

EDITORIAL

The Great Cookie-Cutter in the Sky

by Tony Papert

Sept. 12—Let me tell you about some of the most important articles you won't be reading in this issue of *EIR*. One is an in-depth discussion of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. (We've had two recent articles on this by Jeffrey Steinberg, but this one was to be a more in-depth study by the same author.) I proposed this article to Editor-in-Chief Lyndon LaRouche on Sept. 10. My motivation was that a leading Democrat had just commented privately, after Russian President Putin's surprise move into Syria, to the effect that it appeared to him that the United States might be heading into something like a new Cuban Missile Crisis,—but without a John Kennedy in the White House. Anything but.

LaRouche shot it down instantly. "No," he said, "we shouldn't do that. This is *not* a new Cuban Missile Crisis. I don't know what it is, but it's definitely not a new Cuban Missile Crisis."

Okay.

Another idea which I had also drawn up and had just discussed with Editorial Board members, was a juxtaposition of Lyndon LaRouche's contemporaneous understanding of the critical, turning-point importance of Russia's two Chechen Wars in the 1990s, with Putin's vivid understanding of the existential importance of the Second Chechen War at just the same moment.

"No," said LaRouche. "This is not anything like a continuation of the Chechen Wars. There's a relationship, but it's completely different."

All right. He went on to reject yet a third proposed article on analogous grounds. (Although he enthusiastically endorsed the other articles which appear here.)

I put down the phone in a gloomy and irritated state. I knew that I had been wrong,—but how? What did it mean? Then, the moment he finished his editorial discussion with me, LaRouche began his nationwide [Fire-](#)

[side Chat](#) with supporters around the U.S. I found it extremely thought-provoking. But throughout that call-in program, and then overnight and into the early morning, I wrestled with myself over the significance of that earlier discussion.

What had just happened?

Putin had suddenly outflanked Obama, to Obama's complete surprise and astonishment. Obama had been attacking Putin in Europe, centering on Ukraine; he had thought he was succeeding. Suddenly, Putin shows up and attacks Obama unexpectedly from the rear, from the Middle East, by threatening to destroy the ISIS terrorists. As part of the same flanking action, Putin had influenced China's organization of its unprecedented and brilliant military display at its September 3, Seventieth Anniversary Victory Day celebrations, with Putin their number one guest.

Simultaneously,—and neither coincidentally nor in any simple relationship,—Europe had suddenly begun to break away from the British-Obama dictatorship which had aligned all the Europeans for near-term thermonuclear war against Russia, while locking them into the anti-Russian sanctions policy which was shutting down German industry. The initial breakaway came, again, from a completely unexpected direction: Germany reversed itself on the question of the floods of refugees from Obama's disastrous wars. Suddenly, the German government reversed itself and committed to accept 800,000 to a million refugees this year, and half a million each subsequent year. Just at that moment, the anti-Blairite Jeremy Corbyn was elected leader of the British Labour Party in a landslide victory. Then, the German Foreign Ministry said it welcomes Russian participation in the fight against ISIS in Syria. German Chancellor Merkel was quoted to say that the Germans, along with other Europeans, want Russia to be involved

in solving the Syria war,—while meanwhile, Obama’s White House continued to struggle internally over how to respond. Signs come from France; other possible signs from Italy.

This is an historic, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity,—but exactly what is it? Well, the fact is, in reality, we just don’t yet fully know what it is. We don’t know, but we have the duty to learn what it is,—in the course of exploiting the opportunity it offers us to avert an imminent thermonuclear war by turning Obama out of the White House, and cancelling the bankrupt Wall Street system.

But we know what it is *not*. It certainly is not,—as Lyndon LaRouche told me Thursday night,—it is not a new Cuban Missile Crisis. It is not a continuation of the Chechen Wars. More generally, it is not a *revenant*, a ghost, a corpse of the undead returning from past history like last night’s pizza.

Exactly the opposite. This is totally new. It is *sui generis*, or, in English, “one of a kind.”

