

The Crisis in U.S. Strategic Policy

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 10, Number 42, November 1, 1983. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

The majority perception among influential strategic planners around Washington, D.C. is that the Soviet leadership will be forced to turn to serious negotiations with President Ronald Reagan once the Pershing II missiles begin to be installed in Europe later this year. The minority view shares more or less exactly my contrary perception of the situation. The Soviet leadership is presently escalating a thought-out plan toward thermonuclear, global showdown with the United States, and will merely accelerate its drive toward confrontation once the first missiles are installed.

The problem is, that by spring 1984, the minority's view will be fully confirmed and the majority's view shown to be profoundly mistaken, not only as an assessment, but also as a method of assessment. The problem is, that there exists no fallback option in place for the case that the minority's view is corroborated by early developments.

These differences within the community of official and private circles responsible for giving military and political strategic counsel to the President are compounded by the voices of the politicians whispering into the President's ear from the other side. "Mr. President, we're in an election period. Let's not have any crises. We have to keep up the perception that there's an economic upswing, or we're going to lose the election to John Glenn. You've got to duck that 'warmonger' image, Mr. President. I know you're no warmonger, but public opinion"—holding up a copy of the *New York Times*—"thinks you are." The State Department is an inexhaustible source of disinformation on crisis spots in various parts of the world, and so are the circles of Henry A. Kissinger. There is a strong tendency around the Executive Branch to believe only what one wishes to believe.

"Gee, fellas, wouldn't it be grand if the perception of an economic upswing could be kept up through November 1984!" "Prosperity is just around the corner, Mr. President." "If Andropov would come through and start negotiating seriously before Spring, that would make the President really look good with the press. They couldn't call him a 'warmonger' then."

The majority of the intelligence community, or so it seems, is busy telling the White House what the election-campaigners wish to hear.

Meanwhile, President Reagan's former policies are becoming a shambles. His earlier unequivocal commitment to the sovereign integrity of Lebanon has been discarded during recent negotiations with Syria and Israeli circles. Soviet SS-21s have been placed openly on the territory of the Soviet puppet, Syria. The Arab Gulf states, abandoned by the United States, have agreed to dump Iraq's President Saddam Hussein and to pay Iran a demanded \$50 billions in "reparations"—à la outgoing President Jimmy Carter. If that deal goes through, and Lebanon is carved up as now scheduled, the Arab world west of Egypt will disintegrate under movements funded in part by that \$50 billion in reparations, before the end of 1984.

It is worse; Soviet-backed Qaddafi is moving step-by-step to destroy every targeted nation of northern Africa. Chad is virtually gone—a process aided by Soviet pressure on the French government. The destruction of Sudan is already under way, threatening the existence of Egypt. Cameroon, Niger, Ghana, and Nigeria are targets of early destruction by aid of Qaddafi's forces. Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco are targeted by Qaddafi and Iran's Savama, all steered from powerful bankers of the Nazi International based in Switzerland, and collaborating with Moscow.

In West Germany, there is presently scheduled a November vote in the German parliament, on whether Germany shall permit the United States to station Pershing IIs in Germany. The proposed vote, arranged by Christian-Democratic parliamentary leader Rainer Barzel, is presently estimated to carry. The Social-Democrats are solidly behind the vote to stop the stationing, together with their Nazi-tinged Green Party allies, and a significant minority of the Christian-Democrats, including Kurt Biedenkopf, are now campaigning to vote against the stationing. This would mean the beginning of the "Finlandization" of Germany, the Netherlands, and so forth, the launching of an escalating process of break-up of the Atlantic Alliance.

In Iran, the majority of the U.S. intelligence community greatly underestimates Soviet control over that country, since U.S. circles count as Soviet only those circles bearing plain and simple Soviet-agent labels. The Soviets however have a working arrangement with the Switzerland-based Nazi International, which controls the hard core of "Islamic fundamentalist" organizations from the terrorism scheduled for the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, through the Middle East, into the Philippines island of Mindanao. Through the cover of a so-called "democratic anti-Zia coalition" in Pakistan, both Soviet and Khomeini agents are preparing to break up Pakistan, and to carve out a new Soviet puppet state, Baluchistan, to serve as a Soviet warm-water port on the Indian Ocean.

