

The strategic parameters of WWII

LaRouche on how the China-Vietnam war will go nuclear

During the recent period I have been aided by my associates in piecing together a qualified picture of the strategic implications of the present war in Vietnam. It is established that this picture is far more accurate than that being generally supplied by U.S. and other military experts within NATO countries. Therefore, I publish our findings, knowing that qualified military professionals will be able to recognize the accuracy of my report, and to verify independently the general conclusions I outlined.

First, the bare facts

Fact No. 1, Vietnamese Strength: Not including air forces, the Vietnamese regular forces are in the order of excess of one million troops, including approximately 500,000 former ARVN (Army of the Republic Vietnam) units assimilated into the NVA (North Vietnamese Army) (according to a 1977 RAND estimate). Excepting the Israeli airforce capability, the NVA is the third most effective land war military force in the world today. In any *conventional* form of land warfare, the Chinese Communist forces could not defeat a Vietnamese force. Only one important qualification needs to be made, to which I shall turn attention below.

Fact No. 2, Vietnamese Deployment: Most reports assert that Vietnam has only an estimated 50,000 crack NVA units available for fighting in the zone of warfare defined by the Chinese invasion. This is based on the presumption that (a) "Crack NVA units" are pinned down in Cambodia, (b) that Vietnam cannot redeploy these to the North "in time." In fact, it is principally the former ARVN units using original U.S.-supplied equipment which are deployed in support of the present de facto government in Phnom Penh — which places between 400,000-500,000 regular NVA in the North.

In addition, an authoritative source in India received a detailed DRVN (Democratic Republic of Viet Nam) outline of the projected Peking invasion of Vietnam weeks prior to the Feb. 17 invasion. DRVN deployments in preparation for Peking's invasion must therefore be dated to no later than approximately Feb. 1, 1979, and not the Feb. 15-17 period.

Fact No. 3, Peking Deployment: Following an initial "bloody nose" administered to Peking forces by secondary DRVN defense forces, the Peking forces regrouped for a new assault featuring the "human wave" tactic em-

ployed against U.S. and allied forces in Korea — and under the same general who commanded those Chinese forces in Korea.

Militarily this represents an effort to compensate for the inferior quality of limited regular Peking land forces by massive deployment of militia-grade auxiliaries conscripted from the populations of the China provinces in the invasion's staging area. In short-hand: Send wave after wave of conscripts of marginal combat quality, each armed with the proverbial one old rifle, a bayonet and ten cartridges. Through massive sacrifice of such auxiliaries the Peking commanders seek to inundate the regular forces defenders with minimal relative losses to regular Chinese army units deployed under the screen of human wave deployments.

The military treatment of such human wave tactics is obvious — *as it was obvious to Gen. Douglas MacArthur*. The point of maximum vulnerability of human wave deployments is defined in the staging areas used for assembling assault forces. General Giap, moreover, is free of MacArthur's Harry S. Truman problem, as are the relevant Soviet commanders. If the indicated course of counteraction is taken, the present Chinese invasion is transformed into military disaster for Peking.

Fact No. 4, Countermeasures: Although the two Soviet naval taskforces in the regions do have included 30-kilometer range "katusha-type" naval high-explosive bombardment capabilities, it is to be doubted most strongly that those units would be risked within Chinese land-based counterforce range. Therefore, the Soviet naval capability centers on surface-to-surface nuclear capabilities. If Peking masses sufficient force to threaten successfully Northern Vietnam population centers, it is probable that Soviet nuclear counterforce will be deployed.

However, since Peking possesses an estimated 30-40 IRBMs in the ICBM range, a Soviet commander would be obliged to employ nuclear counterforce measures of assault and defense against IRBM Peking capabilities as an adjunct and accompaniment to a counterforce against Peking staging areas near the Vietnam borders. For numerous reasons, Soviet political-military strategy specifies "counterforce" against Peking, *whereas no such policy applies to strategic action against the NATO powers proper*.

Soviet strategic policy toward China centers around enhancing the action of a revolt against the combined forces of the Hua-Teng-"Gang of Four" factions.

Whereas, against U.S. or NATO forces generally, World War III begins with a total, in-depth strategic strike against U.S. and other logistical (population) centers, as well as against military force concentration.

