

Editorial

The conventional war push

Robert McNamara's proposal that the United States and NATO unilaterally renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, and focus on building up conventional forces, has now been adopted by sections of the U.S. "nuclear-freeze" movement and the European "peace" movement. The former Defense Secretary, joined by McGeorge Bundy, Gerard Smith, and George F. Kennan, made his proposal at an April 7 press conference publicizing the publication of their demand in the spring issue of *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

It is worth noting who is on stage here, ballyhooing the dangers of nuclear war. Mr. McNamara not only devised the "body-count" method of prosecuting the Vietnam War, a war that lacked any substantial strategic goals except to annihilate Indochinese and restructure the U.S. military to accept such a travesty; he headed the World Bank's battle against urbanization and population growth in the underdeveloped sector. Gerard Smith, Henry Kissinger's arms negotiator under Nixon, has actively opposed the peaceful use of nuclear energy in the so-called Third World because it allegedly leads to nuclear weapons proliferation. Mr. Kennan is best known for his 1947 "Mr. X" articulation of the containment policy against the U.S.S.R., but even before World War II ended he was most concerned with curbing a revival of European sovereignty and industrial expansion, and now says openly that population growth and the spread of technology are the two greatest evils facing man.

The Council on Foreign Relations itself, as *EIR* has documented, most clearly outlined its goals by 1) installing the Carter administration in 1976 and Paul Volcker in 1979; 2) publicly supporting the overthrow of the Shah of Iran and the spread of Khomeini-style fundamentalism; and 3) announcing, in its *Project 1980s* series of volumes, that the West's chief enemy is not communism, but "Hamiltonian policies," whether practiced in the Soviet command economy or in the Gaullist and Japanese

dirigist economies.

Now this group is attempting to establish new rules for the conduct of warfare in the 1980s and beyond.

The essence of the proposal is to extend the no-first-use pledge worldwide and reduce both strategic and tactical nuclear arsenals further and further. By removing the threat of nuclear retaliation, McNamara and his associates within the government would be free to launch conventional warfare in the underdeveloped sector, through surrogates or directly, without risk. Thus their plan is not a proposal for peace, but for managed, self-multiplying conventional conflicts. George Kennan stated as much at the April 7 press conference, when he specified that the wars of the future will not be fought in Europe but in the Persian Gulf or Africa.

Next week *EIR* will explore the origins of this policy in British strategic circles since it was first put forward in the 1960s. Recently, its most vocal proponent has been Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the former chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, a spokesman for the Draper Fund/Population Crisis Committee who looks forward to a cycle of depopulation, chaos, and war in Africa, Asia, and Latin America requiring conventional-arms involvement by NATO. We will further explore the premises of the McNamara policy—that a nuclear war will never be fought under any circumstances, that the reductions in strategic outlays demanded by Paul Volcker are therefore appropriate, and that the Soviets, because they have nibbled at the no-first-strike approach and stupidly support elements of the peace movement in the West, can be persuaded never to deploy or use their superior strategic war-fighting capability.

Matters of war and peace cannot be left to those who have so abundantly shown both deluded reasoning and evil intentions. The only welcome aspect of the "no-first-strike" campaign is that it will force proponents of industrial progress to take responsibility for this question.