

doctrine that says you need to be able to inject conventional forces into the developing sector and actually be able to fight there. Strategic forces are no good at all in these situations, and that is a real shocker to some people who think that strategic forces can solve everything. So if choices are being made, I say get your conventional forces ready and make sure they can be deployed in the right configuration, not anchored in Europe. The idea of sea-based land power, supported by sea-based air power, is what we need to get ready for the battles of the next decades.

'This is the first battle of the new era'

A defense analyst involved with the Atlantic Council study on Western defense in the 1980s, and former adviser to leading Congressmen on military affairs, April 6, 1982.

Q: What effect will the Falklands crisis have on British military doctrine and NATO policy?

A: I'm not saying that Britain is going back to the days of its colonial empire. But they are going to be credible and they are going back to basics, so to speak, on the naval doctrine they developed. That is the key—the sea-based projection of military force into the developing sector, with sea-based troop-marine capabilities, augmented by U.S. airlift capabilities. We are looking at the first battle of the new era—whether it comes to actual fire or not. This is a confrontation in the military theater of the next several decades—the developing sector. It is better than a war in the Gulf, since it demonstrates greater logistical problems. Carrington boasted that you didn't need the British Navy any more, that all you needed was a few Trident submarines to have a credible nuclear deterrent. Garbage. To be real nowadays, you need the ability to project conventional forces into remote regions.

Q: Does the crisis create problems for the British-American relationship?

A: Yes. I know of a meeting that took place recently between senior British and U.S. military officials to discuss the idea of coordinating NATO out-of-area deployments through a new type of directorate. The conclusion was reached that the Carrington-influenced doctrine that consigned the British Navy to oblivion stood in the way of really implementing anything. . . . So these military people said the best thing that could happen was for Carrington to get canned.

Q: What impact will the crisis have on the domestic defense debate?

A: It will make the case for sea-based projection capabilities. It will strengthen—within limits—the arguments of those who say that we need carrier task forces capable of injecting troops into the developing sector.

LaRouche outlines counterplan for NATO restructuring

In response to continuing British blackmail against President Ronald Reagan, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., proposed on April 16 to call the British bluff. LaRouche, a probable candidate for the 1984 presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, today proposed a sweeping reorganization of NATO and of related features of the United States' transatlantic military treaty organizations.

"Despite the noisy tradition of Benedict Arnold currently visible within parts of the executive branch and Congress," LaRouche stated, "the Monroe Doctrine is the current law of the United States. The Senate has ratified the Havana Treaty of 1940, the Chapultepec Treaty of 1945, and the Rio de Janeiro Treaty of 1947. Therefore, by law, Britain is embarked upon an act of war against the United States.

"Against this fact," LaRouche continued, "The British and their agents of influence have circulated two blackmail documents against United States' enforcement of its own law, the Monroe Doctrine. The chief point of blackmail by the Ayatollah Thatcher government's friends is the threat that Britain will pull out of NATO. The second point of blackmail is financial; not only does London threaten to collapse the U.S. dollar, but the argument is made that the United States is so poor, and its Congress so craven that it could not defend itself adequately without the aid of the formerly-industrialized nation known as Britain.

"It is time to call the British bluff on both counts. Therefore, I outline a proposed sweeping reorganization of NATO. I also identify, once again, the means at the disposal of the President and Congress for organizing an economic boom in the United States," the former 1980 Democratic candidate continued.

Two key measures

The kernel of LaRouche's proposal for reorganization of NATO is twofold: strip away the civilian apparatus associated with Joseph Luns and his cronies, and

reorganize NATO as a classical form of military general staff.

"Each allied nation should bring its own military command into classical general-staff form, and the general staffs of the allies should be interlocked to form the NATO General Staff." This is the gist of the former Democratic Party candidate's proposal.

"We must end," LaRouche emphasized, "the emphasis upon inter-service budgetary rivalries among arms within the alliance and its participating nations. Military services must never become competing arms of warfare, but must be complementary and integral facets of a total, coherent logistical and war-fighting capability.

"Each nation must retain its own sovereign war-fighting capabilities, even at some costs of redundancy within the alliance as a whole. Otherwise, the tendency for budgetary warfare among naval power, air power, and ground-fighting power is a form of insanity which must promptly cease."