Hence, an approximation of "theater-limited nuclear escalation" is probable for Soviet action against Peking, *whereas this constrained policy would not be Soviet doctrine for general warfare against NATO forces.*

Continuing warfare against Peking's forces would be tactical nuclear-(thermonuclear) plus BC measures.

The threshold of World War III

If Soviet action reaches the threshold for the indicated counterforce actions the only condition separating the world from WW III is whether the Carter Administration is then committed to a U.S. nuclear umbrella for China. Any U.S.-NATO "counterforce" deployment against the Soviet forces portends a total ABC strategic barrage, in consequence of which between 50 and 60 percent of the U.S. population dies from effects of the first hour bombardment.

It is for this reason that Sen. Jacob Javits' statements in a Feb. 18 televised broadcast are widely regarded as criminal lunacy.

If Western continental Europe and Japan submit to combined British-Carter pressures in the issues of this present crisis, that in and of itself would require the Soviet command to lower the "deterrent threshold" to zero for any counterforce action by the USA forces. It must be emphasized that Soviet command expects to lose about the same proportion of its population as it lost through all of World War II in consequence of strategic bombardment. Soviet policies toward nations generally, will inevitably tend to be determined by the position those nations' governments have taken in the issues of the crisis leading into a general thermonuclear war.

Crucial in determining Soviet command policy must be the fact that the development of the U.S.'s China policy was pressed, from Spring 1978 as a London revival of "geopolitical themes." Since 1902 decisions by the Lord Milner group, the very name "geopolitics" has meant the destruction of the "Eurasian heartland." The fact that the U.S. government is committed to a geopolitical premise for its Middle East and China policies is sufficient to prompt Soviet commanders to regard U.S. support of a China or Israeli military adventure as an act of war against the Soviet Union itself.

If similar developments had occurred under the circumstance of Carter Administration policy postures of late 1977, or policy postures of the Ford or Nixon Administrations, during a crisis it is probable that Moscow would have gone to the greatest lengths in seeking to maintain detente with the governments of NATO countries.

Moscow would assume that there was no intent to go to war by those governments, and that therefore the issues of conflict were negotiable in principle.

Under the condition that a London-Washington-Jerusalem-Peking combination of axis powers is dedicated to a successful geopolitical confrontation with the Soviet Union the issues which might be negotiable under circumstances of Nixon or Ford Administrations become non-negotiable, and border on acts of war.

The Cambodia hoax

Some persons who ought to have more sense argue that (a) Peking is reacting to Vietnam's military support to the present government of Phnom Penh, and (b) that Vietnam must simply withdraw forces from Cambodia and recognize a Sihanouk government. This quid pro quo formulation included in a diluted compromise form in the recent statement of the European community's nine, is in fact, a piece of strategic imbecility which increases the probability of general thermonuclear war.

Fact A: The Peking invasion of Vietnam is not caused by the Vietnam military action in Cambodia. Analogous to Hitler's invasion of Poland, the Cambodia issue is simply a Goebbels-modelled pretext for an action which Peking intended to take prior to the fall of the Pol Pot regime. *The plans for the Peking invasion of Vietnam existed prior to the fall of Pol Pot.* Peking was previously engaged in building up the scenarios for its invasion of Vietnam.

Fact B: The Peking puppet government of Cambodia, the Pol Pot regime, killed an estimated half of the Cambodian population over less than four years of its rule — the worst case of genocide in modern history. Prince Sihanouk patiently contemplated this genocide against his own people. The condemnation of Vietnam's action, against the regime which had already initiated undeclared warfare against Vietnam, is a piece of diplomatic moral imbecility, which has been tolerated only because frightened governments have capitulated to British and Carter Administration pressure to continue recognition of Pol Pot force.

The issue is not that the condemnation of the Vietnamese actions in Cambodia is immoral. The issue is that issuance of such condemnation shows the governments endorsing that, to be operating under overreaching influence of the combined force of London and London's Carter administration puppet. If governments of continental Western Europe, Japan and the developing sector, continue to tolerate this support of Peking's Cambodia policy, those governments define themselves as complicit with declared adversary of Vietnam and the Soviet ally. Therefore, such endorsements contribute significantly to increasing the probability of general thermonuclear war.

