

Maneuvers to trigger shooting wars?

by Nancy Spannaus, Contributing Editor

While it has become commonplace for the two superpowers to hold virtually continuous military maneuvers over the past years, signs are increasing that the current strategic and military deployments are leading the world rapidly toward World War III. The devolution of U.S. Mediterranean maneuvers into a shooting conflict with Soviet-supplied Libya, and the inclusion of an invasion of Cuba in U.S. Caribbean maneuvers, provide the most striking indications of this threat. Combined with other operational commitments of the NATO and Warsaw Pact blocs—militarily, politically, and economically—these incidents raise the serious question of whether we have now entered the countdown stage toward full-scale war.

We choose as our point of comparison the Hilex 75 war games, during which the command-and-control for an actual strategic confrontation was put into place. The characteristics of Hilex, which were discovered and destabilized by Lyndon LaRouche's organizations in December of 1975, have been virtually duplicated in the actions of Washington and NATO, and the Soviet Union in response.

First, there is the military deployment itself, now encompassing an undetermined number of Soviet troops—some under the command of Defense Minister Ustinov himself—and, in August and September, 137,000 American and allied troops in the Ocean Voyager '81, Autumn Reforger, and Crested Cap exercises. Second, there is the return to an undiluted version of the Kissinger-Schlesinger policy of trying to provoke the Soviet Union into a limited nuclear war, a policy based

on a *calculatedly insane* ignoring of the Soviet refusal to play such deadly game.

Third, the Reagan administration and its British controllers in NATO have determined to force through this limited nuclear war strategy on Western Europe, and to militarize the economies of both Europe and the United States in preparation for what they see as a long period of sustained conflict (see National). Fourth, Washington and the British have fully committed themselves to crushing the Third World, with the included feature of ensuring control over what they see as strategic raw materials and military access routes for prolonged conflict, including theater nuclear conflict.

The re-emergence of Henry Kissinger, once President Reagan's greatest enemy and now an honored mentor of both the President and his chief adviser Edward Meese, underscores the similarity of the U.S. strategic posture to that of the fall of 1975. Kissinger was virtually running the U.S. government in 1975, and using his full weight to crush German and French resistance to a policy of militarizing the world economy around control of raw materials, and directing economic and political provocations against the Soviet Union. His theory actually called for maximum insanity by the United States, the so-called "mad dog" doctrine of diplomacy that was brought to what appeared to be its height under the insane Jimmy Carter.

Economic warfare against the Soviets, an alliance with China, and the preparations for limited nuclear exchanges were all part of implementing this doctrine. Such actions were intended to convince the Soviets that

the U.S. command was so insane that it would have to be respected—just as the sane person would do if confronted with a maniac coming at him in a game of “chicken.”

The fundamental miscalculation in this global game by Metternich aficionado Kissinger is the Soviet strategic commitment. Soviet disavowals of the limited nuclear war doctrine in their own press and by their own most prominent military spokesmen are in fact preparing their own population for imminent military confrontation with the United States. *Pravda* describes the course of U.S.-Soviet relations as verging on “the greatest catastrophe of [mankind’s] history,” due to the “logic of nuclear insanity” which has led the U.S. to enter massive preparations for “limited nuclear war.”

Traditional Soviet “softliners” now reflect the fact that the military is running the Soviet government and committing all its economic surplus to military preparedness. Georgii Arbatov, for example, a longtime David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger associate, declared on U.S. television Aug. 16 that U.S. actions are the very opposite of a signal for fruitful negotiations. We would welcome a signal, the chief of Moscow’s U.S.A.-Canada Institute said, “if you have come to your senses and decided you want to live on this planet. But we are not going to beg for a signal.”

In fact, the only signals that Kissinger protégé Haig and the rest of the administration have given is that they are eager to start a plethora of wars throughout the Third World, under the insane conviction that such wars will pin down the Soviets, but never lead to a full confrontation that will wipe out U.S. cities. President Reagan himself demonstrated his subscription to this lunacy when he declared at his press conference on Aug. 17 that he “was not afraid of a shooting war.” A look at U.S. deployments internationally shows that these shooting wars have already begun.

Cuban roulette

On Aug. 17 the U.S. Navy landed 400 Marines at the U.S. base of Guantanamo on the island of Soviet ally Cuba in the course of a practice invasion of the island. These exercises, which included evacuation of civilian personnel from the base, were accompanied by reports of a several-hundred-strong Cuban government-in-exile landing on the base as well.

The maneuvers, part of an overall exercise called Ocean Venture '81, have led Cuba, Nicaragua, and the tiny Socialist International-controlled island of Grenada to put their armies on alert in case of an invasion. The landing against Cuba had been canceled during Atlantic maneuvers last year because of an international outcry about its provocative nature, but this year the Reagan administration paid no heed.

The mock invasion of Cuba will directly affect the state of war ongoing in the Central American isthmus,

where Socialist International-backed guerrillas are joined in battle with Haig-supported right-wingers in the hope of not only depopulating the area through continuous bloodshed, but militarizing the entire continent. U.S. United Nations ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick this month brought both Chile (also a military supplier of Communist China) and Venezuela into a military pact for the “defense” of Central America. To make the plan work, however, Haig must accelerate the Cuban involvement in the area, and thereby hopefully the Soviet indirect involvement. Top intelligence sources indicate the Soviets are doing everything they can currently to cool Cuba’s response to these provocations, but that the Socialist International and their Haig allies are making it difficult to control the Cubans’ *machismo*.

