

Editorial

A Nuclear War When?

Our coming issue will feature a strategic assessment by Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, which makes brutally clear why his campaign's mobilization to force Vice President Dick Cheney's *immediate* resignation, is no partisan political battle nor simply domestic anti-fascist fight, but a matter of survival of the United States and other nations. War including nuclear-weapons use, against apparently weak or Third World nations, apparently incapable of resisting U.S. military power, is at the top of the Cheney gang's agenda—including the threat of a “new 9/11” to justify it. But such intimidation with nuclear weapons, LaRouche's historical study will show, will instead change the global strategic threat of worldwide nuclear war, in ways that neither dumb Dick Cheney nor his Synarchist corporate and banker backers understand.

In “World Nuclear War When? or, How Harry Truman Defeated Himself,” LaRouche writes: “In mid-1945, there was never any rational military need, under a policy of strategic defense, for our making a forced entry into the main island of Japan. . . . All the relevant available reports indicate that former Captain Truman did not consult General MacArthur, the relevant commander, on the matter of using nuclear weapons; but, the military implications of the reports from MacArthur's staff were clear. General Eisenhower, in Europe, was consulted, and did warn against such a use of nuclear weapons; but Truman went ahead, anyway. That Truman decision was the beginning of the tradition of strategic lunacy which has seized the office of the President of the U.S.A., under “Svengali” Cheney's poor “Trilby,” Bush, today.”

And later, “I point our attention to a set of extended remarks by a relevant British military historian Correlli Barnett, as to be found beginning page 13 of the fourth volume of his series, his 2001 *The Verdict of Peace*. My purpose in referencing his work, is to show you a relevant comparison between the present logic of today's medium-term threat of major nuclear conflict and the strategic situation which existed in 1949-1950 East Asia, as summarily identified by a quote from President Truman's Undersecretary of State George Kennan:

The U.S. [Truman] Administration did not consider that the Russians were preparing to enter the war. There were signs that they intended to leave themselves a way out and it was a reasonable assumption, therefore, that the Russians were merely making an important probing. There was no evidence that this adventure contained the seeds of a major war, and it was important to cope with it in such a manner as to restrict it to minor proportions.

LaRouche continues, “Cheney and his fellow-Synarchists are fatally blinded by their bi-polar, brutishly egoistical, orgasmic faith in the imagined cleverness of their pathological impulses. They are also self-blinded, that to a most crucial strategic effect, by that kind of self-inflicted folly which Barnett identifies with the Truman Administration's plunge into setting off the war in Korea. The Bush Administration's lunatic policy toward Korea today, shows that Cheney's role in that administration is also an historical irony, a policy impelling the current Bush Administration toward an awful caricature of Truman's own earlier blunders.

“Worse than the danger in their Korea policy itself, Cheney and his crew are impelling the United States toward a spread of the kind of nuclear warfare which no one, including the United States, could actually win. Such a new variety of doomsday war is, most unfortunately, possible under appropriate circumstances; but, for reasons I shall identify below, no side would win it in terms any sane member of modern European culture would consider acceptable. Cheney's continued presence in the Bush Administration now, could lead to such awful results, not because he cares about the outcome, but only for the evil satisfaction of doing the deed. . . .

“Compare that with the effect of Cheney's repeated threats, since he was Secretary of Defense in the 1989-1993 Bush Administration, of nuclear warfare against, implicitly, post-Soviet Russia and other targets.”

That effect, including the threat of a global nuclear-weapons response to U.S. intimidation, is the threat of leaving Cheney in office even a short while longer.