

# EIR Strategic Studies

## 1986: the world at a turning-point

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

During 1986, the governments of the United States and Western Europe must face certain policy-decisions, which will decide whether or not Moscow becomes the unchallenged, dominant force in the world by the end of this decade. The leading policy-decisions to be faced are economic and military.

The so-called "Reagan economic recovery" never happened. U.S. inflation-rates have climbed, from 10% per year in 1982, to approximately 14% by the end of 1985. The U.S. rate of output, has shrunk at the rate of approximately 2.5% per year, during 1983, 1984, and 1985, and will collapse by approximately 15%, or even more, during 1986, if present U.S. monetary, economic, and taxation policies are continued. Worse, the U.S. banking-system is at the brink of a potential collapse worse than the crisis of 1931-32.

What the United States, and the world needs during 1986, is a genuine economic recovery. We must adopt drastic changes in policies of economy, monetary affairs, and taxation, of the type used successfully to begin economic recoveries in the past. Naturally, as long as the U.S. government, and Western European governments, believe in the existence of a "Reagan economic recovery" which never happened, they will refuse to consider the kinds of policies needed to generate a real recovery.

Two problems in military policy are outstanding. First, we must act to complete the shift, away from a "nuclear deterrence posture," to a new posture consistent with strategic ballistic missile defense. Without such a change, Western Europe will be indefensible against the kind of threat which the Soviet empire will be in a position to deploy two or three

years from now. Second, we must face the simple fact, that U.S. military expenditures have been dropping during the past three years. The margin of Soviet strategic superiority over NATO and France has been growing rapidly. Moscow is presently operating on a policy of full-scale pre-war mobilization, while the West is disarming in an effort not to annoy Moscow.

The economic and military collapse of the West generally, is nourishing the spread of an already deep cultural pessimism, like that which destroyed Weimar Germany. The continuation of such cultural pessimism, means a West lacking the moral commitment, to defend the institutions of Augustinian civilization against the Soviet imperial barbarians.

As a candidate for the 1988 U.S. presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, it is my duty to report the facts of the situation to our citizens and our allies, and to take a leading part in presenting solutions.

As President, I would rid the policies and practices of the United States of everything associated with the foreign policies of former U.S. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. Kissinger has proposed that the U.S.A. reduce its commitments to about 25% of the pre-Jimmy Carter level: This means abandoning the commitments to Western Europe and the Asiatic Rim, and retreating into the Americas, abandoning most of the world to Soviet domination. I oppose Kissinger's "Guam Doctrine," for abandoning Asia. I oppose the proposals of Kissinger and of Democrats such as former President Carter and Senator Nunn, to abandon Europe, just as I am opposed to the treacherous "détente" policies of the Socialist International left-wingers.

I reject, unconditionally and absolutely, any acceptance of strategic domination by the Russian empire, under a Soviet dynasty or any other dynasty. Such Russian strategic domination would mean the rapid obliteration of Augustinian civilization from the pages of future history. I know that such domination would become inevitable very soon, unless we of Western civilization eliminate those present policies through which we are destroying the West from within.

### 1) U.S. relations with Europe

Effective defense of Western civilization is not possible, if continental Europe is treated as a junior partner of the United States, or of an Anglo-American agency. Defense must be designed as a true partnership among equally sovereign republics.

As President of the United States, I would request that European nations loan me advisers including senior military professionals, to the purpose that the European point of view be expressed at the highest levels on all matters pertaining to joint defense policies and joint economic policies.

Under the U.S. Constitution, the responsibility for foreign policy, as well as military command, lies directly, personally with the President, and no one else. The President cannot conduct foreign policy competently, if he tries to play the part of "chairman of the board," leaving the making of policy to the State Department bureaucracy. The President must deal personally and frequently with the heads of government and other representatives of the nations toward which U.S. foreign policy is directed, and must understand personally the vital interests and pressing problems of other nations. He requires a Secretary of State who has something of the qualifications of a Benjamin Franklin or John Quincy Adams, and the chief deputies of that Secretary must mirror the policy-thinking of the President. As President, I would work personally for a depth of understanding of strategic and economic policies with the governments of our European, and other partners.

