

To The Governments Of A World At The Brink Of War

The following statement was issued on June 4th, 1977 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., U.S. Labor Party Chairman and Presidential candidate.

It is now clear to all leaders of the governments and major parties of the world that the analyses and warnings I have circulated among you during recent years to date are profoundly correct. Global events have proceeded along the line of development of which I have warned, and, in consequence of that, we now stand at the brink of global atomic-biological-chemical warfare.

Although the exact timing and exact circumstances of an outbreak of general war can not be precisely predicted, we have entered into a geometry in the relations among finance, economy, nations and major factions which is at the verge of becoming an uncontrollable plunge into general war during the immediate period ahead. The issue before us is not that of attempting to predict exactly when and how war might erupt; the issue is that of adopting resolute action to effectively disrupt the complex of interacting processes which are the rapidly developing preconditions of imminent general war.

The Driving Force Toward War

The driving force impelling the world toward general war is the commitment of financial circles typified by David Rockefeller to attempt to stabilize monstrous bubbles of financial speculation, such as the notorious "Bermuda Triangle" element of the Eurodollar market.

This has been underlined in recent statements by President Carter and in other public statements by spokesmen for the Carter Administration. The extent of the international financial overhang is of such a magnitude that a postponement of total collapse of the remains of the Bretton Woods system past the third quarter of 1977 could not be accomplished without imposing Chilean models of austerity throughout both the developing and OECD nations. The interests allied with David Rockefeller and the Carter Administration itself have made it clear that such austerity, modeled in intensity upon Nazi occupation practices of the 1940-1945 period, is the conscious policy commitment of those forces at this time.

This leads directly toward probability of general intercontinental war during 1977 because of the strategic implications of such austerity measures. Forces allied with David Rockefeller's interests are determined to force a Soviet back-down in face of a gigantic parody of the 1962 Cuba missiles crisis, as a calculated effort to break the will to resist austerity throughout the OECD and developing nations, and to also set up the preconditions for conquest and assimilation of nations of the Warsaw Pact at a subsequent date.

Although Rockefeller puppet, Jimmy Carter, compares unfavorably with Adolf Hitler in matters of attention-span, comprehension and emotional stability, as the puppet of the David Rockefeller-centered interests Carter's personal inadequacies only contribute to the

effect that he is in practice a far worse menace to the human species than Adolf Hitler.

Furthermore, the Carter Administration and allied forces prove conclusively that they are committed to general, intercontinental ABC warfare by the way in which they have lately increased their blatancy in lying concerning the military-strategic balance of war-fighting capabilities of the NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. Exemplary of this is the most recent chatter from Air Force Academy cheating-expellee Jody Powell concerning the so-called Mark 12A warhead. Powell attributes a war-winning potential to a war-head scheduled for delivery two years hence, whose sole projected military effect would be to damage *empty* Soviet missile silos.

The significance of this lying is that the pro-confrontation faction dominating the Carter Administration is disposed to risk actual thermonuclear war, but, knowing that most U.S. citizens and NATO governments are not,

The theory of depth operations was a major achievement of Soviet military thought. Here the problem of breaching the enemy's in-depth defense and turning a tactical success into an operational one was solved for the first time. This fundamentally new theory of offensive operations made it possible to renounce slow, gradual overcoming of the enemy's defense positions in favor of more decisive and maneuverable forms of waging combat and operations.

The essence of the theory of depth operations was the simultaneous destruction of the enemy's defenses throughout the depth of their positioning; breaching of the tactical zone of defense; and swift, deep offensive action...

A great deal of attention in our military theory was devoted to the economic prerequisites for war and use of the moral-political factor for victory over the enemy.

— Marshal of the Soviet Union, I. Bagramyan
Kommunist, May 1977

the Administration is flagrantly lying as an attempt to manipulate the wills of the credulous.

The only possible political alternative to near-certainty of general, intercontinental ABC war during 1977 is the establishment of a new world monetary system immediately.

I can not guarantee that that measure will succeed. While President Ford was still in office, it would have succeeded; with the Carter Administration, all rationality and realism concerning U.S. vital interests is effectively lacking. The Carter Administration will not respond rationally or realistically to the interests of the United States or its allies as a capitalist industrial nation; that Administration is governed solely by the perceived self-interests of David Rockefeller and allied circles.

All that I — or anyone else can promise competently — is that establishing a new monetary system, if done immediately, will enormously reduce the risk of war. If such a new monetary system is not established, war is certain, and with a proverbial 90 percent probability, before the end of August 1977.

