug. 9 by Lyndon LaRouche, the Chairman of the U.S. Labor Party and internationally-known writer on strategic questions.*

Since the newly announced "Peace Through Strength" grouping of conservatives includes persons

for whom I have personal regard, it is doubly important that I publicly ridicule the foolish declaration issued yesterday in their name.

William Simon, for whom I have personal regard, has been on a foolish track since his discussions of monetary policy with Rothschild circles in Europe some months past, and is currently being used by such enemies of the U.S. dollar as Milton Friedman. Bill is a good person, but not a person of consistently remarkable judgmental powers in matters of economic or military strategies.

The cases of Admiral Thomas Moorer and General Jack Singlaub are of a different order. Generally, I have great esteem for their competence as professionals. Unfortunately, by applying that competence to solving problems within incompetent strategic parameters, they permit themselves to be sucked into postures contrary to the best interests of the United States. It is to their problem that I address myself here: hoping to wean them away from the nonsense with which current press reports associate them.

## **General Jack Singlaub**

My first warning that Jack Singlaub was going off on the wrong track was the confirmed report of his approach to the "neutron warhead." While I sympathize with General Singlaub's distress over the condition of U.S. strategic military capabilities and postures, the efforts of Singlaub and other professionals to improve U.S. capabilities within the parameters of existing strategic doctrines is a profound disorientation, to the effect that their proposed remedies share the essential incompetence of the Kissinger-Schlesinger-McNamara doctrines in general.

From the standpoint of officers such as General Singlaub and Admiral Moorer, the USA is currently embarked on an intensified confrontation-course with the Warsaw Pact, while, at the same time, U.S. war-fighting capabilities are rapidly deteriorating. In response, professionals such as Singlaub propose to fight to modernize and otherwise improve military-strategic capabilities, picking on issues — such as the

“neutron warhead” — which have some established support among political conservatives.

From a strategic standpoint, the “neutron warhead” is a piece of junk. If I were President of the USA, I would probably produce it — *but quietly*, storing it in reserve in the replenishing arsenal of combined “neutron” and ordinary nuclear warheads. This policy would be followed solely on the assumption that a situation might arise in which a stock of such specialized weapons might be suitable and needed, but with the general understanding that such weapons would be strategically useless against the Warsaw Pact nations.

The point is this — as General Singlaub, Admiral Moorer, and others ought to agree quite readily. The advantage of a relatively “clean” neutron warhead exists only for the special circumstance that mobile assault forces are advancing rapidly through adversary terrain, in which *special case* the bombarded terrain represents a reduced ABC hazard for one’s mobile, advancing forces, and increases one’s forces’ logistical advantages in the course of continuing assault.

However, the NATO forces have no such assault capability against Warsaw Pact territory, either presently or for the indefinite future. The order of warfare for warfare between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces begins with total intercontinental bombardment of U.S. cities in excess of 50,000 or so population, plus ABC strategic bombardment of NATO force concentrations, plus ABC “paving” of pathways in depth through all concentrations of NATO ground forces. Before any mobile assault occurs, the terrain — on both sides — will be ABC-“dirtied” to the point that neutron warheads are of no significant advantage over more abundant ordinary nuclear warheads.

Therefore, the *publicized* deployment of neutron warheads has no strategic significance except to enrage the Warsaw Pact command into escalating its war-fighting capabilities and to apply intensified pressure to weak points of NATO strategic political deployment throughout the world.

If one scratches behind the arguments for the neutron warhead among professional military figures, one quickly discovers that their arguments for this weapon depend axiomatically upon the assumption of “limited nuclear war” as the overwhelmingly-probable mode of NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation. Although many of this background rightly despise Henry A. Kissinger (sometimes for wrong reasons included), one finds them favorable to James R. Schlesinger, tolerant of General Alexander Haig, and tolerant of such maniacs as Walt W. Rostow. This toleration coincides with general acceptance of some version of the insane, incompetent “limited nuclear warfare” or “first and second strike” doctrines.

Thus, the problem of professionals such as Singlaub and Moorer is that they apply their professional competence to solve a nonexistent strategic problem.

The best solution to a nonexistent problem is foolishness; when an entirely different, real problem is ignored in the process, the solution to the nonexistent problem becomes worse than mere folly.

I nonetheless compassionately understand the kind of thinking Moorer and Singlaub represent. Things are bad, and they wish to improve them. Being “practical military men,” working within the political and related policy parameters permitted to them as serving or retired officers, they seek wrongly to repair a strategic “Rube Goldberg.”