In that region of the world, the Soviet Union has learned that it is not necessary to control forces ideologically. Often, it is sufficient merely to buy them, aided by Soviet circles

operating part of the international black market in drug trafficking. Soviet penetration of Burma is partly based on this, giving Moscow effective control over so-called Maoist communist organizations of the subcontinent and Southeast Asia, as well as official communist parties.

One of the deadliest confrontations is shaping up in the Far East, where Washington's deluded, if slightly diminished confidence in the "China Card" is relevant. Since Kissinger's activities of 1972-75, the United States no longer has strategic credibility among any of the nations of eastern Asia's rim, especially in China itself. China may dislike both the Soviet Union and the United States, but China is determined to maneuver in whichever way seems best suited to the cause of China's survival during any conflict between the superpowers. The Philippines is crumbling—largely a result of recent years of bungling by the U.S. State Department—placing the entire region in jeopardy. Meanwhile, the United States has pulled most of the Seventh Fleet out of the Far East, to chase guerrillas in Central America. The Republic of Korea is the principal next target of Moscow in that part of the world after the Philippines.

In the Western Hemisphere, the Soviet Union has no projected strategic interest in assuming the costly liability of subsidizing a "new Cuba" in Central America, but it serves Soviet interests elsewhere to have as much as possible of the U.S. Navy tied down in an escalating "new Vietnam" in that part of the world. Since Henry Kissinger, Al Haig, and Lane Kirkland have lured the President into wasting scarce U.S. capabilities—and credibility—in Central America, and since present U.S. policy is turning Latin America against the United States, it would be uncharacteristic of Moscow not to exploit the mess which the United States has created for itself in that part of the world. It helps keep U.S. capabilities down in the Middle East, in Africa, and the Far East.

Meanwhile, in Moscow itself, the Soviet leadership is operating presently on the perception that present Soviet military superiority, the deepening economic depression of nations under the Bretton Woods System, an imminent, 1931-style international financial collapse, and pressures of the 1984 election campaign will hamstring the Reagan administration so much during the coming six to nine months that the White House will be unable to react effectively to any added element of strategic crisis. This is Moscow's perceived historic "window of opportunity." A strategic confrontation now, it is calculated in those quarters, will force the Reagan administration to make a strategically decisive backdown under Soviet globally distributed confrontation. This would not mean the Red Army's conducting a victory march up and down Constitution Mall. It would mean that Soviet world-hegemony would be unchallengeable for the foreseeable decades to come.

Between the State Department and Kissinger, and Volcker coming in from the sidelines, Moscow's calculations are well-prepared, and for the moment unshakeable. Since August, the Soviets have been unfurling, step by step, a series of actions—first in one part of the globe, then another, a calculated buildup toward an eyeball-to-eyeball showdown with the United States, including the targeting of the territorial United States with warheads from extended-range SS-20s and from submarines stationed off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Perhaps some thermonuclear pranks in the Caribbean might be tossed in just to make the pot boil more energetically.

Will we submit? Will we consent to be virtually conquered? It is not in our nature to do so. Germans are now accustomed to being conquered, as are, more or less, most of the cultures of Western Europe. Americans? I think not. On this point, the Soviet leadership has miscalculated badly. I think we are headed for early thermonuclear war, if the White House continues to heed the counsels of those representing the evident majority view. Unless we take dramatic steps now which prompt Moscow to rethink its ongoing march toward thermonuclear confrontation, Moscow will drive us to the point of thermonuclear war, and that perhaps—even probably—before the 1984 elections.

The Political Problem

The obvious political flaw in the White House today is that it is attempting to adapt to what advisers tell it is “public opinion,” rather than to employ the extraordinary powers of the White House to shape public opinion. The key to understanding this is the evidence of the White House's blind faith in the fraudulent statistics which report a “1983 U.S. economic upswing” in progress. The White House demonstrated, by its swallowing that hoax, that it has lost contact with the real people around the country.