The Americas and Western Europe are bound together in a special way by deep ties and long traditions. Within that setting, the United States' emergence as a 20th-century superpower, assigns to us a special place within the partnership.

The English-speaking colonies in North America, were, most directly, a result of the influence of the 15th-century Golden Renaissance upon the culture of Tudor England. The establishment of our constitutional republic, during the years 1776-89, was chiefly the result of the connection between Benjamin Franklin's circles and the continental European networks earlier centered around Gottfried Leibniz. The principles of universal moral law, affirmed in our 1776 Declaration of Independence, were European principles, shared among the circles of Lafayette, the circles of Schiller and Humboldt, and the circles of Cavour in Italy. The United States was created, with great assistance from Europe, to become a temple of liberty and beacon of hope, for all mankind.

## LaRouche issues policy statement on Europe



The 63-year-old economist and Democrat, Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr., is presently the only legally registered candidate for the 1988 U.S. presidential nomination. He is, also, the leading spokesman for a list of over 650 Democratic candidates for various national, statewide, and local offices in the 1986 elections. Since 1975, he has become known, increasingly, worldwide, for his proposals for reform of the presently collapsing international monetary system. More recently, he has become extremely controversial, because of his campaign against the drug-traffic and international narco-terrorism, and his 1982-83 campaign for what is now known as the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. He is the founder of an international news service, which has been described by officials of several governments as one of the world's best private intelligence organizations.

He is at the top of the list of public figures hated by the terrorists and the drug-lobby. He is also near the top of the list of international figures repeatedly denounced by leading Soviet officials and publications.

The statement by the candidate which we publish here, was issued on Feb. 17 both to U.S. citizens in Europe, and as information for European friends of the United States.

From day to day, it is the business of the President, to preside over the ordering of our internal affairs: to promote the general welfare and the common defense, and to secure the rights affirmed by our Declaration of Independence, to all persons, citizens and others, who reside among us. Yet, as President Charles de Gaulle affirmed for France, nations lack the moral fitness to endure, unless they adopt some national purpose, some special contribution which they must render to the benefit of present and future generations of mankind.

The higher purpose of the United States' existence is simply defined, as Secretary of State John Quincy Adams defined it, in his arguments for the unilateral adoption of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine. Our constitutional republic had no imperial goals, no desire to subjugate other nations. Our national purpose is to be a servant of the spread of the principles of moral law affirmed in our Declaration of Independence, the principles of Judeo-Christian humanism earlier affirmed by the Golden Renaissance. The fundamental principle of our foreign policy, our strategy, is our commitment to fostering of such republics, and to establishing a strong and durable community of principle among all such republics.

Our great failures in foreign policy and strategy, must be attributed, in very large degree, to the fact that our schools and our popular culture today, cause the majority of our citizens to be utterly ignorant of the true history of Europe and the Americas, and ignorant of the principles upon which our republic was founded. The resulting moral and intellectual mediocrity has corrupted our government, our political parties, and popular opinion. It is this disease of mediocrity, which leads us to destroy the economic and strategic resources of both our own nation and our allies, in face of the increasing threat represented by the Soviet empire.

The next President must act to eliminate such mediocrity from our government. He must act according to the principles embodied in the design of that Constitution he is sworn to serve. By word, and by example of practice, he must mobilize the citizens to educate themselves in forgotten principles of truth and justice. In matters of partnership with Europe and the other nations of the Americas, he must imagine that the eyes of Lafayette are upon him.

The most crucial test, which measures how well the United States and Europe serve our great tradition, is our policy toward the so-called "developing nations." The patriots of these nations desire nothing different from the principles of our Declaration of Independence. We must reverse the wicked betrayal of our tradition, which Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson represent. We must promote the economic strengthening and security of these nations as truly sovereign republics. We must form the strong bonds of a community of principle with them. We, and Western Europe, must understand that the strength and security of such a community of principle, in the Americas, in Africa, and in Asia, is an

essential part of our own strategic strength in depth. This community must become so strong, that no adversary on earth could dare to endanger any part of it.