LaRouche described these positive recommendations for NATO reorganization. "I am merely stating what is obvious to any qualified member of the military professional tradition of the United States. These are principles which revolutionized warfare under France's Lazare Carnot, during the middle of the 1790s, principles copied and developed by General Scharnhorst and others in the Prussian reforms of 1809. These are the tested principles of the American military experience, even more appropriate in the thermonuclear age than at any earlier time."

He continued, "It is the negative features of present NATO organization which must be emphasized, even among many of those field-grade and flag-rank officers who understand with greater or lesser degrees of excellence the principles of general-staff organization.

"It is undoubtedly the best choice in this connection," LaRouche argued, "to focus attention on the compelling reasons President Charles de Gaulle pulled France out of NATO during the middle of the 1960s. As former Prime Minister Michel Debre has stated, not only was NATO engaged in efforts to overthrow the French government, but officials of NATO were implicated in aid of assassination-plots against de Gaulle himself.

"In addition to the military functions of NATO, centered around the political secretariat is a mass of assorted sociologists, psychologists, futurologists, and kindred civilian elements, typified by former OECD official Dr. Alexander King, and directed chiefly by a psychological-warfare branch of British intelligence, the London Tavistock Institute. This aspect of NATO was the conduit for subversion against France during the 1960s and has been the chief conduit for 'clockwork orange' varieties of operations deployed under the 1969

NATO 'strategy of tension' deployment of 'environmentalist' and international-terrorist elements.

"This fruit-cake side of the NATO organization must be closed down, and the lunatics sent back to the Tavistock Institute and other cookie-factories at which they were originally half-baked," LaRouche emphasized. "The remaining, legitimate aspects of our military-alliance organizations must then be reorganized simply as a military general-staff functions."

Tavistock riddles NATO with incompetence

LaRouche insisted that the aspects of NATO linked to Tavistock and Joseph Luns are worse than unwholesome parasites. "The effect of Tavistock futurology upon NATO strategy is to make the military policies of NATO more or less wholly incompetent.

"If I state the policy-issue as briefly as possible, the conflict between Tavistock and strategic competence in NATO command is defined historically as follows," LaRouche began his short outline of the problem.

"Modern military science is most efficiently understood in terms of two broad phases of its development. The first phase began in Italy during the 15th century, typified by the successive contributions of Plethon, Leonardo da Vinci, and of da Vinci's collaborator, Niccolo Machiavelli. The second phase was launched by Gottfried Leibniz during the last quarter of the 17th century, and was essentially completed in respect to principles of military science, with the Prussian reforms of 1809-13.

"Reduced to their most essential terms, the policies of republican military science today include these: the training of the able-bodied citizenry of a nation as its qualified war-fighting reserve in depth; the development of the economy as the logistical basis for war-fighting and for equipping combat forces with modern technology; the introduction to the application of these two ground-principles of the notion of technology created by Leibniz.

"Exemplary of Leibniz's contributions to military science as such are Leibniz's specification of the urgency of developing the cartridge shot and breech-loaded weapons, a means for increasing qualitatively the firepower of republican military forces, and for generating a revolution in the mode of war-fighting on that basis.

"In brief, Leibniz applied to military science the same principle he employed for his creation of modern economic science. In both, the issue is the development of ever-improved heat-powered machines, to the effect that one man (as workman or soldier) may be as effective as 'a hundred others' lacking such improved means. Weapons-revolutions do not eliminate the single citizen-soldier; new weapons increase the power and importance of that soldier, and also increase the level of

cultural development required of that soldier.

“Leibniz’s approach to military science influenced leading circles in France throughout the 18th century, with results put into operation with concerted effect by Lazare Carnot during the middle of the 1790s. The Prussian reformers of 1809 directly copied and built upon Carnot’s reforms, establishing the modern general-staff principle of military science.

“The general-staff principle is an integral aspect of a total science of Republican statecraft. The essential, non-combat functions of the general staff are to specify and foster war-winning qualities of logistical, general production-level, and technological potentials of the economy, at the same time as developing the individual citizen as variously a professional soldier or a qualified member of the military reserves. The development of people requires certain standards of general education and culture, as well as specifically scientific and technological competencies.

“Such a development creates a mass of potential war-fighting capabilities whose quality can be measured as an analogue of energy-flux-density. The military problem is to shape the deployment of this potential, geometrically, to neutralize the war-fighting potential of an adversary. The adversary’s will to continue fighting must be broken, if possible. More fundamentally, his capacity to continue effective warfare, however stout his persisting will in the matter, must be neutralized, using combined means for destruction and disorganization.