### USA-Soviet Balance

At present, there is a “rough parity” of first-line combat capabilities between the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces, such that a NATO advantage here is offset by a Warsaw Pact advantage there, and vice versa. This configuration persists only as far as the initial assaults and counter-assaults. *Under conditions of continuing warfare between the powers*, it is the total, in-depth capability of the Warsaw Pact forces which presently provides the Soviets with an in-depth war-winning capability — at the price of loss of between 30 to 40 percent of their population and logistical capabilities.

The crux of the military-strategic problem on the U.S. side is not notably weapons systems as such — at least not at the present moment. The fatal lack of in-depth warfighting capabilities on the U.S. side centers around the “all-volunteer army” and “civil defense.” The prodefense conservative groups decline to feature the deeper implications of the “all-volunteer army,” and what they offer on “civil defense” is in effect mere cosmetic posture without depth of substance.

The principles of modern warfare were articulated by Niccolo Machiavelli. Machiavelli’s proposition was essentially this. In order that the anti-“black nobility,” republican forces be enabled to defeat the “all-volunteer” professional military forces of the Black Guelphs, it was necessary to transform the adult population of the republic into a well-trained, well-equipped fighting force in depth. The commitment of republics to scientific and technological progress, and the consequent mental and moral superiorities of their general citizenry represented potentially a force in depth which no well-trained army of the Black Guelph, pro-zero-growth faction could defeat.

Putting aside the not-unimportant, but subsidiary issues of military tactics as such, war is essentially a meat-grinder, in which victory lies with that side which emerges from successive massive losses with an efficiently deployable fighting force left over from the ashes of ruinous earlier encounters. It is thus the in-depth capability of a fighting republic which is the essence of military victory. This, not accidentally, is the essence of Marshal Zhukov’s and Stalin’s counter-attack policies during World War II, a basic military doctrine embedded in modernized forms in Warsaw Pact capabilities.

The prolonged prosecution of the war in Vietnam ruined U.S. in-depth strategic capabilities in many ways, most notably through the British-fostered growth of the New Left and its development as a force dedicated to antitechnology and to destruction of the universal draft. Any review or criticism of U.S. strategic posture which does not focus first on that gut problem is inherently an evasion which leads to nothing but folly.

If that problem were competently examined, the essence of U.S. lack of in-depth strategic capabilities originates in the U.S. alliance with the United Kingdom, and the corruption of strategic policy and military command by the various derivatives of British "air power" doctrine, including not only Rand Corporation "brainwashing" of professionals, but the "limited war" doctrines associated with General Maxwell Taylor. This problem has become more acute since President Richard Nixon's resignation, with the retirement and purging of ground officers with field-grade combat experience during World War II. While various Air Force and Navy senior officers are professionally competent, too many of the responsible professionals currently in the saddle have sucked too long on the tit of British "cabinet warfare" doctrines to be of much good in strategic planning.

Relevant to the problem is the recent, hideously-slanted film *against* General Douglas MacArthur. MacArthur epitomized those U.S. professionals rooted in the Civil War and earlier traditions of West Point and Virginia Military Institute. It was these officers who brought the USA through World War II, and those from the 1930s graduating classes trained under them as field-grade officers, who represented the gut of competent military-strategic thinking in our military establishment. They possessed a *political* sense of war, as MacArthur's case exemplifies. They understood that the United States was an industrial republic, a constitutional republic committed to influencing the global order among nations to the same moral purpose. MacArthur's administration of the postwar recovery of Japan is exemplary of the point.

Beginning with General Maxwell Taylor's British-influenced retreading, to become advisor of President J. F. Kennedy, the most fundamental principles of strategy were heaved out of the window, in favor of British-style, "colonialist" cabinet-warfare thinking concerning "special forces," etc. The reasons for the slaughter of Canaris's Second Division in Yugoslavia and similar experiences of World War II were forgotten. Under British-tainted influence, Kennedy put the USA into what President Eisenhower avoided: land war in Asia. Unfortunately, on their weak psychological side, even senior military professionals too easily become obsessed with "hot shot" local military tactical enterprises, forgetting the strategic principles which properly govern tactical undertakings. A little of the "macho" in the junior and field-grade officer carries over into the flag officer.

As for "civil defense," it is clear that American Security Council types are so enamored of the mere phrase, "civil defense" that they overlook the cost of providing the USA with a civil defense capability matching that organically built into Soviet in-depth capabilities. It could be accomplished, but it would require a retooling of the U.S. economy suggesting productive capital formation on the order of 10 to 15 percent or more a year. Digging a few holes in the ground, concocting cockeyed evacuation procedures, and sandbagging a few plants is a gesture which is disgusting because of its essential futility.