The effect of such an improvement in our foreign and strategic policy, is to increase greatly the export of capital goods from the United States, Europe, and Japan. Without such a flow of capital goods, the increased misery of developing nations would be assured. Without such expanded export markets, the economies of Western Europe and Japan are threatened.

As an economist, I am aware, as most influential circles in the United States are presently ignorant of this fact, that "trade wars" among the United States, Western Europe, and Japan, are both unnecessary and wickedly absurd. With a rational approach to fostering a mutually advantageous division of labor among us, and providing a flow of capital goods to nations which desperately need such goods, the export markets of the OECD nations will soon greatly exceed our potential to produce.

The economy of Japan, and the economies of Western Europe, are so structured, that a large percentile of their productive capacity must be devoted to production for export. It is the vital strategic interest of the United States to assist this. If they are denied such markets, their economies are ruined, with all the results that such ruin implies. If we understand economics competently, it is also in our economic interest to assist in expanding export markets for these friends.

The exports from industrialized, into developing nations, must be based on three elements of trade: basic economic infrastructure, certain agricultural products, and capital goods. The dumping of households' goods and labor-intensive services, into developing nations, is a foolish practice. If these nations are to be able to pay for growing volumes of imports, they must increase the per-capita and per-hectare productivity of agriculture, and must increase employment, and increase the productivity of labor in infrastructure-building and industrial production. There can be no significant increase of productive investment, without large-scale building of infrastructure. There can be no significant improvement in output, without a balanced and adequate diet, and improved longevity. It is the improved technologies transferred as capital goods, which enables labor to become increasingly productive.

We of the OECD nations, must expand our capital-goods production. We must reverse the directed collapse of agriculture in North America and Europe. We must greatly expand the employment of scientists and other technologists, in generating new technologies to be built into improved capital goods. We must cooperate with one another in promoting these policies.

To organize these flows of expanded trade, we must reform the presently bankrupt International Monetary Fund. We must reestablish a system of stable parities of currencies among exporting and importing nations. We must provide

credit for world trade and productive investment at low interest rates. We must put our industrial unemployed and idled productive capacities back to work.

We must promote a general revival of cultural optimism, by promoting renewed technological optimism. Every nation, and every person, must be given a justified confidence in a better future. By aid of such changes in policy, the United States must return to being a temple of liberty and beacon of hope, for all mankind.

## 2) The nature of the Soviet menace

For approximately 25 five years, the military posture of the Western Alliance, has been dominated by wishful thinking, concerning the motives, war planning, and capabilities of the Soviet empire. The central, although not exclusive feature of our wishful thinking, has been our delusion that the Soviet command intended to play indefinitely by the rules of "nuclear deterrence" and "détente."

Since no later than 1962, Soviet long-range military policy has been based upon the principles elaborated in Soviet Marshal V. D. Sokolovskii's *Military Strategy*. He argued, that the Soviet empire could launch and win a total thermonuclear war, with losses acceptable to the Soviet command, on the condition that Soviet strategic superiority included an effective form of strategic defense against ballistic missiles. He recognized that so-called "kinetic" weapons were not an acceptable form of strategic defense over the period ahead. He insisted, quite accurately, that strategic defense must be based on advanced physics principles, including laser-weapons. Since 1962, Soviet policy has been to delay war until the Soviet forces had both overwhelming superiority for the offense, and also had deployed an effective form of strategic defense.

It was for this reason, that Moscow and its Western fellow travelers have protested so violently, and with such absurd arguments, against the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. Moscow is preparing to deploy a massive strategic defense, sometime during the next two or three years ahead. However, if the Western Alliance also has a strategic defense, Moscow would have to scrap its war-plans for a "first strike" attack against Western Europe and the United States, simultaneously. That is Moscow's real objection to the SDI, all its other arguments are simply lying propaganda.

There are three conditions under which Moscow would launch general thermonuclear war:

- 1) If the Soviet empire were directly attacked;
- 2) If Moscow believed the United States were about to launch a "first strike";
- 3) If Moscow had both a "first strike" superiority, plus an effective strategic defense.

Otherwise, Moscow would prefer to wait, to "buy time" with lying promises of "détente" and "arms reduction."