“These are the assignments the political command of a democratic republic delegates to its military general staff. This is the approximate line of division between the political command of the republican state and the delegated functions of that state’s military professionals.

“In opposition to these principles of military science, the Tavistock-influenced components of NATO have used the political privileges of NATO to conduit a ‘technetronic post-industrial society’ policy against the governments and policy-influencing institutions of both NATO member-nations and other nations. In consequence of the success of such Tavistock-led subversion, present NATO military policy is a balance between an assumedly unusable thermonuclear-deterrent capability and a contraction in scale and quality of so-called conventional forces.

“The spread of drug-usage and illiteracy in volunteer ranks of the U.S. military services is exemplary of this general problem.”

LaRouche stated, “I laugh with a sense of woeful tragedy whenever I hear Soviet sources and their Western echoes speaking of an alleged Reagan arms-race. Except for continuation of Carter administration policy for deploying updated Nazi V-1s and V-2s into Western Europe—the cruise and Pershing missiles—it is the

Soviet Union which has been conducting a single-handed, unilateral arms race during most of the past ten years.

“It is true that, beginning February 1977, the United States and NATO have been escalating geopolitical strategic confrontation against the Warsaw Pact, aggravating this by forward-based thermonuclear assault-postures. Yet, at the same time, the NATO countries have been destroying their in-depth military capabilities, while Moscow has been arming at a furiously-accelerated pace in depth. The weaker we make ourselves, the

“The kernel of LaRouche’s proposal for reorganization of NATO is twofold: strip away the civilian apparatus associated with Joseph Luns and his cronies and reorganize NATO as a classical form of a military general staff.”

more adventurous we become. Our strategic posture has become lunatic desperation born of our refusal to cease destroying the foundations of our strategic potential.

“Naturally, Moscow, which has lived under the anxiety and other pressures of a 1947-82 continuing superpower conflict, seeks to exploit every visible opportunity it deems prudent for perpetuating and increasing the self-imposed weakness of the economies of the transatlantic alliance.

“As long as we tolerate the lunatic anti-nuclear movements, and tolerate the madmen of the cult of the ‘technetronic post-industrial’ utopia, we shall become ever weaker. The result will be either thermonuclear war born of desperation, or ultimate assimilation by the spread of Soviet power.

“NATO and its OECD adjunct have been among the principal coordinating agencies for spreading among the alliance-nations a mixture of Malthusian economic suicide and lunatic varieties of military policies to match. It is Joseph Luns and the Tavistock overreach within NATO which typify the worms and viruses destroying NATO from within. We should lose nothing, therefore, by ridding ourselves of such elements of NATO.”

Economic rearmament

LaRouche turned, then, to the question he described as “our ability to replace the capabilities lost by the withdrawal of a treacherous Britain.”

“Our chief problem is the Congress’s and administration’s combined, continuing folly, in supporting the

British 'free trade' system against the American System of political-economy. Were I President, armed with what I know concerning proper dealing with the news media and certain problems within the Congress, I could mobilize an economic boom within the United States immediately. Under conditions of economic boom, I would have no great budgetary difficulty in more than replacing the military capabilities of a mere formerly-industrialized nation such as Ayatollah Thatcher's Britain.

"The measures needed are these.

"First, ruin every member of Congress up for this year's election unless that Congress supports the President's actions to stop the new world economic depression. Fire Volcker, slap Hamiltonian forms of regulation upon the U.S. national-banking system, and issue several hundred billion dollars of gold-reserve-denominated U.S. treasury-notes for lending to goods-producing agriculture and high-technology industry as well as certain needed items of basic economic infrastructure.

"The federal tax-revenues would be automatically increased at rates of more than \$200 billion within a year or so.

"In other words, shut down the growth of the money markets, and channel low-borrowing-cost credit in hundreds of billions of dollars to crank up high-technology agriculture and to absorb nearly the entirety of our idled skilled and semi-skilled labor-force components in either building essential transportation, water-management and energy infrastructure, or in employment in goods-producing sectors such as manufacturing, construction, mining, and related categories of high-technology engineering and scientific research. This requires no general tax-increase, but only closing of tax loopholes for income derived from sources other than goods-producing investments.