Fact C: There will be no compromise by the Vietnamese

or their Soviet allies on the simple issue of immediate Peking withdrawal from Vietnamese territory. To pretend otherwise is worse than a waste of breath — it is to contribute to the probability of thermonuclear war.

The crucial issue is the London-Carter-Jerusalem-Peking axis and the geopolitical policies of that axis. That is the issue which defines imminent World War III. That policy of that axis is the issue of war. Unless the Carter Administration backs off from and repudiates that Peking and related policies, general war is probable whenever war is triggered by the mere fact of push coming to shove on any subsumed developments.

“Incidents”

Egypt-Israel pact — the second front

The meeting at Camp David today of Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Prime Minister Mustafa Khalil of Egypt, and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan of Israel is slated to set up an operational command for a military “second front” against the Soviet Union to complement the Chinese invasion of Vietnam.

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat has reportedly told the United States that he has a shopping list for arms that includes 300 F-15 fighter-bombers, 500 tanks, and over 40,000 military vehicles. Such a huge buildup, which Arab sources expect Saudi Arabia to finance, is meant to help Sadat act as the policeman for what the Egyptian president called “an arc of crisis from Algeria to Afghanistan.”

In alliance with Israel, the Egyptians intend to act as the cornerstone of a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO). METO was the goal of the recent swing through the area by Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, the first ever by a Pentagon chief, who visited Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel, and Egypt. Iran, which is almost without any government and on the verge of disintegration, might be expected to enter the METO pact following a coup d'état by the Air Force.

During his visit to Egypt, Brown stated that the U.S. and Egypt should “act in concert with each other and with other nations in the region,” calling for “new patterns of security cooperation.” In an interview later with the *New York Times*, Brown said that he was looking forward to the increase of U.S. presence in the Middle East, including more frequent naval visits, possible U.S. bases, stepped up arms sales, and periodic meetings of Ministers of Defense. He also hinted that the Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean would be expanded for a Middle East role.

The *London Observer* reported on Feb. 18 that Brown's visit to Saudi Arabia has been coordinated closely with the current tour of the Arabian Gulf states by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth of England, who is

trigger a pre-existing state of virtual warfare.

The United States must break away from its special alliance with London, immediately break off President Carter's too intimate relationship to the household of British ambassador Peter Jay.

We are at the brink of a war which means the immediate death of between 50 and 60 percent of our nation's citizens. Admittedly numerous so-called and actual experts think the danger is not so immediate. Their arguments in each case show that they are considering wishfully only an isolated selection of the facts and not the facts as a whole.

giving her “assurances” to the nervous Arab sheikhs that Britain and the U.S. will stand behind them. Reportedly, Britain is pressuring the U.S. to set up a joint Persian Gulf command for the defense of the Gulf — an intolerable provocation to the Soviet Union.

According to the *Christian Science Monitor*, Brown intends to include Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Somalia, Jordan, Iran, and other states along with Egypt and Israel in his proposed METO pact. But, many observers say, drastic political earthquakes would have to shake Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Iran for those countries to consider joining a NATO-like bloc in the Middle East.

Reports are already in that in Iran and Turkey, NATO is planning for a bloody coup d'état to establish a junta, like that in Pakistan, that could resist the tendency toward nonalignment that is current Turkish policy and was, until his overthrow, increasingly that of the Shah of Iran.

At the same time, Saudi Arabia is being blackmailed by the U.S. and Britain into support for the Camp David policy, although so far there are few signs that the Saudis are willing to play the role assigned to them.

Critical to this strategy is NATO's use of the festering crisis in Iran to destabilize and weaken all surrounding governments.

Iran itself has begun to disintegrate, with Kurdish, Baluchi, Arab, Azerbaijani, and other minority tribesmen beginning to demand independence from Iran. Without an Army — which fell apart after the fall of the Shah — Iran is unable to keep the unruly tribesmen under control, with British and Israeli intelligence conduits supplying arms and support to the rebels. This process, should it continue, will spark an explosion in Turkey, Iraq, and Pakistan — and possibly Saudi Arabia itself.

—Robert Dreyfuss