The danger of war does not arise because the Carter Administration is committed to having such a war. It is merely committed to creating an overwhelming risk of general war, clinging hysterically to the hope that Warsaw Pact political surrender will enable them to avoid actual war-fighting. The Warsaw Pact clearly does not wish a general war. However, the policies of David Rockefeller et al. have put the NATO forces on a short-term collision-course with the most vital and fundamental interests of the Warsaw Pact nations. World War III will erupt for the same reasons of wishful miscalculation that determined the course of World War I. It will erupt for the same reasons of criminally wishful miscalculation that Neville Chamberlain and Daladier exhibited during 1938 Munich discussions with Hitler, their criminal stupidity in imagining that a Nazi Germany projected eastward would not secure its position for that enterprise by first crushing France.

It is the stupidity of men driven mad by the desperation of their financial bankruptcy which is impelling the world toward general war.

See It From the Soviet Side

As for the Warsaw Pact side, I am not privy to their councils, and can not be certain that they themselves have thought through this situation fully enough. I know the relative strategic capabilities of the forces deployable, and I know I would be forced to act if I were placed in the position Soviet leaders will soon confront if the Carter Administration continues its present policy.

I state that here, because there are certain governments and parties who are still duped into wishful pictures of a theater-limited military confrontation involving NATO and allied forces.

The military and related strategic advisors upon whose opinions the Rockefeller forces rely — what we in the United States refer to as the “utopians” — reject the lessons of the American Revolution and all the major wars following it. Their strategies converge upon the “set-piece” military doctrines of the mid-eighteenth century. No professional military person or political strategist who has studied military Machiavelli and Clausewitz on war and the militia principle, who has studied the period 1776-1815, the U.S. Civil War, two world wars, the Yugoslav partisan warfare or the lessons of Indo-China 1946-1976, would tolerate so abysmally incompetent a strategic policy and evaluation as these utopians provide.

Certainly, the Soviets will not base a political strategy or a war-fighting doctrine upon such utopian nonsense.

The object of war is to win a durable peace. This prescribes that the defeated forces will accept peace because it is based on policies corresponding to the vital interests of their nations, in which the economic prosperity of the nation is fundamental and determining of the feasibility of fulfilling other forms of self-interests. Hence, the forces associated with David Rockefeller, because they

are committed to austerity policies emulating Nazi occupation policies, are incapable of winning a peace, and therefore can neither win a war against a well-matched adversary, nor induce him to surrender in favor of some alternative set of vital national interests.

The principal reason Napoléon Bonaparte was finally defeated was that his foreign policies were those of looting the nations of Europe rather than establishing republican governments efficiently directed toward developing industrial progress in concert with France. It was not England or Prussia, or Russia, that defeated France, but Napoléon himself, a fact exemplified by the militia forces created by the Scharnhorst reforms.

Nazi Germany was defeated for the same categorical reasons, the same vital political principles of strategy which defeated the U.S. forces in Vietnam. U.S. strategy toward Indo-China was degraded to the objective of pure destruction, because U.S. policy, especially after the dumping of “Big Minh,” precluded offering the adversary population the positive basis for a durable peace. Nazi Germany had no war-aims but the cannibalistic looting-to-extension of the subjugated economies and populations. Nazi Germany therefore had no competent strategic war-objectives but an interminable war-fighting whose very successes accumulated the potential forces of the Nazi forces’ destruction.

The strategic policies of David Rockefeller and his allies are identical in character and implications to those of Adolf Hitler. Just as the Nazi regime was impelled to loot Europe because austerity against the German industrialists and labor force, austerity in behalf of the Mefo-Bill and Rentenmark financial bubbles, could no longer be continued without destroying Germany, so David Rockefeller and his dupes and allies are embarked on the same extrapolation of a Schachtian inward-turning hyperinflation. The Carter Administration, while it continues to be David Rockefeller’s puppet, can not win a war for the fundamental reason that it is incapable of adopting durable peace-winning objectives.

In that sense, the Carter Administration is incapable of formulating a war-winning strategy against any well-matched adversary. It is incapable of gaining wilful surrender against any well-matched adversary, because the results of surrender are the same as those of surrender to the Nazis. The Carter Administration can obtain the surrender only of forces which lack effective means to resist overwhelming pure military forces deployed against them.

Thus, the utopian’s reversion to the degenerate “set-piece” military doctrines of the eighteenth century.

This is exemplified by the nonsense doctrine of “deterrence.” Military capabilities define only threshold-levels for war-fighting. When the most vital interests of any nation are threatened, it must fight a war at all costs, if it has the means to do so. The Carter Administration’s utopians do not think in terms of fighting a war against a well-matched adversary, but only of the use of the threat of war, the “aura of power,” in place of war-fighting itself.

