

have argued for relatively more spending on conventional forces—ed.] Russia’s conventional forces will present no threats to NATO for decades to come. The rusting rockets Sergeyev clings to can still destroy the world.

American politicians should be doing everything they can to encourage the devaluing of nuclear weapons as national status symbols and to lessen Russian fears that the Pentagon seeks a “first-strike” ability. . . .

The Clintonites also cling to outmoded arms control negotiations that reinforce Moscow’s pretensions to military superpower status. Despite some promising beginnings, George W. Bush has yet to show how he would change U.S. strategic forces to spur Russia to live down to its foundering technological base.

Helping Russia understand how to make that adjustment should be a high-priority U.S. political objective. Grandeur through unneeded and expensive technology is a bad investment in a world where even nationalism must pay its own way or yield.

Marilyn Rauber, “Arctic Tag ‘Game’ Is Cold War Throwback,” *New York Post*, Aug. 15.

Lawrence Korb, former Reagan assistant secretary of defense, and Brookings Institution military analyst Michael O’Hanlon strongly attack the continuing U.S. and NATO practice of stalking Russian naval maneuvers as a dangerous throwback to the bad old days of the Cold War. “The Cold War has ended. . . . Why the heck are we still doing this?” Korb commented.

O’Hanlon warned that such tailing of Russian subs could trigger a bloody incident. “The Navy acts like the undersea areas are its own universe, and I think their attitude is dangerous. . . . It’s provocative.” He warned, “Russia says to itself, if the Americans are coming after us and our nuclear forces early on in any crisis, we can’t afford to let down our guard, and that raises all your ‘Red October’ scenarios.” He continued, “This sort of behavior reinforces Russian paranoia, and therefore makes us less secure, because it makes the Russians more likely to launch.” The *Post* reported that, at any given time, the United States has around four nuclear submarines near Russia, and many more scouring the waters for Chinese subs.

The New Storm over Russia, and LaRouche’s August 1999 Forecast

On Aug. 22, the truth began to penetrate the Western media’s “soap opera” concerning the supposed “human tragedy” of the *Kursk* submarine. Pravda.ru headlined, “The Saturday World War III Almost Broke Out.”

That same day, the Singapore *Straits Times* published an article acknowledging what Russian President Vladimir Putin had actually been doing during five critical days, Aug. 12-16, when supposedly “extending his vacation”: Putin had been talking to President Bill Clinton, and other leaders, seeking to ascertain, and to decide, whether world war had already begun.

Do not leap to the comforting conclusion, that that was the case then, but that now war has been averted. Rather, read the forecast published in *EIR* just one year ago by Lyndon LaRouche, “Is World War III Coming?,” which we reprint below.

“For maniacs such as Blair, Brzezinski, and Albright, the orchestration of the recent war against Yugoslavia was only the prelude to a nuclear confrontation with Russia,” wrote LaRouche. The same is true in spades for the George W. Bush foreign policy team, “The Vulcans,” as *EIR* demonstrated in last week’s *Feature*. The escalating path of that nuclear confrontation—the *confrontation over whether NATO can force Russia to cease to be a nuclear superpower*—has led to a potential trigger for war, in the sinking of the *Kursk*. The strategic implications of the presently unfolding global financial crisis, in which the Russian economy has been looted and destroyed by Western financial speculators, are tilting the path sharply downward.

Escalating Toward Confrontation with Russia

LaRouche’s August 1999 strategic statement was issued five months after his U.S. Presidential campaign committee had circulated a mass leaflet on the danger of war. That leaflet warned Americans that Gore’s foreign-policy team had used the impeachment threat to overrule President Clinton and plan a new NATO war against Iraq, to be followed by more direct threats against Russia. From that March 1999 leaflet until LaRouche’s August warning, these events, steps on that downward path toward war driven by global financial desperation, occurred:

- In March 1999, the bombing of Iraq was intensified, reaching the war-level of 100 sorties daily.
- In April, the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia began, accompanied by shrill British demands for a NATO ground-force invasion of Yugoslavia through the Czech Republic and Hungary. The NATO bombing was ineffective against the Yugoslav Army and military police, and could only be ended after Russia intervened to get Yugoslav dictator Slobodan Milosevic to pull out of Kosovo.
- Russia responded to the NATO war on Yugoslavia, by holding “all-ocean” naval maneuvers, including nuclear naval missile launches, involving three of the four Russian fleets. These “all-ocean” maneuvers *had not been held since the breakup of the Soviet Union*.
- In April, NATO held its 50th Anniversary meeting in Washington, D.C. Though President Clinton rejected British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s public demands for a ground invasion of Yugoslavia, NATO shifted to a new war doctrine,