And right now, if there is any one sure recipe for defeat, in this unique, all-embracing crisis which opens up the path towards victory, it is just that,—to imagine that we are living through a repeat of past history, when in fact, just the opposite is true. What is going on now is totally new and unprecedented.

The Duty to Learn

With this, I was reminded again of one of the most inspiring books I have ever read: the autobiography of



Lt. Gen. Vasily Chuikov, commander at the Battle of Stalingrad, 1943.

Soviet Marshal Vasily Ivanovich Chuikov, *The Beginning of the Road*. Stalingrad was the “beginning of the road” towards the defeat of Hitler and the Nazis; it was the turning point of the whole war, and likewise one of the greatest victories of the human spirit amidst the great darkness of the Twentieth Century. Chuikov and his ever-dwindling 62nd Soviet Army had held the city for 100 days against von Paulus’ Sixth Army, and against the Luftwaffe’s total control of the air. By the end, the 62nd was hanging on to no more than a square kilometer or less, but it was that square kilometer,—like Kepler’s eight minutes of arc,—which permitted the great encircling operation which finally



House-to-house fighting in the Stalingrad suburbs.

turned the tide of World War II.

When he had been ordered back to European Russia from Asia, the long train ride had given Chuikov time to think. “What is this new system of war which the Germans are using, which defeats us in almost every en-



Frontline clashes in an urban area of Syria, May 2015.

agement? Just exactly what is it they're doing, and how can we counter it?" Once he arrived at the front, Chuikov spent a lot of time in solo reconnaissance from hilltops, which will remind our readers of Douglas MacArthur in World War I.

He observed the carefully choreographed advances of the Germans wedging themselves over and through the weaker positions in the Russian lines. First came the Luftwaffe, followed by combined formations of tanks and infantry. "I wonder if I can get them to bomb their own troops?" he asked himself. He tested it out. Shortly before the German attack was to come, Russian troops under his command quickly evacuated their own trenches, and in effect invited the Germans in. Along comes the Luftwaffe, and bombs their own German troops, just as he expected. The German soldiers fired off rockets to try to warn off their planes, but to no avail.

Skipping briefly over Chuikov's whole enthralling account, as we are forced to do here for reasons of space, we can link these first observations and experiments of his, to one of the tactics he made famous, called "hugging the enemy." Where possible (or impossible), Chuikov's troops placed their lines so close to the enemy, practically in his lap, that German air supe-

riority often became semi-useless; it could not be exercised for fear of inadvertently hitting German positions.

Then, when he was given the order to defend Stalingrad at all costs, Chuikov invented an entirely new method of warfare for the battle in the now-destroyed city. As he wrote, nothing like this was ever taught in military academies; indeed, it had never even been dreamed of before. Others called it "street warfare," but, as Chuikov wrote, you never wanted to be caught in a street in Stalingrad; you'd be obliterated. Much of the fighting consisted of seizing fortified buildings, left stand-

ing amidst the rubble, from the enemy at night. Chuikov re-formed whole units down into 21-man squads, subdivided into specialized groups, which seized the buildings, and often cleared them hall by hall, and room by room.

And as in war, to think you understand this current, September 2015 crisis by analogy with past events, is to be deluded, to know less than nothing at all, and is tantamount to instant, disastrous defeat.

Now, Lyndon LaRouche has long emphasized the harmfulness of mathematics for science, i.e., for understanding the truth, especially since British Lord Bertrand Russell contrived to substitute mathematics for science at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, and to hound and persecute actual scientists, most prominently Albert Einstein, who refused to go along with this fraud. But what is the issue? The issue is precisely the same. The mathematical mind, as Edgar Allan Poe argued tirelessly in his time, is the mind which believes that everything is known, everything has been discovered, and there is nothing that is truly new; at most, anything which might appear to be new, can simply be deduced from the same tired old axioms.

It is the mind of the sucker, of the born loser.