The Soviet command, on the contrary, *if forced to war*, has a basis for a war-winning political strategy. Whereas, the Rockefeller strategic policy is slashing the extent of the productive forces of agriculture and industry, and

reducing populations, Soviet economic policy is development of productive forces and realizing the productive potentials of labor forces. This distinction arises because the financially bankrupt Rockefeller forces have a *monetarist* policy, while the Soviets have an *economic* policy.

If, then, the Soviets are confronted with the choice between losing all of their population through surrender or some of their population through war, they must choose war, and pursue that with a commitment to establishing a durable peace through a war-winning strategy, no matter how awful the price this incurs. War, if won, saves something: surrender means all is lost. Faced with such a choice, at such time they are confronted with that calculation, the Soviets must launch general intercontinental war.

If I were in command of Soviet forces, I would have only one course of war-fighting action accessible to my view. I insist that any qualified political or military strategist placed in the same position, would achieve the same outlook. The first act of war must be to destroy as much of the adversary's in-depth war-fighting capability as is immediately possible by the maximum of means available to that purpose. That means that an immediate full-scale launch of maximum intercontinental throw-weight of all ABC weapons against the military bases and population centers of the United States and Canada, plus, simultaneously, nuclear and other ABC destruction of every NATO and allied military base or relevant deployment in every part of the world, with special emphasis on ABC-armed naval capabilities.

The urgency of dwelling briefly on that point, as we are doing here, is that numerous frightened governments and similar circles have wishfully accepted at least an approximation of the utopian doctrine of "escalation." It is wishfully argued that since modern war is so terrible, principal adversaries will therefore elect to limit the scale of warfare as much as possible. That is not an arguable military-political doctrine: any belief in the doctrines of "escalation within maximum deterrent capability" is sheer imbecility.

The governing risk in war is the danger of losing the war.

Hence, the conduct of war must start with the maximum possible destruction of the adversary's *in-depth* war-fighting capabilities. This pre-shapes the circumstances in which the outcome of the war will be determined.

The possibility of winning a war by limiting initial objectives to first-line military targets in an illusion, comparable to the would-be professional boxer who enters the ring believing that if he is sufficiently clever he will never be hit a painful blow. One must, in fighting a war, start by acknowledging that the adversary's deployed military capabilities will effect that damage of which they are capable, a damage which can be only partially deflected. The idea of some "Superman" from the American comic strips arriving to destroy an adversary's first-line weapons before they are fired is just that — an infantile fantasy, like Goebbels' "miracle weapons."

On the other hand, if one can eliminate an adversary's war-fighting capabilities in depth, and is prepared to survive his initial force capabilities, then the basis for

winning the continuing war is firmly grounded. It is *after* the maximum possible destruction of in-depth logistical and related capabilities of the principal adversary that the continuation of the war by ground-fighting in an ABC-shaped geometry of aerial-and-ground artillery and infantry begins.

World War III does not begin with ground-fighting on a theater-limited scale between principal adversary forces. Once the war between principal adversary forces is initiated, the war begins with total, simultaneous use of the so-called "maximum deterrence," and then the ground-fighting begins amid the ABC-saturated rubble-piles.

There is no other way to order the fighting of a thermonuclear war, unless one is determined to lose that war.

This is the situation the lunatics of the Carter Administration are gambling with.

The Edge of Midnight

To avoid that, or to at least secure an excellent possibility of avoiding that, the governments and major parties of the world must immediately cast off those wishful delusions which have shaped their pathetic vacillations and blunderings on the crucial strategic issues to date.

It is indispensable that the bulk of the Third World external financial debt be frozen immediately: debt moratoria. Without that nothing works. There are those who threaten to do horrible things if this occurs, but what is to be feared more than the general thermonuclear war which becomes immediately unavoidable unless a new monetary system is established?

Debt moratorium by itself will not work. Without a new monetary system, providing credit for international trade and vast imports of high-technology into the developing nations, there is no way out of the current depression, and therefore no possibility of avoiding general war. Any leading force which acts in any way to attempt to block the establishment of such a new monetary system is, intentionally or not, an accomplice in promoting World War III.

The issue is not between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is between David Rockefeller and the human race.

Every informed person knows this, but most governments and leading parties have so far lacked the courage to tell the truth on this issue, or to act competently to neutralize Rockefeller and his dupes and allies. Although I have warm regard for many of these governments and parties' leaderships as well-meaning persons, in face of the most vital issues facing their nations and humanity, most of them have behaved like cowards.

You know that I am not seized by such intellectual cowardice. I have presented competent solutions to this mess, and will not flinch from fulfilling those commitments. Therefore, I ask all those governments and major party leaderships which have the perception and courage to save the human race from war to publicly state their confidence in the proposals I have made. If you do, we have a chance to prevent war. If you do not, then the death of your nation and general thermonuclear are to that extent the awful guilt of cowardice you must carry with you to your grave.

June 4, 1977