The fact that the American Security Council and Committee on the Present Danger are formally, politically allied with Milton Friedman types means that the posturing of the Peace Through Strength Committee's initial declaration is rank imbecility. By allying with those political forces dedicated to collapsing the U.S. dollar and collapsing U.S. high-technology industrial, agricultural and infrastructural development through "fiscal austerity," these military strategists remind one of the persons who attempt to drain the water out of a sinking lifeboat by smashing holes in the hull of the craft.

### Goodbye, Larry MacDonald

It was illustrative of General Singlaub's relative disorientation on strategic issues that he appeared on Representative Larry MacDonald's (D-Ga) circuit recently. While Jack Singlaub disassociated himself from MacDonald's political cause, he associated himself with the silly "patriotic anticommunist" reds-under-the-beds lunacy in which MacDonald specializes. Considering the fact that the John Birch Society was promoted in behalf of the policies of Britain against President Dwight D. Eisenhower, General Singlaub's judgment of what represents American patriotism was tainted by that unfortunate association with MacDonald.

Fortunately, the voters of the Seventh District of Georgia have acted to bring an end to the farce of MacDonald's presence in the U.S. Congress.

I assure General Singlaub, Admiral Moorer and others that if the U.S. enters a sharp confrontation with the Warsaw Pact in alliance with Great Britain, the United States will lose that war miserably and totally. If the U.S. were to back Israel against the Soviet Union in the course of an Israeli assault against Syria and Saudi Arabian oil fields, it is probable that the U.S. would be defeated and destroyed because of Soviet in-depth capability.

Ostensibly, Singlaub and Moorer are not thinking through the Soviet strategic problem competently.

If the policies of Brezhnev, Kirilenko, et al. prevail — if the principles adopted by President Brezhnev and Chancellor Schmidt (May 1978) prevail, any American who seeks military confrontation with the Soviet Union is a dangerous lunatic, surely bent upon the needless destruction and conquest of the United States. However, should the opposite faction in the

Soviet Union come to power, the "Jacobin" heirs of Bukharin and the wild-eyed "hard-liners," the Soviet Union itself would tend to be committed to a hard-line confrontation course against the United States. If the policies of Kissinger, Schlesinger, Brzezinski, Rostow and other British types prevail, if the USA pursues a confrontationist course against the Brezhnev leadership and supports London on the issue of the International Monetary Fund, the Jacobin faction in the Soviet Union will be pushed to the fore, and war which the United States will lose is virtually inevitable.

That is the essence of the political-military strategic equation.

It should be clear that the Peace Through Strength Committee's posture is fundamentally incompetent strategic thinking in any case. The purpose of war is to win the peace of victory. Here, at the moment we have it within our reach to win the peace of World War II — insofar as the Soviet leadership is concerned, various self-styled "patriots" are proceeding from a totally incompetent reading of Soviet postures and capabilities, and espousing a course of war-preparations by the United States which are incompetent from the standpoint of any war which would actually be fought between the two superpowers.

At the moment, the nation against which the United States ought to consider conducting war is not the Soviet Union, but the United Kingdom. It is the British monarchy which has flooded our youth with drugs, which deploys international terrorism against us, which mobilizes to accomplish the collapse of the U.S.

dollar and to collapse our industrial output and agriculture. It is the British, through their control of a dominant faction within Israel, which is preparing to pull the trigger on Armageddon in the Middle East, which threatens to put bombs on the Saudi Arabian oil supplies of our European and Japanese allies, which is attempting to foment a warlike situation between the United States and Soviet Union.

Yet, William Simon is working in cahoots with such enemies of the United States as Milton Friedman, and much of our military and conservatives are rallied around subversive branches of British intelligence such as the Heritage Foundation, aiding the British in promoting internal destabilization of the United States.

To Admiral Moorer, General Singlaub, and others, I say, "Get off this foolish kick, men. You know that I am the President to fight any war the United States must fight, and that I have confidence in your counsels and related expertise in shaping U.S. strategic capabilities accordingly. However, otherwise, relative to me, you are miseducated children in matters of political strategy. If you are truly concerned with developing the strategic capabilities and posture of the United States, as I know you are, you should have accepted my offer to form a body for this purpose — and get yourselves away from the sort of lunatics and muddlers with whom you have unwisely preferred to associate yourselves.

"Either you already know I am right, or at least you strongly suspect I may be correct. Conduct yourselves accordingly."