There is a deepening economic depression, with the highest rate of bankruptcies since 1933. The people out there experience this depression. It is the oppressive, frightening reality of their daily lives. What do such people feel when they look into the television tube and watch the President of the United States tell them that a remarkable economic recovery has begun? Gradually, they simply don't believe anything the man says on any subject. The President's blindness to economic realities is turning him into a “new Herbert Hoover,” much to the delight of the stage-managers for the frontrunning Democratic candidates.

Had the President said, or would he say, instead, “I've been lied to. You've been lied to. There is no economic upswing. We are in the worst economic depression since the 1930s, and we are threatened with the biggest international financial collapse in history. We can overcome these problems, but I need your support,” the wide reaction would be: “At last, someone in charge is facing the truth!”

The people, generally, are totally ignorant of national policies. They know policies only as the effects of policy strikes them in their personal lives. If persons in whom they have confidence tell them one policy is good and another bad, the people will usually accept such recommendations, without any understanding of what they are actually supporting or opposing. The usual voter's argument is of the form, "So-and-so is an authority I trust, and I have to go along with what he says." The people today mostly believe what they read in the newspaper or see on the television tube. They don't know what it is they believe on subjects of national policy, international affairs, and so forth. What they know is their concern to "get by" in life with personal affairs, family affairs—and hoping for a pension. The rest, the things which occur outside their immediate experience, they simply don't understand. On matters which they do not understand, they believe usually whatever they are told to believe by the "authorities" in whom they have chosen to place their trust.

However, as Lincoln said, you can fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. Sooner or later, wrong policies lead the nation into a disaster which touches directly, and frighteningly, upon the personal conditions of life of most of the citizens. The general feeling among growing numbers of the people then is "Everything has gone wrong." Authority is then suspect. All those authorities who assured them that this would work out, that that would work out, are now potentially discredited.

Being ordinary everyday people, not exactly full-time professional heroes, the people seek some authority who will lead them in political combat against the authorities who have misled them. They look upwards, toward the higher-ranking circles of power, seeking someone "in authority" who will "come over to our side" on the issues which frighten them sorely. In our republic, such hopeful looks are directed first to the office of President, either for him or against him. If the President will but come over to their side, they will rally behind him, and bum every newspaper which slanders him for so doing.

This same White House insensitivity to reality is otherwise shown in White House policy toward Latin America. United States policy is destroying Mexico. It is threatening to destroy very quickly every nation of South America. Since the spring of 1982, there has been a growing sense of being betrayed by the United States, spreading even among Washington's formerly fast friends in the continent. They are angry with Washington, and justly so. We are turning loose the flock of vultures gathering around Henry Kissinger to loot those nations, one by one, to collapse their economies, to drive the people into misery, and to unleash out of misery the forces of social chaos by which those nations might be torn apart internally, and so destroyed. How would we feel against any foreign government which did that to the United States?

President Reagan is not to be singled out for this blame. Jimmy Carter was the worst President the United States ever had, at least since Pierce and Buchanan. It's the Harriman Democrats and the Morgan liberal Republicans who have been committed to looting most of the world for the sake of a gang of New York, London, and Swiss bankers. The problem is that election-minded circles around the White House believe that it is important to win support for the President's re-election away from Mondale and Glenn. The fear is that Kissinger's cronies will take a section of the liberal Republicans over to a Mondale or Glenn candidacy. The word or the subject from the orbit of the White House is: "If Mondale were elected, this would be a disaster for the nation." One cannot disagree with that; however, is it wisdom to alienate the American people with a deepening depression before the election; is it wisdom to avoid facing up to the fact that we face the worst strategic crisis in more than a century—probably before the November 1984 elections?