Libyan dogfight

Full details have not yet emerged on the dogfight that occurred between planes from the U.S. Sixth Fleet and naval air force, and the Libyan armed forces. What is clear is that the U.S. maneuvers were preplanned to cause a confrontation in the interest of showing the Soviets that American F-14s are better than Soviet MIGs, and that they can be hit without fighting back.

Unlike Cuba, Libya is not a member of the Warsaw Pact, but Qaddafi has been attempting to strengthen his ties with Moscow, which has its largest external military base in Libya. Qaddafi is currently working overtime to pull together the radical opposition to Israeli expansionism in the Middle East. He is reported to plan a visit to Moscow soon. Most importantly, the United States is setting a wild precedent for maneuvers to turn immediately into shooting wars.

James Buckley of the State Department and Jeane Kirkpatrick are now touring Southeast Asia in a coordinated effort to inflame the area. In Thailand, Buckley announced that “the U.S. would not mind seeing the Vietnamese troops [in Kampuchea] tied down in a new war,” and uttered further praises of the Afghanistan “freedom fighters” whom the U.S. is openly bankrolling. He also declared that the F-16s should be hurried to Pakistan even if it meant depriving other nations of them. These by-no-means-covert encouragements of foreign invasions into Kampuchea and Afghanistan are just as calculated as they are insane.

No survey of U.S.-NATO provocation would be complete without looking at Europe. Top Reagan advisers are known to have swallowed the Carrington line that continuous destabilization of Poland, and perhaps even the imposition of International Monetary Fund controls on that economic-crisis-wracked country, will “pin the Soviets down” and aid the U.S. Similar lines are being fed about the decision for the neutron bomb deployment, destined unequivocally for Europe if the West German government can be forced to accept its

role as NATO's chief nuclear battlefield.

In fact, the same delusion possessed Kissinger in 1975—the delusion that the Soviets would accept a limited nuclear war in Europe and the U.S. would once more come through a major war without having to fight on its own soil. Will the Soviets have to preempt total war, starting with massive bombardment of U.S. cities, in order to prove Kissinger wrong?

Kissinger, Carrington, Rockefeller and NATO as a whole are miscalculating badly. But if the next stop in their global war games—militarizing the Western economies—succeeds, there will be little opportunity to stop them politically in the West. It will be up to the Soviets; but most of us will not be around to notice.

Current U.S. military policy lunacy

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Excerpts from an Aug. 16 statement by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

The Achilles-heel of the Anglo-American geopolitical encirclement of Moscow is the "China Card" and the Pakistan branch of the "China Card." Looking at Moscow's strategic problem through the eyes of the old Prussian General Staff's Schlieffen, this is key to the point at which Moscow can act to the greatest advantage with the least opposition and strategic risk.

Turn to the relevant map. Look at a very relevant little strip of Afghanistan abutting the Soviet Union, Peking China, and Pakistan. This little piece of real estate, unknown to most people today, could become the crucial pivot. This little strip of land—contested by Peking China—is the most singular element in the strategic geography of the world at this moment.

Now, look south from that strip, along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. If your map is politically accurate, it notes a section of this border area as Afghan, but claimed by Pakistan and under de facto Pakistan administration. . . . This contested area is integral to the staging of forces being launched by China and the United States under Pakistani surrogate cover, into Afghanistan.

Imagine that Gen. Douglas MacArthur were a Soviet general. How would he judge the significance of these elements of the real-estate offerings?

Now, turn your attention to a road leading from Peking China-occupied territory into Pakistan, the principal land-supply route from China into Pakistan, along

which a significant portion of Peking materiel flows into the Pakistan-based staging areas.

Any U.S. general officer of the old, "traditionalist" school of war-fighting, sitting in the Pentagon and imagining, as a modern Schlieffen might, what he would do were he in Moscow's shoes, comes to the very obvious conclusions. The relevant concluding point this general officer would include in his proposal is: "There's really not a damned thing we could do to counter this. It is potentially devastating for the entire geopolitical position in Asia."

Would Moscow pass up such a golden opportunity?

No Soviet military planner would wish to engage the Soviet forces in Pakistan as a whole. It is almost certain that no such superfluous undertaking would be considered by Moscow. It would be sufficient to massively discredit both Peking and Zia ul-Haq, by limited military action taken under the cover of the Afghan flag, neutralizing the rear bases of the forces deployed against Afghanistan, and cutting the land route into Pakistan from China.

During the recent weeks, since this writer first drew the conclusions just summarized here concerning the Pakistan option, it is clear that Moscow has reached analogous conclusions. *Any competent military analyst would reach exactly the same conclusions.*

An action neutralizing the geopolitical buildup of Pakistan and China has been repeatedly defined as current Soviet strategic policy in the Soviet press. The nature of the action has not been specified, but the fact of imminent action against precisely the Pakistan-Peking element of the geopolitical complex has been published as official policy of the highest bodies of the Soviet Union.

Some big-mouth idiots around Washington brush all this off, arguing in effect that the Soviets are publishing disinformation aimed at throwing us off track. On the contrary . . . it is the Soviet population which is being conditioned to acceptance of some action.

Add to this the fact that Soviet consumer-goods investment has been cut for increasing military expenditures, and that one in ten of the persons seen on the main streets of central Leningrad or Moscow are in military uniforms, and one has a picture of the state of mind emerging in the Soviet population generally today. It is estimated that Soviet military expenditures are rising rapidly toward 20 percent of the GNP, and are already at approximately 17 percent.

How can Moscow: 1) weaken Pakistan, 2) humiliate Peking to the degree of aggravating internal political instabilities there, 3) weaken the entire Asia buildup of the geopolitical combination, 4) reduce pressures on the Afghan involvement? What choices of action match the Moscow commitment to action?

If you were in Moscow, what would your choice be?