Once Moscow had reached the level of strategic superiority required by the current "Ogarkov-Andropov Doctrine,"

Moscow would launch thermonuclear attacks on the United States and Western Europe, simultaneously, unless one of the following alternative conditions existed:

- 1) That the West had a strategic defense;
- 2) That the United States conceded to Soviet demands, under nuclear blackmail;
- 3) That Western Europe and Japan were in the process of falling peacefully into the Soviet sphere of influence.

Under certain special conditions, Moscow might launch a limited military operation, such as a limited attack on Europe's northern or southern flank. It would do so only if Soviet intelligence were assured that the West's reaction would be "crisis-management bargaining," rather than a full-scale counterattack. Otherwise, Moscow would never launch either a general "conventional" assault against Europe, or fight a "limited nuclear war" in the European theater.

Any general Soviet attack against Europe, would be part of a simultaneous, full-scale, "first strike" attack against the United States. Soviet war-winning potential depends upon either pinning-down, or destroying a major portion of the Western Alliance's missile-capabilities, before those Allies' missiles could be launched. Unless the Soviet Union were coming under attack from the West, Moscow would not voluntarily launch a "first strike," unless it had a credible strategic defense.

Although Moscow hopes to achieve world domination gradually and without general war, it believes it cannot win peacefully unless it has the capability for successfully launching and winning a general thermonuclear war. Under Party Secretary Mikhail Gorbachov, the Soviet empire is presently engaged in the full-scale pre-war mobilization specified by the war-plan of Soviet Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov. According to the Ogarkov Doctrine, once the present Soviet pre-war mobilization has reached its peak, Moscow must either bluff the West into surrendering peacefully, or launch full-scale war. The best estimate, therefore, is that the hour of decision is about three years or perhaps slightly more, ahead. We may have that much time to decide, whether or not Western Europe's farms and factories are going to become slave-labor for the Soviet economy. We have that much time, to make the policy-changes needed, to cause Moscow to change its ambitious plans.

From the standpoint of military science, the arguments of Soviet planners such as Marshals Sokolovskii and Ogarkov are sound strategic doctrine, and the doctrines of "nuclear deterrence" and "flexible response," become suicidal doctrines as soon as a superpower has developed the kind of strategic superiority proposed in the Sokolovskii doctrine.

It is not impossible to avoid the alternatives of either thermonuclear war or surrender. Two sets of facts must be studied to find the solution: military principles, and the psychology of the Russian empire's rulers. The SDI is the key to the military part of the solution. Getting rid of the nonsense about Russia we read in most of the news media, is the key

to the other part of the solution.

During the recent two years, approximately, networks of Soviet agents planted inside so-called "right-wing" circles in the United States, Western Europe, and Israel, have been spreading Soviet-manufactured disinformation, alleging that the Soviet empire is either already "crumbling," or is about to begin "crumbling." There are three supposed "facts" used to dupe credulous dupes into swallowing this disinformation.

It is reported that the Soviet economy is collapsing. There are no facts to justify this, but the agents spreading this line are rather clever. In place of economic facts, they appeal to the ideology of the British Fabian Society's Friedrich von Hayek. They argue that, since the Soviet economy is "Marxist," it is automatically unable to compete with "free enterprise" economy. The "true believers" in Hayek and Milton Friedman nod their heads, and say, "Yes, of course, the Soviet economy must be crumbling."

It is true, that if the economies of the United States and Western Europe were still operating under the policies of Adenauer, de Gaulle, and President Kennedy, the Soviet empire could never have acquired the strategic superiority it has gained since SALT I. However, since Adenauer's and de Gaulle's so-called "dirigist" policies were scrapped, during the middle to late 1960s, the West has adopted the "Greens'" neo-Malthusian policy of "post-industrial society." Since 1970-1972, the industrial economies of Western Europe and North America, have been contracting at an accelerating rate, while the Soviet economy has sustained a slow rate of net economic growth in per-capita physical output-rates. This has permitted Moscow to overtake the West, and to gain a growing absolute superiority in strategic capabilities.