The White House's inability to perceive the monstrous proportions of the strategic crisis now in progress flows largely from the White House's blindness to the realities of the economic situation. This blindness causes it to block out insight into what increasing numbers of ordinary citizens feel as the economy comes tumbling down upon their unprotected heads. It blocks out, therefore, the fact that those frightened, abused people are waiting for signs of leadership out of the depression from someone in charge. White House perception is: "If there is a depression, we shall lose the re-election. We must never allow ourselves to believe that it would ever happen."

By now, the White House is aware that we are on the verge of an international financial collapse. Therefore, it has turned U.S. economic policy over to Fed chairman Paul Volcker—almost lock, stock, and barrel. It is the wishful hope that Volcker's measures will at least stop a chain-reaction collapse of U.S. banks. "Forget what happens in the rest of the world. Volcker will hold the banks together for the election-period! Give Volcker whatever he needs!" What Volcker will do to the United States is more or less an exact copy of what Nazi Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht did to Germany, but the White House does not wish to think such things through. "We can't have a banking collapse in the middle of the election campaign." There is another way, but that way—my way—would alienate the voting block controlled by Henry Kissinger's banker friends. So, the nation goes.

If it continues to go the way it is going now, either the United States will knuckle under to a Soviet confrontation during as early as the first half of 1984, or we shall be at the edge of thermonuclear war. Fritz Mondale prefers to be a Nuclear Freeze coward; President Reagan's circles are not cowards—they are merely confused by the pressures of a reelection campaign. The President doesn't wish to rock the boat during an election campaign. He probably won't unless the Soviets directly force him to.

The Solution

Dr. Edward Teller pointed toward the basic solution to our strategic crisis during a recent public address in Texas. We must use the President's March 23, 1983 promulgation of a new U.S. strategic doctrine as the pivotal feature of a "crash program," like that launched during the 1939–43 period. We must ensure that the new technologies spill over rapidly and massively into the civilian economy, to generate a—this time—real economic upswing. As Dr. Teller assured that audience, the first generation of the new ballistic-missile defense systems are in reach, much closer because of recent breakthroughs in these technologies. As he said then, these breakthroughs will have unprecedented effects on technological progress in the civilian economy.

Only such an immediate crash program approach to beam weapons development could simultaneously spark a genuine economic recovery and forewarn the Soviet leadership against continuing on the present course of thermonuclear confrontation.

Globally, our main line of defense is not military, but economic. Western Europe—including West Germany—is in the process of being a Finlandized buffer state for the Soviet bloc for many contributing reasons—including John J. McCloy's blunders in the post-war occupation, blunders now coming home to roost. The immediate and most powerful reason is the collapse of Germany's export-market to nearly every part of the world except the Soviet bloc and Khomeini's Iran. The same general problem shapes the policies of Western continental Europe as a whole. The recent worsening of the conflicts with Japan earlier created by Henry A. Kissinger is essentially a reflection of the United States' part in blocking Japan from markets in the developing sector. The deepening, potentially catastrophic rift between the United States and Latin America as a whole is a result of the United States' tailing after the policies of a handful of foolish, rapacious New York and California bankers, and U.S. support for the insane policies of the International Monetary Fund—which is virtually a mere errand-boy for the Swiss bankers and Venice-centered complex of insurance cartels. Our foreign economic policy has been "Support the IMF—and lose the world!"

Almost with the stroke of a pen, the President of the United States could collapse the power and policies of the bankrupt Bretton Woods monetary system, and create a new international monetary order based on a new issue of Treasury gold-reserve-denominated currency notes, pegged at at least \$750 an ounce for gold. The debts could be reorganized, and the internal debt-crisis of the U.S. banks stabilized. This would open up Latin America immediately for a high-technology boom, a boom which would spread to other parts of the world.

Such monetary-reform action to stop the present depression is of equal strategic importance with the crash-program implementation of the President's strategic doctrine of March 23, 1983.

It must be done now, before the full impact of the thermonuclear confrontation hits. If we wait, we risk the alternatives of becoming virtually Soviet puppets or going to thermonuclear war to prevent that.