

## Editorial

# The issue of war or peace

The introduction of the issue of war or peace into the U.S. presidential campaign by the Carter camp was one of the most cynical ploys imaginable. In effect, it signaled the consummation of a Carter administration deal with the Soviet government to make the adoption of the SALT II treaty a major platform plank of the campaign, in exchange for Soviet support for the incumbent president.

The Soviets, of course, do not believe that Carter is a peace lover. They went through with the deal in order to buy time in preparation for what they consider to be an unavoidable world war.

The European nations, especially West Germany, which has publicly indicated its preference for Mr. Carter in the nominal interest of "world peace," should know better. For the moment, however, Europe has decided to take the cold-war rhetoric of Mr. Reagan and some of his advisers as an indication that he is a greater danger to their security than the "unpredictable" and quite insane Mr. Carter. The irony of all this posturing is that the outcome of the U.S. elections *will* in fact largely determine the chances for achieving world peace. And the chances are virtually nil if President Carter is reelected.

We base this judgment on the fundamental laws governing the interaction of economics and politics. The onset of a new world depression makes the outbreak of a new world war *inevitable*. Thus the only way to avoid such a war is to bring the world out of its rapid slide into economic depression.

Jimmy Carter is totally controlled by international oligarchical families and institutions who are consciously exacerbating the depression. He is committed to extending "painful sacrifice" in the United States. He has put the political weight of the U.S. government behind the International Monetary Fund and its prescriptions for the genocide of hundreds of millions in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. He has also joined with the government of Margaret Thatcher in demanding the de-

struction of the European economies.

With its policy of high-technology exports to the developing sector, and a new financial arrangement around the European Monetary System, Western Europe provided the only hope for turning around the depression. But for the moment this hope has been stymied.

The British-promoted destabilization of Poland has knocked the props out from under Helmut Schmidt's successful entente policy, a policy based primarily on economic cooperation between Eastern and Western Europe. Schmidt's key contact man in the East was Edward Gierek, and Gierek's absence makes a big difference. The weakening of Schmidt's links to the East limits his ability to strengthen the EMS against Washington's wishes. This has immediate repercussions for Giscard's France as well. Europe thus remains virtually paralyzed, at the mercy of a threatened oil cutoff and a Russian invasion of Poland.

We do not argue that Ronald Reagan is a man with economic policies that would foster world peace. One of the men who has emerged as Reagan's key advisers, Henry Kissinger, is the original architect of the Europe-bashing, IMF-reinforcing policies of the Carter administration. Others, like Milton Friedman, are notorious for their advocacy of monetary shock treatments that may well make the world depression irreversible.

The advantage to putting Mr. Reagan in the American White House is a negative one. A Reagan presidency means that the cynical Soviet-Carter deal is off. It means the opening of new possibilities in America's relations with Western Europe. It also means openings for a political fight within the United States.

If Carter is reelected, it will take very creative imagination to bring that economic policy debate to the fore. The pursuit of Billygate—the Carter alliance with terrorist Libya and Iran—before inauguration day may be our only effective option.



The EIR has warned for over five years that the decline in American industrial, scientific and moral strength would undermine the nation's military capabilities and security. Industrial weakness has led to deficiencies in military hardware, and the decline of scientific research and education has removed from American youth the moral desire to serve and fight for the country.

Now, the Executive Intelligence Review presents a full strategic assessment of the condition of the U.S. armed forces. How far has America fallen behind the Soviet Union? How severe is the manpower problem? What is the actual "surge" capability of the American economy for arms buildup? This and more in:

## The Erosion of U.S. Military Capability

A special report from the Executive Intelligence Review  
available October 15, 1980 \$50.

And for ongoing domestic and international intelligence, subscribe to our weekly 64-page journal, the EIR. The military report will be provided free of charge with every annual subscription purchased through this offer.

# EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

**We sell intelligence.**

- Enclosed  \$50 The Erosion of U.S. Military Capability. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$65 3 month Introductory EIR subscription. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$99 3 month EIR subscription, plus Erosion of U.S. Military. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$396 Full-year EIR subscription, plus *free* copy Erosion of U.S. Military Capability. Bill me

Charge my subscription to:  Visa  Mastercharge

Card No. \_\_\_\_\_ Interbank# \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

Make checks payable to: Executive Intelligence Review, Dept. M, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th Floor, New York, New York 10019

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_ Company/Org. \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
area code