The weakness of the Soviet economy, is the Russian population's cultural inferiority to the Augustinian culture of Western civilization. Excepting the almost useless "Greens," and rock-drug counterculture victims, Western civilization produces an individual of superior power for rapid and efficient assimilation of scientific and technological progress. Excepting a stratum of Russian scientists, who are approximately as qualified as the average in the West, the Russians have a Middle Eastern variety of "traditionalist" culture, which resists technological progress. Hence, the average Russian farmer or industrial operative is vastly inferior culturally to the skilled or semi-skilled operative of Western Europe or the Americas. Russian culture was based on a "collectivist" ideology a thousand years before Karl Marx was born. Until Russia changes its culture, as Leibniz attempted to show Peter the Great how to accomplish that, Russian culture is inferior to that of Western civilization. Therefore, unless we are behaving like idiots in our economic policy, as we have done for about 20 years, Western Europe and the Americas will easily outproduce the Russians.

Unfortunately, the prophets of the "crumbling Soviet economy" are simply reciting wild fairy-tales.

The second proof the Soviet agents offer, to prove that

Moscow is almost harmless, is the massive upsurge in membership of the Russian Orthodox Church. They argue, since Leninism is atheistic, the rise of religion in Russia means an early threat to the Soviet dictatorship.

The third proof these Soviet agents offer, is the report of the rise of a "Russian Party" inside the Soviet military. The reported emergence of a "Russian Party," is factually true, by itself. But, the argument that this is a threat to the Soviet dictatorship, is a wild falsehood.

The fact is, Russia has not changed essentially, in character, since Czar Ivan the Terrible. Reformers such as Czar Peter the Great and Alexander II, were exceptions. Russia is, and was, the Russia of the Russian soul described by Fyodor Dostoevsky. Once certain temporary features of the Bolsheviks were sorted out, over the 1920s and 1930s, Stalin transformed the Bolshevik Party into a new Russian imperial dynasty, and became himself a kind of reincarnation of Ivan the Terrible. The Soviet empire of today, is old Russia under a new, Soviet dynasty.

The present rise of the Russian church is a continuation of Stalin's 1943-53 alliance with the Church's hierarchy. As Stalin understood, it is impossible to mobilize the Russian population for general war without appealing to Russian "blood and soil" mysticism. The new power of the Russian Church is to be seen as a deliberate measure of war-mobilization by the neo-Stalinists presently in power around Gorbachov and Ogarkov.

The significance of the "Russian Party," is that since the middle to late 1960s, Russia has moved away from Marxism toward Russian traditionalism. The Soviet empire of today, is the Russian empire of which Ivan the Terrible dreamed, the Russia of Alexander I in 1815, and of Rasputin, this time well organized, with the most modern military technology.

Foolish Western counterintelligence services, have spent too much time screening emigrants from the East for Marxist ideology, when they should have been searching for KGB agents whose ideology is that of Fyodor Dostoevsky. Naturally, the Russian exiles who spread the "crumbling empire" fairy-tales, are each and all saturated with Dostoevskyan ideology!

The Russian military mind is fanatically arithmetic. Everything is calculated in detail, in advance, including the number of artillery shells to be fired at each target. The motives of the Soviet rulers are fanatically irrationalist, filled with wild, romantic mysticism. It is a waste of time to search for rational morality in a Russian; he is a fanatically irrational mystic. He is responsive to one kind of influence: his perceptions of who is more powerful, and who is weaker. To deter him from war, present him with arithmetic proof that we are superior, and the mystic in him will postpone the war for a generation or two. Perhaps, with a generation or two of proving to him that Russian culture is inferior to Western civilization's, he might decide to become civilized himself. In the history of Russia, it was only a deep sense of Russia's

cultural inferiority to Western civilization which has inspired Russians to try to imitate Western civilization.

### 3) The Strategic Defense Initiative

Although political pressures have forced the U.S. government to waste a large part of precious SDI funds on Lt.-General Daniel P. Graham's unworkable "High Frontier," the use of so-called "kinetic" anti-missile weapons, such as high-speed rockets, is a worse than useless approach to strategic defense. It would cost the West perhaps three times more to deploy "High Frontier" than it would cost Moscow to defeat such a system, and, the Soviets already have the technology to blow Graham's "High Frontier" system out of orbit moments before the Soviet strategic missile launch. Soviet Marshal V. D. Sokolovskii already understood this fact when Daniel Graham was faking reports on North Vietnam strength during the period of the Tet Offensive.