"In the Western Hemisphere, take the rust from the Monroe Doctrine. Deploy a Western Hemisphere 'Marshall Plan' for development of high-technology agriculture and modern capital-goods industries, together with the essential economic infrastructure of transportation, water-management systems, and high-technology energy-production needed to make agricultural and industrial investments successful.

"In that environment, to the extent the United States requires military expenditures, we shall produce what we require 'like pancakes.'

"It was not fighting a war that enabled Roosevelt to overcome, finally, the Great Depression of the 1930s. It was cranking-up the civilian economy to provide the logistical basis needed for war-fighting which overcame the last depression. By steering low-cost credit, created by government, through the banking-system, and limiting the use of this credit chiefly to high-technology goods-producing employment, we can transform a

depression into an economic boom at any time we exert our national will to produce such a result."

A world-winning strategy

"Our long-term strategy must be to transform the greater portion of the populations of the developing sector into both our durable allies and our growing market for the high-technology export-goods produced by our children and grandchildren.

"The key to this is rapid development of energy-production, fresh-water management systems, and transportation systems. We must aim to produce, in the United States, approximately 100,000 annual kilowatt-hours per person of electrical or equivalent heat-process energy by early in the coming century. We must also aim at bringing the energy-production levels of most of the world up toward similar values during the early decades of the next century. Electrical and equivalent energy produced per-capita is the determinant of the potential productivity of nations in agriculture and industry. This is the key limiting condition on which the future purchasing power of nations depends.

"We must transform our economy into a major exporter of high-technology capital goods and related categories of engineering services. We must concentrate our export-strategies in collaboration with Japan and Western Europe on three basic categories of investments by developing nations:

- "Increasing the per-hectare and per-man-year yield of agriculture while increasing the extent of agricultural land in use, using advanced technologies for this purpose.

- "Investments in such key elements of basic economic infrastructure as high-technology energy-systems, transportation capabilities, and water-management systems.

- "Investments in those categories of capital-goods industries such nations require locally to service both agriculture and basic economic infrastructure.

"Consumer goods industries will develop as a by-product of increased productivities and per-capita incomes generated in agriculture and capital-goods industries.

"That is our vital, long-term national interest as a constitutional form of democratic republic. It is to defend that interest that we must be prepared to wage war if necessary.

"However, if we pursue that interest, and invite the Soviet Union to cooperate with us and our allies in furthering that great world-development task, there is no circumstance under which a sane Soviet leadership would consider war against us.

"It is from that vantage-point that NATO must be reorganized and our agenda of negotiations with Moscow be radically changed in contents."

EIR

The special reports listed below,
prepared by the EIR staff, are now available.

1. **Crisis In Washington: The Fight for Control of the Reagan Administration.** Details the power grab by George Bush, Alexander Haig, and James Baker III; the growing influence of Henry Kissinger; why Paul Volcker has gone unchallenged; the "Swiss group" led by Fred Ikle and Jack Kemp. Includes 25 profiles of leading administration figures. 75 pages. \$250.

2. **Mexico After the Devaluation.** Analysis of the international assault which forced the recent peso devaluation, and of the new government economic measures. Examines four pressure points on Mexico: new threats of capital flight, the danger of trade war with the U.S., spillover of the Central American conflict, and flaws in the ruling PRI party. 75 pages. \$250.

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

I would like to receive these EIR Special Reports:

Order Number(s) _____

Bill me for \$ _____ Enclosed is \$ _____

Please charge to my VISA Master Charge

Card No. _____

Signature _____ Exp. Date _____

Name _____

Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone (_____) _____
area code

Make checks payable to:

Executive Intelligence Review, Dept. MC-1, 304 West 58th Street, 5th floor, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 247-8820.

EIR

U.S., Canada and Mexico only

3 months \$125

6 months \$225

1 year \$396

Foreign Rates

Central America, West Indies, Venezuela and Colombia:
3 mo. \$135, 6 mo. \$245, 1 yr. \$450

Western Europe, South America, Mediterranean, and
North Africa: 3 mo. \$140, 6 mo. \$255, 1 yr. \$470

All other countries: 3 mo. \$145, 6 mo. \$265, 1 yr. \$490

I would like to subscribe to the *Executive Intelligence Review* for

3 months 6 months 1 year

Please charge my

Master Charge No. _____

Interbank No. _____

Visa No. _____

Signature _____

Expiration date _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable to *Executive Intelligence Review* and mail to *EIR*, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10019. For more information call (212) 247-8820.