Depressed-trajectory attacking missiles, of the type which would be used against Western Europe, fly at about Mach 4, while IBCMS fly at about 5 kilometers per second. At the very best, high-speed interceptor-rockets fly only a few times faster than ICBMs, with a maximum range of about 500 kilometers, and a much shorter range for reasonable accuracy. The number of pieces of junk flying in the mid-range course of ICBMs, from 30,000 to perhaps as much as 100,000, means that "High Frontier" is useless for the mid-course interception of Soviet warheads. They might work, to intercept Soviet missiles in the boost phase, except that the Soviets could easily shoot up Graham's low-orbiting platforms before the launch occurred. They are useful only for ground-based, last-resort, point-defense.

The real SDI, is based on lasers and other applications of advanced physics technology. These weapons fire at either the speed of light, or relativistic velocities. When the Soviet attacking systems would have about a 3-to-1 or greater advantage over "High Frontier," true-SDI systems have about a 10-to-1 advantage over the thermonuclear offense.

Suppose the Western Alliance had the combination of a true-SDI system of strategic defense, plus neutron bomb defense against Soviet fleets, aircraft, and ground assault. From the Soviet planners' standpoint, it would be suicidal to launch an attack against the West. Most Soviet missiles would be destroyed, and the rest of the Soviet assault would never break through into the Federal Republic of Germany. The probable result would be the military defeat of the Soviet empire. Unless we threatened to start the war, the Soviets would take their war-plans back to the drafting-table, and try to work out something for a generation or two in the future: two generations for us to convince them to become civilized.

### 4) Germany and France

The United States' military forces won World War II, but the Anglo-American diplomats made a mess of the peace. The diplomats lost the peace in Asia, by recolonizing Indo-

China and Indonesia. The diplomats prepared the ground for the threat of World War III, by the Yalta agreements, which included the carving of Germany into two parts, as they sought disaster by carving up Korea.

As prospective President of the United States, I despise the division of Germany, as one of the greatest pieces of diplomatic lunacy in modern history. The worst part of that blunder, is that this mistake is not easily undone. Nevertheless, it is impossible to create a competent U.S. foreign policy toward Europe, without examining the nature of the errors to which the United States was party at Yalta.

The essential strategic fact of Europe, is the historical fact, that the division of Europe, between East and West, is the westernmost line of conversion of Europeans to Western Christianity. We may, and we do, wish the people of Eastern Europe well, because they are human beings, for whom we care, but to turn Poland, Eastern Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary over to Soviet domination, was a great piece of strategic lunacy, for which we—including the Poles—are suffering greatly today.

Germany, as the repository of German classical and scientific culture, is one of the great bastions of Western civilization. Once Germany was rid of a Hitler more Dostoevsky than German, a sound strategic policy for the peace, was to create the circumstances under which the German classical culture of the Great Elector, Leibniz, Schiller, vom Stein, Humboldt, and Gauss, could take over Germany fully. That doctrine ought to be the premise for shaping U.S. policy toward the two Germanies today.

No clear short-term possibility for the unification of Germany presently exists, unless the Federal Republic were to accept Soviet terms for being gobbled up as part of the Soviet puppet-state, the German Democratic Republic, all working very hard, and very cheaply for the greater profit and glory of the Soviet dynasty in Moscow. Presently, the Soviets would never consent peacefully to the unification of Germany: They merely promise the prospect of something they never intend to deliver; they dangle false promises, as the fisherman dangles false lures to the fish he intends to have in his frying-pan.

Yet, the United States must premise its foreign policy on the same principles it should have offered to a unified post-war Germany.

The building of the economy of continental Europe, and European defense, depends upon the principled features of the de Gaulle-Adenauer cooperation. Around the economic and strategic cooperation of France and Germany, the next phases of advancement of a European community must be developed: Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, the Benelux nations, Scandinavia, and Britain, must dovetail with the France-Federal Republic cooperation as the hub. This is not a matter of some arbitrary choices of U.S. foreign policy; it is an economic, strategic, and cultural fact of life, a fact which must mold the thinking of a qualified American President.